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#### The Space Race is simulacra – the mythos of a distinction between institutional space flight and the market fuels the image-machine.

**Dickens and Ormrod 16** – Peter Dickens, Senior Research Associate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge, member of the Red-Green Study Group in London, James S Ormrod, Principal Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton, 2016, “Introduction: The Production of Outer Space” in The Palgrave Handbook of Society, Culture and Outer Space, pp 5-6, footnote 4 included in curly braces

An argument can be made that ‘the space race’ – as a material technological project, as a discourse about the conquest of space, and as an imagined competition – clung on to the older conceptions of space that were being abandoned in so many other areas of social life (while, it should be noted, embracing some of the developments Kern identifies). The space race was historicized and spatialized by its protagonists, by academics, and by the public, in largely consensual terms on both sides of the iron curtain (‘consensual’ in the sense that all agreed on how the race was to be understood). Indeed, for Baudrillard (1994), this was one of the keys to understanding the space race. Its aim was not to put a man on the Moon. The Moon landings functioned as models of rational, calculated control, in relation to which all earthly activity was to become oriented. As in nuclear proliferation,4 ‘[t]heir truth is to be models of simulation, the model vectors of a system of planetary control (where even the superpowers of this scenario are not free – the whole world is satellized)’ (1994, p. 35). Viewed in this way, the space race was a conspiracy, albeit one that nobody had charge of.

{4. Baudrillard believed the space race played the same role as the Cold War arms race that preceded it. In his understanding, nuclear deterrence was not aimed at containing a real threat from the other side, just as the aim of the space race was not to put a man on the Moon. Rather, the former represented a pretext ‘for installing a universal security system whose deterrent effect is not at all aimed at an atomic clash … but, rather, at the much greater probability of any real event, of anything that would be an event in the general system and upset its balance’ (p.33). Baudrillard sees the Cold War and space race as taking place in the cause of rationalization of the world and the exclusion of pre-modern forms: ‘[B]ehind this simulacrum of fighting to the death and of ruthless global stakes, the two adversaries are fundamentally in solidarity against something else, unnamed, never spoken, but whose objective outcome in war, with the equal complicity of the two adversaries, is total liquidation. Tribal, communitarian, precapitalist structures, every form of exchange, of language, of symbolic organization, that is what must be abolished, that is the object of murder in war – and war itself, in its immense, spectacular death apparatus, is nothing but the medium of this process of the terrorist rationalization of the social – The murder on which sociality will be founded, whatever its allegiance, Communist or capitalist’ (p.37)}

Because of this conspiracy, there now exists a standard account of the space race, and of the history of the American space programme. Histories of the Soviet programme are still being produced (see, for example, Siddiqi, 2010), but these do not necessarily challenge this standard account. A very condensed account runs as follow. Wernher von Braun, the Nazi rocket scientist, had been taken back to the United States in 1945 as part of Operation Paperclip, to later use what he had learnt working on the V-2 in the services of the American space programme. The launch of Sputnik in 1957 by the Soviet Union had shocked the United States. Eisenhower had then created NASA in 1958, and Kennedy had announced the decision to send a human to the Moon in 1962 in the wake of the embarrassment of the Bay of Pigs invasion. The United States had beaten the Soviet Union to the Moon by 1969.5

Kennedy (1962) had attempted to assert that the reasons for conquering space were noble and involved ‘new knowledge to be gained and new rights to be won … for the progress of all people’. However, he also made it clear that it was crucial for America to secure these victories. It was meant to be understood that the space race was intimately connected with the Cold War, although academics disagreed about exactly how (see Dickens & Ormrod, 2007b). The space race was nonetheless about the extension of the space of the nation state, whether this was physical space or the space of national prestige. It was also well understood that the space race, civilian and military, had to do with the proper or improper ‘meshing’ of the spaces of government, business and politics (see Chapter 3 by Wills, this volume). The existence of a military-industrial complex of some kind is widely accepted, even if historians and social scientists have been left arguing about which interests were the most significant (see, for example, Baran & Sweezy, 1966).

#### This war of images plays on the terms of simulation – the aff reinforces technological forms and refashions a new space race headed by the government.

**Dickens and Ormrod 16** – Peter Dickens, Senior Research Associate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge, member of the Red-Green Study Group in London, James S Ormrod, Principal Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton, 2016, “Conclusion: The Future of Outer Space” in The Palgrave Handbook of Society, Culture and Outer Space, pp 446-449

An argument can be made that the conquest of outer space has represented the ultimate victory of abstract space (see also Shaw, 2008, p. 115). Any meaningful distinction between terrestrial space and the rest of the cosmos has been eroded. This is not to say that the whole of outer space has been humanized, which of course it has not, but that space has come to be reconceptualized and re-experienced as a space for accumulation like any other. It is a space thoroughly colonized by terrestrial knowledge and practice (whether considered primarily capitalist, male, white or anything else).

For Benjamin and a host of others (from Klerkx, 2005, to Parker, 2009), the disinvestment in outer space exploration and development came as a result of the bureaucratization of NASA, and its engulfment within the military-industrial complex. With the development of the International Space Station (ISS) and the Space Shuttle (which according to some accounts were each the rationale for the development of the other), space exploration became routine and unexciting. Nothing fundamentally new appeared to be happening in space. Whether or not this is seen as true depends a great deal on perspective. Even if NASA budgets were being cut, this volume has hopefully made clear that a great deal was still happening in space. New space technologies continued to be developed, and these technologies were being integrated into terrestrial life in innumerable ways. But we believe it is also true (and this has been the emphasis of our work elsewhere, see Dickens and Ormrod, 2007) that these developments represent the continuation of terrestrial power relations and social dynamics. Space development is, to put it one way, business as usual. And crucially, any novelty to these developments was undermined by the representation of outer space in similar terms to the representation of terrestrial space. As evidenced in this book, political scientists, geographers and legal scholars had begun to talk about outer space as a knowable, if not actually known, space. The origins of this representation of space can be traced to Copernicus (MacDonald, 2009) and/or Kepler (Zubrin, 1996). But with the routinization of outer spatial practices (from increasing launch rates to the proliferation of satellite-receiving terminals, to the everyday use of satellite services to underpin military operations, communications, entertainment, navigation and so on), these representations were made manifest in the creation of a new social space.

The central problem with the final victory of abstract space was that it obliterated the very ‘absolute spaces’ on which it was founded, and from which it derived its emotional appeal. It is in a way surprising that the development of modern spaceflight was from its inception anchored in a religious or spiritual cosmology. This was true of both Russian and American contexts (see also Geppert, 2007, p. 599). The Russian programme has long roots in the tradition of Russian cosmism (Kohonen, 2009; Siddiqi, 2010). And, as Pop notes, Richard Nixon said to the Apollo 11 astronauts; ‘Because of what you have done, the heavens have become a part of man’s world.’ Pop goes on:

‘Are we today turning mythology into fact?’ – asked Joseph Campbell on the occasion of the Apollo programme. The astronauts walked on the real astronomical moon, as it was; but they walked on the mythical moon of each culture, as thought to be, as imagined. Their trip was physical and metaphysical. They walked through different cosmogonies; through different models of the universe.

(Pop, 2012, personal communication, see also ‘High Flight: A Spiritual History of the Space Age’, in preparation)

This continued relationship was not coincidental. As a number of contributions here show, the appeal of outer space lay in the promise of conquering the wondrous or Godly and hence the elevation of the status of humanity (or, rather more specifically, white men). This is not necessarily that dissimilar to the process Sims describes in his chapter, whereby myths ‘record time’. Ormrod illustrates this in his chapter through analysis of Tsiolkovsky’s science fiction in which the best human beings are able to fly like angels in space. As Kilgore notes in his chapter, Carl Sagan owed his continued appeal to his simultaneous reproduction of wonder as well as knowledge. The British celebrity cosmologist Brian Cox (see Mellor, this volume, for more on him) has arguably taken this even further, such that his popular shows and writing dedicate more time to what is unknown than to knowledge itself. These lacunae became spaces for wild imaginative projects – projects more captivating than any empirical knowledge. It is no wonder that the continued disenchantment and re-enchantment of the universe have become a major theme in recent work. Based largely on studies of astronauts’ experiences, Kilbryde (2015) argues that space exploration can potentially be a means of overcoming the dualism through which outer space is constructed as an object, and thus of experiencing unity. This is provided that the sense of awe and wonder it engenders is not sought as a ‘possession’ of the individual or as something to be subsequently rationalized.

It is the invocation of obstacles that produces space as something potentially unconquerable, and hence worth conquering. And yet the obliteration of the irrational or wondrous sweeps the ground from underneath such a project. To the extent that outer space has become an abstract space, it has been foreclosed as a frontier. It is a frontier, but a frontier without a future. In removing the possibility of an elsewhere, it serves only to secure terrestrial hegemony. In their own ways, both Baudrillard and Virilio present such a view of outer space. For Baudrillard, it was in any case a frontier that served as a model for terrestrial life, which set the permissible limits for struggle and confrontation within it. He concludes,

Through the orbital inscription of a spatial object, it is the planet earth that becomes a satellite, it is the terrestrial principle of reality that becomes eccentric, hyperreal, and insignificant. Through the orbital installation of a system of control like peaceful coexistence, all the terrestrial microsystems are satellized and lose their autonomy. (p. 35)

Everyone on Earth is neutralized and homogenized. The proliferation of space technology since he was writing, and the blurring of civilian and military technologies, has only broadened the potential of such an understanding. Parks and Schwoch (2012, p. 4), in the context of the ‘satellization’ of global security, refer to the satellites as ‘the ultimate rationalization and instrumentalization of the quest for global security and domination’.

For Virilio, there was such a homology between the technologies of war, the image of space as a battlefield and the political discourses about space that the future seemed equally foreclosed. He makes the claim that any space is constituted ‘from the outside’ (cited in Bormann, 2009, p. 80). That is to say, it is perceived on the basis of that which precedes it. Bormann is therefore able to argue that ‘nothing about outer space is “out there”, what we get to know about outer space is always socially, spatially and locally embedded’ (p. 80). Bormann, following Virilio, seems to believe that this is especially true of the vacuum of outer space:

[O]ther than the view there is no physical or physiological contact. No hearing, no feeling in the sense of touching materials, with the exception of an actual Moon landing. Thus the conquest of space, of outer space – isn’t it more the conquest of the image of space?

(Virilio & Ujica, 2003, cited in Bormann, 2009, p. 84)

Bormann reaches the pessimistic conclusion that ‘the perpetuation of outer space as a sphere of permanent war and its claims to weaponization will soon make no alternative possible’ (p. 84). This is the product, in the large part, of her assumption that ‘[w]hat we get to know about the space of outer space is dominated by information provided through the possibilities (and limits) of military technology’ (p. 81).

#### The west operates on a consumption of images of pain – the aff trades the suffering of others for a ballot, sustaining a system in its death throes.

**Baudrillard 94** – Jean Baudrillard, dead French philosopher, former professor emeritus at the University de Paris X, The Illusion of The End, pg. 66-70, Agastya

We have long denounced the capitalistic, economic exploitation of the poverty of the 'other half of the world' ['autre monde]. **We must** today **denounce the** moral and **sentimental exploitation of** that poverty - **charity cannibalism being worse than oppressive violence**. The extraction and humanitarian reprocessing of a destitution which has become the equivalent of oil deposits and gold mines. The extortion of the spectacle of poverty and, at the same time, of our charitable condescension: a worldwide appreciated surplus of fine sentiments and bad conscience. We should, in fact, see this not as the extraction of raw materials, but as a waste-reprocessing enterprise. Their destitution and our bad conscience are, in effect, all part of the waste-products of history- the main thing is to recycle them to produce a new energy source. We have here an escalation in the psychological balance of terror. World capitalist oppression is now merely the vehicle and alibi for this other, much more ferocious, form of moral predation. One might almost say, contrary to the Marxist analysis, that **material exploitation is only there to extract that spiritual raw material that is the misery of people**s, **which serves as psychological nourishment for** the rich countries and media nourishment for **our daily lives**. The 'Fourth World' (we are no longer dealing with a 'developing' Third World) is once again beleaguered, this time as a catastrophe-bearing stratum. The West is whitewashed in the reprocessing of the rest of the world as waste and residue. And the white world repents and seeks absolution - it, too, the waste-product of its own history. The South is a natural producer of raw materials, the latest of which is catastrophe. The North, for its part, specializes in the reprocessing of raw materials and hence also in the reprocessing of catastrophe. Bloodsucking protection, humanitarian interference, Medecins sans frontieres, international solidarity, etc. The last phase of colonialism: the New Sentimental Order is merely the latest form of the New World Order. **Other people's destitution becomes our adventure playground**. Thus, the humanitarian offensive aimed at the Kurds - a show of repentance on the part of the Western powers after allowing Saddam Hussein to crush them - is in reality merely the second phase of the war, a phase in which charitable intervention finishes off the work of extermination. We are the consumers of the ever delightful spectacle of poverty and catastrophe, and of the moving spectacle of **our** own **efforts to alleviate it** (which, in fact, merely **function to secure the conditions of reproduction of the catastrophe market**); there, at least, in the order of moral profits, the Marxist analysis is wholly applicable: we see to it that extreme poverty is reproduced as a symbolic deposit, as a fuel **essential to the moral** and sentimental **equilibrium of the West**. In our defence, it might be said that this extreme poverty was largely of our own making and it is therefore normal that we should profit by it. There can be no finer proof that the distress of the rest of the world is at the root of Western power and that the spectacle of that distress is its crowning glory than the inauguration, on the roof of the Arche de la Defense, with a sumptuous buffet laid on by the Fondation des Droits de l'homme, of an exhibition of the finest photos of world poverty. Should we be surprised that spaces are set aside in the Arche d' Alliance. for universal suffering hallowed by caviar and champagne? Just as the economic crisis of the West will not be complete so long as it can still exploit the resources of the rest of the world, so the symbolic crisis will be complete only when it is no longer able to feed on the other half's human and natural catastrophes (Eastern Europe, the Gulf, the Kurds, Bangladesh, etc.). We need this drug, which serves us as an aphrodisiac and hallucinogen. And the poor countries are the best suppliers - as, indeed, they are of other drugs. We provide them, through our media, with the means to exploit this paradoxical resource, just as we give them the means to exhaust their natural resources with our technologies. Our whole culture lives off this catastrophic cannibalism, relayed in cynical mode by the news media, and carried forward in moral mode by our humanitarian aid, which is a way of encouraging it and ensuring its continuity, just as economic aid is a strategy for perpetuating under-development. Up to now, the financial sacrifice has been compensated a hundredfold by the moral gain. **But when the catastrophe market itself reaches crisis point**, in accordance with the implacable logic of the market, when distress becomes scarce or the marginal returns on it fall from overexploitation, **when we run out of disasters from elsewhere** or when they can no longer be traded like coffee or other commodities, **the West will be forced to produce its own catastrophe for itself, in order to meet its need for spectacle and that voracious appetite for symbols which characterizes it** even more than its voracious appetite for food. It will reach the point where it devours itself. When we have finished sucking out the destiny of others, we shall have to invent one for ourselves. The Great Crash, the symbolic crash, will come in the end from us Westerners, but only when we are no longer able to feed on the hallucinogenic misery which comes to us from the other half of the world. Yet they do not seem keen to give up their monopoly. The Middle East, Bangladesh, black Africa and Latin America are really going flat out in the distress and catastrophe stakes, and thus in providing symbolic nourishment for the rich world. They might be said to be overdoing it: heaping earthquakes, floods, famines and ecological disasters one upon another, and finding the means to massacre each other most of the time. The **'disaster show' goes on without any let-up** and our sacrificial debt to them far exceeds their economic debt. The misery with which they generously overwhelm us is something we shall never be able to repay. The sacrifices we offer in return are laughable (a tornado or two, a few tiny holocausts on the roads, the odd financial sacrifice) and, moreover, by some infernal logic, these work out as much greater gains for us, whereas our kindnesses have merely added to the natural catastrophes another one immeasurably worse: the demographic catastrophe, a veritable epidemic which we deplore each day in pictures. In short, there is such distortion between North and South, to the symbolic advantage of the South (a hundred thousand Iraqi dead against casualties numbered in tens on our side: in every case we are the losers), that one day everything will break down. One day, the West will break down if we are not soon washed clean of this shame, if an international congress of the poor countries does not very quickly decide to share out this symbolic privilege of misery and catastrophe. It is of course normal, since we refuse to allow the spread of nuclear weapons, that they should refuse to allow the spread of the catastrophe weapon. But it is not right that they should exert that monopoly indefinitely. In any case, the under-developed are only so by comparison with the Western system and its presumed success. In the light of its assumed failure, they are not under-developed at all. They are only so in terms of a dominant evolutionism which has always been the worst of colonial ideologies. The argument here is that there is a line of objective progress and everyone is supposed to pass through its various stages (we find the same eyewash with regard to the evolution of species and in that evolutionism which unilaterally sanctions the superiority of the human race). In the light of current upheavals, which put an end to any idea of history as a linear process, there are no longer either developed or under-developed peoples. Thus, to encourage hope of evolution - albeit by revolution - among the poor and to doom them, in keeping with the objective illusion of progress, to technological salvation is a criminal absurdity. In actual fact, it is their good fortune to be able to escape from evolution just at the point when we no longer know where it is leading. In any case, a majority of these peoples, including those of Eastern Europe, do not seem keen to enter this evolutionist modernity, and their weight in the balance is certainly no small factor in the West's repudiation of its own history, of its own utopias and its own modernity. It might be said that the routes of violence, historical or otherwise, are being turned around and that the viruses now pass from South to North, there being every chance that, five hundred years after America was conquered, 1992 and the end of the century will mark the comeback of the defeated and the sudden reversal of that modernity. The sense of pride is no longer on the side of wealth but of poverty, of those who - fortunately for them - have nothing to repent, and may indeed glory in being privileged in terms of catastrophes. Admittedly, this is a privilege they could hardly renounce, even if they wished to, but natural disasters merely reinforce the sense of guilt felt towards them by the wealthy – by those whom God visibly scorns since he no longer even strikes them down. One day it will be the Whites themselves who will give up their whiteness. It is a good bet that repentance will reach its highest pitch with the five-hundredth anniversary of the conquest of the Americas. We are going to have to lift the curse of the defeated - but symbolically victorious - peoples, which is insinuating itself five hundred years later, by way of repentance, into the heart of the white race.

#### The management of mining is rooted in a militarized approach to the future that culminates in the *full-spectrum dominance* of the globe.

**Reno 20** – Joshua Ozias Reno, Associate Professor of Anthropology at Binghamton University. PhD from the University of Michigan, “The Wrong Stuff”, chapter 4 of Military Waste: The Unexpected Consequences of Permanent War Readiness Univ of California Press, Feb 4, 2020 Pg. 127-130, recut Agastya

**Space debris** can be dangerous to orbiting vessels and, as such, it represents an ever-growing hazard to human uses of Earth space. But these objects are hard to track and easy to mistake for something else, even for people who spend all of their time looking up at the night sky. Like space exploration itself, this is a difficult problem to solve, so it is not surprising that **only the most powerful and prominent space agencies imagine they are capable of finding space debris**, let alone clearing it from orbital environments. A core dimension of that power and prominence, moreover, is about having military ambitions that extend beyond the surface of the planet. And, **from the very beginnings**, doing so has meant enrolling amateur or civilian scientists in DoD plans for outer-space.

Historically, **solving space-related challenges has meant getting funds and resources from wealthy and powerful nations**. **With the growth of** a permanent war economy, **such expenditure** is very often **tied** **to** imagined or real military applications. Consequently, the history of space explo ration has been and continues to be shaped by tensions and networks between **civilian and military** scientific objectives. But these seemingly opposed **groups** also align and become indistinguishable, especially insofar as they embrace a fascination with developing the latest technology and an unrelenting faith in its ability to solve all problems. This is also known as techno-solutionism. Evgeny Morozov (2013) developed this idea related to utopian appraisals of the internet. His account draws heavily on **Hannah Arendt’s** *On Violence* (1970), a book which openly criticizes **US administrations** that thought they could solve global problems through technically ingenuous forms of death and destruction. Broadly defined, techno-solutionism is faith that technical fixes can solve any problem…even when they are targeting a realm like **outer space**, one that is already saturated with the leftovers of generations of technological problem-solving. According to Gökçe Günel (2019, 129), any technical adjustment is not only about “functionality, effectiveness, or use, but rather the ways in which its materially and conceptually indeterminate existence mobilizes potential towards a technically adjusted future.” In this sense, **technical fixes for space debris are more about extending the possibility of future technical intervention in orbital environments**, rather than, for instance, **encouraging ethical reflection** on whether people should create debris at all.

Space debris is not just any problem, it is **one that originated** **with** and threatens **space science** and, as such, shows the limits of technical solution-making in general. If it is problematic to see space debris as a technical glitch, as noise in an otherwise perfectly rendered human design, that is because such a view can **mislead us** into thinking that all it takes is a little more ingenuity, a bit more mastery, to solve the problem entirely. But, following Virilio (2007), every new technical innovation and improvement brings a new disaster, an unprecedented act of contamination. If **space debris represents inevitable traces** that human artifacts and projects leave behind in the space beyond Earth, then, whatever the future may hold, this problem is unavoidable. If people want to continue to escape their earthly confines, space debris will have to be reckoned with. Space debris is a possibility that haunts all uses of space *tout court*, rather than an incidental by-product of space exploration and travel.

A focus on technical mastery links the cause of space debris with its proposed cure. As a counterpoint, I discuss how amateur astronomers and ham radio operators have engaged with space debris in a different manner and with altogether different goals. Specifically, they tend to look for ways to become attuned with and enliven debris that has been abandoned.

Militarizing Civilian Science

The possibility of a semiautonomous civilian space agency had defined space exploration from the start, but by the 1970s and ‘80s, funding had dropped precipitously from the heyday of the Apollo missions. By that time, NASA had come under widespread criticism as the country entered recession and other big programs (such as the CIA) and national initiatives (the War on poverty, Civil Rights Legislation, the Vietnam War) were attacked by political representatives and activists across the political spectrum. The prominent images that NASA members used to promote the organization during the 1960s was that of pragmatism, that space efforts would yield scientific benefits. This failed to improve the prestige of the organization within the government, until the Reagan era, when there was a resurgence of nationalist and romanticist rhetoric from earlier in NASA’s history. With the Reagan administration there was an effort, first, to block international efforts to ban weapons use in outer space and, second, to invest new symbolic importance and new financial resources in the militarization of space.

Since that time, **solving space debris has become a common pursuit** of space agencies all over the world, both the more militarized and the more civilian among them. By the early 1980s, **satellites were central infrastructure**, particularly for the United States. The militarization of space had already occurred, in other words, and **without extravagant laser weapons**. Consequently, among the most central issues of the time was the testing and development of antisatellite weaponry (ASAT). The use of experimental ASAT has been partly responsible for reorienting international attention to space debris, since ASAT is a spectacular technology, the goal of which is to transform working satellites into unusable waste.

Since satellites were so vulnerable to attack, and space treaties did not allow for the defense of particular regions of space as sovereign territory, satellites could be destroyed simply by sending “space mines” to collide with them. This constitutes one clear reason why DARPA and the Air Force are so intent on tracking space debris—they want to know whether satellites colliding with unidentified objects represent coincidental hazards or deliberate attacks. Being able to tell the difference between space debris and an actively launched space mine would be like knowing whether an ocean vessel sank because of an iceberg or a submarine. Even if one cannot capture space debris, being able to detect and identify it might be **necessary to predict or avoid war**. The ambiguities of witnessing discussed in the previous section, not knowing what one is seeing, therefore take on perilous consequences.

While Reagan’s “Star Wars” and Trump’s “Space Force” have been heavily discussed and derided, other administrations have had similar designs. Perhaps most enduring has been the Clinton-era concept of *full-spectrum dominance*, first outlined in the United States Space Command “Vision for 2020” released in 1997. This relationship between outer space and defense and security has been so central to US policy that prominent advocates for science, notably Neil deGrasse Tyson, have authored reports suggesting that **NASA could be restored to its former glory by becoming more like DARPA**, that is, the militaristic organization it was partly created ***not to become***.

In many ways the DoD’s Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (**DARPA) is the epitome of techno-solutionist practice**. Though the term *defense* was only added to the acronym later (it was termed ARPA until 1972), **the agency was always closely linked to military interests and problem-solving**. In management studies, the concept of problems that are “DARPA-hard” has become widespread, with websites baiting visitors to see whether their company’s challenges would come close to qualifying. According to Leifer and Steinert (2011, 159), there are four criteria for the agency to consider something DARPA-hard: 1. Technically challenging (beyond current limits); 2. Actionable (proof of concept or prototype); 3. Multidisciplinary (complex); and 4. Far-reaching (advances on a grand scale, radical).

At the turn of the century, **DARPA** clearly **determined that solving orbital space debris met these criteria**. Space debris fragments **exceeded the capabilities of the Air Force’s Space Surveillance Network** (SSN), it would take work with specialists from various fields, and the achievement of a solution would be legitimately global in impact. The only thing missing was proof of concept.

Their first attempt at a solution was to work with MIT aeronautics labs to develop a specialized telescope to detect faint objects. In 2011, DARPA unveiled a massive new telescope, the Space Surveillance Telescope (SST), specially developed with MIT labs to identify space debris. In contrast with what DARPA spokespersons described as the “soda straw approach” of existing telescopes, the SST would allow wide-angle shots of the night sky, made possible by a much larger aperture and an advanced visual processing system. **In at least one report** provided to NBC, moreover, cleaning up space debris was linked directly with military objectives.

#### Their simulated policymaking frames all threats as accidental – this obscures the symbolic operations of power that manifest nuclear demise and replicates the zombification of life.

Bishop 9 – Ryan Bishop, Professor of Global Arts and Politics and Co-Director of the Winchester Centre for Global Futures in Art Design & Media, Director of Research, Director of Doctoral Research at the University of Southampton, “Baudrillard, Death, and Cold War Theory,” Baudrillard Now: Current Perspectives in Baudrillard Studies, polity, pg. 64-70, ar

The salvation of theory in death, or the salvation that is death

Although death is pivotal to many whose work falls within the domain of critical theory, Baudrillard’s work, perhaps more so than others’, articulates, embodies, and enacts the role of Death within theoretical writing and its relation to the political. Death, and especially the death drive in Freud according to Baudrillard, does not provide any space for the operation of dialectical co-option or reclamation. And it is this trait, Death’s absolute imperviousness to the dialectic, that makes it radical, intractable, usable (Symbolic Exchange and Death, 151). Such is the position that Baudrillard himself assumes within analyses of media, simulation, the subject, the object, politics, war, economics, culture, the event, theory itself, and thought. In relation to systems, the Death that Baudrillard wishes to address functions in a two-fold manner: it is what waits at “the term of the system” – at its end – and it is “the symbolic extermination that stalks the system itself” (Symbolic Exchange of Death, 5). Therefore Death is both internal to the system and its “operational logic” and “a radical-finality” outside it. Only Death operates both within and without the system (5). As such it carries the mark of perfection (completion of the system’s operation and project) and the defectiveness inherently lurking within it. Death is ambiguity and paradox made manifest, and is both the system’s realization and its impediment.

Death resists modeling, the simulation. Its lack of predictability and the difficulty in controlling it, in fact, resides at the center of the various systems, policies, and logics that drive the Cold War. Death is the event without compare and which must be elided at all costs. Under the patriotic yet threatening rubrics of security, safety, “our way of life,” etc., the entire elaborate apparatus of the Cold War was erected and launched, while also continuing with intensified reverberations into the present – all to ward off Death on a scale hitherto the domain of Nature or the gods. Following a lead from the poet Octavio Paz and sounding like an interlocutor of Paul Virilio’s, Baudrillard discusses Death, therefore, in terms of the accident (Symbolic Exchange and Death, 160–6). For as Paz contends, modern science and technology, including medicine, have converted epidemics and natural catastrophes into explainable and controllable phenomena. The rational order can explain and contain anything that threatens it, as can Integral Reality (for which the rational order is another metonym, as is the global). As such, Death becomes an accident to be contained and controlled, explained and predicted. If Death equals an accident, and accidents threaten the rational order, Baudrillard argues, then Death-as-accident also threatens political sovereignty and power, “hence the police presence at the scenes of catastrophe” (161). Death is the disruption that destabilizes all that has been ordered and made stable.

At the height of the Cold War as an historical phenomenon, the major powers relied heavily on a rational order that both players acknowledged (at least between themselves) to be operational. This led to the enforced and heavily armed stalemate of MAD, and with it arrived the horrific spectacle of the nuclear accident, or the computer accident. The accidental launch of the impossible exchange of missiles would be, in rote pronouncements of certitude, “the only way” these rational and sane nations would fire nuclear weapons: hence the many examples of cultural representations of accidental nuclear war that filled popular media (invoking worlds synonymous to the one portrayed as the simulated wasteland in The Island). The import of simulation in containing Death on a global scale can be seen in the supposed rational containment of both the opposition and oneself. The simulated scenarios of both war games and accidental launches, the modeling of events, become a kind of necromantic or occult means of controlling unleashed forces and foretelling possible futures in order to prevent the accident (or the event) – to prevent Death itself.

The thought processes, or mental make-up, required to plan and design large-scale modeling meant to pre-empt accidents are themselves a kind of technology of thinking, and this mental technicity comprises an important element in the construction of Integral Reality. Simulation requires faith not in its own verisimilitude but in its capacity to change events, even Death. The US embodies this kind of faith and has from the Cold War to the present, which, as such, becomes a target for many satiric novelists. One particularly influenced by Baudrillard’s ideas about simulation is Don DeLillo, whose novel White Noise reads like a primer on the French theorist’s writings. One motif in the novel is a company called SIMUVAC, which stands for “simulated evacuation.” The company stages fake evacuations for a variety of emergencies, including nuclear events, complete with a theatrical or cinematic set of special effects: uniforms, sound effects, smells, and blood (if required). The firm turns up several times in the novel but makes its first, and most satirically poignant, appearance during an actual emergency. In perfect Baudrillardian fashion, the company, which operates solely with and for simulation, uses a live emergency to practice (or simulate) its own simulated emergencies, which is the commodity it packages and sells to various government agencies.

The protagonist of the novel asks a SIMUVAC employee, in the midst of the actual crisis, to evaluate their rehearsal. The SIMUVAC operative replies in darkly comedic fashion:

The insertion curve isn’t as smooth as we would like. There’s a probability excess. Plus which we don’t have our victims laid out where we we’d want them if this was an actual simulation. In other words we’re forced to take our victims where we find them. We didn’t get a jump on computer traffic. Suddenly it just spilled out, three-dimensionally, all over the landscape. You have to make allowances for the fact that everything we see tonight is real. There’s a lot of polishing to do. But that’s what this exercise is all about. (DeLillo, 1985: 139)

The passage contains beautiful parodic examples of the vagaries that language suffers at the hands of bureaucrats, with nonsense phrases passing as technical jargon, including “insertion curve” and “probability excess,” as well as the delightfully oxymoronic “actual simulation.” But beyond this parody, DeLillo evokes the technicity of thought deeply embedded in Cold War America, the same technicity that Baudrillard works through at multiple levels, to reveal the deep investment in the power and control afforded by simulation. The desirable element of simulation is, in fact, control, such as with body placement, which is something actual disasters arrange without care or consultation with the modelers. When the SIMUVAC employee claims that things are in need of “polishing” because “everything we see tonight is real,” we witness the retreat into the comfortable delusion afforded by simulation despite its no-nonsense claims to hard-nosed pragmatism – “that’s what this exercise is all about,” he asserts. SIMUVAC, as a company, markets readiness, the capacity to make a community alert and prepared, but can only deliver on this promise as long as everything remains contained in the model. (And if events do not remain neatly in the model, then the company can use the “accident” to better refine their simulation and techniques.) The same is true of governments, and this is the fear of the accident – and the fear the accident manifests – that Baudrillard (pace Paz) analyzes. Every sector of Integral Reality lives in fear of events because they can “spill out, three-dimensionally, all over the landscape,” no longer in control of the system. All that various institutions, systems, and technologies promise to contain refuses to be contained. Such is the revenge of the object, about which Baudrillard writes, and the intractability of that which lies outside the systems of transparency and integration. Death stalks the protective simulating enterprises from inside and out.

Baudrillard as a stylist of considerable skill and a rhetorician well-steeped in the rhetorical tradition similarly mobilizes his writing itself as Death in relation to the systems operative within academic discourse. From the late 1960s on, his writings and books have deviated rather widely from the conventions of sociological or philosophical genres and academic writing by reaching into the humanistic essay tradition (long since abandoned) and combining it with the most current of pressing issues. What constitutes a standard argument within the humanities and qualitative social sciences, what passes for knowledge and knowledge formation and construction, depends heavily on the adherence of a given work to these conventions. Baudrillard’s textual Deaths provide “fatal strategies” intended to stave off the actual death of thought that can result from routinized, by-the-number, knowledge formation. The aphoristic style, borrowed most directly from Nietzsche, works in a nonlinear fashion that nonetheless makes consistent and sustained arguments across his books as well as within them. Baudrillard teases an idea, settles on a problematic, and pulls at its various permutations, checking how it might work from one context to another. As a result, his writing can be simultaneously readable and enjoyable while also being difficult and frustrating. Like his friend Virilio, he does not develop his argument in a full or linear fashion, instead allowing for fragments, tangents, and hyperbole to carry thought off course and place readers in a textual space that is comfortable (especially if they have read nineteenthcentury philosophers) and discomfiting at the same time.

To this end, he resurrects outmoded philosophical discourse while at the same time adding to it a late modernist poetic sensibility. The latter quality emerges most obviously in his deployment of terms as talismans of the moment of writing as well as terrain themselves for inquiry: the strategic deployment of labels and phrases intended to make us pay attention to their elasticity and formidable ability to fascinate, illuminate, and instantiate a stability of unstable phenomena. Baudrillard is always contemporary, his thoughts being solidly grounded in the present, and his terminology is always embedded in the current moment. He relies on older essayistic forms to structure his thoughts and musings, which often appear as thoughts and musings, i.e. slightly inchoate and coming into focus through the act of writing. The processual quality of his style injects Death as that which cannot be represented adequately into the deathly regimes of academic language meted out by rote adherence to genre-driven formulae within academic discursive practices.

In an important sense, Baudrillard posits that Death is the salvation of theory while also arguing for the salvation that is Death. With the nuclear sword of Damocles dangling over our heads ever since the explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, we have slipped into a constant state of imminent global death that no longer seems like death, so swift and horrible will it be that it outstrips our imagination. “If the bomb drops,” he writes in America, “we shall neither have the time to die nor any awareness of dying” (42). Echoing the neo-Freudian psychoanalyst Ernst Becker, Baudrillard argues that Death ostensibly has been removed from our horizon in the American Era, and we, those who follow in America’s global footsteps, have moved easily and subtly into a state of daily ease and material comfort, buffeted and protected by a staggering array of tele-technologies, opto-electronics, and international ballistic missiles all meant to keep Death at bay and survival at the forefront. Lost in this heady combination of technological, intellectual, and economic materiel mounted for sheer survival, of course, is life (43). Only that which is alive can die, and our cocooned embrace of globalization, which in turn cocoons and embraces us, leaves us with an existence that recalls the prescient horror films of George Romero begun early in the Cold War: an existence like that of zombies, neither alive nor dead, but frantically and ~~brainlessly~~ consuming all in sight.

Baudrillard rescues Death from its purgatorial condition of “the not alive” or mere survival. And in order to do so, he takes his cue from the masses who are the targets of this weaponry and way of life, the enactors of this ethos of bland avoidance and unthinking consumption. Their wholesale passivity to the apparatus of survival – from nuclear bunkers to Star Wars – emerges from a weariness of having been ceaselessly confronted with apocalyptic visions since the first nuclear explosions in New Mexico and Japan, and they “defend themselves with a lack of imagination” (America, 44). “The masses’ silent indifference to nuclear pathos (whether it comes from the nuclear powers or from antinuclear campaigners) is therefore a great sign of hope,” he asserts, “and a political fact of great import” (44). To understand Death as immanent within the system and without it, as immanent within bios and zoe and without it, is to resist the simulation of Death that hovers over our heads in the Cold War and the War on Terror. The salvation of Death, which is also the salvation of Baudrillard’s writing, thought, and analyses, provides us with the means of getting this specific brutal excess back into our collective frame of reference, not for the sake of nihilism, but to resist the nihilism built into all the projects of utter completion and realization that have rendered politics, the subject, the object, thought, and theory as simulation.

#### We refuse to be for or against New Space. Vote negative to understand the space race as pure spectacle – anything else plays into the military industrial complex.

Shapiro 14– Alan, senior lecturer at the Offenbach Art and Design University in Germany, “Jean Baudrillard and Albert Camus on the Simulacrum of Taking a Stance on War”, IJBS Volume 11, Number 2 (May 2014), Special Issue: Baudrillard and War

Unlike other thinkers such as Noam Chomsky or Chris Hedges (whose positions are highly valuable in their own right), Jean Baudrillard is not ‘against war’. Baudrillard’s position is rather that of being ‘neither for nor against’ contemporary hyper-real mediatized wars, and seeing the imperative of choosing whether one is ‘for’ or ‘against’ war as being something of a forced and imposed simulacrum. To say that one is ‘against’ a specific war, or even all wars, would be to implicitly acknowledge the ‘reality’ of war(s), which have, to the contrary, drifted increasingly into the fakeness of virtuality, simulation, and an indeterminate hyperspace. Baudrillard, in his orientation of being ‘neither for nor against’ war, finds a strong predecessor in another great writer and thinker who wrote in French: Albert Camus. In his political theory and activist engagements, Camus was an independent hybrid anarchist-liberal (the very notion of hybrid, with which one can retrospectively illuminate Camus’ politics, has only emerged as a well-known concept in recent times, in the wake of, for example, Donna Haraway’s cyborg theory). Camus was a serious thinker who – like Plato, Nietzsche, Baudrillard, Deleuze and Philip K. Dick – had deep insights into the genealogy of image-making simulacra in and of Western culture. As a major figure of twentieth century French intellectual history, Albert Camus appears now in retrospect to have been way ahead of his time in his positions on ethics, aesthetics, virtuality, and political philosophy. The intention of this essay is not to claim that Baudrillard and Camus had ‘the same position’ on war or on simulacra. It is, rather, to make an initial attempt to outline important affinities between the two thinkers, hinting at a sort of ‘alliance’ between these two intellectual figures which has not been previously articulated in the academic literature in Baudrillard or Camus studies. The essay indicates certain key starting points for substantiating the affinity/alliance, but it should also be read in the spirit of suggesting fruitful directions for future research. The stance of opposition to a war undertaken by America’s ’military-industrial complex’ (MIC), as President Dwight D. Eisenhower termed it in his Farewell Address to the nation on January 17, 1961 after spending 8 years as President, seems to be based on the assumption of the discursive viability of projecting oneself into the imaginative space of being a sort of ‘shadow government of truth-speakers’, empowered by democracy into the democratic position of being able to make ‘better’ decisions for the body politic of democracy than those who hold institutional power in political economy and government. Most political discourse in the U.S., including the anti-war stance, seems to take for granted the idea that we should clarify ‘our politics’ by imaginatively putting ourselves ‘in the shoes’ of national strategists choosing among the policy options available. Jean Baudrillard expands our sense of what is history because he does not operate with a strict separation between what are ‘the facts’ and what are the engaging stories that we as a culture have written and enacted about important ‘historical’ events. Much of what we know about the Holocaust, the Second World War, and the Vietnam War comes from Hollywood films about the Holocaust, the Second World War, and the Vietnam War that we have seen. In his essay on Francis Ford Coppola’s 1979 blockbuster Vietnam War movie Apocalypse Now, Baudrillard writes that Coppola’s masterpiece is the continuation of the Vietnam War by other means. “Nothing else in the world smells like that,” says Lt. Colonel Bill Kilgore – played by Robert Duvall – in the 2 hour and 33 minute film. “I love the smell of napalm in the morning… It smells like victory.” The high-budget extravaganza was produced exactly the same way that America fought in Vietnam, says Jean Baudrillard of the film made by director Francis Ford Coppola (Baudrillard 1981: 89-91). “War becomes film,” Baudrillard writes of Coppola’s spectacularly successful cinematic creation. “Film becomes war, the two united by their shared overflowing of technology” (Ibid.: 89). There is implosion or mutual contamination between ‘film becoming Virtual Reality’ and War. Think also of Steven Spielberg’s Saving Private Ryan (1998): total immersion in the Virtual Reality of combat – an aesthetics of VR different from ‘critical distance’ – as a new kind of ‘testimonial position’ with respect to war and atrocities. In Vietnam-slash-Apocalypse Now, War is a Drug Trip and a God Trip, a psychedelic and pornographic carnival (Baudrillard 2010), a savage cannibalism practiced by the Christians, a film before the shooting and a shoot before the filming, a vast machine of excessive special effects, a ‘show of power’, a territorial lab for testing new weapons on human guinea pigs, and the sacrificial jouissance of throwing away billions of dollars – all these aspects alluded to or mentioned by Baudrillard. Coppola’s film, according to Baudrillard, is the carrying on of an undeclared, unfinished and unending War. An interminable Heart of Darkness. Jean Baudrillard is not ‘against war’, not even against specific wars like the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. He says this explicitly in “Le masque de la guerre,” published in the Parisian daily newspaper Libération, just prior to President George W. Bush’s invasion of Iraq in 2003. Ni pour ni contre. Neither for nor against. “This war is a non-event,” writes Baudrillard, “and it is absurd to take a stance on a non-event (Baudrillard 2003).” The non-events of the Iraq War and the War on Terror opposed themselves to the event of September 11th, 2001. Baudrillard’s two most explicit texts about war are The Gulf War Did Not Take Place (1991), written just before, during, and just after the Persian Gulf War of 1991 that was initiated by President George H.W. Bush, and The Spirit of Terrorism (2002), written just after 9/11. At the very beginning of the essay “The Gulf War Will Not Take Place,” the first of the three essays that comprise The Gulf War Did Not Take Place, Baudrillard explains that non-war – which is what the military-industrial complex or the (non-)war machine has become very adept at carrying out in the age of virtuality – “is characterised by that degenerate form of war which includes hostage manipulation and negotiation (Baudrillard 1995: 24). The Eisenhower-coined term of the military-industrial complex is used by Baudrillard in his essay "No Reprieve For Sarajevo," published in Libération, January 8, 1994. He sees the MIC as still operative yet in need of conceptual upgrading. “Hostages and blackmail,” Baudrillard continues in “The Gulf War Will Not Take Place,” “are the purest products of deterrence. The hostage has taken the place of the warrior. He has become the principal actor, the simulacral protagonist, or rather, in his pure inaction, the protagoniser (le protagonisant) of non-war” (Baurillard 1995: 24). And we, the television viewers of the non-war, are all in the situation of hostages, “all of us as information hostages on the world media stage” (Ibid.). Hostages of the screen, of the intoxication of the media, dragged and drugged into a logic of deterrence, "we are no longer in a logic of the passage from virtual to actual but in a hyperrealist logic of the deterrence of the real by the virtual” (Ibid.: 27). The post-structure [the successor to a sociological structure with less stability and with less of a center] of the (non-)war machine in the age of media virtuality has properties of binary/digital, simulation/modeling, viral metastasis, and complex intricate paradoxical topology. Let us consider all four of these properties as aspects of a Baudrillardian theory of war (or a theory of war in honour of Jean Baudrillard). First of all, the post-structure of the (non-)war machine in the age of media virtuality has the property of binary/digital. It presents itself to us through the dualistic structure of a forced binary choice, where the system obliges each of us to take a position ‘for’ or ‘against’ war, or ‘for’ or ‘against’ particular wars, as waged, for example, by the Pentagon, the EU ‘humanitarian’ forces, or the surveillance state’s War on Terror. It is this very binary logic of ‘yes’ or ‘no’ that is the news media discourse, the rhetoric of politicians, and the hybrid virtual-and-real-killing of the screen and the bomb. Today, of course, the Internet has superceded television as the prevailing universal media (although there is much convergence and combination of the two). And the Internet is much more interactive and participatory. There is much more response. There is much less of a ‘spectacle’ than there was when Guy Debord and the Situationists conceptualized their media theory in the 1960s. Yet everywhere that the ‘news media’ and the (non)-war machine still prevail, everywhere that they are still massively influential, everywhere that they still exercise their power, we are not quite liberated from the ‘speech without response’ described by the early Baudrillard. When Muammar Gaddafi, the former dictator of Libya, was brutally killed by rebel forces on October 20, 2011, during the Libyan Civil War, the event, having been filmed by a cell phone, was presented to worldwide viewers by almost all of the ‘news media’ as some kind of triumph for ‘justice’, even though it was clearly a loss for democratic principles and the possible coming to light of priceless information about the decades of atrocities committed by Gaddafi’s regime during a public trial which would never take place.
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#### Interpretation – affirmatives must demonstrate how they engage efforts to advocate the plan beyond hypothetical imagination in the 1AC – only this model signals spiritual life and prevents ascetic tourism.

**Reid-Brinkley 20** – Shanara Reid-Brinkley 2020, “The Future is Black: Afropessimism, Fugitivity, and Radical Hope in Education”, Edited by Carl Grant, Ashley Woodson, Michael Dumas, https://books.google.com/books?id=SMHyDwAAQBAJ&pg=PR5&source=gbs\_selected\_pages&cad=2#v=onepage&q&f=false//WY

What lies in the wake" of competitive policy debate? How are Black debaters doing wake work? In the following section I take two examples from the National Debate Tournament Final Round to demonstrate wake work in competitive debate. Next, I ana-lyze the central argument in the final round characterizing the current clash of civilizations in debate and the ramifications of building community in debate. The final round of the 2017 National Debate Tournament was not just a com- petition, it was a referendum on the notion of a universal community and the structural exclusions and fairness issues that characterize the traditions and norms of competitive practice. Georgetown is affirmative in the debate and of fer a federal policy toward Alaska as an example of a specific proposal to combat catastrophic climate change. Based on the norms of competition, Georgetown presents a coherent affirmative argument providing an effective stasis point for fair deliberation of the climate change resolution. After the affirmative's speech Rutgers is allowed to cross-examine the speaker. Devane Murphy asks, “When is the first life saved as a result of the afffirmative]?” (2017). While Georgetown admits that a debate round cannot save lives directly, they argue that discuss- ing climate change policy is a valuable academic conversation. Rutgers then asks a series of questions about Georgetown's relationship as individuals to the people and places targeted by the federal policy they suggest: “Do you know any people in the arctic? Do you know any communities in the arctic? Can you name a family in the arctic?” (Murphy, 2017). While Georgetown answers no to these questions, they argue that a focus on debaters as individuals rather than the policy option they have presented is a distraction from the stasis point they have set for the debate. Using Afropessimism as a heuristic for engaging the resolution, debaters like Rutgers, reject any affirmation of the United States Federal Government. For these students, the federal government is always an unethical actor. In as much as the resolutional statement requires the affirmative to posit federal government action as an ethical response to public need, the vast majority of Black debaters refuse to take such a position. To combat this refusal to follow com- petitive norms, the Framework argument developed to confront the disruption of the normative form and content of policy debate competition. Framework debaters (mostly White and non-Black POCs) argue that if a team violates the norms of common practice they reject the normative stasis points for delibera-tion destroying the educational benefits of policy debate. Framework has operated as a strategic tool of capture and exclusion of Black thought in competitive debate. However, as "the holds multiply" so too does Black innovation. Rutgers' strategy in the final round took the form of the traditional Framework argument, but using Black thought to revise the content and turn it against the norms of traditional debate. Black Framework, Rutgers' strategy, argued that the affirmative must embody their politics and demonstrate how they directly engage in efforts to reduce climate change. Rutgers' argues that Georgetown is disconnected from their politics which is why they can advocate a policy that may affect the people of the Arctic while having little knowledge of those people or their lives. This kind of orientation toward policy action is dangerous, encouraging what Rutgers refers to as “ascetic tourism" by which debaters role-playing policy advocates “tour [the] trauma of various populations without ever acting to alleviate the harm” (Murphy, 2017). When Georgetown seeks further clarification of Black Framework, Rutgers' responds: "We provided an interpretation of what we think debate should look like, the same way in which when you're negative and you read my affirmative and you say we should not be able to do what we do. Very simple” (Murphy, 2017). Georgetown often runs the traditional Framework argument against Black Debate teams who fall outside their interpretation of a fair stasis point for debate about the resolution. Rutgers' turns the tables on Georgetown argu- ing that the traditional form of policy debate produces poor policy advocates and that Black Debate practice which centers embodied political practice is a superior method of training political advocates. Black Framework is an exam- ple of political theorizing from the hold. It operates from the perspective that anti-blackness is the stage upon which all political deliberation is played and then strategically identifies a tactic and an exigency for disruption.Rutgers capitalizes on the growing middle majority of judges who agree that Black Debate practice is an effective training tool for political advocacy. The use of Black Framework flips the script; it is a jarring (re)performance of the acts of exclusion that Black debaters have faced for decades. It took the form of Framework, paired with Black content, to argue that the neo-liberal norms of civil society would no longer get a free pass as the base frame for political negotiation. Rutgers turned a mirror on debate and offered a reflection of itself haunted by the specter of Black death. Arguing Black Framework was an act of bringing out the dead.

#### Vote Neg:

#### 1 – Access – Not only are privileged debaters forced to mobilize as accomplices to minority debaters, but students confront how abstract vernacular shapes knowledge outside of the round.

#### 2 – Presumption – Absent a connection towards space exploration that moves past fiated action, voting aff cannot actualize their advantages and entrench cruel optimism.

#### 3 – Pornotroping – The 1AC utilizes suffering as a currency to trade in exchange for ballots which commodifies experience – our interp forces them to realize the lived consequences of in-round practices.

#### 4 – TVA – Introduce a petition to halt space exploration.

#### Drop the debater – we indict their model of debate. Evaluate the T-shell through competing interpretations – you cannot be reasonably oppressive, and reasonability bright-lines are arbitrary which requires judge intervention. No RVIs – you should not win for proving you’re accessible – their model deters debaters from indicting oppressive practices and it forces debaters to defend repugnant norms.

#### 1NC Theory First – If I was abusive it’s because the AC was.
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#### Interpretation – affirmatives must not defend implementation on the JanFeb 2021-2022 Topic.

#### Violation – they do.

#### 1 – Jurisdiction – it’s NSDA rules.

**NSDA 21** – 2021-22 Lincoln-Douglas Ballot, https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/Sample-Lincoln-Douglas-Debate-Ballot-Blank.pdf // JB

Each **debater** has the burden to **prove** their **side** of the resolution **more valid** as a **general principle**. It is **unrealistic** to expect a debater to prove **complete validity or invalidity** of the resolution. The **better debater** is the one who, on the whole, proves their side of the resolution **more valid** as a general principle.

#### Outweighs – It’s on the LD ballot which means whenever a judge submits the ballot it’s what they contractually abide by.

#### 2 – Precision:

#### Resolved in LD is a statement of values.

**UPitt ND** – University Of Pittsburgh Communications Services Webteam, copyright 2015-21, "Basic Definitions," Department of Communication , <https://www.comm.pitt.edu/basic-definitions> CHO

Affirmative/Pro. The side that “affirms” the resolution (is “pro” the issue). For example, the affirmative side in a debate using the resolution of policy, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens, would advocate for federal government implementation of a poverty reduction program. Argument. A statement, or claim, followed by a justification, or warrant. Justifications are responses to challenges, often linked by the word “because.” Example: The sun helps people, because the sun activates photosynthesis in plants, which produce oxygen so people can breathe. Constructive Speech. The first speeches in a debate, where the debaters “construct” their cases by presenting initial positions and arguments. Cross-examination. Question and answer sessions between debaters. Debate. A deliberative exercise characterized by formal procedures of argumentation, involving a set resolution to be debated, distinct times for debaters to speak, and a regulated order of speeches given. Evidence. Supporting materials for arguments. Standards for evidence are field-specific. Evidence can range from personal testimony, statistical evidence, research findings, to other published sources. Quotations drawn from journals, books, newspapers, and other audio-visuals sources are rather common. Negative/Con. The side that “negates” the resolution (is “con” the issue). For example, the negative side in a debate using the resolution of fact, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production, would argue that global warming does not threaten agricultural production. Preparation Time. Debates often necessitate time between speeches for students to gather their thoughts and consider their opponent's arguments. This preparation is generally a set period of time and can be used at any time by either side at the conclusion of a speech. Rebuttal Speech. The last speeches in a debate, where debaters summarize arguments and draw conclusions about the debate. Resolution. A specific statement or question up for debate. Resolutions usually appear as statements of policy, fact or value. Statement of policy. Involves an actor (local, national, or global) with power to decide a course of action. For example, Resolved: The United States federal government should implement a poverty reduction program for its citizens. Statement of fact. Involves a dispute about empirical phenomenon. For example, Resolved: Global warming threatens agricultural production. Statement of value. Involves conflicting moral dilemmas. For example, Resolved: The death penalty is a justified method of punishment. Topic. A general issue to debate. Topics could be “The Civil War,” “genetic engineering,” or “Great Books.”

#### Be is a linking verb, not an action verb so implementation is incoherent.

Grammar Monster ND – "Linking Verbs," Grammar Monster, <https://www.grammar-monster.com/glossary/linking_verbs.htm> CHO

What Are Linking Verbs? (with Examples) A linking verb is used to re-identify or to describe its subject. A linking verb is called a linking verb because it links the subject to a subject complement (see graphic below). Infographic Explaining Linking Verb A linking verb tells us what the subject is, not what the subject is doing. Easy Examples of Linking Verbs In each example, the linking verb is highlighted and the subject is bold. Alan is a vampire. (Here, the subject is re-identified as a vampire.) Alan is thirsty. (Here, the subject is described as thirsty.)



#### Precision outweighs: (A) They can arbitrarily jettison words which decks ground and preparation. (B) Jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the authority to vote aff if it wasn’t legitimate.

#### 3 – Fairness: (A) It prevents abusive PICs out of certain parts of the plan that steal aff ground by isolating a hyper-specific DA to the plan. (B) Extra-T – The resolution is a value statement, which means the CI justifies them defending infinite policy action that could affirm appropriation as unjust.
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#### Interpretation – space mining isn’t appropriation – it’s not permanent and OST consensus.

Hofmann and Bergamasco 19 [Mahulena Hofmann (SES Chair in Space, SatCom and Media Law at the University of Luxembourg) and Federico Bergamasco (PhD Researcher in aviation, telecommunication and space law University of Luxembourg). “Space resources activities from the perspective of sustainability: legal aspects”. Global Sustainability. 9 December 2019. Accessed 12/18/21. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/DF153F4A77970AC9E12444EC2B001F8A/S2059479819000279a.pdf/div-class-title-space-resources-activities-from-the-perspective-of-sustainability-legal-aspects-div.pdf> //Xu]

However, the purpose of space mining activities is considered to be neither any ‘appropriation’ of parts of outer space nor of space resources in situ. Instead, the sole aim of any such activities is their extraction, use and commercialization, without any territorial demands or titles as to the celestial bodies (or parts thereof) concerned (Mizushima et al., 2017). The argument, which sees in the use or exploitation of a space mineral by one subject a limitation of the same right of another subject, is difficult to contest by other means than analogy with space exploration. As has been recognized by the drafters of the OST in its Articles IX and XII, a purely scientific project in one area of outer space could de facto prevent research at the same site by a subject from another State. To avoid such situations, the Treaty pre-envisages a system of international consultations aimed at avoiding any harmful interference with operations.

#### OST is the standard for space law.

Wikipedia No Date [Wikipedia. “Outer Space Treaty.” No Date. Accessed 12/18/21. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Outer_Space_Treaty> //Xu]

The Outer Space Treaty, formally the Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies, is a multilateral treaty that forms the basis of international space law. Negotiated and drafted under the auspices of the United Nations, it was opened for signature in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union on 27 January 1967, entering into force on 10 October 1967. As of February 2021, 111 countries are parties to the treaty—including all major spacefaring nations—and another 23 are signatories.[1][5][note 1]

#### 1 – Precision – C/A from the last shell.

#### 2 – Predictable limits – their aff explodes the object of the resolution to include random space activities from tourism to research to satellite surveillance – that allows them to cherry-pick the best aff with no neg ground – also kills predictable advocacies which decks prepared engagement.