## 1AC

### Lightning McQueen

#### January 28th, 1986. 11:38 AM.

#### T minus 3 … 2 … 1 … We have liftoff!

#### *Challenger* is a go.

Howell, E. (2019, May 1) | Challenger: The shuttle disaster that changed NASA. Space.com. | <https://www.space.com/18084-space-shuttle-challenger.html>, Agastya

#### 11:39 AM – a booster engine tears apart and Challenger explodes mid-air. Welcome to the original accident.

**Featherstone 1** – Speed and violence: Sacrifice in virilio, Derrida, and Girard - Anthropoetics VI, no. 2 fall 2000/ Winter 2001. Anthropoetics. (2018, September 17). Retrieved December 1, 2021, from <http://anthropoetics.ucla.edu/ap0602/virilio>, Agastya

Paul Virilio’s theory of the accident suggests that when one creates **technology one also engineers the faults and mistakes that plague the machine**. Virilio shows how technology and the accident are caught in a dynamic relationship, akin to Descartes’ (O’Neill, 2000) manic quest to exorcise doubt; the **more complex** the technology one develops the **more evasive** the faults that cause the machine to malfunction become. Thus, the invention of new technology represents the attempt to order the disorder of the system and drive out the chaotic influence of the accident. Regarding this technology / accident economy, Virilio writes: The accident is an inverted miracle, a secular miracle, a revelation. When you invent the ship, you also invent the shipwreck; **when you invent the plane you also invent the plane crash**; and when you invent electricity, you invent electrocution…**Every technology carries its own negativity**, which is invented at the same time as **technical progress** (1999: 89). Here, Virilio’s attempt to see technology as totality explains the idea of the accident as negative invention. Later in the same interview, Politics of the Very Worst, he expands his position in order to show how **the machine combats error through technological innovation**: …the development of technologies can only happen through the analysis and surpassing of these accidents. When the European railroads were introduced, the traffic was poorly regulated and accidents multiplied. The railroad engineers convened in Brussels in 1880 and invented the famous block system. It was a way to effectively regulate traffic so as to avoid the devastating effects of progress, train wrecks. The sinking of the Titanic is a similar example. After this tragedy, SOS was developed, a way of calling for help by radio. The explosion of the **Challenger space shuttle is a considerable event that reveals the original accident of the engine** in the same way as the shipwreck of the first ocean liner (1999: 89). Virilio’s reference to the Challenger space shuttle as the “original accident of the engine” allows one to understand the moment of the machine’s error from a theoretical point of view. It shows how **the radical over-determination of the mechanical structure is represented by the accidental event and invites us to see how the crash is constitutive of the violent expenditure of an excessive “supplement,” that the crash occurs because the machine has been designed to work at speeds that leave absolutely no room for error**. Thus Virilio explains how the excessive pace of progressive technology is limited by the faults the accident exposes. The essential function of the destructive event is to consume the excessive energy of the superabundant machine and prolong the productivity of the technological model. According to this realization it is clear that the destructive accident is also the source of the machine’s renewal; its destructive consumption allows for the endless re-invention of the ordered system. At the synchronic level, we can see how Virilio’s theory of technological progress is located within a contextual framework. It is apparent that there is always a technical structure available for the exploration of the accidental event. However, beyond this analysis of the dynamic technology / accident bind, a theory that can be compared to Bataille’s (1991) thesis of excess and consumption, the narrativity of Virilio’s account appears to follow Derrida’s theory of différance into the groundless sphere of textuality. Put another way, because Virilio’s reasoning suggests that each technological form emerges from the noise and chaos of the accident, while every accident issues from the excessive pace of technology, one seems unable to derive any originary, causal understanding from Virilio’s text. For instance, in the Challenger example, Virilio’s theory implies that the invention of the space shuttle was provoked by the failure of some earlier form of space technology, while its crash led to the invention of later, **more complex, designs** aimed at driving out the errors that led the space shuttle to malfunction. Although this analysis of the Challenger episode grounds the thesis of the accident at the synchronic level, it is difficult to locate any foundational crash or invention at the level of diachronic analysis. In other words, the temptation is to suggest that Virilio fails to excavate the “originary event”: did technology predate the accident or should we see the accident as the disordered chaos that provoked the invention of the ordered machine?

#### 33 years later – SpaceX plans a static test for its *Super Draco Engine*. However, a leaky propellant valve causes the capsule to burst into flames – two decades of technological investment erased.

Futurism. (2020, January 21) | Watch a spacex rocket explode in mid-flight. Futurism. | <https://futurism.com/the-byte/spacex-rocket-explode-mid-flight>, Agastya

#### Modernity is marked by the politics of speed – founded by the accelerationist drive towards techno-rationalism. Speed shapes subjectivity – deliberative schemas and cultural vivacity are rendered obsolete through the striation of time.

**Ebert 13** – John David Ebert, 2013, “Dromology” in “The Virilio Dictionary” edited by John Armitage, pg 69-71

From the Greek word dromos for ‘race’ or ‘racetrack’, dromology is a science invented by Virilio for the study of speed and its impacts upon human cultural and technological systems**.** **Speed**, according to Virilio, **exerts** a number of **transformative effects upon human culture, sometimes in very subtle ways, such as, for instance, the phenomenon of the gradual enclosure of the human individual inside the automobile** as it moves ever faster, first with goggles, then with the windscreen and finally the complete enclosure of the body within the sedan. Indeed, for Virilio**, speed is the decisive factor in human technological evolution.** In Negative Horizon(2005a [1984]), he surveys the course of technological development, noting that **there has been a gradual increase in speed throughout history, beginning with woman as the first pack animal to the mounted horse to the chariot and the road, and then onward to the automobile and the aeroplane.** He points out that in the nineteenth century, a transportation revolution occurred which developed from the railroad to the automobile to the aeroplane, **and that these technologies of relative speed tended to support industrial democracy. The absolute speed achieved by the communications revolution**, on the other hand, with the advent of electromagnetic technologies such as the telegraph, telephone, radio and TV **tended to abolish the necessity for human physical movement and to reverse into the stasis of inertia of human individuals in their homes surrounded by the gadgets** of their smart houses that provide so many services for them that they no longer have any need even to leave the house**.** Virilio often points out the paradox of stasis resulting from the gradual increase in speed, as in the case of Howard Hughes, whom he discusses primarily in The Aesthetics of Disappearance(2009a [1980]), who spent the first half of his life rushing about the planet in his aeroplanes, only to end, in the second half, isolating himself in his hotel room from which he rarely ventured forth at all. The effects of the transport revolution on military technologies, Virilio insists, have led to the gradual disappearance of the geostrategic battlefield, so that the front is no longer to be found at the boundary of the territory, but wherever the vectors of mechanised transport are found. Where the mechanised vehicles are, there we find the state, for the country has today disappeared in the non- place of the state of emergency in which territorial space vanishes and only time remains. Whereas **in conventional warfare we could still talk about manoeuvres of armies in the field, today there is no field**, since the speed of reaction time is so fast and the invasion of the instant now succeeds the invasion of the territory. The countdown becomes the scene of battle now. Reaction time and the time for political decision are reduced to nothing by nuclear deliverance. Today, speed is war. In Speed and Politics: An Essay on Dromology(2006 [1977]), where Virilio first developed the idea of dromology, he points out that the reason the West was able, through colonial genocide and ethnocide, to conquer other populations was because of its speed. It moved faster than these other societies because of its ever- increasing mastery first of the sea, then the rail, then the sky, etc. In Negative Horizon, he insists, furthermore, that because the Spaniards had the horse and the Maya had no pack animals other than women, this gave the Spaniards a dromocratic superiority which allowed them to conquer the Maya simply by their ability to manoeuvre much more quickly. In Speed and Politics, he also points out how the increase in military speed has given preference to movement itself over the strategics of place, which has led to the disappearance of places themselves in what he calls ‘vehicular extermination’. The strike power of the navy in the 1940s, for instance, in which power was spoken of in knotsgave way in the 1960s to machswith the advent of jet power. Geographic localisation has therefore given way to the speed of the moving body and the undetectability of its path. Furthermore, according to Virilio, it matters little whether what is sped up is information or physical objects, since in both cases it is the message of movement itself that is at issue. Acceleration, moreover, tends to produce accidents, since the faster a technology moves, the greater the likelihood that a crash of some sort will result. Dromological speed- up has affected both the realms of transport and of human data communications equally, for after the crashes attending the speed- up of rail and maritime dromoeconomics 71 accelerations comes the crashes of planes and cars, while after them, in turn, come the electromagnetic wave trains with their mediatic crashes of video and radio signals, in which news functions as what Virilio calls The **Information Bomb**(2000d [1998]). Dromology is also tied in with Virilio’s concept of the aesthetics of disappearance, since excess speed tends to correspond to a loss of **information content**. With the speed- up of war, as we have seen, the geostrategic front disappears, while the soldier himself disappears with camouflage. With the stealth bomber, the speed- up in flight has resulted in the actual disappearance into invisibility of the aeroplane offthe radar screen. The increasing speed of the automobile leads, via the phenomenon of dromoscopy, to the impoverishment of the information content of its immediate milieu, which speeds past the observer and tends to take on a certain flatness in the process. Cities, too, are disappearing with mobile architecture and the rapidity of demolition of buildings that are not built to last for more than a dozen or so years. The speed- up in media, in addition, has led to the disappearance of deferred time, a kind of mental space in which thought could move about slowly enough to reflect upon the significance of events, into the advent of real time, in which **events take place so fast that the mind cannot keep up** with them, and written media, correspondingly, suffer a diminishment of information content.

#### With technological accumulation comes the accident – inevitable failure fueled by imperatives of progress.

**Crogan 99** – Patrick Crogan. “The Tendency, the Accident, and the Untimely: Paul Virilio’s Engagement with the Future,” Paul Virilio: From Modernism to Hypermodernism and Beyond, ed. John Armitage. Article from Theory, Culture & Society, 1999. Google Books, pp. 171-173, Agastya

Virilio recasts the relation between what is considered essential and what peripheral to technological ‘advance’ by punning on the buried relationship between the classical, philosophical notion of accident as an ‘inessential’ attribute or quality of a thing and the everyday sense of the term accident as an unexpected mishap. In doing so Virilio proposes not just to remove the censorship of positivism by acknowledging the ‘specific accident’ of a given technology. Instead he calls for a rethinking of technological development so as to address the substance/accident ‘inversion’ through which **the accident is not only a regrettable contingency but** becomes something ‘every technology produces, provokes, programs’. This is why war and military developments are so crucial for Virilio. ‘What are war machines?’, Virilio asks in an interview with Chris Dercon: ‘They are machines in reverse—they produce accidents’ (Dercon, 1986:36). This explains to a significant extent Virilio’s focus on theorizing war as a central aspect of modernity. War not only provides a major impetus for the development of new technologies of speed—it is, he says in the same text, the ‘laboratory of modernity’ (1986:36). The war machine, in its reversal of the commonsense notion that machinery is essentially productive, promotes this ‘negative side of technology’ which Virilio argues is a central aspect of all technologies. This negative side, he says in another interview (with Florian Rotzer), is always there, doubling the side of ‘productive reason’ (Rotzer, 1995: 100). In privileging the accident over the substance Virilio sees himself as a theorist of this hidden negativity, correcting, he says, the Western metaphysical tradition’s denial of ‘military intelligence’: ‘When Aristotle says there is no science of the accidental, he puts into motion the process of denying the negative’ (1995: 100). Virilio provides further insight into his privileging of the accident in ‘La Musee de l’accident’ (in Virilio, 1996). Taking the occasion of the opening of a museum of technology at the Parc de la Villette in Paris, he repeats his assertion of the ‘symmetry between the substance and the accident’ and speculates on the need for and the possible design of a ‘museum of accidents’ to counter the positivism of conventional museological practices (1996: 110). Describing the approach of such a museum as ‘postpositivist’, he argues that its goal—to ‘expose the accident’—would be to ‘expose the unlikely, the unusual yet inevitable’ (1996: 112). This would serve to expose to ‘us’ ‘that to which we are habitually exposed’ as a form of protection from it. To achieve this ‘preventative perspective’ **the museum would need to comprehend the accident as: “…no longer [identify] simply with its deadly consequences, its actual results: ruins and scattered debris, but also with a dynamic and energetic process, a kinetic and cinematic sequence not bound to the relics of all kinds of destroyed objects and rubble.”** (1996: 114) This ‘kinetic and cinematic sequence’ is the inverse of the positivist conception of the dynamic process of historical progress**. It is the double of progress in that it borrows the ‘progressive’ assumptions of linear temporality and teleological inevitability**, as well as the notion that a visible image of the movement of progress is discernible across the passage of time. The revealing of this sequence that Virilio identifies with the accident would challenge the habitual understanding of the connection between historical and technical developments by ‘showing the advent of something in what seems to happen unexpectedly’ (1996: 115). What Virilio’s ‘meta-museography’ of the imaginary museum of accidents to is a characterization, in a typically rapid, evocative form, of his theoretical project. The kinetic sequence of the unexpected that doubles the narrative of historical/technological progress is another description, I would suggest, of the tendency. As seen in the relation between the ‘technical surprise’ of the First World War and the logistical tendency toward pure war, the accident plays a central role in the ‘vector-ization’ of the tendential sequence. Indeed, it is the ‘substance’ of the tendency’s change of level, the motor of its unexpected detouring of the rational course of progress. Virilio’s writing attempts to sketch out the tendency through a description of the accidents of technological (post)modernity. These descriptions are in effect critical reinscriptions of these adventitious yet somehow constitutive mishaps of techno-science. The tendency is, therefore, accidental—it arises and gains momentum in and through these unforeseen detours of techno-scientific ‘advances’ in civilization. But these unexpected events are, paradoxically, ‘substantial’; they link up to form the dynamic sequence that perturbs the march of forward progress by doubling and disfiguring its teleology. The tendency is made up of these enigmatic accidents that Virilio says ‘every technology produces, provokes, programs’.

#### Private appropriation is driven by the lust for technological expansion – conquering space turns it into yet another battleground to flaunt progress.

Kroker 4 – Arthur, 2004. “The Will to Technology and the Culture of Nihilism: Heidegger, Nietzsche, and Marx.”, pat recut Agastya

With this, the age of Artificial War has begun. In its manifesto for the future of cyber-war, Vision 2020, the newly created United States Space Command theorizes a future battlefield of "full spectrum dominance." Abandoning the earth-bound dimensions of land, sea air, USSPACECOM projects a new era of artificial war in which the battlefield occurs in the "4th dimension" of space. Befitting a "space-faring nation" such as the United States, third-dimensional warfare is surpassed by a vision of future war in which "battle managers" are, in essence, computerized editing systems running on automatic, absorbing fluctuating data fields concerning attacks and responses, monitoring satellite transmissions from 20,000 miles in deep space, sequencing missile launches, integrating "dominant maneuvers" in space with "precision engagement" on the ground, sea and air, providing "full-dimensional protection" to "core national assets" and focusing logistics" for a virtual battlefield that stretches into an indefinite future. As USSPACECOM theorizes: the control of the seas in defense of commercial economic interests and the war of the western lands in defense of the expansion of the American empire to the shores of California has now migrated to a war for the "control of space" befitting a "space-faring nation" like the United States, this spearhead of technology. Consequently, a future of artificial warfare in which space itself is weaponized. 4th Dimensional warfare is the technical language by which the American empire now projects itself into a future of Artificial War: a 4th Dimensional rhetoric of "global engagement," "full-force integration," "global partnerships," weaponized space stations, tracking satellites, reusable missile launchers, and on-line, real-time remotely controlled anti-missile systems. I emphasize this story because it is revelatory of the meaning of the will to technology. Here, technology is not only the chosen aim of technological instrumentality (weaponizing space), but also involves technologies of mythology (the well-rehearsed story of the unfolding American frontier where wagon trains evolve into Predator Drones, and sea-faring navies migrate into space-bound automated battlefield manager systems), technologies of thinking (the fourfold "tactics" of space war: dominant maneuver, precision engagement, full-dimensional protection, focused logistics), and technologies of (aggressive) judgment ("multinational corporations" are also listed in Vision 2020 as potential 'enemies' of USSPACECOM). More than futurist military doctrine for the 21st century, Vision 2020 represents the essence of the will to technology. Here, technology is both a space-faring means to the successful prosecution of artificial warfare and its sustaining ethical justification. The will to technology folds back on itself--a closed and self-validating universe of thinking, willing, judging, and destining--that brooks no earthly opposition because it is a will, and nothing else. As Nietzsche reflected in advance: "it is a will to nothingness." Or, as Hannah Arendt eloquently argues in her last book, The Life of the Mind, "the famous power of negation inherent in the Will and conceived as the motor of history (not only in Marx but also, by implication, already in Hegel) is an annihilating force that could just as well result in a process of annihilation as of Infinite Progress." Could it be that the world-historical movement captured by the military logic of Vision 2020-- this command vision of America as the historical spearhead of the will to technology-- represents that which is probably unthinkable but consequently very plausible, a contemporary expression of the metaphysics of "not-being?" If "permanent annihilation" is the sustaining (military) creed of Vision 2020, then this also indicates that the world-historical movement, which it so powerfully strategizes, is driven onwards by the seduction of negation, another suicide note on the way to the weaponizing of space. Consequently, if the American novelist, Don DeLillo, can write so eloquently in his recent essay, "In the Ruins of the Future," that '(T)echnology is our fate, our truth" this also implies that in linking its fate with the "truth of technology," the United States, and by implication the culture of globalization, may have, however inadvertently, infected its deepest political logic with the will to nihilism. In the sometimes utopian, always militaristic, language of technological experimentalism, "Not-being" finally becomes a world historical project. Those who are only passive bystanders to the unfolding destiny of the contemporary American descendents of the Puritan founders can only look on with amazement coupled with distress as the "American project" embraces not only the weaponizing of space but also genetic experimentation with the question of evolution itself. While DeLillo goes on to say that (technology) "is what we mean when we call ourselves a superpower," his pragmatism sells short the point he really wants to make: namely, that by linking its fate, its truth, with the question of technology the United States has also enduringly enucleated itself within the larger historical, indeed if USSPACECOM is to be believed, post-historical, project of technology. Enucleated not as something other than the technological destiny which is its profession of faith, of truth, but enucleated in the more classical sense of the term, of being somehow interior to the unfolding destiny of the will to technology. The larger cultural consequence of this bold act of willing remains deeply enigmatic. In this case, is the will to technology an intensification of the pragmatic spirit upon which the American experiment was founded? Or has the will to technology, at the very moment of its historical self-realization, already reversed its course, becoming its own negation: Arendt's prophecy of "not-being" as a "process of annihilation." On the ultimate resolution of this question depends the American fate, the American truth, as the spearhead of technology. On the public evidence, what makes the American project truly distinct today is its enthusiastic abandonment of the pragmatic will for the uncharted metaphysical territory of "not-being." The will to the conquest of empty spatialization and the vivisectioning of the code of life itself has about it the negative energy of suicidal nihilism. Here, the language of "not-being"--the desiccating logic of what Heidegger memorably termed, "Nothingness nothings" as the historical form of the technological project of "permanent annihilation" --expresses itself vividly in two master commands: Space Command and Genetic Command. The first operates in the language of weaponized astrophysics where the curvature of space is manipulated for strategic purposes, and the other sequences the human genetic code itself. Thus, control of space is inextricably linked with control of time. The dynamic will to technology projects itself doubly in the macrophysics of a "space-faring nation" and the microphysics of a body-faring cellular biology. This is a collective demonstration of hubris that Greeks in the classical age would only admire, and then fear, for its (technical) audacity and stunning (metaphysical) innocence. Ironically, at the very instance that USSPACECOM projects an imperialist military future of "full spectrum dominance," 9/11 occurs and we are suddenly time-shifted into the age of viral terrorism. Similar to the incommensurability of technology itself where the reality of "permanent annihilation" is sometimes offset by other ways of thinking technology, the human imagination does not begin, cannot begin, with tactics of 'dominant maneuver' and 'precision engagement' and 'full-dimensional protection' and 'focused logistics' but, with the terrorist side of fluid, earth-bound, real material warfare. Artificial war, then, as a prolegomenon to the codes of technology.

#### The drive to conquer the cosmos is antagonistic with the disabled subject – it necessitates our eradication.

Boucher 18 – Martin [PhD Candidate in Human Studies at Laurentian University. His work is primarily situated in disability studies and posthumanism, but he maintains an interest in the philosophy of social science and the history of ideas.] “Prostheticity, Disability, and Spaceflight”, Jwala

Posthumanist theory is beginning to make a considerable impact on the theoretical foundations of Critical Disability Studies. To a certain extent there has been engagement with cyborg theory in this field for over a decade;1 however, more recently, work influenced by Rosi Braidotti’s The Posthuman has been gaining momentum.2 Given that the goal of this issue of Con Texte is to provide short reflections on posthuman topics, I will not summarize or explore these literatures in great detail. Instead, I will reflect on a question that came to me recently while watching the launch of Falcon Heavy, and will do it from the perspective of this latter stream of posthumanism in disability studies. The question I asked myself was: within the eventual goal—spearheaded by SpaceX and its CEO Elon Musk—of colonizing Mars, how do we interpret the astronaut from a posthuman critical disability perspective? What can we learn from disability about this futurist superhuman event and vice versa?

It seems to be the consensus in the space technology field that future Mars astronauts (or colonists) are already born. As I write this, the Austrian Space Forum (OeWF) is conducting an isolated Mars analogue mission on the Arabian Peninsula (Austrian Space Forum). At least for optimists, interplanetary travel is crossing from science fiction to science proper. Of the plethora of questions this raises, I will limit myself quite narrowly to a reflection on how we might modify our framework of understanding to capture the interaction with technology from both the perspective of the individual with a disability and that of the interplanetary astronaut.

In a sense, this paper has nothing to do with space travel. It is interested in the way we interpret the protagonist of such an adventure. For the transhumanist, technological advancement has endowed the human with the means to surpass himself towards a new and unrecognizable future—epitomized in the cosmo-colonist. The question of disability seems to be at the other extreme of the spectrum. Technology is not enhancement but correction towards the normal range of human limitations. In both cases, the difference is contingent on the acceptance of a foundational humanness with concrete limits. Critical posthumanism and critical posthuman disability studies challenges this foundation. As result, I will conclude that both the astronaut and the individual with a disability are congruent posthuman subjects insofar as a) their differentiation is contingent on a shaky natural-able human category, and b) they share the same originary and reflexive relationship with technology. Exploring this relationship can tell us something about how posthuman subjects may be understood more generally. However, within the limits of this special issue, this paper can only point us in the direction of a complete analysis. I will therefore focus primarily on a few works by Tamar Sharon and Dan Goodley and on the narrow questions of the congruency of the subjects mentioned above and the model of technology that can make sense of this relationship. However, it is important to recognize that exhausting the question posed here would require a much more detailed engagement with the work of these two authors among others.

One undeniable fact is that the astronaut’s survival and success is contingent on their relationship to a whole array of highly sophisticated technological machinery. Furthermore, the interplanetary astronaut depends on a large network of support staff, training infrastructure, political and social human investment, and tremendous economic wealth in order to eventually carry out their mission. The complex technological and human networks that exist to support one individual, on an International Space Station (ISS) spacewalk for example, lead us to think of these individuals as somehow surpassing the natural limits of the human animal. It is this idea of surpassing itself (i.e. going beyond nature) and the what that we are surpassing (i.e. natural human limits) that is at issue. The paradigm of critical posthumanism recognizes that (a) there is no fixed natural ‘human’ and so no natural limits to be surpassed, (b) all beings are interconnected and depend on networks of human, non-human, and inorganic entities—they are never stand alone agents, and (c) the novelty of survival in space, for example, is not a change in kind from other achievements, but a continued expression of the possibilities of life. This does give rise to new subjectivities, but not contradictory ones. Outside of such a posthumanism, the ‘disabled body’ is interpreted as the antithesis of the highly techno-enhanced interplanetary astronaut. They are both new and protean posthuman subjects, but one does not represent the overcoming of the other.

The prevailing idea of the natural human and its fixed limits and abilities has been intrinsically challenged from the critical disability perspective, because that subject—the individual with a disability—was not considered truly ‘human’ to begin with. This population has been subject to dehumanization through a collection of historical events such as freak shows, institutionalization, segregation in education, medical experimentations etc., because they represent the ‘other’ of the able-human and embody a problem to be solved. Prosthetics, surgical/pharmaceutical treatments, rehabilitation programs, service animals, social support workers, and community organizations are examples of technologies and networks that allows individuals living with a disability to attain the theoretical ‘natural ability’ of the human being. Although Critical Disability Studies challenges this latter idea of natural ability, it remains the prevailing interpretation outside of it. Alternatively, “disability has always demanded to be recognized not as lack but possibility”; moreover, we should “be careful not to be seduced by shiny technology when, on a more mundane level, we are already potentially enhancing our humanity through a myriad of inter-relationships” (Goodley, Lawthom, and Runswick-Cole 352). A critical understanding means a re-evaluation of how we interpret those technologies and relationships mentioned above.

#### Reject counter-accounts – theories cannot rely on an external linguistic framework for validation.

**Joyce 1** – Joyce, R. (2001). The Myth of Morality (Cambridge Studies in Philosophy). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511487101

This distinction between what is accepted from within an institution, and “stepping out” of that institution and appraising it from an exterior perspective, is close to Carnap’s distinction between internal and external questions. 15 Certain“linguistic frameworks” (as Carnap calls them) bring with them new terms and ways of talking: accepting the language of “things” licenses making assertions like “The shirt is in the cupboard”; accepting mathematics allows one to say “There is a prime number greater than one hundred”; accepting the language of propositions permits saying “Chicago is large is a true proposition,” etc. Internal to the framework in question, confirming or disconfirming the truth of these propositions is a trivial matter. But traditionallyphilosophers have interested themselves inthe external question –the issue of the adequacy of the framework itself**:** “Do objects exist?”, “Does the world exist?”, “Are there numbers?”, “Are the propositions?”, etc. Carnap’s argument is that theexternalquestion**,** as it has been typically construed,does not make sense. From a perspective that accepts mathematics, the answer to the question “Do numbers exist?” is justtrivially“Yes.”From a perspective which has not accepted mathematics, Carnap thinks, the only sensible way of construing the question is not as a theoretical question, but as a practical one: “Shall I accept the framework of mathematics?”, and this pragmatic question is to be answered by consideration of the efficiency, the fruitfulness, the usefulness,etc., of the adoption. But the (traditional)philosopher’s questions – “But is mathematics true?”, “Are there really numbers?” – are pseudo-questions**.** By turning traditional philosophical questions into practical questions of the form “Shall I adopt...?”, Carnap is offering a noncognitive analysis of metaphysics. Since I am claiming that we can critically inspect morality from an external perspective – that we can ask whether there are any non-institutional reasons accompanying moral injunctions – and that such questioning would not amount to a “Shall we adopt...?” query, Carnap’s position represents a threat. What arguments does Carnap offer to his conclusion? He starts with the example of the “thing language,” which involves reference to objects that exist in time and space.Tostep out of the thing language andask “But does the world exist?” is a mistake, Carnap thinks, because the very notion of “existence” is a term which belongs to the thing language, and can be understood only within that framework, “hence this concept cannot be meaningfully applied to the system itself.” 16 Moving on to the external question “Do numbers exist?” Carnap cannot use the same argument – he cannot say that “existence” is internal to the number language and thus cannot be applied to the system as a whole. Instead he says that philosophers who ask the question do not mean material existence, but have no clear understanding of what other kind of existence might be involved, thus such questions have no cognitive content. It appears that this is the form of argument which he is willing to generalize to all further cases: persons who disputewhether propositions exist, whether properties exist**,** etc., do not know what they are arguing over, thus theyare not arguing over the truth of a proposition, but over the practical value of their respective positions**.** Carnap adds that this is so because there is nothing that both parties would possibly count as evidence that would sway the debate one way or the other.

#### Incessant development within the technological apparatus further a state of permanent conflict – culminating in serial policy failure, arms racing, and extinction.

**Virilio 9** – Paul Virilio, philosopher, urbanist, and cultural theorist, 2009 “The State of Emergency,” The Virilio Reader, p 48-57, Agastya

The ancient inter-city duel, war between nations, the permanent conflict between naval empires and continental powers have all suddenly disappeared, giving way to an unheard-of opposition: the juxtaposition of every locality, all matter. The planetary mass becomes no more than a “critical mass,” a precipitate resulting from the **extreme reduction of contact time,** a fearsome friction of places and elements that only yesterday were still distinct and separated by a buffer of distances, which have suddenly become anachronistic. In The Origin of Continents and Oceans, published in 1915, Alfred Wegener writes that in the beginning the earth can only have had but one face, which seems likely, given the capacities for interconnect ion. In the future the earth will have but one interface... **If speed thus appears as the essential fall-out of styles of conflicts and cataclysms, the current “arms race” is in fact only “the arming of the race” toward the end of the world as distance**, in other words as a field of action. The term “deterrence” points to the ambiguity of this situation, in which the weapon replaces the protection of armor, in which the possibilities of offense and offensive ensure in and of themselves the defense, the entire defensive against the “explosive” dimension of strategic arms, but not at all against the “implosive” dimension of the vectors’ performances, since on the contrary the maintenance of a credible “strike power” requires the constant refining of the engines’ power, in other words of their ability to reduce geographic space to nothing or almost nothing. In fact, without the violence of speed, that of weapons would not be so fearsome. In the current context, to disarm would thus mean first and foremost to decelerate, to defuse the race toward the end. **Any treaty that does not limit the speed of this race (the speed of means of communicating destruction) will not limit strategic arm**s, since from now on the essential object of strategy consists in maintaining the non-place of a general delocalization of means that alone still allows us to gain fractions of seconds, which gain is indispensable to any freedom of action. As General Fuller wrote, “When the combatants threw javelins at each other, the weapon’s initial speed was such that one could see it on its trajectory and parry its effects with one’s shield. But when the javelin was replaced by the bullet, the speed was so great that parry became impossible.” Impossible to move one’s body out of the way, but possible if one moved out of the weapon’s range; possible as well through the shelter of the trench, greater than that of the shield — possible, in other words, through space and matter. Today, the reduction of warning time that results from the supersonic speeds of assault leaves so little time for detection, identification and response that in the case of a surprise attack the supreme authority would have to risk abandoning his supremacy of decision by authorizing the lowest echelon of the defense system to immediately launch anti-missile missiles. The two political superpowers have thus far preferred to avoid this situation through negotiations, renouncing anti-missile defense at the same time. Given the lack of space, an active defense requires at least the material time to intervene. But these are the “war materials” that disappear in the acceleration of the means of communicating destruction. There remains only a passive defense that consists less in reinforcing itself against the megaton powers of nuclear weapons than in a series of constant, unpredictable, aberrant movements, movements which are thus strategically effective — for at least a little while longer, we hope. In fact, war now rests entirely on the deregulation of time and space. This is why the technical maneuver that consists in complexifying the vector by constantly improving its performances has now totally supplanted tactical maneuvers on the terrain, as we have seen. General Ailleret points this out in his history of weapons by stating that the definition of arms programs has become one of the essential elements of strategy. If in ancient conventional warfare we could still talk about army maneuvers in the fields, in the current state of affairs, if this maneuver still exists, it no longer needs a “field”. The invasion of the instant succeeds the invasion of the territory. The countdown becomes the scene of battle, the final frontier. The opposing sides can easily ban bacteriological, geodesic or meteorological warfare. In reality, what is currently at stake with strategic arms limitation agreements (SALT I) is no longer the explosive but the vector, the vector of nuclear deliverance, or more precisely its performances. The reason for this is simple: where the **molecular or nuclear explosive’s blast made a given area unfit for existence, that of the implosive (vehicles and vectors) suddenly reduces reaction time, and the time for political decision, to nothing. If over thirty years ago the nuclear explosive completed the cycle of spatial wars, at the end of this century the implosive (beyond politically and economically invaded territories) inaugurates the war of time**. In full peaceful coexistence, without any declaration of hostilities, and more surely than by any other kind of conflict, rapidity delivers us from this world.

#### Vote affirmative to reject the appropriation of outer space by private entities as a method of dwelling within slow time.

#### Appeals towards status-quo political reforms further a cyclical model of governmentality that revolves between speed, war, and totalitarianism.

Glezos 9 – Simon Glezos, Ph.D. in political theory and international relations from Johns Hopkins University, now works in the department of political science at University of Regina, “ The politics of speed: Capitalism, the state and war in an accelerating world” [dissertation] pg. 93-94, Agastya

The goal then is thus to politicize the military, to politicize war, to challenge the military from a political standpoint, and return it to civilian control. However, there is an obstacle to this endeavour, since, as we've learned, there is a fundamental disjunct between politics and dromocratic war. This is because politics is rooted in what Virilio term "the last commodity: duration. Democracy, consultation, the basis of politics, requires time. Duration is the proper of man; he is inscribed within it"189 Dromocratic war instead employs what Virilio terms "Trans-politics" which "marks the end of a concept of politics based on dialogue, dialectic, time, reflection."190 The problem then, is one of pace. Having taken advantage, or rather being the result, of the technological acceleration of the dromocratic revolution, the globalitarian state moves too fast to be challenged by traditional politics ("There will be no time"). Popular political resistance then must take aim at the dromocratic revolution; at the technological acceleration which provides the foundation of the globalitarian state. Virilio says in multiple instances that this shouldn't be confused with a simple luddsism, an attempt to do away with technology tout cours. "I'm not saying that we should revert to ancient democracy, stop the clock and all that."191 Rather what he advocates is that "We must politicize speed."192 And though he states that he does not want a regressive rejection of technology, to politicize technology and speed is, for Virilio, to slow it down, to make it subject to debate, discussion and deliberation. Thus, he goes on to say. ...that there's work to be done, the epistemo-technical work we were talking about before, in order to re-establish politics, at a time when technology no longer portions out matter and geographical space as was the case in ancient democratic society but when technology portions out time - and I would say: the depletion of time193 Virilio thus says that we must invert the material hierarchy that we find ourselves in; that we must develop an environment where technology is subject to the mandates of politics, not politics subject to the mandates of technology.194 In short, Virilio argues that we must deploy slowness against speed. Popular resistance must (mimicking the old forms of war that have now been abandoned) form a brake on technology. This must happen theoretically and culturally, partly through philosophical work such as Virilio, and more through the valorization of older forms of organization which were based on principles of slowness and territoriality (the family195, the nation state196). However, it must also happen materially, through political practice. When Virilio speaks of concrete political forms of resistance that could be put in to practice, they invariably take the form of a brake. The strike, the barricade, popular defense; political resistance, says Virilio, decelerates society. An appeal to slowness is the only defense against historical necessity of the vicious cycle of reinforcement between speed, war and the (Globalitarian) state.

#### Our method breaks free from categorical rejection of technology in favor of a re-orientation that challenges the perfect portrait of progress.

**Adams 3** – Jason Adams (B.A., Evergreen State College). “Popular Defense in the Empire of Speed: Paul Virilio and the Phenomenology of the Political Body.” Thesis submitted for a Masters in Political Science, Simon Fraser University. 2003.

Virilio’s critique of technology is not so much that of one who would abolish all technologies, but instead is a criticism in the same way one critiques art; as he explains, “progress is one thing nobody sees as an object for criticism. Yet technology is the vector of progress and I would say that there can be no art without criticism. An art lover is at the same time an art critic, since a taste for art implies a certain quality of judgment. As a lover of new technology art, I totally contest the objective status accorded to the technosciences” P. Virilio, Virilio Live: Selected Interviews, 149. Without this freedom to criticize technology, one is also not free to really love technology because for Virilio, to love means to be cognizant of both the positive and the negative dimensions of the thing that is loved. This is why Virilio always recalls the image of Jacob wrestling with the angels before coming to the understanding that there is only one God; rather than ‘sleeping before technology’ he advocates beginning with its negativity, fighting against its instrumental dimensions so that we might come to really understand it at a much deeper level than we usually do, which would show a true love for technology, as paradoxical as it may sound. As he continues, “today we have admen, even experts, who spend all their time saying how wonderful technology is. They are giving it the kiss of death. By being critical I do more for the development of new technologies than by giving in to my illusions and refusing to question technology’s negative aspects”. Sans, Jerome, “The game of Love and Chance: A Discussion With Paul Virilio”. Retrieved June 20, 2003 from <http://www>. Watsoninstitute.org/infopeace/vy2k/sans.cfm.

#### Absent technological intervention, reasons are infinitely violent from creation.

**Derrida** – Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority”

But **justice,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It **is that which must not wait.** To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: **a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with** infinite information and the **unlimited knowledge of conditions,** rules or hypothetical imperatives **that could justify it.** And **even if it did** have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, **the moment of decision,** as such, **always remains a finite moment of urgency** and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **since it always marks the interruption of the** juridico- or ethico- or politico-**cognitive deliberation that precedes it,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. **Even if time** and prudence,the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions **were** hypothetically **unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite,** however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, **acting in** the night of **non-knowledge and non-rule.**

#### The role of the judge is to expose the accident. The University of Disaster emerges as a bulwark of cynical critique that comes complicit within accelerationism – voting affirmative injects a dose of negativity within academia.

**Ebert 13** – John David Ebert, 2013, “Dromology” in “The Virilio Dictionary” edited by John Armitage, pp. 202-203, MNGB recut Agastya

* Comes before theory, Weigh between pre-fiat/post-fiat to derive offense

By **The University of Disaster**, Virilio (2010a [2007]) **does not so much** **mean the foundation and creation of a real university dedicated to studying accidents and catastrophes** – he has stated that he is not militant enough for that – **as** he **does the taking up of a point of view regarding the situation of today’s sciences and humanities. Such an approach would study not only literal disasters**, or accidents of substances**, but also** other **disasters such as accidents of knowledge and epistemology. For example**, the disaster of specialisation in the universities, or the disaster of the pollution of distances on the earth by technologies of telepresence and the global tourism industry (which have a tendency to exhaust places by over- exploiting them), or else the disaster of the triumph of real- time technologies, which have brought history to an end by contracting time into an eternal present that eliminates history and replaces it with accidents. Thus, the concept of the university of disaster functions like one of those old memory theatres in Renaissance rhetoric designed as mnemonic devices for organising a specific type of discourse; in this case, one that studies the accident of substances as well as the accidents of knowledge in all their various manifestations. In The University of Disaster, Virilio suggests that, in light of the failure of the ‘success’ of Big Science, the university could be reformed in such a way as to counter the barbarism of progress, the hubris and arrogance of a science that no longer knows, or respects, any bounds and has led from an accident in knowledge to a mass- produced repetition of accidents in substances. This would also be meant to counter Aristotle’s assertion that there is no science of the accident, only a science of substances. But, due to **the spectacular success of this science of substances**, it **has wreaked havoc on all traditional forms of knowledge, threatening to render them obsolete. The problem**, then, **with Big Science** in particular, **is that it remains oblivious to all its ravages and sees only its own successes instead of seeing how it perpetuates integral accidents that cause chains of other accidents in the various domains of atomic physics, biology and genetics**. The ultimate hubris of Big Science, Virilio further notes, is the global outsourcing of looking for an exo- planet for the human race to colonise while leaving the Earth, now rendered too small by the ever- accelerating pace of progress, behind. **Speed, in other words, has miniaturised the Earth and transformed it into a claustrophobic object. Hence, the accident of knowledge of the success of progress has paradoxically accelerated the finitude of the Earth. This is one of the effects of a technology that has estranged us from geophysics**. As Virilio (2009: 42) says in Grey Ecology**, the university was founded around the year 1000 as an antidote to barbarism, but any sort of university of disaster founded nowadays, either real or imagined, would have to counter and curb the effects of the barbarism of the progress of science by making its various knowledge accidents visible through concrete applications**.

### UV – Standard

#### 1 – Yes 1AR theory – anything else means infinite abuse – drop the debater, competing interps, no 2N paradigm issues – the 1AR is too short to make up for the time trade-off – no RVIs – 6 min 2NR means they can brute force me every time.

#### 2 – Presumption affirms on this topic: (A) The aff is the status quo since existing I-Law treaties and the OST all ban private space appropriation. That affirms since negating requires a coherent obligation to take action – absent one you default to an action being unjust (B) Unjust is defined as not based on or behaving according to what is morally right and fair.1 If there isn’t a proactive obligation, everything doesn’t behave according to what is morally right.

### Shell

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation – they don’t.

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### 1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs who can’t bypass paywalled articles.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### Evidence ethics is an independent voter and a reason to drop them absent DTD – 1] it’s key to assessing the honesty of your form of argumentation which means if you’re lying about an argument then we don’t know if it’s correctly implicated 2] turns their ROB – if the judge is an educator they should enforce norms that won’t get you kicked out of college in the future 3] prevents neg solvency – movements and thought experiments are cool but it doesn’t matter if you’re getting sued to space and back cuz it prevents your ability to theorize and create a movement given that you’ll either be bankrupt with no credibility or too caught up in legal forms to plan 4] you have a constitutive role to vote these practices down absent the flow – even if we lose the tech of this argument, you know they intuitively did something that violates a D-Rule.

#### Competing interps because they can’t reasonably plagiarize.