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## 1

#### Interpretation – The affirmative can only garner offense from “the appropriation of outer space by private entities being unjust”. To clarify, they can’t garner offense off of methods to solve private entities appropriating outer space such as treaties or actor action.

#### Violation – They have extra offense embracing the lack

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits –The CI will let the aff garner offense from any possible way to reduce property rights/private appropriation, which can range from treaties like OST, PTD, Common Heritage or state/actor action, and any other ation like nationoalization, communism etc, which there are hundreds of. Turns clash and leads to surface level understanding

#### 2] Strat-Skew – open ended questions Forces the negative to allows fall back onto generics and randomo pics that can never have the potential to engage with affirmative on a content level.

#### Voters -

#### 1] Education – 2-month time limit on the topic means every round is valuable. Specific education about the direct question the resolution asks is the only take away we get from this event. Precision in what they aff can read forces concise topic research in a limited area that allows us to deeply explore every area of the topic.

#### Paradigms -

#### Extra T is drop the debater – We indict your ability to read and garner offense from the affirmative in the first place. DTA on this shell means drop the aff as a whole anyway. The more the aff drops offense to meet the shell the less they solve and you can vote on presumption.

#### Competing interps over reasonability – Reasonability is always arbitrary and can never set a Brightline on what is reasonable and what isn’t. Extra T is a question of models not specific affirmatives or rounds.

#### No RVIs on Extra T –

#### 1] Extra T is a gateway issue for the negative towards the affirmative. Affirmative is always proactive towards topicality while the neg is forced to always be reactive towards the affirmative. The ground is skewed because we always have to hyper tailor T args to the affirmative while the aff can infinitely prep out the 6 T shells on the Topic

#### 2] Illogical – You don’t get to win for following the rules. That’s like me getting to win because I didn’t read 8 condo positions

#### 3] Deterrence – Winning you are topical isn’t justification for an aff ballot. Deters debaters from calling out untopical affs against techier opponents because they will always lose on the flow even if they are true. Shouldn’t actively punish for trying to meet the rules of the game.

#### Extra T outweighs 1AR theory –

#### 1] Extra T is a forced reaction to untopical affs, even if we did something wrong, you drew first blood. Any abuse from the negative is predicated by abuse from the affirmative.

## 2

#### [Badiou 08] “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point, however, is to change it” – truth is the process from theory to practice, pure theorization divorced of practice and rebellions leads to useless accumulation of ideas and idealist absurdities. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best method to rebel against the reactionary bourgeoise

Badiou 08 [(Alain Badiou, a professor emeritus of philosophy at the Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris, works with Organisation Politique, a postparty organization.)“The Maoism of Alain Badiou.” The Marxist-Leninist, The Marxist-Leninist, 24 Mar. 2008, marxistleninist.wordpress.com/2008/03/23/the-maoism-of-alain-badiou/. Accessed 4 Sept. 2021.] Comrade PW

A. Practice, Theory, Knowledge We are already handed something essential here: every Marxist statement is—in a single, dividing movement—observation and directive. As a concentrate of real practice, it equals its movement in order to return to it. Since all that is draws its being only from its becoming, equally, theory as knowledge of what is has being only by moving toward that of which it is the theory. Every knowledge is orientation, every description is prescription. The sentence, “it is right to rebel against the reactionaries,” bears witness to this more than any other. In it we find expressed the fact that Marxism, prior to being the full-fledged science of social formation, is the distillate of what rebellion demands: that one consider it right, that reason be rendered to it. Marxism is both a taking sides and the systematization of a partisan experience. The existence of a science of social formations bears no interest for the masses unless it reflects and concentrates their real revolutionary movement. Marxism must be conceived as the accumulated wisdom of popular revolutions, the reason they engender, the fixation and detailing of their target. Mao Zedong’s sentence clearly situates rebellion as the originary place of correct ideas, and reactionaries as those whose destruction is legitimated by theory. Mao’s sentence situates Marxist truth within the unity of theory and practice. Marxist truth is that from which rebellion draws its rightness, its reason, to demolish the enemy. It repudiates any equality in the face of truth. In a single movement, which is knowledge in its specific division into description and directive, it judges, pronounces the sentence, and immerses itself in its execution. Rebels possess knowledge, according to their aforementioned essential movement, their power and their duty: to annihilate the reactionaries. Marx’s Capital does not say anything different: the proletarians are right to violently overthrow the capitalists. Marxist truth is not a conciliatory truth. It is, in and of itself, dictatorship and, if need be, terror. Mao Zedong’s sentence reminds us that, for a Marxist, the link from theory to practice (from reason to rebellion) is an internal condition of theory itself, because truth is a real process, it is rebellion against the reactionaries. There is hardly a truer and more profound statement in Hegel than the following: “The absolute Idea has turned out to be the identity of the theoretical Idea and the practical Idea. Each of these by itself is still one-sided” (Hegel, [Science of Logic](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/hl/hlconten.htm)). For Hegel, absolute truth is the contradictory unity of theory and practice. It is the uninterrupted and divided process of being and the act. Lenin salutes this enthusiastically: “The unity of the theoretical idea (of knowledge) and of practice—this NB—and this unity precisely in the theory of knowledge, for the resulting sum is the “absolute idea” (Lenin, [Philosophical Notebooks](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/volume38.htm)). Let us read this sentence very carefully, since, remarkably, it divides the word “knowledge” into two. That is a crucial point, on which we shall often return: knowledge, as theory, is (dialectically) opposed to practice. Theory and practice form a unity, that is to say, for the dialectic, a unity of opposites. But this knowledge (theory/)practice contradiction is in turn the very object of the theory of knowledge. In other words, the inner nature of the process of knowledge is constituted by the theory/practice contradiction. Or again, practice, which as such is dialectically opposed to knowledge (to theory), is nevertheless an integral part of knowledge qua process. In all Marxist texts we encounter this scission, this double occurrence of the word “knowledge,” designating either theory in its dialectical correlation to practice or the overall process of this dialectic, that is, the contradictory movement of these two terms, theory and practice. Consider Mao, [“Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?”](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-9/mswv9_01.htm): “Often, correct knowledge can be arrived at only after many repetitions of the process . . . leading from practice to knowledge and then back to practice. Such is the Marxist theory of knowledge, the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge” (Mao Zedong, Five Philosophical Essays). The movement of knowledge is the practice-knowledge-practice trajectory. Here “knowledge” designates one of the terms in the process but equally the process taken as a whole, a process that in turn includes two occurrences of practice, initial and final. To stabilize our vocabulary,2 and remain within the tradition, we will call “theory” the term in the theory/practice contradiction whose overall movement will be the process of “knowledge.” We will say: Knowledge is the dialectical process practice/theory. On this basis we may expose the reactionary illusion entertained by those who imagine they can circumvent the strategic thesis of the primacy of practice. It is clear that whoever is not within the real revolutionary movement, whoever is not practically internal to the rebellion against the reactionaries, knows nothing, even if he theorizes. Mao Zedong did indeed affirm that in the theory/practice contradiction—that is, in a phase of the real process—theory could temporarily play the main role: “The creation and advocacy of revolutionary theory plays the principal and decisive role in those times of which Lenin said, ‘Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement'” (Mao, [On Contradiction](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_17.htm)). Does this mean that, at that moment, theory amounts to an intrinsic revolutionary possibility, that pure “Marxist theoreticians” can and must emerge? Absolutely not. It means that, in the theory/practice contradiction that constitutes the process of knowledge, theory is the principal aspect of the contradiction; that the systematization of practical revolutionary experiences is what allows one to advance; that it is useless to continue quantitatively to accumulate these experiences, to repeat them, because what is on the agenda is the qualitative leap, the rational synthesis immediately followed by its application, that is, its verification. But without these experiences, without organized practice (because organization alone allows the centralization of experiences), there is no systematization, no knowledge at all. Without a generalized application there is no testing ground, no verification, no truth. In that case “theory” can only give birth to idealist absurdities. We thus come back to our starting point: practice is internal to the rational movement of truth. In its opposition to theory, it is part of knowledge. It is this intuition that accounts for Lenin’s enthusiastic reception of the Hegelian conception of the absolute Idea, to the point that he makes Marx into the mere continuation of Hegel. (“Marx, consequently, clearly sides with Hegel in introducing the criterion of practice into the theory of knowledge,” Lenin, [Philosophical Notebooks](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/volume38.htm).) Mao Zedong’s sentence lends its precision to Lenin’s enthusiasm. It is the general historical content of Hegel’s dialectical statement. It is not just any practice that internally anchors theory, it is the rebellion against the reactionaries. Theory, in turn, does not externally legislate on practice, on rebellion: it incorporates itself in the rebellion by the mediating release of its reason. In this sense, it is true that the sentence says it all, an all that summarizes Marxism’s class position, its concrete revolutionary significance. An all outside which stands anyone who tries to consider Marxism not from the standpoint of rebellion but from that of the break; not from the standpoint of history but from that of the system; not from the standpoint of the primacy of practice but from that of the primacy of theory; not as the concentrated form of the wisdom of the working people but as its a priori condition.

#### [Gordon 1] Psychoanalysis is pointless political defeatism that trades off with Marxist struggles against capital.

**Gordon 1** Paul Gordon, Professor in the Humanities department at University of Colorado - Boulder. “Psychoanalysis and racism: the politics of defeat.” Race & Class. Copyright 2001 Institute of Race Relations, Vol. 42(4). || COMRADE OES-SW

The flight from politics Cohen is in many ways representative of those `radicals' who, in response to the setback of the radical political project of the 1960s and 1970s, abandoned not just the Marxist framework within which they had worked, but anything which they saw as in any way connected to the idea of the Enlightenment. It is here, goes the thinking, that the roots of so much that is wrong with radical politics are to be found, for it is with the Enlightenment that men (yes, men) begin to think that they, rather than God or fate, may be able to make history. But for the postmodernists, this is not only hubris, it is a hubris that leads inexorably to the nightmares of the twentieth century, in particular the Holocaust and the Gulag. Cohen adds to this the claim that the very notion of `enlightenment' (his inverted commas) is deeply implicated in a practice of reason which is historically rooted in certain dominant forms of European race thinking. Reason, he appears to be saying, is racist.57 The postmodernists' problem is that they cannot live with disappointment. All the tragedies of the political project of emancipation ± the evils of Stalinism in particular ± are seen as the inevitable product of men and women trying to create a better society. But, rather than engage in a critical assessment of how, for instance, radical political movements go wrong, they discard the emancipatory project and impulse itself. The postmodernists, as Sivanandan puts it, blame modernity for having failed them: `the intellectuals and academics have fled into discourse and deconstruction and representation ± as though to interpret the world is more important than to change it, as though changing the interpretation is all we could do in a changing world'.58 To justify their flight from a politics holding out the prospect of radical change through self-activity, the disappointed intellectuals find abundant intellectual alibis for themselves in the very work they champion, including, in Cohen's case, psychoanalysis. What Marshall Berman says of Foucault seems true also of psychoanalysis; that it offers `a world-historical alibi' for the passivity and helplessness felt by many in the 1970s, and that it has nothing but contempt for those naive enough to imagine that it might be possible for modern humankind to be free. At every turn for such theorists, as Berman argues, whether in sexuality, politics, even our imagination, we are nothing but prisoners: there is no freedom in Foucault's world, because his language forms a seamless web, a cage far more airtight than anything Weber ever dreamed of, into which no life can break . . . There is no point in trying to resist the oppressions and injustices of modern life, since even our dreams of freedom only add more links to our chains; however, once we grasp the futility of it all, at least we can relax.59 Cohen's political defeatism and his conviction in the explanatory power of his new faith of psychoanalysis lead him to be contemptuous and dismissive of any attempt at political solidarity or collective action. For him, `communities' are always `imagined', which, in his view, means based on fantasy, while different forms of working-class organisation, from the craft fraternity to the revolutionary group, are dismissed as `fantasies of self-suf®cient combination'.60 In this scenario, the idea that people might come together, think together, analyse together and act together as rational beings is impossible. The idea of a genuine community of equals becomes a pure fantasy, a `symbolic retrieval' of something that never existed in the first place: `Community is a magical device for conjuring something apparently solidary out of the thin air of modern times, a mechanism of re-enchantment.' As for history, it is always false, since `We are always dealing with invented traditions.'61 Now, this is not only nonsense, but dangerous nonsense at that. Is history `always false'? Did the Judeocide happen or did it not? And did not some people even try to resist it? Did slavery exist or did it not, and did not people resist that too and, ultimately, bring it to an end? And are communities always `imagined'? Or, as Sivanandan states, are they beaten out on the smithy of a people's collective struggle? Furthermore, all attempts to legislate against ideology are bound to fail because they have to adopt `technologies of surveillance and control identical to those used by the state'. Note here the Foucauldian language to set up the notion that all `surveillance' is bad. But is it? No society can function without surveillance of some kind. The point, surely, is that there should be a public conversation about such moves and that those responsible for implementing them be at all times accountable. To equate, as Cohen does, a council poster about `Stamping out racism' with Orwell's horrendous prophecy in 1984 of a boot stamping on a human face is ludicrous and insulting. (Orwell's image was intensely personal and destructive; the other is about the need to challenge not individuals, but a collective evil.) Cohen reveals himself to be deeply ambivalent about punitive action against racists, as though punishment or other ®rm action against them (or anyone else transgressing agreed social or legal norms) precluded `understanding' or even help through psychotherapy. It is indeed a strange kind of `anti-racism' that portrays active racists as the `victims', those who are in need of `help'. But this is where Cohen's argument ends up. In their move from politics to the academy and the world of `discourse', the postmodernists may have simply exchanged one grand narrative, historical materialism, for another, psychoanalysis.62 For psychoanalysis is a grand narrative, par excellence. It is a theory that seeks to account for the world and which recognises few limits on its explanatory potential. And the claimed radicalism of psychoanalysis, in the hands of the postmodernists at least, is not a radicalism at all but a prescription for a politics of quietism, fatalism and defeat. Those wanting to change the world, not just to interpret it, need to look elsewhere.

#### [S&L 17] The future is determined by current practices and ideologies, we must disrupt and contest the neoliberal ideology and invest in the communist fantasy of space

Sammler and Lynch 17 [(Katherine Sammler is an Assistant Professor in Global Studies & Maritime Affairs. Her research focuses on political geography and resource management of non-terrestrial spaces like oceans, atmospheres, and outer space. Casey Lynch is an urban, political, and digital geographer aiming to understand the relationships of power through which particular visions of urban techno-futures come to monopolize popular imagination and guide policy and action.)2017 Sammler, K. & Lynch, C. Spaceport America: Contested Offworld Access and the Everyman Astronaut. American Association of Geographers An- nual Meeting, Boston, MA, 5–9, Apr. Free access here: (<https://csum-dspace.calstate.edu/bitstream/handle/10211.3/207988/Sammler%20-%202019_SpaceportAmericaPreprint.pdf?sequence=1>)] Comrade PW

While private firms increasingly gain control over key technology and infrastructure, their long-term viability is dependent on the emergence of a class of offworld consumers. Virgin Galactic founder, Richard Branson, proclaims his hope is to “create thousands of astronauts over the next few years... [and for] every country in the world to have their own astronauts rather than the privileged few” (September 2004). This anticipatory discourse from the commercial sector’s cultivated imaginary, enticement for the every- man astronaut, is rather different than Congress and NASA’s projection of the everybusiness astromarket–a function of their diverging audiences of citizen taxpayer versus space business mogul. Virgin Galactic is working to build a Future Astronaut global community that they anticipate as a “wonderfully diverse group of pioneering individuals” (Virgin Galactic website), yet requires $250,000 to be paid as an upfront deposit. As of 2013 the Future Astronauts club boasts over 600 men, women, and children from more than 50 nations that have bought in. The spaceport facility is a manifestation of this transitional imaginary away from the publicly-supported space program of the expert astronaut towards publiclysubsidized private ventures, portending an offworld future that reproduces and refines neoliberal relations. As discussed earlier, the image of the everyman astronaut touted by Branson and others has a longer history going back to NASA’s shuttle programs. The fusion of Branson’s pseudo-egalitarian discourse and NASA’s vision of the everyman astronaut are key to securing the dual support needed for the current public-private space model–the transnational class of millionaires and billionaires who stand to become the first space tourists or otherwise stand to benefit from commercial space activity, and the broader, grounded public, whose tax- dollars are needed to support the basic infrastructures needed to make future commercial space enterprises possible. The Spaceport Between Us Spaceport America, while consistently missing its financial and launch goals, still maintains some control of its place within the cultural imaginary. As it continues to sit vacant, awaiting the first commercial launches, the facilities have been used as backdrops for music videos, commercials, and Hollywood film productions. While such activities may seem unrelated to the Spaceport America vision, these forms of media indeed help further spread the image of the everyman astronaut and discursively orient the future of public-private space travel. Spaceport America promotes the first major motion picture filmed at the facility on their website: “The production employed at least 100 New Mexico crew members and approximately 30 New Mexico principal actors and an estimated 1,000 local background talent” (Spaceport America 2016). Spaceport’s kickoff film project, The Space Between Us (2017), is a romantic teen drama about a boy born on Mars who falls in love with a girl he met via the internet back on Earth. In it, the spaceport is pictured as the headquarters of a private space company that has partnered with NASA to found a colony on Mars. The birth of the main character on Mars is seen as a mistake that is covered up by the company managers, who fear the news would hurt the company’s support from NASA and their private investors. The film is littered with discussions of the company’s business model. Yet, the vision of the everyman astronaut touted by the private space sector and NASA, and reproduced in popular media, has not been completely successful in securing public support for Spaceport America. Google reviews of Spaceport America reveal some public concerns, as Bryan Lindenberger writes: “A great idea at one time, but turned into more tax- payer funded welfare for the wealthy and wired-in. I played a small part in touting it as a huge boon for local economy through tourism, but there’s really not much to see here.” User “Rich Alfano,” writes a one star review, “A huge taxpayer funded boondoggle in the frigging desert! A waste of time and money on a white elephant built for the wealthy,” while another claims “Space Port. The place for rich people only. NO POOR ALLOWED.” These criticisms have been echoed more broadly across the state as the New Mexico State Auditor found that in 2016 only $2.2 million of an over $10 million operating budget was covered by income from commercial lease- holders (NM State NPR, Dec. 8 2017; New Mexico Spaceport Authority 2016). As the facility is not yet self-sufficient, it has relied on “excess funds” from state coffers to cover its daily operating budget. The facility has also drawn criticism for failing to meet public transparency requirements, including refusing requests for public documents and blacking out key information from those documents released (Las Cruces-Sun News, Aug. 23 2017). Indeed, Spaceport managers have asked the New Mexico state legislature to exempt the facility from public records laws with the express intent of offering privacy to their corporate tenants (El Paso Proud, Mar. 14, 2017). While New Mexico residents have criticised the fiscal model and state policies supporting Spaceport America, activists and amateur astronauts elsewhere have focused their attention on proposing alternatives to the public-private model of offworld activity that it represents. The final declara- tion of the Association of Autonomous Astronauts reads: “On April 23rd 2000, which marks the fifth anniversary of the official launch of our inde- pendent space exploration programme, the AAA will spontaneously dissolve itself in order to initiate a new phase of selfhistorification. We will enter the realm of myth, an inspiration for the Next Generation of space explorers.” Since the spontaneous self-dissolution of AAA in 2000, the Next Generation has indeed arisen. Space for a Constellation of Actors The Autonomous Space Association Network (ASAN, NASA’s acronym in reverse), which sees themselves as a direct descendant of AAA’s activities, is “planting the ideological and technical seeds for future space revolutionaries...to let the world know that autonomous space exploration is not only possible, it is imperative.” The network launches high altitude balloons through their Aphrodite Balloon Program and hopes to experiment with open-source rocketry and cubesat technology. In 2017, one ASAN launch made headlines as the “First protest in space” (a claim that potentially over- looks actions like the 1973 Skylab strike discussed above) for sending a printout of a tweet high into Earth’s atmosphere criticizing the Trump administration’s reduced funding for NASA’s space program (The Washington Post, Apr. 14 2017). The message read “@realDonaldTrump: Look at that, you son of a bitch.” This was a sentiment taken from astronaut Edgar Mitchell (quoted in Swearingen 2017), describing viewing earth from outer space: “You develop an instant global consciousness, a people orientation, an intense dissatisfaction with the state of the world, and a compulsion to do something about it. From out there on the moon, international politics look so petty. You want to grab a politician by the scruff of the neck and drag him a quarter of a million miles out and say, ‘Look at that, you son of a bitch.’” Other projects ASAN is developing include producing open-source rocket engines, placing a cubesat in orbit by 2020, and creating programs teaching youth how to receive signals from the International Space Station and amateur satellites. ASAN’s logic stems from the fact that “everyone is already an astronaut by virtue of existing on this vast spaceship we call ‘Earth.’ Our members are distressed that the exploration of the cosmos has been entirely monopolized by military actors and, increasingly, private interests.” This network of community-based groups do both discursive work and material projects to (re)claim a collective place in space, advancing a mission that is two-fold: on the one hand, we seek to overturn this government and corporate monopoly on space exploration by raising awareness that everyone is entitled to space and should demand its peaceful exploration. Secondly, ASAN is pursuing the development of open-source technologies so that space exploration becomes a truly global phenom- enon in the future, rather than the privilege of a handful of government astronauts (Laika Valentina, ASAN Director General, personal comm. Dec 8, 2017). As ASAN pursues its goals, it will be able to take advantage of designs, plans, and data from a growing open source space movement. The notion of “open source” has its origin in the software development sector and is used to describe software whose source code is not subject to private intellectual property regimes, and is thus available to study, edit, modify, and reuse. By allowing open experimentation and decentralized cooperation, the open source development model has spawned constant innovation in software while promoting alternative models of work and ownership (Coleman 2013). In recent years, the successes of the open source software movement has prompted similar activities across hardware development, including the development and production of satellites, rockets and spacecraft (Powell 2012; Simmons, Moran, and Black 2011). ASAN plans to make use of recent developments in open source Cubesat technology–small satellites weighing between 1 and 10 kilograms that can be easily launched into orbit by “piggybacking” on other launches (Woellert et al. 2011). Copenhagen Suborbitals may be the most technologically advanced group in the growing open source space movement. Founded in 2008, Copenhagen Suborbitals touts itself as “the world’s only manned amateur space program.” The program relies on crowdfunding, volunteers, and open-source technology and has launched five rockets and space capsules since 2011. The group operates out of a shipyard in Copenhagen, Denmark and launches from a ship in a military firing practice area in the Baltic Sea off the coast of the Danish island of Bornholm. In order to carry out their rocket launches, they negotiate complicated state regulations which limit access to outer space. The group claims to be “the only space organisation that launches rockets from a sailing platform in international waters, since it’s virtually impossible to get permission to do it from the ground in any country” (CopSub website, accessed Dec. 24, 2017). Yet, the group still needs to cooperate with the Danish and Swedish navies and other authorities to ensure the closure of the airspace over their launch sites, access to the firing practice area, and to ensure the launches occur under proper weather conditions. Thus, while the group is autonomous, its activities rely on at least the passive acceptance of national governments, demonstrating that the state is not absent from off- planet activities, but that its main thrust is shifting to facilitation and coordination of such endeavors. Copenhagen Suborbitals is based around the development, testing, and use of open source technology. They post frequent text and video updates on their blog about the evolution of their designs and their successful and failed experiments with rocketry systems, space capsules, parachutes, space suits, and communication systems, among other technical aspects of their mission– designs and plans that then may be taken and modified by other DIY (Do-It- Yourself) space programs. Copenhagen Suborbitals’ autonomous, open source, volunteer-based, and crowdfunded model presents a different image of the everyman astronaut than those promoted by NASA or the private space industry. While the group works toward launching their first crewed rocket, they describe who their first astronaut may be: We’re ordinary guys building a big rocket, so our astronaut should also be an ordinary person. Hiring a professional superhero just wouldn’t match our philosophy (or budget). It should be someone like ourselves, a teacher, engineer, unemployed or housewife with a very, very special dream and balls made of rocket- grade alloy... It will fit with our DIY culture that she or he has been building the rocket herself. (Copenhagen Suborbitals website, accessed Dec. 21, 2017) While echoing other familiar discourses around the everyman astronaut (and working through some gendering regarding housewives and testicles), coupled with Copenhagen Suborbitals’ broader organizational model and relationship to technology, this discourse presents a far more collective understanding of offworld access. Conclusion With the shifting role of nation-states in offplanet activity, there are openings for outer space to become another site of capital accumulation and neoliberal relations of domination and exclusion. Yet, there is also potential to manifest outer space as envisioned by social movements such as the Association of Autonomous Astronauts. Connecting the cultural and political dimensions of the “everyman astronaut” with the techno-material infrastructures of Spaceport America and decentralized, communal space programs, demonstrates how the future is rendered present through a spectrum of visions and practices. The actors discussed in this paper are each negotiating various anticipatory futures. The premises set forth in the Outer Space Treaty – outer space exploration and use for the benefit of all – are not guaranteed visions for the future. Congealed in the upward-looking infrastructure of Spaceport America is the material and symbolic rhetoric of publicly funded, private space development, a trajectory that runs from the defunding of NASA’s shuttle program through the U.S. Space Act. Autonomous outer space collectives activate radical visions and practices that plug into the technological assemblages of open source rocketry that erode status quo development models emerging for offplanet activities. These competing outer space imaginaries, and multiple others, are vying to reconfigure the political economic, technological, and cultural aspects of offworld access. Within this field of diverging ideologies and actors, Spaceport America exists in the desert, lacking the private launches it was built for, disappointing public taxpayers, and making its big screen debut in a movie critics call “A sci-fi-tinged heap of sentimentality” (Tribune News Service). However, despite its failings, the performative nature of this infrastructure, and the set of practices that accompany it, represent a daunting inertia, infused with decades of neoliberal doctrine. The building itself, with all its futuristic motif and technological radiance, already seems outdated. The future it stands for seems to harken back to past futures of the 1960s, a popular imagination where everyone drives a flying car. In this sense, as ASAN contends, functionally Spaceport America does not really exist ...one can only imagine the dismay of the tourists as they traverse this dead facility, a monument to a space-age that will never materialize....Spaceport America points to a reality that has never existed, a reality where spaceports offer uninhibited access to the cosmos for everybody. Arguably, Spaceport America doesn’t exist (Laika Valentina, ASAN Director General, personal comm. Dec 8, 2017, emphasis in original). Instead Spaceport America is neither a spaceport, in that it demonstrates no relation to a public infrastructure in the way that an airport does. Nor is it for America in any broad sense, but instead for the few, super-rich, while being supported by the people of the sixth poorest state in the nation. Yet, new imaginaries of offworld futures continue to proliferate, while intertwining with persistent political and material relations. Advances in robotic technology have fueled interest in future possibilities for private exploitation of mineral deposits on asteroids, the moon, and other offplanet environments–with the Colorado School of Mines even launching a program in Space Resources in 2018 (NPR, Sept. 25, 2018). In 2017, a bipartisan proposal in the US House of Representatives called for the foundation of a “United States Space Corps” within the US Air Force, while in 2018 the Trump Administration began calling for an entirely new branch of the military known as the “Space Force.” A critical geopolitics of outer space needs to be able to address–and contest–these developments, and indeed geographers are well positioned to do so. Given existing geographical scholarship on questions of human-environment interactions, extractivism, spatio-legal regimes, militarization, social movements, and processes of technological innovation and political economic change, geographers have much to contribute to understanding the shifting contours of offworld access and imagining and enacting alternative futures.

#### [Landis 21] Capitalism causes warming and extinction – prioritization of profits, commodification of nature, and its impulse to expand – only the alt solves

Landis 8-10 [(Tina Landis is the author of a new book entitled “[Climate Solutions Beyond Capitalism](https://store.pslweb.org/Climate-Solutions-Beyond-Capitalism_p_69.html).”) (2021, August 11). “Code red” climate report and the failure of capitalism. Retrieved September 26, 2021, from Liberation News website: <https://www.liberationnews.org/code-red-climate-report-and-the-failure-of-capitalism/>] Comrade PW

The [UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/09/climate/un-climate-report-takeaways.html) report released August 9 warns of a “code red for humanity” if we fail to drastically cut greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. Compiled by 234 scientists and based on analysis of 14,000 studies, the new report states that even rapidly cutting emissions immediately means warming will continue beyond 2040 — meaning adaptation measures, as well as immediate mitigation efforts, are crucial. The [report](https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-working-group-i/) states: “Global surface temperature will continue to increase until at least the mid-century under all emissions scenarios considered. Global warming of 1.5°C and 2°C will be exceeded during the 21st century unless deep reductions in carbon dioxide (CO2) and other greenhouse gas emissions occur in the coming decades.” We are currently on track to reach 3 C warming based on global emissions reduction pledges, which would be catastrophic. The report’s [Interactive Atlas](https://interactive-atlas.ipcc.ch/) forecasts various scenarios for each degree of temperature increase and its impact on precipitation and temperatures in different regions globally and shows the dire impacts if we fail to act now. Every corner of the globe is already experiencing ever worsening impacts of the climate crisis — from droughts and wildfires, to temperature extremes, floods and severe storms. Our [climate is unraveling](https://www.liberationnews.org/inaction-from-government-as-climate-unravels-coast-to-coast/) and still little is being done to turn the tide despite decades of warnings from the scientific community and the existence of actual solutions. The Earth’s systems are rapidly destabilizing faster than previous IPCC reports warned, which tend to be conservative in their predictions. If our so-called “leaders” continue to fail to act, humanity’s future is very uncertain as the life-sustaining systems of the planet falter. The endless growth model of capitalism, that treats everything on the planet as a commodity to be exploited with complete disregard for future generations, is the root cause of climate change. The capitalist “expand-or-die” model is incompatible with sustainability and is rapidly driving the majority of species toward extinction — including our own. Meanwhile, the billionaires play “astronaut” in their “space race” as the working class around the globe suffers in the real world from climate change. And the millionaires in Congress waste precious time debating the bandaid passive solutions in Biden’s infrastructure bill that may achieve some minor reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, but do nothing to steer the train off course from hurtling over the cliff. These millionaire “representatives” have proven time and again to be completely out of touch and unconcerned with the plight of those they claim to represent. From COVID relief and eviction moratoriums to an increased minimum wage, they squabble over even throwing tiny crumbs to the working class while they eagerly hand out trillions to the banks, corporations and military industrial complex. These wealthy politicians, and their billionaire corporate backers, can continue life as usual largely free of the climate impacts that the working class deals with in our “new normal.” They can just go to their second or third home if one burns down or gets washed away in a flood. They can shift their investments so that they actually make profits off these disasters. And they likely don’t even notice the increased costs for food and clean water as droughts impact availability — beyond perhaps seeing an increase in their return on investments in these sectors. Their economic status protects them from the reality that the rest of us face. It is poor communities and communities of color that are forced to live in inadequate housing that isn’t weatherized to withstand temperature extremes or to keep out wildfire smoke. It is working-class people who froze to death in their homes in the deep freeze in Texas in February and working-class people in the Pacific Northwest who died in the severe heatwave in June. It is low-income residents in the rural West whose wells are running dry, unable to afford to drill deeper wells, while Big Agriculture drains the precious aquifer for cash crops. It is the immigrant farmworkers who face lethal heatwaves and wildfire smoke working in the fields of California. It is poor communities and communities of color that are forced to live in floodplain areas where the affordable housing is, who have their homes washed away from the ever increasing severe storms. It is working-class urban communities that live in sweltering heat islands where temperatures are up to 7 F higher than in wealthy neighborhoods with trees and vegetation — which during prolonged heat waves can mean life or death. It is working-class people who are priced out of flood and fire insurance, who are left homeless when climate disasters occur. It is indigenous communities and low-income rural communities that bear the brunt of pollution and ecological destruction from extractive industries that make profits while continuing to fuel the climate crisis. The climate crisis is a class war. The rich can install state-of-the-art air filtration in their mansions so they can breathe easily while the world burns. They can move to higher elevation while the coastal areas are inundated by sea level rise. The 1% richest, the capitalist owners, have caused the climate crisis and their wealth should be used to solve it. We must stand up and demand that the government take action to protect the people from the unfolding catastrophe and do everything possible to stem the crisis. We cannot allow fear to demobilize us. There are real solutions and must join together and demand real action. And if our “leaders” continue to stall and make excuses, we must rise up and replace them with people and a system that truly does represent us. And that system is socialism, where the resources and knowledge of society are used for the benefit of all of humanity and the planet. Under socialism, our representatives would be those most qualified and knowledgeable to do the job, not those who have the millions needed to pay for campaign ads and a marketing team. Our representatives would be scientists, ecologists, engineers, medical doctors, educators, farmers and other leaders from our communities, who understand the problems and the solutions. These are the people we need in leadership — people who are workers themselves — who can mobilize all sectors of society to make the transition to an equitable and ecologically-regenerative society where humanity and all life have a positive, livable future.

#### [Escalante 18] The alt is to embrace the dual power strategy through party organizing – builds popular support by serving the people, offers accountability measures, and unified in the long-term goal of creating a better society to replace capitalism

[Escalante 18 (Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist.)theforgenews. “Party Organizing in the 21st Century.” The Forge News, The Forge News, 21 Sept. 2018, theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/. Accessed 15 Aug. 2021.] Comrade PW

Chauvinism = aggressive/exaggerated patriotism

The Need For A Party: I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

## Case

#### Presumption

#### A] embarcing the lack doesn’t solve cap or anything, just accpets anxiety

#### B] ivory tower DA – ppl in the squo.

#### C] too vague doesn’t make sense

#### [S&W 15] Neoliberalism is neither inevitable nor a historic norm – it’s a social project with a long-term goal executed by abstract theorization and strategic planning – to dismantle the global neoliberal project we must do the same and fight back by working beyond the local scale

Srnicek and Williams 15 [(Nick is a Lecturer in Digital Economy in the Department of Digital Humanities. He is interested the development of Marxist economics and engaged in the long tradition of anti-work politics. Alex Williams is a lecturer in the sociology department at City, University of London. ) *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World Without Work*. P65 – P67. Published in 2015. Accessed August 1st 2021.] Comrade PW

* AT neolib inev

A MONT PELERIN OF THE LEFT? It has often been argued that neoliberalism succeeded (and continues to succeed in spite of its failures) because it is supported by a series of overlapping and powerful interests – the transnational elite, the financiers, the major stockholders of the largest corporations. While these interests have certainly assisted the potency of the neoliberal ideology, such an explanation nevertheless leaves certain questions unanswered. If elite support was sufficient for ideological success, and if neoliberalism was clearly beneficial to elites, there would not have been a forty-year delay between the initial formulation of the ideas and their implementation. Instead, the embedded liberalism of Keynesianism remained ideologically dominant even as it constrained powerful interests. In particular, financial interests were sidelined for a long period after the 1929 crash and ensuing Great Depression. The power dynamics maintaining the Keynesian consensus needed to be taken apart piecemeal. Equally, an explanation of neoliberalism’s success that relies solely on its compatibility with particular elite interests also leaves unexplained why other possible responses to the problems of the 1970s were never implemented. An important element of neoliberalism’s eventual ideological success is that there was both a crisis and a readily available solution. The crisis (stagflation) was one that no government knew how to deal with at the time, while the solution was the preconceived neoliberal ideas that had been fermenting for decades in its ideological ecology. It was not that neoliberals presented a better argument for their position (the myth of rational political discourse); rather, an institutional infrastructure was constructed to project their ideas and establish them as the new common sense of the political elite. In all of this there are important lessons to be learned, which have led some to call for a Mont Pelerin of the left. 66 On the broadest level, this history of neoliberalism serves to demonstrate that the greatest recent success of the right – installing a neoliberal hegemony on a global scale – was accomplished through non–folk-political means. This means, in the first place, that the neoliberals thought in long-term visions. This was a different temporality from both election cycles and the boom-and-bust of individual protests. Instead, what the left can learn from is how the MPS patiently set out explicit objectives and analysed the terrain of their historical conjunction, all in order to propose specific and effective means to alter that terrain. It set its sights on long-term change, waiting forty years for the crisis of Keynesianism and the emergence of Reagan and Thatcher. In taking this approach, the intellectuals of neoliberalism thought abstractly in terms of possibilities: what was impossible during their own time became possible later, partly through their actions and preparations. Secondly, they sought to build a counter-hegemonic project that would overturn the consensus around social democracy and Keynesian policies. They took a full-spectrum approach to changing hegemonic conditions and built up an entire ideological infrastructure that was capable of insinuating itself into every political issue and every fibre of political common sense. It overthrew the hegemonic ideas of its time. As Philip Mirowski writes, their strategic genius was to appreciate that it is not enough to dangle a utopian vision just beyond reach as eventual motivation for political action; the cadre that triumphs is the side that can simultaneously mount a full set of seemingly unrelated political proposals that deal with the short-, medium-, and long-term horizons of action, combining regimes of knowledge and interim outcomes, so that the end result is the inexorable movement of the polis ever closer to the eventual goal. The shrewd strategy of simultaneously conducting both a short game and a long game, superficially appearing to the uninformed to be in mutual conflict but united behind the scenes by overarching theoretical aims, is probably the single most significant explanation of the triumph of neoliberal policies during a conjuncture where their opponents had come to expect utter refutation.67 The third major lesson for the left to learn is that the loose collective of MPS also thought expansively in spatial terms – aiming to spread the network globally, through key nodes. In the think tank, they found an organisational form adapted to the task of global intellectual hegemony. They established networks between think tanks, politicians, journalists, the media and teachers – building a consistency between these disparate groups that did not require a unity of purpose or organisational form. This entailed an admirable flexibility in their project. While neoliberalism is often denounced as being too empirically disparate to make sense as a coherent project, it is in fact the willingness to modify its ideas in light of conditions on the ground that has made it particularly powerful as an ideology. The call for a Mont Pelerin of the left should therefore not be taken as an argument to simply copy its mode of operation. The argument is rather that the left can learn from the long-term vision, the methods of global expansion, the pragmatic flexibility and the counter-hegemonic strategy that united an ecology of organisations with a diversity of interests. The demand for a Mont Pelerin of the left is ultimately a call to build anew the hegemony of the left.

#### [B&S 09] Dominant scholarship and literature on space today are still haunted by a Cold War sentiment, thus the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best deconstructs the militarized image of outer space

Bormann and Sheehan 09 [(Natalie Bormann teaches at the Department of Politics, Northeastern University, Boston. Prior to that she held a position at the Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University. Michael Sheehan is Professor of International Relations at Swansea University. His current research focuses on European space policy, and on the relationship between liberalism, democracy and war.) Bormann, Natalie. Securing Outer Space. London Routledge, 2009. |http://library.lol/main/595AB4C6B8521A6F9E7323DD023CC97E|Accessed 29 Dec. 2021.] PW

For ﬁfty years, much of our thinking about socio-political, economic and military-related issues were deﬁned, shaped and driven by the Cold War and the centrality of a comfortable paradox – that of a bipolar nuclear confrontation. A decade and a half after the end of that confrontation we are still deemed to be living in a period, the ‘post’-Cold War era, that is deﬁned only in relation to the preceding one. And while there is a strong temptation, if not an expectation, for some scholars to adhere to these well-known and totalizing terms of the debate, for others the past two generations have been animated by a different, and pervasive, intervention – the ‘space age’. The movement of humanity into space and the development of satellite technology in retrospect may well appear as the deﬁning characteristic of this period. The ﬁftieth anniversary of the beginning of the space age was marked on 4 October 2007. It was on this day, in 1957, that the Soviet Union launched Sputnik 1, the ﬁrst satellite to be placed in orbit. This dramatic event not only ushered in the space era, it also triggered a set of questions regarding the assumptions and effects that were (and are) constitutive of this new endeavour: questions of the global, the international, the political, the ethical, the technical, the scientiﬁc, humankind and modernity – to name but a few. In what ways would these questions guide, alter and intervene with our activities in space? But also, in what ways would the space age guide, alter and intervene with these questions? That day in October 1957 also marked the beginning of serious concerns regarding the modes and kinds of space activities that we would be witnessing, and these concerns were dominated from the outset by the fact that the ﬁrst journey into space was accompanied by – if not entirely driven by – the Cold War arms race. The initial steps in the exploration of space were inexorably linked with pressures to militarize and securitize this new dimension. As a geographical realm that had hitherto been pristine in relation to mankind’s warlike history, this immediate tendency for space exploration to be led by military rationales raised profound philosophical and political questions. What should the purpose of space activity be, and what should it not be? And how would we approach, understand and distinguish between military activities, civilian ones, commercial ones, and so forth? More than a half century later, the questions as to ‘what we bring to space’ as well as how space activities challenge us, and to what effects, seem ever more pressing. While the debate over some of the assumptions, modes and effects of the space age never truly abated, most of the contributors in this volume agree that there is sense of urgency in raising concern, re-conceptualizing the modes of the debate, and engaging critically with the limits and possibilities of the dimension of space vis-à-vis the political. This sense of urgency reﬂects the revitalization of national space programmes, and particularly that of the United States and China since the start of the twenty-ﬁrst century. In January 2004, at NASA headquarters, US President George W. Bush announced the need for a new vision for America’s civilian and scientiﬁc space programme. This call culminated in a Commission’s Report on Implementation of United States Space Exploration Policy, which emphasized the fundamental role of space for US technological leadership, economic validity, and most importantly, security. While this certainly stimulated the debate over the future direction of US space exploration, it has led many to express concern over the implicitly aggressive and ambitious endeavour of colonizing space in the form of calling upon the need for permanent access to and presence in space. A critical eye has also been cast on the Commission’s endorsement of the privatization and commercialization of space and its support for implementing a far larger presence of private industry in space operations. Certainly also at the forefront of the current debate on space activities are notions of its militarization and securitization. The deployment of technologies with the aim to secure, safeguard, defend and control certain assets, innovations and activities in space is presented to us as an inevitable and necessary development. It is argued that just as the development of reconnaissance aircraft in the First World War led inexorably to the emergence of ﬁghter aircraft to deny the enemy the ability to carry out such reconnaissance and then bombers to deliver weapons against targets that could be identiﬁed and reached from the air, so too has the ‘multiplier effect’ on military capabilities of satellites encouraged calls for the acquisition of space-based capabilities to defend one’s own satellites and attack those of adversaries, and in the longer term, to place weapons in space that could attack targets on Earth. Here, the Bush administration’s indication that it envisaged a prominent role for spacebased weapons in the longer term as part of the controversial national missile defence system contributed to the atmosphere of controversy surrounding space policy. As space has become crucial to, and utilized by, far more international actors, so the political implications of space activities have multiplied. The members of the European Space Agency have pursued space development for economic, scientiﬁc and social reasons. Their model of international space cooperation has been seen as offering an example to other areas of the world, particularly in their desire to avoid militarizing efforts. Yet even Europe has begun to develop military space capabilities, following a path that has already been pursued by other key states such as China and India, suggesting that there is an inevitability about the militarization, and perhaps ultimately the weaponization, of space. How we conceptualize space has therefore become of fundamental moral, political and strategic importance. Outer space challenges the political imagination as it has always challenged the human imagination in many other ﬁelds. For millennia people have looked up to the stars and imagined it as the home of gods or the location of the afterlife. For centuries they have looked to it for answers about the physical nature of the universe and the place of mankind’s ancestral home within it. And for decades, it has been seen as the supreme test for advanced technology. Space exploration is a driver of innovation, encouraging us to dream of what might be possible, to push back the boundaries of thought and to change the nature of ontological realities by drawing on novel epistemologies. The physical exploration of the solar system through the application of science and technology has been the visible demonstration of this.

#### Psychoanalysis is infinitely regressive, not falsifiable, and too abstract

Gordon 1 – Paul Gordon, accomplished psychotherapist, “Psychoanalysis and Racism: The Politics of Defeat,” RACE & CLASS v. 42 n. 4, 2001, pp. 17-34.

But in the thirty years since Kovel wrote, that attempt to relate mind and society has been fractured by the advent of postmodernism, with its subsumption of the material/historical, of notions of cause and effect, to what is transitory, contingent, free-¯oating, evanescent. Psychoanalysis, by stepping into the vacuum left by the abandonment of all metanarrative, has tended to put mind over society. This is particularly noticeable in the work of the Centre for New Ethnicities Research at the University of East London, which purports to straddle the worlds of the academy and action by developing projects for the local community and within education generally.28 But, in marrying psychoanalysis and postmodernism, on the basis of claiming to be both scholarly and action oriented, it degrades scholarship and undermines action, and ends in discourse analysis a language in which metaphor passes for reality. Cohen's work unavoidably raises the question of the status of psycho- analysis as a social or political theory, as distinct from a clinical one. Can psychoanalysis, in other words, apply to the social world of groups, institutions, nations, states and cultures in the way that it does, or at least may do, to individuals? Certainly there is now a considerable body of literature and a plethora of academic courses, and so on, claim- ing that psychoanalysis is a social theory. And, of course, in popular discourse, it is now a commonplace to hear of nations and societies spoken of in personalised ways. Thus `truth commissions' and the like, which have become so common in the past decade in countries which have undergone turbulent change, are seen as forms of national therapy or catharsis, even if this is far from being their purpose. Nevertheless, the question remains: does it make sense, as Michael Ignatieff puts it, to speak of nations having psyches the way that individuals do? `Can a nation's past make people ill as we know repressed memories sometimes make individuals ill? . . . Can we speak of nations ``working through'' a civil war or an atrocity as we speak of individuals working through a traumatic memory or event?' 47 The problem with the application of psychoanalysis to social institutions is that there can be no testing of the claims made. If someone says, for instance, that nationalism is a form of looking for and seeking to replace the body of the mother one has lost, or that the popular appeal of a particular kind of story echoes the pattern of our earliest relationship to the maternal breast, how can this be proved? The pioneers of psychoanalysis, from Freud onwards, all derived their ideas in the context of their work with individual patients and their ideas can be examined in the everyday laboratory of the therapeutic encounter where the validity of an interpretation, for example, is a matter for dialogue between therapist and patient. Outside of the consulting room, there can be no such verification process, and the further one moves from the individual patient, the less purchase psychoanalytic ideas can have. Outside the therapeutic encounter, anything and everything can be true, psychoanalytically speaking. But if everything is true, then nothing can be false and therefore nothing can be true. An example of Cohen's method is to be found in his 1993 working paper, `Home rules', subtitled `Some re¯ections on racism and nation- alism in everyday life'. Here Cohen talks about taking a `particular line of thought for a walk'. While there is nothing wrong with taking a line of thought for a walk, such an exercise is not necessarily the same as thinking. One of the problems with Cohen's approach is that a kind of free association, mixed with deconstruction, leads not to analysis, not even to psychoanalysis, but to . . . well, just more free association, an endless, indeed one might say pointless, play on words. This approach may well throw up some interesting associations along the way, connections one had never thought of but it is not to be confused with political analysis. In `Home rules', anything and everything to do with `home' can and does ®nd a place here and, as I indicated above, even the popular ®lm Home Alone is pressed into service as a story about `racial' invasion.