# Haunt the Astronauts AC

#### The world is defined by the sociality of labor. The invention of market based capital that now defines the modern world erodes the creative relation that binds the social order and produces a haunted a history. Only in affirming the possibility of a world beyond use-value can we produce a truly ethical spectral politics.

Derrida, Jacques *Specters of Marx* 2006

Marx, then, has just announced its entrance on stage and its transmutation into a sensuously supersensible thing, and now here it is standing up, not only holding itself up but rising, getting up and lifting itself, lifting its head, redressing itself and addressing itself Facing the others, and first of all other commodities, yes, it lifts its head. Let us paraphrase a few lines as literally as possible before citing the translation. It is not enough for this wooden table to stand up (Er steht nich nur) , its feet on the ground, it also stands (sondern er ste1It sich-and Marx does not add "so to speak" as certain French translators had made him concede, frightened as they were by the literal audacity of the description)-it also stands on its head, a wooden head, for it has become a kind of headstrong, pigheaded, obstinate animal that, standing, faces other commodities (er stellt sich allen andren Waren gegeniiber auf den Kopf). Facing up to the others, before the others, its fellows, here then is the apparition of a strange creature: at the same time Life, Thing, Beast, Object, Commodity, Automaton-in a word, specter. This Thing, which is no longer altogether a thing, here it goes and unfolds (entwicke1t), it unfolds itself, it develops what it engenders through a quaSi-spontaneous generation (parthenogenesis and indeterminate sexuality: the animal Thing, the animated-inanimated Thing, the dead-living 1 Thing is a Father-Mother), it gives birth through its head, it extracts from its wooden head a whole lineage of fantastic or prodigious creatures, whims, chimera (Grille), non-ligneous character parts, that is, the lineage of a progeniture that no longer resembles it, inventions far more bizarre or marvelous (vie! wunder/icher) than if this mad, capricious, and untenable table, its head beginning to spin, started to dance on its own initiative [de son propre chef; aus freien Stiicken).20 Whoever understands Greek and philosophy could say of this genealogy, which transfigures the ligneous into the non-ligneous, that it also gives a tableau of the becoming-immaterial of matter. As one knows, hule, matter, is first of all wood. And since this becoming-immaterial of matter seems to take no time and to operate its transmutation in the magic of an instant, in a Single glance, through the omnipotence of a thought, we might also be tempted to describe it as the projection of an animism or a spiritism. The wood comes alive and is peopled with spirits: credulity, occultism, obscurantism~ lack of maturity before Englightenment, childish or primitive humanity. But what would Enlightenment be without the market? And who will ever make progress without exchangevalue? Capital contradiction. At the very origin of capital. Immediately or in the end, through so many differential relays, it will not fail to induce the "pragmatic" double constraint of all injunctions. Moving about freely (aus freien Stiicken), on its own head [de son propre chef], with a movement of its head but that controls its whole body, from head to toe, ligneous and dematerialized, the Table-Thing appears to be at the principle, at the beginning, and at the controls of itself. It emancipates itself on its own initiative: all alone, autonomous and automaton, its fantastic silhouette moves on its own, free and without attachment. It goes into trances, it levitates, it appears relieved of its body, like all ghosts, a little mad and unsettled as well, upset, "out of jOint," delirious, capricious, and unpredictable. It appears to put 192 SPECTERS OF MARX itself spontaneously into motion, but it also puts others into motion, yes, it puts everything around it into motion, as though "pour encourager les autres" (to encourage the others), Marx specifies in French in a note about this ghost dance: "One may recall that China and the tables began to dance when the rest of the world appeared to be standing still~pour encourager les autres."21 The capital contradiction does not have to do simply with the incredible conjunction of the sensuous and the supersensible in the same Thing; it is the contradiction of automatic autonomy, mechanical freedom, technical life. Like every thing, from the moment it comes onto the stage of a market, the table resembles a prosthesis of itself Autonomy and automatism, but automatism of this wooden table that spontaneously puts itself into motion, to be sure, and seems thus to animate, animalize, spiritualize, spiritize itself, but while remaining an artifactual body, a sort of automaton, a puppet, a stiff and mechanical doll whose dance obeys the technical rigidity of a program. Two genres, two generations of movement intersect with each other in it, and that is why it figures the apparition of a specter. It accumulates undecidably, in its uncanniness, their contradictory predicates: the inert thing appears suddenly inspired, it is all'at once transfixed by a pneuma or a psyche. Become like a living being, the table resembles a prophetic dog that gets up on its four paws, ready to face up to its fellow dogs: an idol would like to make the law. But, inversely, the spirit, soul, or life that animates it remains caught in the opaque and heavy thingness of the hule, in the inert thickness of its ligneous body, and autonomy is no more than the mask of automatism. A mask, indeed a visor that may always be hiding no living gaze beneath the helmet. The automaton mimes the liVing. The Thing is neither dead nor alive, it is dead and alive at the same time. It survives. At once cunning, inventive, and machine-like, ingenious and unpredictable, this war machine is a theatrical machine, a mekhane. What one has just APPARITION OF THE INAPPARENT 193 seen cross the stage is an apparition, a quasi-divinity-fallen from the sky or come out of the earth. But the vision also survives. Its hyperlucidity insists. Challenge or invitation, "encouragement," seduction countering seduction desire or war, love or hate, provocation of other ghosts: Marx insists on this a lot for there is a multiple of this sOciality (there is always more than one commodity, more than one spirit, and even more specters) and number belongs to the movement itself, to the non-finite process of spectralization (Baudelaire invoked number very well in the anthill-city of modern capitalism-ghost, crowd, money, prostitution-and Benjamin likewise in his wake). For if no use-value can in itself produce this rnysticality or this spectral effect of the commodity, and if the secret is at the same time profound and superficial, opaque and transparent, a secret that is all the more secret in that no substantial essence hides behind it, it is because the effect is born of a relation (ferance, difference, reference, and differanceY, as double relation, one should say as double social bond. This double socius binds on the one hand men to each other. It associates them insofar as they have been for all times interested in time, Marx notes right away, the time or the duration oflabar, and this in all cultures and at all stages of techno-economic development. This socius, then, binds "men" who are first of all experiences of time, existences determined by this relation to time which itself would not be possible without surviving and returning, without that being "out of joint" that dislocates the self-presence of the living present and installs thereby the relation to the other. The same socius, the same "social form" of the relation binds, on the other hand, commodity-things to each other. On the other hand, but how? And how is what takes place on the one hand among men, in their apprehension of time, explained by what takes place on the other hand among those specters that are commodities? How do those whom one calls "men, living men, temporal and finite existences, become subjected, in their 194 SPECTERS OF MARX social relations, to these specters that are relations, equally social relations among commodities?

#### Only this politics has the power to halt the collapse of the world order – modern semiocapitalism has produced a technocratic image of the psyche that left unchecked culminates in a coming world defined by paranoia and destroyed by ecocide. Berardi 16

Berardi, Franco “The Coming #17” December, 2016 <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/78/82058/the-coming-17////> tmw

The hundredth anniversary of the Soviet Revolution will likely coincide with a global collapse. The oft-announced recovery is not coming, and a rightist wave with racist undertones is mounting. The collapse of capitalism will be interminable and enormously destructive, as long as a new subjectivity does not emerge and a different social model does not develop. The subjectivity that in th e nineteenth century was expressed by the workers’ movement appears today so disintegrated that we cannot imagine any possible recomposition in the near future. The anti-financial uprisings of 2011 have not succeeded in reversing the route of financial plunder, and the European leftist parties have accepted austerity politics, even if this betrayal is likely to provoke their final defeat. The dynamics that led to the ascent of the Nazis and then to the Second World War are back. Contemporary nationalist parties are echoing what Hitler said to the impoverished workers of Germany: you are not defeated and exploited workers, but national warriors, and you will win. They did not win, but they destroyed Europe. They will not win this time either, but they are poised to destroy the world. The ongoing impoverishment of society is not a natural necessity, but a consequence of the politics of financial accumulation. The neoliberal model implements itself by force of automatism, while consensus melts away. The July 2016 issue of The Economist had the theme “Anarchy in the UK” and admitted the bankruptcy of neoliberal globalism. The symptoms are visible: stagnation; overproduction and then deflation; looming recession. The sources of stagnation and unemployment—market saturation and the reduction of necessary labor time—are not inherently negative trends in themselves. On the contrary, from the perspective of social usefulness they prove that the era of scarcity is over and the emancipation of human time from repetitive work is imminent. The material basis now exists for people to devote their time to the care of others, self-care, education, and other non-market activities. Capitalism, however, is semiotically unable to implement the potentialities inherent to knowledge and technology: its dynamic tends in fact to contain those potentialities within old frameworks of growth and accumulation. Consequently, it transforms the potentialities of knowledge and technology into factors of scarcity and destruction. This distortion has impoverished European society and is unleashing an antiglobal reaction that is feeding resentment, fascism, and war. What will happen next? In the age of bio-info-political power, the Winter Palace is empty. But we must revisit 1917, because the Soviet Revolution established the paradigm that presided over the political landscape of the last century: the working class organized via political parties into a social vanguard, seeking to seize central power and use it against the capitalist class. The vision that Lenin expressed in his writings (particularly in What Is To Be Done?) provided a military framework for class struggle. This tactical move allowed the Bolshevik party to seize power, but this was also Lenin’s strategic mistake, and maybe his crime. The Leninist party gave birth to a state and an army, but Lenin’s determination turned class struggle into war, thereby suffocating the processes of revolutionary autonomy in Germany, Italy, and also in the United States, where the Industrial Workers of the World were expanding their social organization. In order to win the war unleashed by the Leninist revolution, Western capitalism fomented fascism against the working class. We know the story of what followed: Soviet communism and Anglo-American capitalism were forced into an alliance. Then democracy defeated the Soviet Union. In the second half of the century, democracy emerged as the winning mythology, but its triumph did not last. Beginning in Chile on September 11, 1973, the neoliberal reformation started cancelling democracy, and went on to cancel democracy everywhere else (including in Greece in July 2015). The dictatorship of the abstract over concrete life emerged under the label of neoliberal governance, which thrived more or less peacefully until the end of the ’90s. Since the dot-com crash of spring 2000 and the new September 11 of the first year of the new century, the global landscape has fragmented into countless conflicting identities that are now exploding into a global civil war. Zbigniew Brzezinski, former adviser to US president Jimmy Carter, has written important books about the global political landscape. In 1993 he published Out of Control: Global Turmoil on the Eve of the 21st Century, a book in which he subverted the prevailing optimism of that period and predicted the uncontrollable proliferation of identitarian conflict. In a recent issue of The American Interest, Brzezinski published an essay entitled “Toward a Global Realignment.” Notwithstanding the flavorless title, the article contains a dramatic consideration that may be summarized as follows: after centuries of colonial domination and violence, the former colonies are asking for a moral and economic restitution that the West is unwilling and unable to pay. The concrete historical debt we own to those we have exploited cannot be paid because we are forced to pay our abstract financial debts. Brzezinski’s style in the essay is elegant, but his words are appalling and unequivocal. He deserves to be quoted at length: Special attention should be focused on the non-Western world’s newly politically aroused masses. Long-repressed political memories are fuelling in large part the sudden and very explosive awakening energised by Islamic extremists in the Middle East, but what is happening in the Middle East today may be just the beginning of a wider phenomenon to come out of Africa, Asia, and even among the pre-colonial peoples of the Western Hemisphere in the years ahead. Periodic massacres of their not-so-distant ancestors by colonists and associated wealth-seekers largely from Western Europe (countries that today are, still tentatively at least, most open to multiethnic cohabitation) resulted within the past two or so centuries in the slaughter of colonised peoples on a scale comparable to Nazi World War II crimes: literally involving hundreds of thousands and even millions of victims. Political self-assertion enhanced by delayed outrage and grief is a powerful force that is now surfacing, thirsting for revenge, not just in the Muslim Middle East but also very likely beyond. In the sixteenth century, due largely to disease brought by Spanish explorers, the population of the native Aztec Empire in present-day Mexico declined from 25 million to approximately one million. Similarly, in North America, an estimated 90 percent of the native population died within the first five years of contact with European settlers, due primarily to diseases. In the 19th century, various wars and forced resettlements killed an additional 100,000. In India from 1857–1867, the British are suspected of killing up to one million civilians in reprisals stemming from the Indian Rebellion of 1857. The British East India Company’s use of Indian agriculture to grow opium then essentially forced on China resulted in the premature deaths of millions, not including the directly inflicted Chinese casualties of the First and Second Opium Wars. In the Congo, which was the personal holding of Belgian King Leopold II, 10–15 million people were killed between 1890 and 1910. In Vietnam, recent estimates suggest that between one and three million civilians were killed from 1955 to 1975. As to the Muslim world in Russia’s Caucasus, from 1864 and 1867, 90 percent of the local Circassian population was forcibly relocated and between 300,000 and 1.5 million either starved to death or were killed. Between 1916 and 1918, tens of thousands of Muslims were killed when 300,000 Turkic Muslims were forced by Russian authorities through the mountains of Central Asia and into China. In Indonesia, between 1835 and 1840, the Dutch occupiers killed an estimated 300,000 civilians. In Algeria, following a 15-year civil war from 1830–1845, French brutality, famine, and disease killed 1.5 million Algerians, nearly half the population. In neighboring Libya, the Italians forced Cyrenaicans into concentration camps, where an estimated 80,000 to 500,000 died between 1927 and 1934. More recently, in Afghanistan between 1979 and 1989 the Soviet Union is estimated to have killed around one million civilians; two decades later, the United States has killed 26,000 civilians during its 15-year war in Afghanistan. In Iraq, 165,000 civilians have been killed by the United States and its allies in the past 13 years. (The disparity between the reported number of deaths inflicted by European colonisers compared with the United States and its allies in Iraq and Afghanistan may be due in part to the technological advances that have resulted in the more productive use of force and in part as well to a shift in the world’s normative climate.) Just as shocking as the scale of these atrocities is how quickly the West forgot about them.1 I agree with Brzezinski’s diagnosis, but he forgets to say that in the twentieth century, internationalism emerged as a way to avert the kind of global conflict he describes. Only the workers’ internationalist sentiment could avoid a planetary bloodbath. But communism has been defeated, and the internationalist way has dissolved. We now face a war of all against all for the sake of nothing. After the dissolution of communism, the mythology of boundless competition and profit gained the upper hand. But after thirty years, this mythology has gone totally bankrupt. Western subjectivity is angrily depressed, and Jonathan Franzen explains why: People came to this country for either money or freedom. If you don’t have money, you cling to your freedoms all the more angrily. Even if smoking kills you, even if you can’t afford to feed your kids, even if your kids are getting shot down by maniacs with assault rifles. You may be poor, but the one thing nobody can take away from you is the freedom to fuck up your life whatever way you want to. That’s what Bill Clinton figured out—that we can’t win elections by running against personal liberties. Especially not against guns, actually.2 The promise of economic success has been achieved by only a small part of society. For the losers, it has resulted in precariousness, neuro-exploitation, a diminishing salary, and more work. But the losers are reclaiming their personal freedoms, and in the US this means first and foremost the freedom to keep and bear arms. With the dissolving of the internationalist vision, everybody now belongs to a clan—ethnic or virtual—and everybody is preparing to protect themselves against the coming invasion. After the abandonment of the universalist horizon of enlightened modernity, conflicting subjectivities are now kept together by a faith in belonging. Since mental activity is captured by the economy, and the bulk of contemporary work is semiotic, reflection is absorbed and assimilated and reduced to work. In the past, industrial workers were not directly mentally engaged in their tasks. Contemporary semio-workers, however, are obliged to engage their mental faculties in the automated process of production. Only a break in the submission of cognitarian consciousness to the paradigm of competition can now open a process leading to the autonomous self-organization of cognitive labor. The emancipation of knowledge-force represents the only chance to defeat the neuro-totalitarian system in the making. The task of the future is to reinvent the process of subjectivation. This reinvention must start from the spreading conditions of mental suffering, and from the discovery of a new level of political action. The concept of a program has long been at the core of political action. In the last century the word “program” referred to an organic ensemble of projects that politics enforced on the social body. Now we should think of “program” in terms of social software: an algorithm based on social needs and aimed at social welfare, which should oppose the financial algorithm prevailing today. Only an algorithm for emancipation can replace the present algorithm for financial exploitation. Programming (in the sense of software for the production process) is the activity particular to cognitive workers. The autonomy of programming practices is the political project that we have to pursue. But we know that the autonomy of practices presupposes the autonomy of the subject. In the global Silicon Valley, millions of cognitive workers are disseminated worldwide: this is the subjectivity that can subvert financial dictatorship. We must view the global Silicon Valley in the same way that Lenin viewed the Putilov factory in 1917, and in the same way that the rebels of Italian autonomia viewed the Mirafiori Fiat plant in ‘70s: as the core of the process of production, the place where the maximal level of exploitation is exerted and where the highest transformative potential can be unleashed. While politics is impotent and nation-states cannot govern the flows of semio-finance, the global Silicon Valley has replaced the governments of the past. However, the global Silicon Valley is not a place without conflict: in this deterritorialized factory, millions of cognitive workers can develop a new form of consciousness and a new social dynamic based on the reduction of labor time, the uncoupling of income from work, and the full implementation of technology and automation. The challenge is to cultivate this consciousness among cognitive workers: from their mental suffering, an ethical awakening can arise. And in the ethical awakening of millions of engineers, artists, and scientists lies the only possibility of averting a frightening regression, whose contours we glimpse already.

#### The appropriation of outer space is just a capitalist’s playground and a terrain of endless possibility to expand the parasitic notion of future breeded wealth accumulation and the mental exploitation of the masses. Shammas and Holen 19

Shammas Victor, Holen Thomas, [], "One giant leap for capitalistkind: private enterprise in outer space", 1-29-2019, Nature, https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9, 12-22-2021, //WHS-FD

Outer space is becoming **a space for capitalism**. We are entering a new era of **the commercialization of space, geared towards generating profits from satellite launches, space tourism, asteroid mining, and related ventures. This era, driven by private corporations such as Elon Musk’s SpaceX and Jeff Bezos’s Blue Origins, has been labeled by industry insiders as ‘NewSpace'—in contrast to ‘Old Space'**, a Cold War-era mode of space relations when (allegedly) slow-moving, sluggish states dominated outer space. NewSpace marks the arrival of capitalism in space. While challenging the libertarian rhetoric of its proponents—**space enterprises remain enmeshed in the state, relying on funding, physical infrastructure, technology transfers, regulatory frameworks, and symbolic support**—NewSpace nevertheless heralds a novel form of human activity in space. Despite its humanistic, universalizing pretensions, however, NewSpace **does not benefit humankind as such but rather a specific set of wealthy entrepreneurs**, many of them originating in Silicon Valley, who strategically deploy humanist tropes to engender enthusiasm for their activities. We describe this complex as ‘capitalistkind'. Moreover, the arrival of **capitalism in space is fueled by the expansionary logic of capital accumulation. Outer space serves as a spatial fix, allowing capital to transcend its inherent terrestrial limitations**. In this way, the ultimate spatial fix is perhaps (outer) space itself. On 6 February 2018, the California-based Space Exploration Technologies Corp., also known as SpaceX, launched its first Falcon Heavy rocket, a powerful, partially reusable launch vehicle, into space from Cape Canaveral Launch Complex 39 in Florida. With its significant thrust and payload capacity, the Falcon Heavy had the ‘ability to lift into orbit nearly 64 metric tons…a mass greater than a 737 jetliner loaded with passengers, crew, luggage and fuel' (SpaceX, [2018](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR58)). Multiple reusable parts, including first-stage boosters (and, in later versions, composite payload fairing)[Footnote 1](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn1) provided a lift capacity nearly twice that of the next-most powerful rocket in operation, the United Launch Alliance’s (ULA) Delta IV Heavy, and at nearly one-third the cost. With this first Falcon Heavy test flight, which produced widespread public enthusiasm and outpourings of support from both politicians and industry observers,[Footnote 2](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn2)SpaceX demonstrated that **private corporations were busy redefining the domain of space exploration.** SpaceX seemed to usher in an era differing markedly from that other period of astronautical excitement, the Cold War-era space race between the United States and the Soviet Union. Additionally, visions once restricted to the domain of science fiction now seemed increasingly attainable, freed from the (alleged) impediments of slow-moving nation-states: with the ascendancy of private corporations like SpaceX, satellite launches, space tourism, asteroid mining, and even the colonization of Mars seemed increasingly achievable (Cohen, [2017](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR8); Dickens and Ormrod, [2007a](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR12), [2007b](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR13); Klinger, [2017](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR35); Lewis, [1996](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR37)). In this sense, SpaceX’s Falcon Heavy also carried a crucial ideological payload: the very idea of private enterprise and capitalist relations overtaking outer space.[Footnote 3](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn3) The Falcon Heavy conveyed this idea quite concretely. Onboard the rocket was an electric car, a Tesla Roadster (said to be Elon Musk’s personal vehicle), which functioned as the rocket’s ‘dummy load', playing David Bowie’s ‘Space Oddity' and ‘Life on Mars?' on repeat on the car’s stereo system. An enticing marketing stunt viewed by millions online through SpaceX’s YouTube live stream—with 2.3 million concurrent views, it was the second biggest live stream in YouTube history (Singleton, [2018](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR56))—the Falcon Heavy test flight embraced the logic of ‘cool capitalism' (Schleusener, [2014](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR53)), with in-jokes referencing Douglas Adam’s *Hitchhiker’s Guide to the Galaxy*, while heralding the arrival of a commercialized space age, dubbed by industry insiders as the age of ‘NewSpace'.[Footnote 4](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn4) But how are we to understand NewSpace? In some ways, NewSpace signals the emergence of capitalism in space. The production of carrier rockets, placement of satellites into orbit around Earth, and the exploration, exploitation, or colonization of outer space (including planets, asteroids, and other celestial objects), will not be the work of humankind as such, a pure species-being (*Gattungswesen*), but of particular capitalist entrepreneurs who stand in for and represent humanity. Crucially, they will do so in ways modulated by the exigencies of capital accumulation. These enterprising **capitalists are forging a new political-economic regime in space**, a post-Fordism in space **aimed at profit maximization** and the apparent minimization of government interference. **A new breed of charismatic, starry-eyed entrepreneurs**, including Musk’s SpaceX, Richard Branson’s Virgin Galactic, and Amazon billionaire Jeff Bezos’s Blue Origin, to name but a selection, aim at becoming ‘capitalists in space' (Parker, [2009](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR49)) or space capitalists. Neil Armstrong’s famous statement will have to be reformulated: **space will not be the site of ‘one giant leap for mankind', but rather *one giant leap for capitalistkind*** .[Footnote 5](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn5) With the ascendancy of NewSpace, humanity’s future in space will not be ‘ours', benefiting humanity tout court, but will rather be the result of particular capitalists, or capitalistkind,[Footnote 6](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#Fn6) toiling to recuperate space and bring its vast domain into the fold of capital accumulation: NewSpace sees outer space as the domain of private enterprise, set to become the ‘first-trillion dollar industry', according to some estimates, and likely to produce the world’s first trillionaires (see, e.g., Honan, [2018](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41599-019-0218-9#ref-CR30))—as opposed to Old Space, a derisive moniker coined by enthusiastic proponents of capitalism-in-space, widely seen to have been the sole preserve of the state and a handful of giant aerospace corporations, including Boeing and Lockheed Martin, in Cold War-era Space Age.

**Modern space exploration equates to a bloody space race in which leads to a war making between countries and endless violence caused by semiocapitalism. Duke 20**

Duke Joshua, [], "Conflict and Controversy in the Space Domain: Legalities, Lethalities, and Celestial Secur", 9-25-2020, Air University (AU), https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/, 1-3-2022, //faizaan

Advancements in space technology are quickly leading to an inevitable conflict over control in space, which includes control over the Moon through lunar bases and potentially control over the colonization of Mars. The PRC has added the capability to "physically attack satellites using antisatellite [ASAT] interceptors, miniature space mines, and ground-based lasers" into its military space program.[1](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote1sym) These capabilities fall under the guise of the Outer Space Treaty’s permission to destroy militarized satellites.[2](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote2sym) These technologies could easily be used offensively to create a decision advantage in combat. Some analysts believe that the deliberate collision of PRC satellites with older satellites shows that the PRC has experimented with "parasitic satellites" designed to lie dormant in the vicinity of a target until activated, potentially for hacking purposes.[3](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote3sym) The PRC even "reportedly launched a hypersonic 'prototype space fighter' " in 2010. It continues to be locked in an intense space race with the rest of the space-savvy international community—particularly Russia, the United States, and India—with a short-term goal of controlling the Moon with a lunar base and a longer-term goal of populating Mars under the rule of the PRC.[4](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote4sym) The development of maneuverable space planes and lunar bases is not unique to the PRC. The National Aeronautical and Space Administration (NASA) developed the X-37 and X-37B space planes, and the Russian Federation is developing a maneuverable space plane using nuclear technology for power.[5](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote5sym) All of these nations (as well as several others, including India and Japan) intend to establish lunar bases within the next 20 years.[6](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote6sym) Despite the array of international treaties and agreements promoting peaceful global development of space resources in the name of science and humanity, it is unlikely that space will remain weapon free and likely that it will become the next frontier of global combat. Space weapons in development may use robotics, nanotechnology, and directed energy such as microwaves and lasers.[7](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote7sym) With the establishment of a lunar base, a nation with advanced laser technology, advanced cyber weaponry, maneuverable space planes, satellite targeting capabilities, nano-science stealth technology, artificial intelligence, and self-guiding nanotechnology bullets would undoubtedly have the capacity to rule the Earth as it sees fit. All of these technologies already exist or are in development phases, and they are the future of intelligence and warfare.[8](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote8sym) The US government and NASA, unlike the PRC and the RF, have been encouraging the commercialization of space cargo transportation to meet future American needs for access to the International Space Station (ISS) and to improve the research and development of spaceborne technologies and other developments.[9](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote9sym) Private sector involvement has also opened the market for alternative rocket propulsion technologies that can achieve government and commercial goals for space at lower costs and faster than possible under the existing bureaucracy of NASA. Enhanced private sector involvement in space travel utilizes the free-market system to foster radical developments and investment for both government and private sector programs, incentivizing broader participation, which benefits both. Commercializing aspects of standard space operations, such as the recent partnership with SpaceX, will also pave the way for space tourism. This will free up resources for NASA and the newly minted US Space Force to pursue broader goals, such as manned deep space travel, a lunar base, and manned missions to Mars. Part 2: Lunar Power Rare earth metals and other minerals are quickly becoming scarce in the United States to the point where the international space race to claim the Moon and Mars has become a top priority, not just for control over them but for the resources available for exploitation. Uranium has even entered the economic radar as a good idea for boosting the American economy instead of remaining too dangerous to mine due to the associated health risks and environmental hazards. This resource is in abundance on the Moon.[10](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote10sym) Estimates suggest there may be up to five million tons of Helium-3 (3He) contained within the lunar regolith.[11](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote11sym) This has the potential to meet all of mankind's power needs for thousands of years when used with fusion power.[12](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote12sym) On top of the resources potentially available, the Moon provides a unique launching position for future missions to Mars with a faster, more direct, and more efficient path to the Red Planet.[13](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote13sym) Control over the Moon is an inherent factor in the future of the human race. Uranium has long been a part of the nuclear fission enterprise on Earth but comes with high costs, including radioactive waste and extreme health and environmental hazards due to the radiation produced in the fission process. Terrestrial reserves of other energy-producing resources, like oil and natural gas, have also been projected to be exhausted within 50–100 years under current and projected mining and usage rates.[14](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote14sym) Alternatively, the element tritium (T), which has a half-life of 12.32 years, naturally decays into 3He,[15](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote15sym) which can be used to create a new kind of power—fusion power. Fusion power can be generated by combining deuterium (D) with either more D, T, or 3He, using the following calculations shown in order of their ignition temperatures: D + T = 4He [Helium-4] + n [neutrons] + 17.6 MeV [Million electron Volts] D + D = T + H [Hydrogen] + 4.0 MeV (50%) = 3He + n + 3.3 MeV (50%) D + 3He = 4He + H + 18.4 MeV[16](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote16sym) Fusion power can also be created by combining 3He with more 3He, creating Helium-4 (4He).[17](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote17sym) The combination of 3He and 3He is the most energy efficient, producing the greatest net energy,[18](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote18sym) but also requires the highest ignition temperature to achieve fusion.[19](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote19sym) Unfortunately, 3He exists only in minute amounts on Earth.[20](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote20sym) The nation that establishes a mining and transportation industry capable of bringing lunar 3He to Earth, and develops a fusion plant network that transforms 3He into power, could control a substantial portion of the planet’s energy industry for decades. Some scientific estimates discount both the estimates of the potential amount of extractable 3He in the lunar regolith and the potential to achieve industrial fusion reactors on Earth capable of processing it. Exemplifying this scientific stance are the calculations of Ian Crawford, who believes both prospects are greatly exaggerated and that there are only approximately 220,507 tons of 3He available in logical extraction areas, such as the titanium-rich lunar basalt flats.[21](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote21sym) Despite his dissent, Crawford admits even lunar resources that seem impractical and economically inefficient to transport resources to Earth may provide substantial economic benefits for space-based uses, such as solar power systems and spacecraft fusion engines, for example,[22](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote22sym) which would not require transport back to Earth. Earth's finite resources make lunar and space resource exploitation an inevitability. The most pertinent factor governing future human resource exploitation in space is the question of which nation will achieve a successful and effective industrial supply chain first. The most probable three nations to achieve this are the US, the PRC, and the RF, and the three areas that need to be navigated to succeed are facility establishment, production/refinement, and transportation. Establishing lunar facilities is the easiest of these goals, especially when lunar resources that can be used for building are taken into account, which decreases the amount of materials needed to be brought to the Moon and the time needed for construction. In 2008, a NASA experiment found that lunar regolith has potential construction properties. When scientists heated the regolith and used sulfur as a binding agent, they made "waterless concrete," which can be molded and is nearly as strong as concrete when it hardens.[23](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote23sym) This process requires minimal effort and relies primarily on direct heat application and the ability to shape the regolith. Consequently, the entire process can be automated by robots with the appropriate tools on the lunar surface, such as the ones NASA began developing specifically for this purpose in 2009.[24](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote24sym) The simplicity of the operational requirements means that these three nations already have the technical capability to begin construction using lunar soil after arriving on the Moon. They will also all be capable of bringing any other materials that would be necessary to construct facilities or bases on the lunar surface. Unlike the US, and contrary to existing international law, the PRC's stance on the Moon is that it is territory,[25](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote25sym) despite the prohibition on "national appropriation" of celestial bodies outlined in Article II of the Outer Space Treaty.[26](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote26sym) The PRC has also proposed mining 3He for future fusion power opportunities.[27](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote27sym) The RF, while not openly pursuing a territorial ambition for the Moon, is certainly exploring and advancing prospects of economic development, including 3He extraction and tourism.[28](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote28sym) Facility development and resource exploitation areas on the Moon are limited. This will exacerbate the race for prime locations and desirable resources, particularly at the poles, where water ice is believed to exist in large quantities (which can be used to sustain lunar human habitation), and in the titanium- and 3He-rich basalt flats of Mare Tranquillitatis and Oceanus Procellarum.[29](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote29sym) Once established, facility operations can begin to extract and refine resources either for use on the lunar surface or for transportation to Earth. Transportation of materials from the Moon to Earth is a substantial financial and logistical undertaking. It will not be easy to show a profit after the considerable expenses associated with it. Nevertheless, extraction and transportation of 3He and other resources to Earth, specifically for fusion power production, have been expressed as long-term goals of the PRC and the RF within decades. Interestingly, the US has not stated this as a goal but has already shifted its space transportation industry sufficiently toward the private sector. The private sector will have the most viable opportunity to build the first industrial space transportation system, specifically because of advantages in the American free-market system.[30](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote30sym) By encouraging private sector participation in the space industry and commercializing space transportation, the US has made production of space technologies competitive with proposals in the National Space Policy.[31](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote31sym) A competitive industry makes substantial investments in research, development, and production of space transports; engine components for space travel; and tools for use in zero gravity. America cannot afford to fall behind in the race for lunar facility establishment and resource exploitation. This is for reasons of economic and national security and the future security of human expansion into space as the Moon offers the most efficient launching position for missions to Earth's red neighbor, Mars. Part 3: Mars Domination Mars is widely accepted by the scientific community to be the most plausible planet for the first human habitation on a celestial body and, consequently, the most likely location for the first space colony and eventually a second planet for humankind. Thus, Mars is a desirable goal for nations involved in space exploration for many reasons. The territory on Mars, for example, will most likely become marketable for economic value to civilians in the long term. The Outer Space Treaty prevents ownership of territory on celestial bodies but makes no mention of ownership or sale for profit of structures built on, or items brought to, celestial bodies, just as there is no explicit language in the treaty preventing profit-based resource exploitation on celestial bodies by either governments, organizations, or private nationals.[32](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote32sym) Additionally, the inevitability of Mars becoming a second planet inhabited by humanity must be considered, along with all of the implications of living spaces and ownership of property that will eventually follow. Denying this inevitability and claiming it as outlawed by international law due to the prohibition on appropriating territory on a celestial body would essentially equate owning property on Earth as also outlawed by international law. After all, Earth is also a celestial body. Language in the treaty encourages expansion into space and essentially says that if persons, governments, or organizations build something on a celestial body, they own that building[33](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote33sym) and can do what they want with it, including selling it. They cannot, however, claim to own the planet's ground outside the building—yet. Resources on Mars, while still not mapped out as substantially as lunar resources have been, will likewise create new markets for economic prosperity and national wealth, including more 3He deposits from solar winds like those found in lunar regolith along with substantially high concentrations of iron.[34](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote34sym) In addition to buildings constructed on celestial bodies, spacecraft and facilities constructed in space and on celestial bodies are also considered to be the territory of the owning nation, which means that the UN Charter applies to facilities and spacecraft in space and on celestial bodies. UN Charter Article 2(4), in particular, protects space explorers and potential future residents on Mars by prohibiting the "use of force against the territorial integrity" of another nation party to the treaty,[35](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote35sym) which all space-faring nations are. Article 51 further dictates that if attacked, "the inherent right of . . . self-defense" shall not be impaired.[36](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote36sym) Article V of the Outer Space Treaty prescribes that, in space, all humans are bound to "render all possible assistance to" each other as "envoys of Mankind."[37](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote37sym) Essentially, a peaceful international course is possible—even mandated—for human expansion into space. Unfortunately, the PRC and the RF regard space and celestial bodies as territorial goals,[38](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote38sym) leading to the assumption that attempts will be made to control and defend such territories as necessary to achieve space superiority, control over space resources, and managerial power over the future colonization of Mars. Control over Mars, in addition to affecting resource exploitation, transportation, and scientific advancements, also has implications for the direction of humanity in space. Establishment of a human colony, or human colonies, on Mars will eventually lead to territorial spaces, development of the land and air (potentially involving terraforming the planet for atmospheric enhancement), and security issues. While an established colony on the Red Planet is still likely decades away, trends within the PRC and RF governments suggest that any established colony on Mars under their jurisdiction would be authoritarian, weaponized, and secret. Given the nature of weather on Mars, fortified structures are easily justified, and the lack of a conventional weapons ban on celestial bodies makes weaponization of such a colony both legal and desirable, mainly because of the third inherently desired factor—secrecy. The inevitability of PRC and RF presence on Mars also suggests that any US developments will also include fortifications and weaponization. While the Outer Space Treaty mandates cooperation between nations on celestial bodies, the extreme distance between Earth and Mars means that a compliance verification system with effective monitoring and enforcement will be complicated, if not impossible, for the foreseeable future. For these reasons, a nation that effectively controls near-Earth space and establishes a security presence on the Moon will effectively be in a position to control Mars. Part 4: Space Control Celestial bodies are not the only potential fields of conflict in space, and in the short term, space itself has become a much more immediately relevant focus for spacefaring nations and the world. This is particularly the case in the vicinity of Earth, including orbital paths for communication technologies, weapon platforms, and sensors. Technological improvements and the proliferation of nation-state and private sector interest and capacity to enter space are causing the acceleration of an inevitability—usable orbital space around Earth is diminishing.[39](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote39sym) Satellites and other spaceborne assets orbiting Earth are quickly filling up all of the most useful places to perform their assigned functions within Earth's various orbits, and space debris is complicating matters even further. Increasing numbers of space objects are causing difficulty in establishing safe orbital paths for newly launched spacecraft while increasing the risk to launches destined for deep space.[40](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote40sym) Adding to these complications are international developments of ASAT weapons, many of which add to the more than 500,000 pieces of space debris traveling as fast as 17,500 mph[41](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote41sym)already orbiting Earth.[42](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote42sym) ASATs in use and under development include essentially two broad areas: kinetic energy (KE), such as missiles and rail guns, which impact targets in space; and directed energy (DE), which includes lasers, particle beams, and cyber weapons.[43](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote43sym) The Outer Space Treaty, while prohibiting nuclear weapons from being used in any way in space including being stationed in space, "has no specific provision prohibiting the use of conventional weapons, [including lasers], in outer space,"[44](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote44sym) which inherently authorizes them. The Outer Space Treaty also contains no prohibition of such weapons being stationed on space-based platforms, including on celestial bodies, or of them being used to target objects on Earth, in space, or on celestial bodies.[45](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote45sym) In other words, these weapons are legal in every way, regardless of the potential damage they can cause to international stability and humanity. There are, however, multiple ongoing debates over the nature, definitions, and classifications of several kinds of ASATs currently in operation or in developmental phases. Nearly every KE ASAT results in a large amount of space debris, which causes an abundance of future and immediate problems for space activities, including endangerment of the basic military and commercial functions of satellites for the Global Positioning System (GPS), communications, and recreation. Space debris is therefore a highly undesirable side effect for any nation to risk and potentially dangerous to the integrity of a nation's armed forces. David Koplow addresses this issue in a substantially relevant and logical way in his article “An Inference about Interference: A Surprising Application of Existing International Law to Inhibit Anti-Satellite Weapons.” His stated thesis is as follows: “The [National Technical Means] NTM-protection provisions of arms control treaties already prohibit the testing and use of destructive, debris-creating ASATs, because it is foreseeable that the resulting cloud of space junk will, sooner or later, impermissibly interfere with the operation of another state's NTM satellite, such as by colliding with it or causing it to maneuver away from its preferred orbital parameters into a safer, but less useful, location.”[46](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote46sym) By "interfering" with these NTM verifications mandated by multiple treaties, Koplow suggests that intentional actions creating space debris are already outlawed by international law, and that the development of debris creating KE ASATs should cease and be banned immediately.[47](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote47sym) Laser weapons, particle beams, and weapons containing depleted uranium are also under debate due to their radioactivity as well as nuclear processes used for some of their operations. Some posit that nuclear activities or materials within a weapon system should constitute classifying them as nuclear weapons, thereby outlawing them in space per the Outer Space Treaty's nuclear weapons ban.[48](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote48sym) Advocates for these weapons declare that the weapons are not nuclear. Of the three primary types debated, laser weapons use a nuclear or chemical reaction process to fire a radioactive beam, particle beams rapidly fire atomic charged particles at a target, and hypervelocity rod bundle weapons and railguns use depleted uranium as ammunition.[49](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote49sym) Finally, the potential exists for the use of a nuclear explosion in space designed to generate an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) attack on an Earth target, which the RF "has worked on developing" in the form of an “EMP ASAT.”[50](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote50sym) With the RF’s recent developments in ASATs and its stated intent “to station weapons in space,”[51](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote51sym) the complete weaponization of space by the RF and other nations—including the US and the PRC—is inevitable. The RF and PRC are aggressively pursuing ASAT weapon advancements and preparing for space combat operations, including the RF recently fielding a "ground-based laser weapon" even as it publicly advocated for space not to be weaponized.[52](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote52sym) **Space exploration converges on** two of Sun Tzu's concepts of **the strategic battlespace**: “**open ground” and the “ground of intersecting highways**.” The former consists of areas where all sides have "liberty of movement" and the latter of areas where "contiguous states" converge.[53](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote53sym) On open ground, Sun Tzu advises not "to block the enemy’s way," and on intersecting grounds he suggests to "join hands with your allies.[54](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote54sym) **Space is essentially a combination of these types of ground, where all nations are contiguously connected, and yet it consists of a legally recognized area of free movement** for all persons and nations. Interestingly, Sun Tzu’s The Art of War, written over 2,000 years ago,advocates indirectly for peaceful human expansion into space, where allied nations proceed forth together while intentionally avoiding negative engagements with potential adversaries. This ancient concept of human cooperation and peaceful coexistence is also consistent with the Department of Defense's (DOD) and intelligence community's (IC) National Security Space Policy[55](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote55sym) and the National Space Policy of the United States of America.[56](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote56sym) Executive Order (EO) 13914, signed on 6 April 2020, clarifies the position of the US government that while international cooperation in space exploration is essentially mandatory, America "does not view [space] as a global commons,"[57](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote57sym) reiterating that the Outer Space Treaty does in fact protect the individual interests of nations in space, including the right to self-defense. The policy further clarifies the intent of the United States to harvest materials from celestial bodies and strengthens the implied relationships with both the international community and the private sector concerning space exploration and related developments.[58](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote58sym) By combining these principles, this renewed position on space developments further complements Sun Tzu’s ideas of the strategic battlespace in relation to the space domain moving into the future, regarding space as an area that can be used and exploited by everyone, but acknowledging that claims, defense, and security are also going to be essential factors in the way mankind moves forward in the space domain. In addressing the impact of space exploration, and the subsequent superiority gained by the PRC, the RF, or the US in the process, it is important to recognize the three principle issues of the strategic space environment outlined in these national policies: congestion, contestation, and competitiveness. The US IC is mandated by section 1.1 of EO 12333 to "provide . . . the necessary information on which to base decisions concerning the development and conduct of foreign, defense, and economic policies, and the protection of United States national interests from foreign security threats,"[59](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Wild-Blue-Yonder/Article-Display/Article/2362296/conflict-and-controversy-in-the-space-domain-legalities-lethalities-and-celesti/" \l "sdendnote59sym) which now include threats from space and threats toward US space assets. Congestion, contestation, and competitiveness in space now directly impact the IC's ability to effectively pursue its mandate under EO 12333 and must be addressed collectively to ensure the future national security of the United States on Earth and in space. Enhancing the space industrial base’s ability to innovate and participate in the expansion of humankind into space fosters a unique opportunity to share with, and benefit from, research and development initiatives related to activities in space. Combining private sector and government resources together has the potential to greatly accelerate advancements across a wide range of space assets—including spacecraft developments, zero gravity research, energy production, and weapon applications—all of which will help minimize the risks of congestion, contestation, and competitiveness.

#### This is the violence of semiocapitalism the absolute liquidation of Otherness in the name of transparency – a spectacular genocide against alterity, conducted in the name of nothing at all.

Guignion ‘18

[David, M.A. at the University of Western Ontario. 2018. “The Mirror of Humanism; or, Towards a Baudrillardian Posthuman Theory”, <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=7739&context=etd>] pat

Baudrillard’s two books on war, The Gulf War did not take place and The Spirit of Terrorism propose that war has been engulfed by the mass media. According to Rick Roderick, in his eight-part lecture series: The Self Under Siege: Philosophy in the Twentieth Century, Baudrillard wanted to cover the Gulf War on “CNN where it would really happen” (Roderick), because as the “media promote the war, the war promotes the media, and advertising competes with the war” (Baudrillard, Gulf War 31). For Baudrillard, the degree to which these wars were broadcast over television networks attests to a transformation of the nature of war itself. As he explains, “when it has been turned into information, [war] ceases to be a realistic war and becomes a virtual war” (41). The system of war is not the only one affected by this turn toward virtuality. Those fighting, if on the side of the invader, find a great deal of safety in the war zone itself. As Baudrillard writes, “A simple calculation shows that, of the 500,000 American soldiers involved during the seven months of operations in the Gulf, three times as many would have died from road accidents alone had they stayed in civilian life. Should we consider multiplying clean wars in order to reduce the murderous death toll of peacetime?” (69). Still, Baudrillard’s remarks overlook the enormous casualties suffered by the losing side. In this case, the term “war” does not capture the essence of these military movements as well as the term “invasion,” indicative of a form of neo-colonialism. The transformation of these wars from the domain of reality to that of the virtual performs a dual function for the neo-colonial efforts of the West. First, there is a virtual violence, a violence of the image. In this operation the real events of these wars are substituted for the image of these wars: “The image consumes the event, in the sense that it absorbs it and offers it for consumption” (Baudrillard, The Spirit of Terrorism 27). This process not only replaces the real with the virtual, but filters which images and messages are distributed. The images distributed operate to convince the viewer of the reality of these wars, or, more precisely, their virtual reality. Second, these wars function to destroy the other, virtually and symbolically. The West’s drive toward global hegemony “is a giant project meant to symbolically liquidate all values through consensus or force” (Baudrillard, The Agony of Power 67). Global power, for Baudrillard, “is the power of the simulacrum” (66). Under the code of the simulacrum, where people are reduced to the status of cybernetician, the other poses an avid challenge to global hegemony. Global hegemony responds to this roadblock by declaring war on “the alterity of the other” by either converting or annihilating it (Baudrillard, Gulf War 37). The simulating machine dabbles in the affairs of reality when zones of resistance that do not subscribe to its oppressive logic emerge. In many ways, Baudrillard’s theorization of war bridges the gap between simulation and reality, pointing to a milieu—the war machine—that simulation mobilizes in the service of eradicating difference. Baudrillard’s writing on war points to the erasure and eradication of those points on the globe that are outside of the purview of “our truth” where “nothing is true unless it is desecrated, objectified, stripped of its aura, or dragged onstage” (Agony 67). The West strives to make everything seen, everything tangible, everything real through the “museification” (Baudrillard, The Vital Illusion 40) of the other. The virtuality of the scenes of war exist to convince the viewer that the war is real; that there is something to be fought over, as opposed to neo-colonial genocide. The role of the museum in this process is, in a sense, to deliver the final blow to the objects of this neo-colonial effort. Those affected literally die from the bombardment of artillery strikes and drone strikes, but they also die “from being transplanted from a slow order of the symbolic, master over putrefaction and death, to an order of history, science, and museums, our order, which no longer masters anything, which only knows how to condemn what preceded it to decay and death and subsequently to try to revive it with science” (Baudrillard, Simulacra 10).

**Thus the plan: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.**

* We will meet any of your theory interps in CX, otherwise grant us an I meet
* Your offense probably won’t weigh into our framing, you will need to read your own

#### **The private appropriation of outer space re-entrenches corporations’ violent historical capitalist and colonial origins, asserting privileged and violent dynamics into the realm of space. Our analysis of space exploration is the only way to haunt our present and reconfigure a world which distances from the violence of semiocapitalism. Utrata 21**

Alina Utrata, 7-14-2021, "Lost in Space", Boston Review, https://bostonreview.net/articles/lost-in-space, //WHS-AC

As previously examined in [these pages](https://bostonreview.net/science-nature/byron-williston-case-against-mars), the space race of the Cold War was characterized by a triumphalism around the power and scientific capacity of nation-states. Today’s wave of space exploration, however, is being led by tech billionaires’ private space corporations for financial gain—and, if we believe Bezos and Musk, for the betterment of human civilization. But the rhetoric and history of celestial exploration revea[s] l how **the logics of capitalism, colonialism, and corporations have always been intimately, and violently, intertwined**. And, as history shows us, **allowing corporations the power to colonize space may result in outcomes that even states cannot control**. In the early years of Blue Origin, Bezos personally funded his company (by selling one billion of Amazon stock per year, he revealed in 2017) and initially focused on space tourism as a potential source of revenue, as well as a way—he claimed—to acclimate people to the idea of space travel. But Bezos watched as Musk’s SpaceX quickly eclipsed his company, both in size and success. Musk had funded SpaceX through a combination of venture capital investment and billions in government contracts. While Blue Origin has [never launched](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/26/science/spacex-moon-blue-origin.html) a rocket that achieved orbit, SpaceX has been flying NASA cargo to the International Space Station since 2012. Bezos and Musk spend millions of dollars lobbying Congress to continue funding their projects, which already recieve massive amounts of public money through government contracts. When Tesla received a $1.3 billion tax break to open a battery plant in Nevada in 2014, Bezos [sent off](https://www.simonandschuster.co.uk/books/Amazon-Unbound/Brad-Stone/9781398500969) an email to a fellow Amazon executive asking why Musk had been so successful at securing big government incentives. But now Bezos has nothing to complain about. Blue Origin routinely competes with SpaceX for contracts, and both companies spend millions lobbying Congress to continue funding these projects. After SpaceX initially won a contract to build a lunar lander, a short-lived amendment to the Endless Frontier Act which would have authorized $10 billion to NASA’s moon program and established a second award was even briefly nicknamed the “[Bezos Bailout](https://theintercept.com/2021/05/25/jeff-bezos-blue-origin-senate-bailout/).” It is true that Musk has a particular talent for securing government funding across his business ventures. In her book The Entrepreneurial State (2013), Mariana Mazzucato debunks the notion that free markets and small states, rather than government investment in technological innovation, create economic success. She documents how Musk’s companies SpaceX, Tesla, and SolarCity have received billions in government support, including grants, tax breaks, and subsidized loans. On top of that, they have also secured billions more in procurement contracts and direct investments in new technologies from NASA and the Department of Energy. (This government support is not marginal. Tesla only had its first [full-year profit](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/27/business/tesla-earnings.html) in 2020, although Musk has accumulated much of his personal fortune through ownership of the company’s stock.) But this outsourcing of colonization efforts to private corporations is not just a feature of the neoliberal state; **corporations have long been embedded in the history of colonization**. In the early days of colonization, though companies’ home states often provided them money and legitimacy for their ventures overseas, **governments did not always tightly control these endeavors.** For instance, the British East India Company—a “company-state,” as [coined](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-company-state-9780195393736?cc=gb&lang=en&) by Philip Stern—maintained armed forces, waged and declared war, collected taxes, minted coin, and at one point “ruled” over more subjects than the British state itself. As J. C. Sharman and Andrew Phillips noted in Outsourcing Empire: How Company-States Made the Modern World(2020), “in some cases, company-states came to wield more military and political power than many monarchs of the day.”Today states, not corporations, are perceived to be the truly dangerous actors in space exploration. But **corporations have long been embedded in the history of colonization.** Company-states were predicated on an understanding of sovereignty as divisible and delegatory, defying what we today consider “public” and “private” power. Compared to company-states at their zenith, even the largest modern-day multinational corporation—and certainly SpaceX and Blue Origin—has significantly less authority, with absolutely no military might to speak of. The monarchies that first granted monopoly charters to these voyaging companies, having evolved into modern states, have also consolidated sovereign authority and gained far more power than their antecedents in previous centuries. Today states, not corporations, are perceived to be the truly dangerous actors in space exploration. Particularly in the context of worsening U.S.-China relations, the militarization of space by states is often posited as the most likely way that celestial encounters may become violent. On this view, if private U.S. companies were to extract commercial resources from asteroids, it would be a much more peaceful prospect than the U.S. Space Force establishing a military base on the moon. However, this framing ignores **corporations’ violent histories and the deep connection between private commercial pursuits and systems of capitalism and colonialism**. Moreover, though states may help create and participate in these systems, they do not always control the forces they unleash. For example, there was nothing inevitable about the fact that the East India Company came under the control of the British state. Even when it did, it caused devastating impacts on both the places it claimed to “rule” as well as the state that had chartered and owned it, ushering in the age of the British Empire. As historian William Dalrymple, author of The Anarchy: The Relentless Rise of the East India Company (2019), [noted](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/mar/04/east-india-company-original-corporate-raiders), “It was not the British government that seized India at the end of the 18th century, but a dangerously unregulated private company. . . [that] executed a corporate coup unparalleled in history: the military conquest, subjugation and plunder of vast tracts of southern Asia. It almost certainly remains the supreme act of corporate violence in world history.” As contemporary companies set out to colonize space, we should ask whether modern states have a better grasp on how to control corporations and the violence that may result from battles over who ought to rule these settlers and resources. Though Blue Origin and SpaceX are indebted to the U.S. government for funding, U.S. regulators’ ability to manage these corporations—especially Musk’s—already appears limited. Musk’s [remarks](https://www.wsj.com/articles/elon-musk-tesla-spacex-regulators-crash-11619624227) toward U.S. regulators, even those investigating him, are infamous for being outrageous and crude—and his behavior is no less intransigent. For instance, in December of last year, SpaceX [refused to comply](https://www.theverge.com/2021/6/15/22352366/elon-musk-spacex-faa-warnings-starship-sn8-launch-violation-texas) with Federal Aviation Association (FAA) orders to abort a high-altitude test launch of its Starship rocket after the agency revoked its launch license due to atmospheric conditions. And this was not the first time Musk defied government authority. In May 2020 he [re-opened his Tesla factory](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-health-coronavirus-tesla-california-idUSKBN22N2EY) despite an Alameda county health order to shelter in place due to the COVID-19 pandemic, requesting on Twitter that police “only arrest him” if law enforcement took action. His companies have been repeatedly investigated and fined for various other regulatory and safety violations. (Reports have [claimed](https://revealnews.org/article/tesla-says-its-factory-is-safer-but-it-left-injuries-off-the-books/) that the Tesla factory does not have proper hazard signage because Musk “does not like the color yellow.”) Is it simply the case that Musk, like many powerful men before him, receives preferential treatment from the state? Or are the state and its regulatory agencies truly unable to control him? Colonial destruction was justified by a specific ideology that made a certain view of the world, and humanity’s role in it, appear natural and inevitable. Musk, for his part, does not seem particularly cowed. After the December rocket launch incident, the FAA announced that additional measures, including having an FAA inspector on site, will be imposed on SpaceX during future launches. In response Musk tweeted on January 28 that the FAA “rules are meant for a handful of expendable launches per year from a few government facilities. Under those rules, humanity will never get to Mars.” For Musk, becoming an inter-planetary species is an existential matter for human civilization, far more important than rules and regulations. Both Bezos and Musk use the language of moral imperative when talking about space colonization: humanity must not merely explore space, but settle it, too. The two engineers can easily explain the technical dimensions of their plans to colonize the cosmos. Though these plans differ—Bezos wants to establish artificial tube-like structures floating close to Earth, whereas Musk wants to terraform Mars—the political philosophies underpinning them are remarkably similar. Both offer utopian visions of humanity in space that attempt to provide technological solutions to the political problems that colonialism and capitalism have caused. In 1982 Bezos [said](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/08/31/amazon-jeff-bezos-proposed-colonizing-space-high-school-graduation-speech.html) in his high school valedictorian speech that “the Earth is finite and if the world economy and population is to keep expanding, space is the only way to go.” His views have not changed much since then. “[Within a few centuries] we’ll be using all of the solar energy that impacts the Earth,” he [told](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GQ98hGUe6FM) a crowd at an event hosted by Blue Origin. “That’s an actual limit.” This Malthusian logic underpins his arguments about the inevitability of humanity’s growth and the necessity of expanding into space. There are short-term problems, he explains, such as poverty and pollution, and there are long-term problems, such as running out of energy. If we do not want to become “a civilization of rationing and stasis,” Bezos [warns](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GQ98hGUe6FM), we must expand to the stars where “resources are, for all practical purposes, infinite.” For Musk space colonization is also a means to preserve human civilization, albeit as a hedge against eventual extinction. “I don’t have an immediate doomsday prophecy,” he [told](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H7Uyfqi_TE8) an international conference in 2016, “but history suggests that there will be some extinction event. The alternative is to become a space-faring civilization and multi-planetary species.” Whereas Bezos emphasizes the cyclical logic of capitalist growth—we must expand, in order to keep expanding—Musk is more explicit in his plans for colonial settlement. One of his proposals—to allow individuals to purchase one-way tickets to Mars which can be paid off through promised jobs in the new colony— has been [called](https://gizmodo.com/elon-musk-a-new-life-awaits-you-on-the-off-world-colon-1841071257) Martian indentured servitude. “Mars would have a labor shortage for a long time,” Musk explained, so “jobs would not be in short supply.” And while Bezos imagines that humans will be able to travel between Earth and space often, Musk [contends](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/03/09/spacex-plans-how-elon-musk-see-life-on-mars.html) that the Mars colony should be self-sufficient, able “to survive if the resupply ships stop coming from Earth for any reason.” Imperialist conceptions of ownership transform space into an “empty frontier” where certain individuals can project their political dreams. For two entrepreneurs whose businesses have been lauded as exceptionally visionary, their celestial utopias stand out for their lack of political creativity and awareness. Bezos’s notion that imperial expansion is the only way to support an ever-growing population is an old colonialist appeal, now repackaged for the stars. The infinite need for resources, as well as the “poverty and pollution” that Bezos dismisses as short-term problems, are deeply enmeshed in capitalism’s cycles of extraction and are currently causing Earth’s climate crisis. Given the green-orientation of his enterprises, Musk is presumably aware of the climate crisis—or at least the opportunities it presents for government funding. Yet he has not explicitly named climate change as one of the potential “extinction events” that a Mars colony might protect against. Putting aside the question of whether terraforming Mars is actually feasible—for the record, a Nature Astronomy article [suggests](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41550-018-0529-6) it is not—settling space won’t be cost-free to Earth. As science writer Shannon Stirone [pointed out](https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2021/02/mars-is-no-earth/618133/) in The Atlantic, “Mars has a very thin atmosphere; it has no magnetic field to help protect its surface from radiation from the sun or galactic cosmic rays; it has no breathable air and the average surface temperature is a deadly 80 degrees below zero . . . . For humans to live there in any capacity they would need to build tunnels and live underground.” The environmental and human destruction necessary to make space habitable would dwarf any technological or political response needed to stop the climate crisis now. **And—like capitalism and climate change—the impacts of colonizing space will be far worse for some rather than others, particularly in the Global South.** For example, when Indonesian president Joko Widodo offered SpaceX the island of Biak in Papua, home to an ongoing secessionist campaign, local communities protested that the building of the launch station would cause vast ecological damage and community displacement. They had reason to worry. This is precisely what happened in Boca Chica, a small town on the southern tip of Texas where SpaceX had [built](https://www.vicetv.com/en_us/video/between-musk-and-mars/5f500fb3c83b9a3d80247a84) a previous launch site. After SpaceX moved into town, [residents of the Texas community were pushed out](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2020/02/space-x-texas-village-boca-chica/606382/) from their homes as the area became unsafe due to rocket activity, which has since [damaged](https://au.news.yahoo.com/concern-after-wildlife-refuge-showered-with-rocket-parts-115609011.html) a wildlife refuge in the area. SpaceX has offered to purchase residents’ homes, but below the price many think is fair. An email from SpaceX to Boca Chica holdouts [stated](https://www.vice.com/en/article/z3ep4y/spacex-is-trying-to-force-residents-out-of-a-small-texas-village), “As the scale and frequency of spaceflight activities at the site continue to accelerate, your property will frequently fall within established hazard zones in which no civilians will be permitted to remain, in order to comply with all federal and other public safety regulations.” SpaceX’s impact on the area demonstrated little concern for its displacement and damage of the local community. While we all may use, explore, or research space, no state can claim to own it—though this does not mean states will not try. Musk and Bezos rely on the notion that colonizing space somehow differs from colonizing Earth. Implicit in their arguments is the belief that it was not the systems of colonial-capitalism, but rather the context surrounding their implementation, that wreaked havoc in the past. **On this view, although previous colonization attempts often unleashed genocidal violence, that history cannot be repeated in space.** After all, no one lives there. **This perspective ignores the fact that colonial destruction was justified by a specific ideology that made a certain view of the world, and humanity’s role in it, appear natural and inevitable**. **The idea that space is open for the taking simply because “no one is there” finds root in the exact colonial logics that have justified settler genocide for centuries: that only certain people, using resources in certain ways, have a claim to land and ownership. Imperialist conceptions of ownership thus transform space into an “empty frontier” where certain individuals can project their political dreams, whether they be extractive manufacturing industries or settler colonies.**

**The 1AC is a policy** without a policy  **– our deconstruction of the mental trap of capitalism is necessary to rupture the universalization of politics– the belief that a more economically liberalized world will stop the conflicts only recreates that conflict on a larger and more spectacular scale. The role of the ballot is to endorse the most effective praxis of engaging in hauntological politics.**

**McQuillan 09** (Martin McQuillan, Professor of Literary Theory and Cultural Analysis and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at Kingston University, London, where he is also Co-Director of The London Graduate School, “Derrida and Policy” in *Deconstruction After 9/11*, Routledge pub. 2009)

In order for politics to be thinkable there must be some moment at which thought moves over into politics. Now, one could pick at this opening sentence for some time, books could be written and research projects designed to interrogate whether it is true or not. Its truth or otherwise will certainly depend upon what one means here by ‘politics’ (twice and non-identically), ‘thinkable’, ‘some moment’, ‘thought’, ‘moves over’, and indeed ‘into’, none of this is without consequence for either deconstruction or truth. However, allow me momentarily to place my own opening sentence in inverted commas, as if it had been spoken by someone else and with the authority of someone else. Allow me the considerable license of taking this quotation as axiomatic for what is to follow even if both you and I do not believe it as a statement of fact, or at least even if you and I do not quite believe it as a statement of fact because we are more than capable of acting upon it in good faith as if it were fact. Such a statement is a seduction to short-circuit thinking. It asks us not to look at it—do not question me, take me as ‘read’. In this sentence one can find a concentrated example of the logo-rhetorical illusion that is the predicate of politics, in which politics and thought separate themselves into conceptual spheres just as these spheres emerge from the mediated, supplatory conceptualization in which thought and politics are inextricably bound one to the other. However, today I am in the mood to be seduced and there are ways in which one can, more or less, give oneself up strategically to such overtures. Imagine for a moment that both thought and politics were imaginable outside of mediation and that one followed the other as day follows night and that one could be translated into the other by some alchemical process. Then imagine the consequences of this for politics. If one were able to momentarily suspend all this disbelief (as if ‘deconstruction’ and centuries of politics had never happened) then we would find ourselves in the position of the policymaker. This is not a new position to be in but one that has a certain visibility today in the technocratic space of liberal democracies. Today, ‘policy-making’ is outsourced to so-**called ‘think tanks’ where policy is formulated and road-tested on ‘focus groups’ before being adopted (or paid for) by political parties**, diluting to taste. ‘Policy’ is one of those obscure words of the modern political lexicon; nothing could be more vague or less well understood than this term, which of course means that it is invoked ubiquitously without reflection in a wide sphere. The basic assumption of policy, as an idea, is the logo-rhetorical illusion par excellence that theory translates (and is translatable in principle) into practice. Policy then becomes law, as if the transmission of the law were itself a straightforward and transparent thing. One might laugh at such a naïve, ‘undeconstructed’ notion, if it were not for the fact that this is how the world is run. The comedian Ken Dodd says of Freud’s formulation of laughter as a release of psychic energy, ‘the problem with Freud is that he never played the Glasgow Empire’. Equally, the problem with the deconstruction of policy might be that the White House has yet to open itself to a policy of deconstruction. I want to ask in this essay, what would such a policy or set of policies look like, if they were imaginable? This is not to suggest that, after his death, the writing of Derrida might give rise to a set of ‘practical’ political policies, as the texts of Marx and Lenin were ‘read’ as the biblical revelation of an ontotheo-politics. Rather, it is to accept Roland Barthes’s caution that one cannot simply exclude oneself from the discourse of stupidity. ‘I don’t mean that one can’t be innocent of it’, he told Jean-Jacques Brochier in 1975, ‘that would be bad faith, but one can’t be innocent of it simply . . . In any case, stupidity’s mode of being is triumph. One can do nothing against stupidity. One can only internalize it, take a small homeopathic dose of it—but not too much’.3 Think of this then as a hypothesis, what analytic philosophy would call a thought experiment. It is certainly not a bid for interpretative rights of the text of Derrida or the political futures of deconstruction, whatever such a word continues to mean. I am also reminded here of another caution, that of Edward Said, who had little time for what he called ‘travelling theory’,4 whereby specialization as a mode of professionalization within the academy comes to serve the interests of policymakers. His complaint is against the professional production of specialists on the ‘Orient’ who sell their expertise to the government and media while having their appearance in the government or media affirm their expertise. Whtile the very idea of ‘Policy’ no doubt marks an important, and not easily dismissed, transformation in the arena of competency of both party politicians and academics, it calls out for deconstruction. That is a deconstruction of its very premises as the dialectical-complex and unholy alliance between the technoscientific, global economy and the technocratic university of specialization in relation to a mediatic space, which presents one through the explanation of the other in terms of pragmatism, expediency, compromise or ‘realiswem’. Here I am talking about a certain culture that we call politics, the properly political (the discourse of parties and politicians in governmental power across the world). As Derrida points out in Spectres of Marx, in this culture ‘virtually everywhere Western models prevail’.5 This culture has always been bound to the culture of tele-technology, to mediation and representation. However, today, this relation is accelerated in an unprecedented fashion according to the rhythm of so-called ‘communications’ as the ‘selective and hierarchized production of “information”’6 and its auto-immunized interpretation. The academic discourse of the technocratic university is welded to this apparatus in an indissociable way. It is almost impossible to watch a news programme without the appearance of an academic witness who provides the most banal and unscholarly of comments to justify or exemplify the content of a news item. Whole news items are nothing more than the appearance of academics to promote their ‘research findings’ or latest reports; entire university research strategies are written around the stated desire for such appearances. Which university does not now have a press office? In my institution at least half of the faculties of the university (those that can afford them) have contracts with media consultants who are employed to write ‘accessible’ accounts of research activities with a view to placing stories in the media or promoting individuals to the level of media figure, talking head or guru. There is no point at which it is thought that academic research (another obscure term which we will need to tackle on another day) is inimical to this form of reductionism or that certain forms of thought might be allergic to passing through a media culture in this way. At any rate, the idea of policy is related, in no doubt complex and overdetermined ways, to this mutation in the channels which run between the academic and public spaces, which have more or less neutralized the notion of the public intellectual (another term we might caution against today given its historical relation to closely policed questions of propriety, gender, race and sexuality). A thinking of the relationship between the text of Derrida and the articulation of policy will necessarily involve a new thinking of the ground of policy and its relation to the media-political culture of today. What if it were possible to imagine something like a ‘counter-policy’, a thinking of policy as an intervention in the world that neither separated theory from practice nor accepted the easy place of the academic in the political-mediatic apparatus? What if it were possible to set policy-making against itself, to make policies to which policy was itself allergic? This would be an impossible policy, policy which understood the idea of policy to be impossible: policy without telos, policy without Policy, policy no longer able to accept the name of policy but the only policy to be worthy of the name as an action in the material world. In imaging such a decentring of policy, one might also pertinently ask, does politics as such always imply an idea of policy in the same way that it always implies an idea of man? That is to say, does policy itself (as the pretext, offspring and crafting of the moment of political antagonism) imply or assume an inherited idea of man? Given the location of policy, in its modern sense, within the topography of contemporary political culture, in which policy precedes and enables the agency of political man then the answer is surely yes and a rethinking of policy would be nothing less than an entire disarticulation of this logo-anthro-onto-pological schema. Such a thinking of policy would then require the inauguration of a counter-culture as well as a counter- policy, with its own counter-institutions and spaces of articulation that would of course have their own vexed relation to channels of communication and the new technologies of the digital epoch as an exercise of public critical reason. One should also say that it is undoubtedly the case that such cultural transformations are already under way in spaces not visible to the academic, anthropological or mediatic gaze, across the hinterlands of the World Wide Web, cyber activism and in corners of the thinking world uncompromised by the funded research culture of the transnational university. However, in this text I am only proposing to take a position not to do the work that the sustainability of such a position would require. I am also talking about a relation between philosophy and policy that would be, unlike other articulations of militancy currently to be found in cyberspace, both properly philosophical and properly a ‘political science’, if such a thing exists. Now, the point here is not to scan the text of Derrida for ‘policies’ as such; one hopes that there will never be such a thing as ‘the Derrida Party’ (at least not in the sense of that word as a proper noun).

#### Refuse the belief in time as linear – attachment to future planning breeds an oppressive egoism that produces the foundation for modern violence. Hagglund 4

Hagglund, Martin. THE NECESSITY OF DISCRIMINATION - JSTOR. 2004, www.jstor.org/stable/3805830. //FD WHS 10/6/20

An important clue is the phrase that reverberates throughout the entire book: The time is out of joint. This line from Shakespeareʼs Hamlet is the leitmotif in Specters of Marx. By exploring its resonance we can begin to assess what is at stake in the book. As Derrida points out, Hamletʼs line has often been quoted and translated as a critique of the prevalent state of society. The disjointure of time is then understood in terms of a moral or social decay, in which the founding principles of community have been perverted or gone astray. Such a critique opposes the disjointed time—which keeps losing its course and does not hold together—to a society that is harmoniously synchronized with itself, regardless of whether the synchrony is posited as a lost origin or as a consummated future. The same opposition characterizes the traditional critique of ideology: in contrast to how things are, in contrast to the prevailing injustice and oppression, the demand for justice is raised as a demand concerning how things ought to be. In Specters of Marx, Derrida reconfi gures the understanding of what it means that “the time is out of joint.” As many readers have noted, Derrida is firm in his contention that we cannot do away with a notion of emancipation and progress. He repeatedly emphasizes the importance of pursuing political critique, of not shutting oneʼs eyes to the innumerable victims of global capitalism, and of reaffi rming a certain “Marxist” spirit. These points are reinforced through a critique of the neoliberal rhetoric that proclaims the death of Marx and Marxism, represented in Specters of Marx by Francis Fukuyamaʼs book on “The End of History.” Protesting against Fukuyamaʼs neoevangelism, which celebrates the end of ideologies and emancipatory narratives in the capitalist paradise, Derrida paints a “blackboard picture” of the contemporary world, recalling that “never have violence, inequality, famine and thus economic oppression affected as many human beings in the history of the earth and of humanity” [85/141]. This remark may seem to be nothing but a version of the traditional critique of ideology. Apparently, Derrida maintains that our time is “out of joint” and that we have to combat the disjointure in the name of a better, a more just society. The pivotal difference, however, is that the classical concept of emancipation—like the Marxist form of political critique—is tied to the notion that the ideal condition would be an absolute peace. While the world de facto is marked by violence, exclusion, and discrimination, one thus postulates that justice in principle (de jure) should put an end to violence. The challenge of Derridaʼs thinking is that he undermines the notion of an ideal justice. For Derrida, the disjointure of time is neither something that supervenes upon a state of being that precedes it, nor something that one can or should finally overcome. Hence, the provocative thesis in Specters of Marx is that violence and discrimination are not opposed to justice, but inextricable from its very possibility. Of course, Derrida does not regard violence or discrimination as positive in themselves. Rather, he argues that the machinery of exclusion is at work in the formation of any identity and thus hagglund.indd 41 agglund.indd 41 3/6/06 2:53:07 PM /6/06 2:53:07 PM 42 cannot fi nally be eliminated. The disjointure of time is the condition for there to be any ethics and politics, as well as any society and life to begin with. By tracking the notion of a necessary disjointure, we can discern the continuity of Derridaʼs thinking. Derridaʼs deconstructive “logic” is always concerned with the impossibility of being in itself. I will demonstrate that this logic follows from the implications of temporality and that it entails a thinking of irreducible violence. The temporal can never be in itself, but is always disjoined between being no longer and being not yet.2 Derrida pursues this argument in Margins of Philosophy by analyzing the treatment of time in the fourth book of Aristotleʼs Physics. Aristotle here points out that there would be no time if there were only one single now [218b]. Rather, there must be at least two nows—“an earlier one before and a later one after” [219a]—in order for there to be time. Time is thus defined as succession, where each now is always superseded by another now. In thinking succession, however, Aristotle realizes that it contradicts his concept of identity as presence in itself. A self-present, indivisible now could never even begin to give way to another now, since what is indivisible cannot be altered. This observation leads Aristotle to an impasse, since his logic of identity cannot account for the succession that constitutes time. Derrida articulates the problem as follows: Let us consider the sequence of nows. The preceding now, it is said, must be destroyed by the following now. But, Aristotle then points out, it cannot be destroyed “in itself” (en heautōi), that is, at the moment when it is (now, in act). No more can it be destroyed in an other now (en allōi): for then it would not be destroyed as now, itself; and, as a now which has been, it is . . . inaccessible to the action of the following now. [Margins 57/65] Hence, as long as one holds on to the idea of an indivisible now—or more succinctly: as long as one holds on to the concept of identity as presence in itself—it is impossible to think succession. The now cannot first be present in itself and then be affected by its own disappearance, since this would require that the now began to pass away after it had ceased to be. Rather, the now must disappear in its very event. The succession of time requires not only that each now is superseded by another now, but that this alteration is at work from the beginning. The purportedly single now is always already divided by the movement of temporalization in which “the dyad [is] the minimum,” as Derrida contends [Margins 56/65]. The movement of temporalization can thus not be understood in terms of a presence that emerges from a past presence and anticipates being overtaken by a future presence. The “past” cannot refer to what has been present, since any past was itself divided from its beginning. Likewise the “future” cannot refer to what will be present, 2. In Speech and Phenomena, Derrida maintains that “what is ultimately at stake, what is at bottom decisive” is “the concept of time” [63/70]. This concept plays a dual role in the history of metaphysics, which is why it is so decisive for Derridaʼs deconstruction. On the one hand, time is thought on the basis of the present and in conformity with the logic of identity. This logic prescribes that what is must be identical to itself—that its originary form must be an indivisible unity. The presence of the present is thus the principle of identity from which all modifi cations of time are derived. The past is understood as what has been present, and the future as what will be present. On the other hand, time is incompatible with presence in itself. Thus, although “the present is that from which we believe we are able to think time” this understanding of time in fact effaces “the inverse necessity: to think the present from time as différance” [Of Grammatology 166/236–37]. It is the proposition that time is différance that I wish to develop. Such a deconstruction cannot consist in constructing another concept of time. Rather, the traditional concept of time as succession provides the resources to deconstruct the logic of identity. hagglund.indd 42 agglund.indd 42 3/6/06 2:53:19 PM /6/06 2:53:19 PM diacritics / spring 2004 43 but designates a relentless displacement inherent in everything that happens. Any socalled presence is divided in its very event, and not only in relation to what precedes or succeeds it. Thus, time itself is constitutively out of joint. Or more exactly: time itself is the impossibility of any “itself.” This is not a paradox but follows from analyzing the minimal definition of time. Even the slightest temporal moment must be divided in its becoming: separating before from after, past from future. Without the interval there would be no time, only a presence forever remaining the same. Or as Derrida puts it: An interval must separate the present from what it is in order for the present to be itself, but this interval that constitutes it as present must, by the same token, divide the present in and of itself, thereby also dividing, along with the present, everything that is thought on the basis of the present. [Margins 13/13] The diffi cult question, then, is how identity is possible without being grounded in the form of presence. How can we speak of identity at all if there is no presence as such, but only incessant division between a past that has never been (present) and a future that will never be (present)? Certainly, the difference of time could not even be marked without a synthesis that relates the past to the future and thus posits an identity over time. In order to account for the synthesis of time, Derrida works out his notion of “the trace.” Derrida defines the trace in terms of “spacing.” Spacing is shorthand for the becoming-space of time and the becoming-time of space, which is also the defi nition of différance. My argument is that an elaboration of Derridaʼs defi nition allows for the most rigorous thinking of temporality by accounting for an originary synthesis without grounding it in an indivisible presence.3 The synthesis of the trace follows from the constitution of time we have considered. Given that the now can appear only by disappearing, it must be inscribed as a trace in order to be at all. This is the becoming-space of time. The trace is necessarily spatial, since spatiality is characterized by the ability to remain in spite of temporal succession. Spatiality is thus the condition for synthesis, since it enables the tracing of relations between past and future. However, spatiality can never be in itself; it can never be pure simultaneity. Simultaneity is unthinkable without a temporalization that relates one spatial juncture to another.4 This becoming-time of space is necessary not only in order for the trace to be related to other traces, but also in order for it to be a trace in the fi rst place. A trace can be read only after its inscription and is thus marked by a relation to the future that temporalizes space. This is crucial for Derridaʼs deconstruction of the logic of identity. If the spatialization of time makes the synthesis possible, the temporalization of space makes it impossible for the synthesis to be grounded in an indivisible presence. The synthesis is always a trace of the past that is left for the future. Thus, it can never be in itself, but is essentially exposed to that which may erase it. To think the trace as the condition for life in general (and Derrida aims to do nothing less) is thus to think a constitutive fi nitude, which from the very beginning exposes life to death, memory to forgetting, identity to alterity, and so on. Derrida always proceeds from the logic of such a double bind. What I want to emphasize here is that the 3. I have begun to pursue this argument in the second part of my book Kronofobi: Essäer om tid och ändlighet 138–218. Importantly, Derridaʼs notion of originary synthesis revises the very concept of origin. If the synthesis is originary, then there will never have been a simple element or absolute beginning. Thus, Derrida places the “originary” synthesis within quotation marks and emphasizes that it must be understood as “irreducibly non-simple” [Margins 13/13–14]. 4. Cf. Derrida, Margins 55/63. hagglund.indd 43 agglund.indd 43 3/6/06 2:53:27 PM /6/06 2:53:27 PM 44 understanding of the trace that informs deconstructive logic is radically different from Levinasʼs understanding of the trace. Indeed, both Derrida and Levinas appeal to “the trace of the other” as the trace of a past that has never been present. The shared vocabulary has often been adduced as evidence of their proximity, but a closer study of the terms in question will reveal that the analogy is misleading.5

**Underview**

**[1] ROB before T/theory**

**A) Jurisdiction- the ROB speaks specifically to this round and how the ballot should be signed, while theory is about norm-setting which is out of the judge’s jurisdiction bc that is out of round**

**B) Offense- the ROB constrains what is and isn’t offensive so theory must be contextualized to the framing or else it’s not offensive so you can’t vote on it**

**C) Theory speaks to a fair and educational space but my ROB evidence says that those spaces can’t exist prior to the aff because they’re grounded in accumulatio**

**n D) K education outweighs – LD is uniquely key for kritikal education**

**[2] We get 1ar theory– checks infinitely abusive neg**

**a) drop the debater, a]deters future abuse. Empirically confirmed with the frequency of people running tricks.**

**b) competing interps a] Reasonability is arbitrary with a bright line which literally invites judge intervention b] CI is key to norm setting because it forces them to defend their practice.**

**c) no rvis on 1ar theory- a] Time skew—they get 6 mins to respond to my shell, I only get 3 mins. This creates a massive disadvantage for me**

**[3] Give me new 2AR weighing and arguments - I only know what arguments I have to weigh against after the 2NR, but they know after the 1AR**

**[4] Presumption affirms—we always assume things are true unless proven false (i.e. if I told you my name was sanaya you would believe me unless someone proved that statement false)**