## NEW Space Debris Cards:

**TIMEFRAME ARGS:**

**Now is key – Experts say the amount of space junk will triple by 2030**

**David** in **11** (Leonard, Space.com space insider columnist, Space.com Spaceflight, *Ugly truth of space junk: Orbital debris problem to triple by 2030*, May 09, 2011, <http://www.space.com/11607-space-junk-rising-orbital-debris-levels-2030.html>, NU)

In a recent conference here, Gen. William Shelton, commander of the U.S. Air Force Space Command, relayed his worries about rising amounts of human-made [space junk](http://www.space.com/11305-space-junk-astronauts-bigger-threat.html). "The traffic is increasing. We've now got over 50 nations that are participants in the space environment," Shelton said last month during the Space Foundation’s 27th National Space Symposium. Given existing space situational awareness capabilities, over 20,000 objects are now tracked. [[Worst Space Debris Events of All Time](http://www.space.com/9708-worst-space-debris-events-time.html)] "We catalog those routinely and keep track of them. That number is projected to triple by 2030, and much of that is improved sensors, but some of that is increased traffic," Shelton said. "Then if you think about it, there are probably 10 times more objects in space than we're able to track with our sensor capability today. Those objects are untrackable … yet they are lethal to our space systems -- to military space systems, civil space systems, commercial -- no one’s immune from the threats that are on orbit today, just due to the traffic in space."

**Space debris will increase in coming years – Makes now the critical time to act.**

**Wall 11** (Mike Wall, senior writer at space.com and Former herpetologist , Space.com, Space Junk Threat Will Grow for Astronauts and Satellites, http://www.space.com/11305-space-junk-astronauts-bigger-threat.html ,rn)

Fast-moving chunks of space debris zipped uncomfortably close to the International Space Station twice in the past week — cosmic close calls that will likely become more common over the next several years, experts predict. For one thing, after 50 years of spaceflight there is just [more junk up there](http://www.space.com/9818-expanding-danger-space-debris-fragmentation.html) than there used to be, sharing space with vehicles and their human crews. And this debris can snowball — as when satellites collide, spawning thousands of new pieces of orbiting junk. The sun is also entering an active period, which puffs up Earth's atmosphere and increases orbital drag — causing higher-altitude space debris to rain down on spacecraft below. Solar activity shouldn't hit its peak until 2012 or 2013, so orbiting astronauts may experience some more close shaves soon. "I think that over the next two or three years, this is going to happen more often," NASA's Gene Stansbery told SPACE.com. Stansbery is the program manager of NASA's Orbital Debris Office at Johnson Space Center in Houston.

**Amount of space debris increasing now-making the lower earth orbit potentially uninhabitable.**

**David 11**(Leonard David has been reporting on the space industry for more than five decades. He is a winner of this year’s National Space Club Press Award and a past editor-in-chief of the National Space Society's Ad Astra and Space World magazines. He has written for Space.com since 1999., space.com,

Ugly truth of space junk: No feasible solutions Debris continues to multiply, but there's no affordable way to eliminate it , 5/10/11, <http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/42975224/ns/technology_and_science-space/t/ugly-truth-space-junk-no-feasible-solutions/>, rn)

Point of no return The [concern over orbital debris](http://www.space.com/11191-space-debris-international-response.html) has been building for several reasons, said Marshall Kaplan, an orbital debris expert within the Space Department at the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory in Laurel, Md. In Kaplan's view, spacefaring nations have passed the point of "no return," with the accumulation of debris objects in low-Earth orbits steadily building over the past 50 years. Add to the clutter, the leftovers of China’s anti-satellite (ASAT) test in 2007. "The fact that this single event increased the number of debris objects by roughly 25 percent was not as important as the location of the intercept. The event took place at an altitude of 865 kilometers, right in the middle of the most congested region of low-orbiting satellites," Kaplan pointed out. Toss into the brew the [collision of an Iridium satellite](http://www.space.com/5542-satellite-destroyed-space-collision.html) with an expired Russian Cosmos spacecraft in February 2009 — at an altitude similar to that of China’s ASAT test. As a result of 50 years of launching satellites and these two events, the altitude band from about 435 miles to a little over 800 miles has accumulated possibly millions of debris objects ranging from a few millimeters to a few meters, Kaplan said.

### States are liable for their own shit in space

**UNOOSA 2011**(United Nations Office of Space Affairs, Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies http://www.oosa.unvienna.org/oosa/SpaceLaw/outerspt.html)

The Outer Space Treaty was considered by the Legal Subcommittee in 1966 and agreement was reached in the General Assembly in the same year ( [resolution 2222 (XXI)](http://www.oosa.unvienna.org/oosa/SpaceLaw/gares/html/gares_21_2222.html). The Treaty was largely based on the [Declaration of Legal Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space](http://www.oosa.unvienna.org/SpaceLaw/lpos.html), which had been adopted by the General Assembly in its [resolution 1962 (XVIII)](http://www.oosa.unvienna.org/oosa/SpaceLaw/gares/html/gares_18_1962.html) in 1963, but added a few new provisions. The Treaty was opened for signature by the three depository Governments (the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States of America) in January 1967, and it entered into force in October 1967. The Outer Space Treaty provides the basic framework on international space law, including the following principles: the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries and shall be the province of all mankind; outer space shall be free for exploration and use by all States; outer space is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means; States shall not place nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in orbit or on celestial bodies or station them in outer space in any other manner; the Moon and other celestial bodies shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes; astronauts shall be regarded as the envoys of mankind; States shall be responsible for national space activities whether carried out by governmental or non-governmental entities; States shall be liable for damage caused by their space objects; and States shall avoid harmful contamination of space and celestial bodies.

### RUSSIA is cleaning up space debris now

Heimbuch 10 (Jaymi Heimbuch is a full-time writer at TreeHugger and Planet Green, “[Russia Investing $2 Billion in Space Debris Removal](http://www.treehugger.com/files/2010/11/russia-investing-2-billion-in-space-debris-removal.php)”, http://www.treehugger.com/files/2010/11/russia-investing-2-billion-in-space-debris-removal.php)

We've seen some crazy ideas for getting rid of space debris, a problem that sounds absurd in itself but is actually a real issue for satellites and [**even astronauts**](http://www.treehugger.com/files/2009/11/too-much-space-junk-makes-astronauts-sleep-in-escape-pods.php) in the International Space Station. However, Russia is set on a concept that they think is worth serious investment -- about a $2 billion investment. Energia, Russia's space corporation, is planning to build a "pod" that will knock junk out of orbit and back down to earth. According to [Fast Company,](http://www.fastcompany.com/1705137/space-debris-meh-russias-got-it-covered) the pod will have a nuclear power core to keep it running for about 15 years while it orbits the earth knocking defunct satellites out of orbit so that it can either burn up in the atmosphere or drop into the ocean (hopefully not on somewhere populated...). The pod will be constructed by 2020 and the company hopes it will be in operation by 2013. One of the company's representatives, Victor Sinyavsky, states "The corporation promised to clean up the space in ten years by collecting about 600 defunct satellites on the same geosynchronous orbit and sinking them into the ocean subsequently," [Space Daily reports](http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Russia_To_Spend_2_Bln_Dollars_For_Space_Clean_Up_999.html).

### SPACE DEBRIS IS DANGEROUS, EVEN THOUGH WE CANNOT SEE IT. PUBLIC AWARENESS OF SPACE DEBRIS, AND ITS POTENTIAL HARM TO EARTH, IS KEY.

Dave Baiocchi, National Defense Research Institute, RAND, 2010

[Confronting Space Debris, RAND Publication, p. xxiii]

When a problem’s effects are not directly observable, a community is likely to underestimate the risk posed by the effects. Asbestos and radon are invisible, and the cancers they cause may not appear for several decades. Under such circumstances, a community may have a low perception of risk because the cause and effect are separated by long spans of time. By contrast, the neighbors of a polluting factory are likely to see its effects every day. Orbital debris, unfortunately, belongs to the category of problems that are not easily observed either by those who create it or by those who might be harmed by it. Because the harm is virtually invisible until a major collision occurs, the broader community may be simply unaware of the severity of the problem, or they may tend to underestimate the potential risk. Therefore, the technical community should consider implementing an ongoing, metric-based stakeholder awareness program alongside the development of a technical remedy.

### THE U.S. MUST TAKE THE LEADERSHIP ROLE IN SPACE DEBRIS MINIMIZATION. BEING THE FIRST COUNTRY TO DEVELOP SPACE DEBRIS REMOVAL TECHNOLOGY WOULD PUT THE U.S. AT A POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE

Megan Ansdell, Space Policy Institute, GWU, Spring 2010

[Journal of Public and International Affairs, Princeton, vol 21, p 18]

Moreover, current U.S. National Space Policy asserts that the United States will take a “leadership role” in space debris minimization. This could include the development, deployment, and demonstration of an effective space debris removal system to remove U.S. debris as well as that of other nations, upon their request. There could also be international political and economic advantages associated with being the first country to develop this revolutionary technology.

### ADR Solves Space Debris in the GEO and LEO-🡪 protects crucial Sats

Lioua and Johnson 2010 [3/10,“Controlling the growth of future LEO debris populations with active debris remova”l J.-C., N.L. and N.M. Hill, NASA Johnson Space Center, USA http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0094576509003981]

The LEO-to-GEO Environment Debris (LEGEND) model is capable of simulating the historical and future debris populations in the near-Earth environment [9] and [10]. For this study, the historical component in LEGEND covers the period from 1957 to 2007. The model adopts a deterministic approach to mimic the known historical populations. To accomplish this, launched rocket bodies, spacecraft, and mission-related debris (rings, bolts, etc.) are added to the simulated environment based on a comprehensive NASA Orbital Debris Program Office internal database. Known historical breakup events are reproduced and fragments are created with the NASA Standard Breakup Model, which describes the size, area-to-mass, and velocity distributions of the breakup fragments [11]. The only exception to this process is the FY-1C breakup in January 2007. Since fragments from this event are very different from those of a typical breakup, their distributions are derived from the SSN tracked data [12]. The simulations described in this paper were completed in February 2008. Based on the catalog data available at that time, a total of 1536 FY-1C fragments had both good orbital elements and area-to-mass ratios derived from their orbital element histories and were estimated to be larger than 10 cm in size. Only these objects were included in the simulations. Although more catalog data became available later and additional 10 cm and larger FY-1C fragments were identified, the difference should not affect the overall outcome of the present study in any significant manner.

### ADR Solves Space Debris in the GEO and LEO-🡪 protects crucial Sats

J.-C. LIOU AND N. JOHNSON 2007, [NASA Johnson Space Center, “Orbital debris quarterly news” volume 11 issue 4 october 2007,

http://orbitaldebris.jsc.nasa.gov/newsletter/pdfs/ODQNv11i4.pdf]

Concepts for removing large debris from LEO have been proposed for more than 25 years. Early ideas for using the U.S. Space Shuttle, either directly or in conjunction with an orbital transfer vehicle, were found unattractive due to safety, availability, cost, and policy issues. Numerous independent robotic concepts, ranging from classical space-based garbage scows to momentum and electrodynamic tethers, drag augmentation devices, solar and magnetic sails, and other exotic techniques, have also been considered. However, reviews by panels of international experts have repeatedly failed to identify a single plan which is both technically feasible in the near-term and economically viable. Nonetheless, in late 2006 the International Academy of Astronautics (IAA) initiated a new study to determine if a nexus of technology, cost, and policy might lead to an achievable means of remediating the near-Earth space environment in the foreseeable future. Although the IAA study will not be completed until late 2008 or 2009, the purpose of the present paper is to describe the potential effectiveness of active debris removal (ADR) operations under various scenarios. These results, in turn, could influence the development of efficient debris removal techniques. The tool used in the study is the NASA orbital debris evolutionary model LEGEND (a LEO-to-GEO Environment Debris model). A key component of LEGEND is its collision probability estimation module. A removal criterion based upon mass and collision probability, M×Pc, was developed to rank objects at the beginning of each projection year. A pre-defined number of objects with the highest mass and collision probability products were removed from the simulated environment immediately. Four test scenarios were selected for this case study. The first one was a non-mitigation (“business-as-usual”) scenario. The other three scenarios assumed ADR was implemented in the year 2020, with annual debris removal rates of 5, 10, and 20 objects, respectively. Figure 1 shows the effective numbers of objects, 10 cm and larger, in LEO from the four scenarios. The business-as-usual scenario predicts a fast non-linear growth of the future LEO debris population in the next 200 years. The three ADR scenarios, on the other hand, predict a much slower increase in the environment. The spatial density distributions of the 10 cm and larger LEO objects are shown in Figure 2. The bottom curve is the environment at the end of 2006. The other four curves, from top to bottom, are the predicted environment in 2206 from the non-mitigation, ADR 2020/5, ADR 2020/10, and ADR 2020/20 scenarios, respectively. It is very clear that active debris removal, based on the selection criterion described earlier, is a very effective means to limit the population growth in high collision activity regions between 800 and 1000 km. One possible modification to improve the selection criterion of M°—Pc is to include the longevity factor. When two objects *continued on page 7*

## SETI stuff

### Destruction of anthropocentric domination is key to the end of capitalism.

Robert Kolb, 2008 [Robert W. Kolb is Professor of Finance and the Frank W. Considine Chair of Applied Ethics in the business school at Loyola University Chicago] Encyclopedia of business ethics and society, Volume 1

A certain vision of anthropocentrism is related with business. Since the Industrial Revolution, capitalism and modern business have contributed to considerable economic growth, provided jobs, made produces more accessible and been an effective means to fight against poverty. But at the same time, capitalism has been often associated with freed for wealth accumulation, insatiable use of natural resources, technology with damaging effects on the environment, accumulation of population in large cities, and chaotic urbanization in many places. In the 19th century and a great part of 20th century, an unchecked organizational exploitation of natural resources was seen as desirable and even legitimate for the sake of economic development. While the results of business activity have been beneficial for humans, the consideration of humans in productive processes has frequently been far from being human centered. People have been used as a mere means or resource for gains or for consumption and not in accordance with the requirements of human dignity. In this approach, based on the anthropocentric-domination model, people receive some benefits but the human person and his or her development is not the main motivation for economic progress.

### Astrobiology solves

1. Dolci ‘10 [Wendy, Associate Director for Operations, 8/31/10 http://astrobiology.nasa.gov/nai/about/]

Astrobiology shares with other space related science programs a broad range of research interests. Astrobiology encompasses the understanding of biology as a planetary phenomenon. This includes how planetary processes give rise to life, how they sustain or inhibit life, and how life can emerge as an important planetary process; how astrophysical processes give rise to planets elsewhere, what the actual distribution of planets is, and whether there are habitable planets outside of our solar system; a determination of whether life exists elsewhere and how to search for and identify it; what the ultimate environmental limits of life are, whether Earth’s biota represent only a subset of the full diversity of life, and the future of Earth’s biota in space.

### SETI is not legitimate science--- Cannot assume aliens will be friends

Michael Michaud, November 2004 [Director of the Office of Advanced Technology, and as Counselor for Science, Technology, and Environment at the American embassies in Paris and Tokyo"Active SETI" Is Not Scientific Research” http://www.davidbrin.com/michaudvsmeti.html

Recent discussions within the SETI community have explored the issue of whether people with access to radio telescopes should send powerful signals to alien civilizations without some process of prior international consultation. In particular, those exchanges have focused on the question of "Active SETI." Some who oppose prior consultation have framed their arguments in terms of our right to free speech. Far fewer have addressed the other side of this coin, which is our responsibility to the human species. **Let's be clear about this. Active SETI is not scientific research.** It is a deliberate attempt to provoke a response by an alien civilization whose capabilities, intentions, and distance are not known to us. That makes it a policy issue. We cannot assume that we already have been detected, or that detection is inevitable. Extraterrestrial civilizations might not be looking for the kinds of signals we normally radiate. More importantly from a policy perspective, our leakage signals may be below their detection threshold. An Active SETI signal much more powerful than the normal background emitted by the Earth might call us to the attention of a technological civilization that had not known of our existence. **We cannot assume that such a civilization would be benign, nor can we assume that interstellar flight is impossible for a species more technologically advanced than our own.** This is not just the concern of a few paranoids. Many significant people have argued against our actively seeking contact. Pulitzer Prize-winning author and scientist Jared Diamond, calling astronomers' visions of friendly relations "the best-case scenario," warned that "those astronomers now preparing again to beam radio signals out to hoped-for extraterrestrials are naive, even dangerous" (he was even harsher about the Pioneer plaques, which provided any species that found them with a kind of map to our location in the galaxy). Nobel Prize-winning biologist George Wald declared that he could think of no nightmare so terrifying as establishing communication with a superior technology in outer space. Even the New York Times questioned the view that the effect of signals from extraterrestrials would be beneficial, stating that the astronomers were "boyishly defiant" of our inherited wisdom. **Astronomer Robert Jastrow, addressing the consequences of possible future contact with an alien civilization, wrote that he saw no reason for optimism**. Astronomer Ronald Bracewell warned that other species too would place a premium on cunning and weaponry; an alien ship headed our way is likely to be armed. Astronomer Eric Chaisson thought that physical contact could lead to a neo-Darwinian subjugation of our culture by theirs. Astronomer Zdenek Kopal was more specific: should we ever hear the space-phone ringing, for God's sake let us not answer, but rather make ourselves as inconspicuous as possible to avoid attracting attention! Other scientists also have warned of potential dangers. Biologist Michael Archer said that any creature we contact will also have had to claw its way up the evolutionary ladder and will be every bit as nasty as we are. It will likely be an extremely adaptable, extremely aggressive super-predator. Physicist George Baldwin predicted that any effort to communicate with extraterrestrials is fraught with grave danger, as they will show innate contempt for human beings. Astronomer Robert Rood warned that the civilization that blurts out its existence on interstellar beacons at the first opportunity might be like some early hominid descending from the trees and calling "here kitty" to a saber-toothed tiger. Consider the cautionary views of SETI Institute astronomers. Seth Shostak wrote in one of his books that we can no better guess the motivations of alien intelligence than goldfish can guess ours. Jill Tarter asked rhetorically: **who knows what values might drive an alien culture? Aliens might not have the same motives that we do**. Douglas Vakoch wrote that we should not assume that the ethics of extraterrestrials will be like our own. Physicist Freeman Dyson has written eloquently on this subject. He issued a warning that should be heeded by SETI researchers: "Our business as scientists is to search the universe and find out what is there. What is there may conform to our moral sense or it may not.... It is just as unscientific to impute to remote intelligences wisdom and serenity as it is to impute to them irrational and murderous impulses. We must be prepared for either possibility and conduct our searches accordingly." Dyson proposed two alternatives. Intelligence may be a benign influence creating isolated groups of philosopher-kings far apart in the heavens, sharing at leisure their accumulated wisdom. Or intelligence may be a cancer of purposeless technological exploitation sweeping across the galaxy. None of us knows which alternative prevails. **The best-case scenario that underlies Active SETI is based on belief or preference, not on proven facts.** In modern times, the public, their representatives, and the media have increasingly demanded accountability when powerful technologies are used for controversial purposes, especially when those technologies are built and operated with the taxpayer's money**. Given the fact that there may be risks involved, using radio telescopes to attract the attention of other technological civilizations is controversial.** We owe our fellow citizens some respect for their opinions. More than a year ago, I proposed a standard that recognizes that signals already sent can not be called back: do not transmit a signal more powerful than the Earth's radio leakage (including radars) without international consultation. Canadian scientist Yvan Dutil, who has designed three interstellar messages for transmission from the Evpatoria Radio Telescope, has endorsed a similar approach. If the advocates of Active SETI are not comfortable with the United Nations, I suggest an alternative. Take an Active SETI proposal to the International Astronomical Union and seek that organization's endorsement. If the IAU will not endorse Active SETI, there will be even more doubt about whether it is legitimate science.

### SETI DOESN”T COST anything.

Alan **Buckingham** [5/2/**11**,http://www.geeknewscentral.com/2011/05/02/the-real-cost-of-seti/

The cost of SETI operations is $2.5 million per year, or the cost of 5 Tomahawk missile. And, from that starting point, costs just spiral out of control. I ask you all, if you believe in this program, then read what both links I provided have to say. Check out the info-graphic that displays what we spend elsewhere. Sure, things like national-defense are necessary. But, when $1 from every Starbucks customer could fund such great science for years, is that really too much to ask? When a single bank executive could fund SETI with walking-around money, is that too much to ask? Google could fund this project without even missing the money. Hint to any Google execs who read this blog…

Substantially means at least 80-90 percent.

Curtin 03 (United States Circuit Judge of the Western District of New York, Gateway Equip. Corp. v. United States, 247 F. Supp. 2d 299, lexis)

The regulations do not define "substantially," "limited," or "impaired." The government cites *Webster's Ninth New College Dictionary* for the definitions of "limit" and "impairment" as suggesting "meanings equivalent to restriction and reduction, respectively." Item 30, p. 3, n.1. It posits that the word "substantially" suggests "an order of magnitude equivalent to 80% or 90%." *Id.* It concludes that "using those definitions, 'substantially limited' and 'substantially impaired' means that there must be an 80%-90% restriction and/ or reduction of use by virtue of the design of the CB-4000." *Id.*

Edlin 02 (Aaron, Professor of Economics and Law, University of California Berkeley School of Law, January, 111 Yale L.J. 941, lexis)

Might price reductions of less than twenty percent qualify as substantial? In some markets they should, and it would be reasonable to decide substantiality on a case-by-case basis. One advantage of a bright-line rule is that it would let incumbents know where they stand. Monopolies that price only slightly above their average cost would be insulated from the entry of higher-cost entrants if they could credibly convey a willingness to price below the entrants' cost after entry, as illustrated in Part III. However, these monopolies do consumers little harm and may enhance market efficiency.

Sutton no date- Alexander Sutton has worked in the telescopes profession for nearly 11 years. For more information please visit telescopes, “Space Exploration,” http://www.contour2002.org/article/space-exploration

Space exploration is defined as the use of astronomy and space technology to explore outer space. Exploration has taken space by human spaceflight and robotic space craft. The observations of objects in space, which is known as Astronomy, is one of the oldest known scientific studies, pre-dating reliable recorded history. Fuel Rockets developed in the early twentieth century allowed space exploration to broaden and become a reality. Space exploration often creates political competition, pushing individual countries to pace themselves faster in an attempt to gain exploration first, such as the "Space Race" between the Soviet Union and the United States.Space exploration has shifted from singular flights to reusable hardware which allows for greater exploration. Private interest has began in space exploration creating the urge for more competition and larger government missions. The first orbital launch was made in 1957. A Soviet, unmanned launch named Sputnik, it orbited the earth at about 150 miles. Following the Soviet's success, the United States unsuccessfully launched Vangaurd 1 two months later. In 1958 The Unites States successfully launched and orbited Explorer 1. In 1961 the first human spaceflight took place on the Vostok 1, carrying a 27 year old man. The spaceflight completed one orbit around the globe in around two hours. This triumph urged the world to continue space exploration. The US followed in the Soviet's footsteps within six months. The Mercury flight orbited the Earth six times on February 20, 1962. In 1963 the first woman orbited the Earth 48 times aboard the Vostok 6. One of the main targets of space exploration is astrobiology which is the focus of the study of life in the universe. Astrobiology is primarily focused on the origin and evolution of life. It is also often referred to as exobiology. Astrobiologists consider the possibility of life that is entirely different from any other life discovered in the past.

**Only sophisticated astronomy is exploration**

**Tega 10,** Jessa Tega, 2010, (writer for the UniverseToday) “Exploration of Space” <http://www.universetoday.com/81037/exploration-of-space/>

Exploration of space has followed three major tracks. The first is [astronomy](http://www.universetoday.com/14137/spocks-astro-quiz/). Using increasingly sophisticated tools scientists have been able to look further and further into the universe. Tools such as radio telescopes and spectrometers are now helping us to find objects that were only theories such as black [holes](http://www.universetoday.com/76909/white-holes/), antimatter, dark [matter](http://www.universetoday.com/61587/dark-matter/), and even earthlike planets. The second area of exploration has been with artificial satellites and probes. This has been used to great effect to explore the solar system. However this method has been limited by the current technology in space propulsion. The final area of space exploration is human space exploration. This is the one with the least progress so far. As of this article the furthest mankind has been from Earth is the moon and the last mission to the moon was around 40 years ago.

Frank White 1990 [Frank White is the author of The Overview Effect: Space Exploration and Human Evolution. A member of the Harvard College Class of 1966, Frank graduated magna cum laude, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He attended Oxford University on a Rhodes Scholarship, earning an MPhil in 1969. He is the author or co-author of five additional books on space exploration and the future.] The SETI Factor: How the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence Is Changing Our View of the Universe and Ourselves]

The term “search” is defined in the dictionary as making “a thorough examination in order to find something; explore” The radio search does invoke looking for something, and it is a form of exploration. However, a broad definition of the term can include many activities not always liked with the search for signals.

Donna Haraway 91, "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century," in *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York; Routledge, 1991), pp.149-181.

The second leaky distinction is between animal-human (organism) and machine. Pre-cybernetic machines could be haunted; there was always the spectre of the ghost in the machine. This dualism structured the dialogue between materialism and idealism that was settled by a dialectical progeny, called spirit or history, according to taste. But basically machines were not self-moving, self-designing, autonomous. They could not achieve man's dream, only mock it. They were not man, an author to himself, but only a caricature of that masculinist reproductive dream. To think they were otherwise was paranoid. Now we are not so sure. Late twentieth-century machines have made thoroughly ambiguous the difference between natural and art)ficial, mind and body, self-developing and externally designed, and many other distinctions that used to apply to organisms and machines. Our machines are disturbingly lively, and we ourselves frighteningly inert.

**Animal liberation solves capitalism**

**Best, 12/31/10** – Associate Professor of Humanities and Philosophy at the University of Texas at El Paso (Steven, 12/31/10, “Total Liberation: Revolution for the 21st Century”, <http://drstevebest.wordpress.com/2010/12/31/total-liberation-revolution-for-the-21st-century-4/>,)

**Attacking the new slave economy, the animal liberation movement is a significant threat to global capital; it is not a revolutionary force on its own, but it is hardly reducible to a “petite bourgeois” parlor game. In their universal spread and growth, and frontal attack on capital logic** and on the various slaves trades – meat, dairy, and egg; breeding and vivisecting; leather and fur; “entertainment” and so on — animal liberationists have evolved into a significant enough threat to capitalism to bear the brunt of the “eco-terrorist” label and the fiercest state repression doled out to anyone during the last decade. **Most generally, animal liberation has the potential to affect a cultural paradigm shift, away from predatory and pathological humanism and toward a new ethic, identity, and culture rooted in respect for life and harmonizing society with nature and biodiversity**. Animal liberation is the culmination of a vast historical learning process whereby human beings gradually realize that arguments justifying hierarchy, inequality, and discrimination of any kind are arbitrary, baseless, and fallacious. Animal liberation builds on the most progressive ethical and political advances human beings have made in the last 200 years and carries them to their logical conclusions**. It takes the struggle for rights, equality, and nonviolence to the next level, beyond the artificial moral and legal boundaries of humanism, in order to challenge all prejudices and hierarchies including speciesism.**[**[xiv]**](http://drstevebest.wordpress.com/2010/12/31/total-liberation-revolution-for-the-21st-century-4/#_edn14) **But social, political, and economic changes by themselves are inadequate, unless accompanied by equally deep ethical psychological changes, such as demand a Copernican revolution in human identities, whereby people realize that they belong to the earth, and the earth does not belong to them. Vegans and animal liberationist have the potential to advance rights, democratic consciousness, psychological growth, and awareness of biological interconnectedness to higher levels than previously achieved in history**. Moreover, animal liberation is a dynamic social movement that challenges large sectors of the capitalist growth economy by attacking corporate agriculture and pharmaceutical giants and their suppliers.

## “Its” Answers

1. We meet- The government has jurisdiction over SETI because it provides all of the funding.

Savas ‘00 [E. S. Savas, a Presidential Professor at the School of Public Affairs at Baruch College and an authority in the field of privatization, “PRIVATIZATION AND PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS,” 2000, http://cesmadrid.es/documentos/Sem200601\_MD02\_IN.pdf]

The remainder of this paper presents a dynamic analysis, describing how to change from an arrangement that relies heavily on government to one that relies relatively more on the private sector. Drawing on earlier work, this section presents a simple classification taxonomy that encompasses three broad methods that result in privatizing government-run services and functions and government-owned enterprises and assets2: (1) delegation, where government retains responsibility and oversight but uses the private sector for service delivery, for example, by contracting for services, or outsourcing; (2) divestment, where government relinquishes responsibility; and (3) displacement, where the private sector grows and displaces a government activity.3 Each of these incorporates several specific approaches that are identified in Table 1 and discussed in turn.

1. Counterinterpretation – “Its” means the plan must be done by the USFG or its associated contractors.

Dictionary.com- “its,” http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/its

Its, determiner a. of, belonging to, or **associated** in some way with it: its left rear wheel b. ( as pronoun ): each town claims its is the best

1. **Implications:**
2. Limits - our interpretation sets a good limit – we do not explode the topic – NASA uses private contractors for the majority of its space endeavors, that makes the fact that the government would fund a privately-owned company for space exploration practically inevitable – this is a very fair limit.

### NASA uses private contractors for most of its projects

NASA, 09 [NASA Headquarters Library, Outsourcing and Insourcing, Program/Project Management Resource List #62, <http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/hqlibrary/ppm/ppm62.htm>]

Since 1966, the Office of Management and Budget has encouraged federal agencies and departments to contract out, or outsource, services that are not "inherently governmental", based on the idea that services that are commonly performed by the private sector are performed more efficiently by the private sector than if they were to be performed by civil servants. Since then, NASA has placed many of its day-to-day operations in the hands of private sector employees. NASA uses contractors to build most, if not all, of its spacecraft - indeed, the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, which many people think of as a NASA center, is really operated by one of NASA's oldest contractors, the California Institute of Technology. Other research and development agencies, such as the Dept. of Energy, also rely on contractors.

1. Predictability – The literature on space exploration includes public-private ventures, therefore our interpretation does not limit negative ground because we limit the topic to NASA-affiliated private companies, not any private company in existence – SETI is especially predictable because prior or budget cuts the government used to fund the company.
2. Larger limits are better for education because we have to research more things so we learn more about the topic. This creates a variety of more interesting debates.
3. Don’t vote on competing interpretations – even if their interpretation may be slightly better we set a reasonably good limit on the topic.

So – our aff is completely topical and should not be a voter.

### UV rays will destroy satellites

**Taylor, 7** – Chief of the Space and International Law Division at Headquarters United States Air Force Space Command; B.A, Berry College; J.D. University of Georgia; LL.M. (Air and Space Law), McGill University (Michael W. “Trashing the Solar System One Planet at a Time: Earth’s Orbital Debris Problem,” Georgetown International Environmental Law Review, Fall, 2007, Gale)

<Without Earth's atmosphere to protect them, satellites are exposed to the full force of solar radiation, including ultraviolet rays, X-rays,positively charged protons and negatively charged electrons. n16 Ultraviolet rays and X-rays can damage satellites by degrading solar panels, which many satellites use as a source of energy, thus shortening their useful life. n17 When solar activity increases, the number of damaging rays also increases. The charged particles can cause even [\*5] more damage than the rays because the particles penetrate the outer layers of the satellite and directly degrade its electronic systems. Unlike the rays, which are generally evenly distributed around Earth, the particles become trapped in Earth's magnetic field and concentrate in two doughnut-shaped (torus) areas around the equator. n18 These regions are called the Van Allen radiation belts. n19 The Van Allen radiation belts significantly limit the operation of satellite

### Canadian satellite will already find the most dangerous asteroids

Peter **Calamai**, “Tiny Satellite Wil Keep Tabs on Asteroids,” TORONTO STAR, 6—27—**08**, p. A4.

Canadian space know-how will soon be tracking hundreds of asteroids that regularly scoot across the Earth's orbital path as well as keeping tabs on wayward space debris. A collision with a large asteroid could threaten life on Earth and the space debris could knock out telecommunications and weather satellites. This unique dual surveillance will begin in 2010 and use a modest space telescope aboard a made-in-Canada microsatellite, no larger than a suitcase and costing a bargain-basement $10 million. The Near Earth Orbit Surveillance Satellite (NEOSSat) will be the only operational spacecraft in the world capable of doing either job, said the Canadian Space Agency and Defence Research and Development Canada in formally announcing the project in Calgary yesterday. A U.S. satellite, which had been tracking space debris and defunct spacecraft, was turned off at the beginning of June because of declining accuracy. The federal government had first publicly unveiled the pioneering mission at a UN space meeting in Vienna in February, but the spacecraft design recently passed a crucial milestone, prompting yesterday's news conference. The concept behind the asteroid-tracking half of the mission has been championed since 1999 by professor Alan Hildebrand who holds the Canada Research Chair in planetary science at the University of Calgary. "The most exciting thing is that this spacecraft will allow us to find the most potentially dangerous asteroids while they're still a long way from the Earth," Hildebrand said.

Socialism fails – decreases incentives, is unrealistic, and current examples in other countries proves.

Perry 95 [Mark is a professor of Finance and Business Economics; “Why socialism fails”; The Freeman Ideas on Liberty; June 1995 • Volume: 45 • Issue: 6; <http://www.thefreemanonline.org/featured/why-socialism-failed/>]

Socialism is the Big Lie of the twentieth century. While it promised prosperity, equality, and security, it delivered poverty, misery, and tyranny. Equality was achieved only in the sense that everyone was equal in his or her misery. In the same way that a Ponzi scheme or chain letter initially succeeds but eventually collapses, socialism may show early signs of success. But any accomplishments quickly fade as the fundamental deficiencies of central planning emerge. It is the initial illusion of success that gives government intervention its pernicious, seductive appeal. In the long run, socialism has always proven to be a formula for tyranny and misery. A pyramid scheme is ultimately unsustainable because it is based on faulty principles. Likewise, collectivism is unsustainable in the long run because it is a flawed theory. Socialism does not work because it is not consistent with fundamental principles of human behavior. The failure of socialism in countries around the world can be traced to one critical defect: it is a system that ignores incentives. In a capitalist economy, incentives are of the utmost importance. Market prices, the profit-and-loss system of accounting, and private property rights provide an efficient, interrelated system of incentives to guide and direct economic behavior. Capitalism is based on the theory that incentives matter! Under socialism, incentives either play a minimal role or are ignored totally. A centrally planned economy without market prices or profits, where property is owned by the state, is a system without an effective incentive mechanism to direct economic activity. By failing to emphasize incentives, socialism is a theory inconsistent with human nature and is therefore doomed to fail. Socialism is based on the theory that incentives don’t matter! In a radio debate several months ago with a Marxist professor from the University of Minnesota, I pointed out the obvious failures of socialism around the world in Cuba, Eastern Europe, and China. At the time of our debate, Haitian refugees were risking their lives trying to get to Florida in homemade boats. Why was it, I asked him, that people were fleeing Haiti and traveling almost 500 miles by ocean to get to the "evil capitalist empire" when they were only 50 miles from the "workers’ paradise" of Cuba? The Marxist admitted that many "socialist" countries around the world were failing. However, according to him, the reason for failure is not that socialism is deficient, but that the socialist economies are not practicing "pure" socialism. The perfect version of socialism would work; it is just the imperfect socialism that doesn’t work. Marxists like to compare a theoretically perfect version of socialism with practical, imperfect capitalism which allows them to claim that socialism is superior to capitalism. If perfection really were an available option, the choice of economic and political systems would be irrelevant. In a world with perfect beings and infinite abundance, any economic or political system–socialism, capitalism, fascism, or communism–would work perfectly. However, the choice of economic and political institutions is crucial in an imperfect universe with imperfect beings and limited resources. In a world of scarcity it is essential for an economic system to be based on a clear incentive structure to promote economic efficiency. The real choice we face is between imperfect capitalism and imperfect socialism. Given that choice, the evidence of history overwhelmingly favors capitalism as the greatest wealth-producing economic system available.

### China is irresponsible with their missions in space leads to more space debris.

**Broad 07**(William J. Broad is an author and a senior writer at The New York Times. In twenty-five years as a science correspondent, he has written hundreds of front-page articles,2/06/07, New York Times, ”Orbiting Junk, Once a Nuisance, Is Now a Threat”, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/06/science/space/06orbi.html.

Geoffrey E. Forden, an arms expert at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who is analyzing the Chinese satellite debris, said China perhaps failed to realize the magnitude of the test’s indirect hazards. Dr. Forden suggested that Chinese engineers might have understood the risks but failed to communicate them. In China, he said, “the decision process is still so opaque that maybe they didn’t know who to talk to. Maybe you have a disconnect between the engineers and the people who think about policy.” China, experts note, has 39 satellites of its own many of them now facing a heightened risk of destruction.

**Non-binding consultation can solve the net benefit and our turns**

Daily Oklahoman - 6-12-01

WITH his arrival in Spain this morning, President Bush begins a five-day trip to European countries, many of whose leaders are eager to lecture him on missile defense, global warming and - following the execution of Timothy McVeigh - the death penalty. We hope the president will listen politely but stay the course. **The United States always should consult with its allies. But consultation doesn't mean conformity with a raft of** liberal-to-socialist **views** now popular **in** a number of **European capitals**. "**You can go through the motions of consulting as long as you don't ask and do tell**," Kenneth Adelman, a veteran of the Reagan administration, told the New York Times. "You can ask opinions, but the fact is Europeans don't like change and Americans like change." Bush represents change - change from the arms-control dogma of the 1970s and '80s that remains gospel in Europe and change from reactionary environmentalism that mostly ignores the livelihoods of everyday people. **We're not under any illusion that Bush can change minds** while he visits Spain, Belgium, Sweden, Poland and Slovenia. But **perhaps he can convince our friends that America's positions are principled and well-reasoned** while **dispelling the stereotype that the U.S. selfishly shoots from the hip**. In fact, there's a fine line between the "unilateralism" of which the U.S. is accused by Europe and get-out-front leadership from which the world's lone remaining superpower should not shrink. Missile defense and global warming are excellent examples. Bush and his administration think mutually assured destruction as a deterrent to nuclear war is outdated and illogical. Mutual vulnerability to annihilation doesn't give terrorist or rogue states a moment's pause, nor does it leave options in the event of an accidental launch. This message Bush will deliver to Russia's Vladimir Putin near the end of the trip. On global warming, Bush accurately reflects the 97-0 sentiment of the U.S. Senate, which opposes the Kyoto treaty's unfair and unrealistic guidelines on the use of fossil fuels. The administration is working on rational responses to a warming planet, trying to determine the real effect of human activity. Bush wins if he can convince the Europeans to cool down their rhetoric until more is known. **The president** also wins if he **can**, on an overall level, **help Europe understand who he is and how**, in his governance, he will protect America and its sovereignty as a first course. Americans do care what Europeans think, but in the end they and their president must be prepared to lead even at the risk of ruffling some feathers along the way.

Predictions are possible & making vague epistomological indicts are bad. They prevent progress.

**Fitzsimmons, 07** (Michael, Washington DC defense analyst, “The Problem of Uncertainty in Strategic Planning”, Survival, Winter 06-07, online)

But handling even this weaker form of uncertainty is still quite challeng- ing. If not sufficiently bounded, a high degree of variability in planning factors can exact a significant price on planning. The complexity presented by great variability strains the cognitive abilities of even the most sophisticated decision- makers.15 And even a robust decision-making process sensitive to cognitive limitations necessarily sacrifices depth of analysis for breadth as variability and complexity grows. It should follow, then, that in planning under conditions of risk, variability in strategic calculation should be carefully tailored to available analytic and decision processes. Why is this important? What harm can an imbalance between complexity and cognitive or analytic capacity in strategic planning bring? Stated simply, where analysis is silent or inadequate, **the personal beliefs of decision-makers** **fill the void**. As political scientist Richard Betts found in a study of strategic sur- prise, in ‘an environment that lacks clarity, abounds with conflicting data, and allows no time for rigorous assessment of sources and validity, ambiguity allows intuition or wishfulness to drive interpretation ... The greater the ambiguity, the greater the impact of preconceptions.’16 The decision-making environment that Betts describes here is one of political-military crisis, not long-term strategic planning. But a strategist who sees uncertainty as the central fact of his environ- ment brings upon himself some of the pathologies of crisis decision-making. He invites ambiguity, takes conflicting data for granted and **substitutes a priori skepticism about the validity of prediction** for time pressure as a rationale for discounting the importance of analytic rigor. It is important not to exaggerate the extent to which data and ‘rigorous assessment’ can illuminate strategic choices. Ambiguity is a fact of life, and skepticism of analysis is necessary. Accordingly, the intuition and judgement of decision-makers will always be vital to strategy, and attempting to subordinate those factors to some formulaic, deterministic decision-making model would be both undesirable and unrealistic. All the same, there is danger in the opposite extreme as well. Without careful analysis of what is relatively likely and what is relatively unlikely, what will be the possible bases for strategic choices? A decision-maker with no faith in prediction is left with little more than a set of worst-case scenarios and his existing beliefs about the world to confront the choices before him. Those beliefs may be more or less well founded, but if they are not made explicit and subject to analysis and debate regarding their application to particular strategic contexts, they remain only beliefs and premises, rather than rational judgements. Even at their best, such decisions are likely to be poorly understood by the organizations charged with their implementation. At their worst, such decisions may be poorly understood by the decision-makers themselves.

**Cooperation between nations solves security-we reject realism’s mindset of self-interest.**

**Wang 9** [Sheng-Chi works for the Department of Political and Social Sciences, Free University ofBerlin, Germany, “The Making of New ‘Space’: Cases of Transatlantic Astropolitics”, Geopolitics, Volume 16, Issue 2, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/14650040802693820]

A cogent example occurred during the Cold War, when the U.S. enjoyed outer space supremacy and European dependence. Before the success of European Ariane launcher, France turned to the Soviet Union for launching the Franco-German Symphonie communication satellites in 1971, just because the U.S. proviso for launch was that these satellites can only be used for experimental but no commercial purposes, which seriously undermined European freedom of action and outer space capability development. The demands of independent access to pivotal positions in outer space and autonomous use of satellites prompted Europe to develop its own Ariane launcher. Besides, cooperation in outer space application program even occurred between the U.S. and the Soviet Union during the Cold War, which again denounced the discursive constitution of collective identities, shared norms, and common culture on European and U.S. outer space strategy. The first international human spaceflight cooperation – Apollo-Soyuz Test Project (ASTP) in 1975 – not only represented U.S. and Soviet convergent symbolic policy preferences to reduce the Cold War tensions, but also satisfied their functional policy preferences that the U.S. obtained a firsthand glance of Soviet capability and the Soviet Union obtained access to U.S. outer space technology and know-how. Outer space cooperation between the US and Russia reached a pinnacle by the inclusion of Russia in the ISS programme in 1993. The US departed from its strict policy guidelines of outer space cooperation to transfer funds from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to Russia because the US needed critical technology and hardware of the Russian Mir space station, while Russia needed US funds to operate its outer space programmes. However, the US adamantly restricted sensitive technology and funds transfer to Europe in the same programme. These examples are not exhaustive. European and US practices indicate that the differentiation between ‘us’ and ‘others’ in transatlantic astropolitics is determined by the most cost-effective way to satisfy respective geopolitical interests rather than the constitutive effect of transatlantic security community discourse.

**ADR is not securitizing- works for the benefit of all humanity.**

**Tellis 07** - Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Ashley, Survival, Autumn, “China’s Military Space Strategy”

The emergence of potent Chinese counterspace capabilities makes US military operations in Asia more risky than ever. The threat has not arisen due to a lack of a space arms-control regime, or because of the Bush administration’s disinclination to negotiate an accord that bans the weaponisation of space. Rather, it is rooted entirely in China’s requirement that it be able to defeat the United States in a regional conflict despite its conventional inferiority. This strategic challenge has compelled Beijing to exploit every anti-access and battlespace-denial technology potentially available. The threat posed by this Chinese effort cannot be neutralized by arms-control agreements, even though all countries stand to profit from the absence of threats to their assets in space. Other nations will pay for clean-up. There is a temptation, when it’s especially by the United States. This approach is undesirable and best avoided: Beijing’s desire to defeat the stronger by asymmetric means is not a reflection of its deviousness, nor provoked by mendacity on the part of the United States or the Bush administration. It is grounded in the objective conditions that define the relationship between the two countries: competing political goals, likely to persist whether or not the Taiwan conflict is resolved. In such circumstances, the United States should seek, as the Bush administration’s own National Space Policy declares, to protect the ’use of outer space by all nations for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of all humanity’. But if this fundamental goal is threatened by Chinese counterspace activities aimed at American space assets, the United States has no choice but to run an offence–defence arms race, and win.

### Critiques of power are so localized that they prevent coalition from forming that could genuinely fight oppression.

Cook, 92**-** Associate Professor at Georgetown Law School (Anthony E., “A Diversity of Influence: Reflections on Postmodernism, Spring, 26 New Eng.L. Lexis)

Several things trouble me about Foucault's approach. First, he nurtures in many ways an unhealthy insularity that fails to connect localized struggle to other localized struggles and to modes of oppression like classism, racism, sexism, and homophobia that transcend their localized articulation within this particular law school, that particular law firm, within this particular church or that particular factory. I note among some followers of Foucault an unhealthy propensity to rely on rich, thick, ethnographic type descriptions of power relations playing themselves out in these localized laboratories of social conflict. This reliance on detailed description and its concomitant deemphasis of explanation begins, ironically, to look like a regressive positivism which purports to sever the descriptive from the normative, the is from the ought and law from morality and politics. Unless we are to be trapped in this Foucaultian moment of postmodern insularity, we must resist the temptation to sever description from explanation. Instead, our objective should be to explain what we describe in light of a vision embracing values that we make explicit in struggle. These values should act as magnets that link our particularized struggles to other struggles and more global critiques of power. In other words, we must not, as Foucault seems all too willing to do, forsake the possibility of more universal narratives that, while tempered by postmodern insights, attempt to say *and* do something about the oppressive world in which we live. Second, Foucault's emphasis on the techniques and discourses of knowledge that constitute the human subject often diminishes, if not abrogates, the role of human agency. Agency is of tremendous importance in any theory of oppression, because individuals are not simply constituted by systems of knowledge but also constitute hegemonic and counter-hegemonic systems of knowledge as well. Critical theory must pay attention to the ways in which oppressed people not only are victimized by ideologies of oppression but the ways they craft from these ideologies and discourses counter-hegemonic weapons of liberation.

**A focus on representations destroys social change by ignoring political and material constraints**

**Taft-Kaufman, 95** (Jill, professor, Department of Speech Communication And Dramatic Arts, at Central Michigan University, Southern Communication Journal, Spring, proquest)

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from and ignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(pp. 2-27) The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstances hides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities, because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets that fuel them.

They embrace anti-politics – this dooms their project, creates atrocity, and cedes politics to the Right.

Boggs ’ 97 (CARL BOGGS – Professor and Ph.D. Political Science, National University, Los Angeles -- Theory and Society 26: 741-780)

The false sense of empowerment that comes with such mesmerizing impulses is accompanied by a loss of public engagement, an erosion of citizenship and a depleted capacity of individuals in large groups to work for social change. As this ideological quagmire worsens, urgent problems that are destroying the fabric of American society will go unsolved -- perhaps even unrecognized -- only to fester more ominously into the future. And such problems (ecological crisis, poverty, urban decay, spread of infectious cannot be understood outside the larger social and global context diseases, technological displacement of workers) of internationalized markets, finance, and communications. Paradoxically, the widespread retreat from politics, often inspired by localist sentiment, comes at a time when agendas that ignore or side-step these global realities will, more than ever, be reduced to impotence. In his commentary on the state of citizenship today, Wolin refers to the increasing sublimation and dilution of politics, as larger numbers of people turn away from public concerns toward private ones. By diluting the life of common involvements, we negate the very idea of politics as a source of public ideals and visions.74 In the meantime, the fate of the world hangs in the balance. The unyielding truth is that, even as the ethos of anti-politics becomes more compelling and even fashionable in the United States, it is the vagaries of political power that will continue to decide the fate of human societies. This last point demands further elaboration. The shrinkage of politics hardly means that corporate colonization will be less of a reality, that social hierarchies will somehow disappear, or that gigantic state and military structures will lose their hold over people's lives. Far from it: the space abdicated by a broad citizenry, well-informed and ready to participate at many levels, can in fact be filled by authoritarian and reactionary elites -- an already familiar dynamic in many lesser- developed countries. The fragmentation and chaos of a Hobbesian world, not very far removed from the rampant individualism, social Darwinism, and civic violence that have been so much a part of the American landscape, could be the prelude to a powerful Leviathan designed to impose order in the face of disunity and atomized retreat. In this way the eclipse of politics might set the stage for a reassertion of politics in more virulent guise -- or it might help further rationalize the existing power structure. In either case, the state would likely become what Hobbes anticipated: the embodiment of those universal, collec- tive interests that had vanished from civil society.75

### b. Moving away from anti-politics is vital to check extinction

Small ‘6 (Jonathan, former Americorps VISTA for the Human Services Coalition,“Moving Forward,” *The Journal for Civic Commitment*, Spring, http://www.mc.maricopa.edu/other/engagement/Journal/Issue7/Small.jsp)

What will be the challenges of the new millennium? And how should we equip young people to face these challenges? While we cannot be sure of the exact nature of the challenges, we can say unequivocally that humankind will face them together. If the end of the twentieth century marked the triumph of the capitalists, individualism, and personal responsibility, **the new century will preset challenges that require collective action**, unity, and enlightened self-interest. **Confronting global warming, depleted natural resources, global super viruses, global crime syndicates,** and multinational corporations with no conscience and no accountability **will** require cooperation, openness, honesty, compromise, and most of all **solidarity** – ideals not exactly cultivated in the twentieth century. We can no longer suffer to see life through the tiny lens of our own existence. Never in the history of the world has our collective fate been so intricately interwoven. **Our very existence depends upon our ability to adapt to this new paradigm, to envision a more cohesive society.** With humankind’s next great challenge comes also great opportunity. Ironically, modern individualism backed us into a corner. **We have two choices, work together in solidarity or perish together in alienation.** Unlike any other crisis before**, the** noose is truly around the neck of the whole world at once. Global super viruses will ravage rich and poor alike, developed and developing nations, white and black, woman, man, and child. Global warming and damage to the environment will affect climate change and destroy ecosystems across the globe. Air pollution will force gas masks on our faces, our depleted atmosphere will make a predator of the sun, and chemicals will invade and corrupt our water supplies. Every single day we are presented the opportunity to change our current course, to survive modernity in a manner befitting our better nature. **Through zealous cooperation and radical solidarity we can alter the course of human events**. Regarding the practical matter of equipping young people to face the challenges of a global, interconnected world, **we need to teach cooperation**, community, solidarity, balance and tolerance in schools. We need to take a holistic approach to education. Standardized test scores alone will not begin to prepare young people for the world they will inherit. The three staples of traditional education (reading, writing, and arithmetic) need to be supplemented by three cornerstones of a modern education, exposure, exposure, and more exposure. How can we teach solidarity? How can we teach community in the age of rugged individualism? How can we counterbalance crass commercialism and materialism? How can we impart the true meaning of power? These are the educational challenges we face in the new century. There is a longstanding dispute over how to properly quantify civic engagement. Some will say that today’s youth are less involved politically and hence demonstrate a lower degree of civic engagement. Others cite high volunteer rates among the youth and claim it demonstrates a high exhibition of civic engagement. And there are about a hundred other theories put forward on the subject of civic engagement and today’s youth. But one thing is for sure; **today’s youth no longer see government and politics as an effective or valuable tool for affecting positive change in the world**. Instead of criticizing this judgment, perhaps we should come to sympathize and even admire it. Author Kurt Vonnegut said, “There is a tragic flaw in our precious Constitution, and I don’t know what can be done to fix it. This is it: only nut cases want to be president.” Maybe the youth’s rejection of American politics isn’t a shortcoming but rather a rational and appropriate response to their experience. Consequently, the term civic engagement takes on new meaning for us today. In order to foster fundamental change on the systemic level, which we have already said is necessary for our survival in the twenty-first century, we need to fundamentally change our systems. Therefore, **part of our challenge becomes convincing the youth that these systems, and by systems we mean government** and commerce, have **the potential for positive change**. Civic engagement consequently takes on a more specific and political meaning in this context.

### c. Perm solves their K business – net benefit is our 1AC and not ceding to the Right

Todd Gitlin 5 formerly served as professor of sociology and director of the mass communications program at the University of California, Berkeley, and then a professor of culture, journalism and sociology at New York University. He is now a professor of journalism and sociology and chair of the Ph.D. program in Communications at Columbia University. He was a long-time political activist( from the Left). From the Book: The Intellectuals and the Flag – 2005 – available via CIAO Books – date accessed 7/17/10 – <http://www.ciaonet.org.proxy1.cl.msu.edu/book/git01/git01_05.pdf>

So two Manichaeisms squared off. Both were faith based, inclined to be impervious toward evidence, and tilted toward moral absolutism. One proceeded from the premise that U.S. power was always benign, the other from the premise that it was always pernicious. One justified empire—if not necessarily by that name—on the ground that the alternatives were worse; the other saw empire every time the United States wielded power. But these two polar tendencies are not the only options. There is, at least embryonically, a patriotic left that stands, as Michael Tomasky has put it, “between Cheney and Chomsky.”5 It disputes U.S. policies, strategies, and tactics—vociferously. But it criticizes from the inside out, without discarding the hope, if not of redemption, at least of improvement. It looks to its intellectuals for, among other things, scrutiny of the conflicts among the powers, the chinks in the armor, the embryonic and waning forces, paradoxes of unintended consequences, the sense immured in the nonsense, and vice versa. It believes in security—the nation’s physical security as much as its economic security. It does not consider security to be somebody else’s business. When it deplores conditions that are deplorable, it makes it plain, in substance and tone, that the critic shares membership with the criticized. It acknowledges—and wrestles with—the dualities of America: the liberty and arrogance twinned, the bullying and tolerance, myopia and energy, standardization and variety, ignorance and inventiveness, the awful dark heart of darkness and the self-reforming zeal. **It does not labor under the illusion that the world would be benign but for U.S. power** or that capitalism is uniformly the most damaging economic system ever. **It lives inside, with an indignation** born of family feeling. Its anger is intimate.

Development is advancing technology; especially that helps industry, like space debris ADR.

Messier 11 [Doug is a Science, Technology and Public Policy from The George Washington University; he studied at the Space Policy Institute. And is a graduate of the International Space Universit**y;** “Bigelow to Keynote International Space Development Conference”, 7/30, <http://www.parabolicarc.com/2011/05/02/bigelow-keynote-international-space-development-conference/>]

NSS PR **–** Robert Bigelow, Founder and President of Bigelow Aerospace, will be the Honored Keynote Speaker at the ISDC Governors’ Dinner and Gala to be held in the Davidson Center at the U.S. Space & Rocket Center in Huntsville, Alabama on May 20.  Mr. Bigelow founded Bigelow Aerospace, which is noted for developing and launching the first inflatable space habitats.  At the Gala, Mr. Bigelow will also receive the National Space Society’s Space Pioneer Award for Space Development for his efforts to advance the technology of space habitats and for the significance they may play in the development of space tourism, industry and exploration. Bigelow Aerospace took over the Transhab space habitat development program after NASA scrapped it, and effectively reinvented it.

## DA—Politics

**Issues in Congress are compartmentalized – political capital not key**

**Dickinson, 09** – professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt (5/26/09, Matthew, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/, JMP)

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is **rarely influenced by anything a president does**. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee.

**Focus on the political process kills agency**

**Van** Oenen 6 (Gijs, senior lecturer in practical philosophy at the Department of Philosophy, Erasmus University Rotterdam, A Machine That Would Go of Itself: Interpassivity and Its Impact on Politic al Life, Theory and Event, Muse)

This understanding of interpassivity differs from, but accords well with th e views espoused by Zizek and Pfaller. For instance, it fits Zizek's observation of the loss of 'substance': series of products are nowadays deprived of their 'malignant properties', that is to say of their substance, the hard resistant kernel of the Real: coffee without coffeine, cream without fat, beer without alcohol, politics as expert administration, that is, without politics.15 My account also confirms Pfallers and Zizeks thesis that interpa ssivity implies an increase in activity. In interpassive 'mode' we do indeed exhibit increased activity, but this activity expresses a shift of involvement, or 'interest', from **product to** **process**. In its radical fo rm, interpassivity even implies that the product is being replaced (we might say 'negated') by the process. The product, once the original goal and pu rpose of the process, has become superfluous; it is no longer especially needed or valued. **What is valued, on the contrary, is the ability to be involved in the production process**.

The whole notion of 'involvement', however, has itself been affected by thi s development. **The commitment has become procedural rather than substantial.** To a certain extent, this is inherent in the flexibility they are expecte d to exhibit. Skills are no longer connected to specific products; the most important skill of modern workers is the ability to 'interact', or be inte ractive', in a variety of different processes.

Let me summarize my theses concerning the way interpassivity affects our co ntemporary lives, in the sphere of labor.

First, we do not much care (anymore) about the end result of the productive process we are involved in. We just do not get around to consummating the product of our involvement. Second, and more precisely, our activity and ou r 'interest' shifts towards the earlier or preceding phases of the process. Our passivity concerning the product is compensated for by our increased ( inter-)activity in the process of production. Third, the process of interac tivity itself suffices; the reception and appreciation of the product is **taken over**, or preempted, by the process of production, or 'provision' .

**Political capital is flawed approach to decision-making—the rhetoric of finite capital results in exclusionary violence**

**Ruby-Sachs 8** – J.D. from the University of Toronto and practices civil litigation with Sutts Strosberg LLP (Emma, Ranking the Issues: Gay Rights in an Economic Crisis, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/emma-rubysachs/ranking-the-issues-gay-ri_b_146023.html>)

The classic approach to politics is to rank priorities and measure the finite bowl of political capital. If Obama pushes hard on a green new deal, he likely won't have much left for universal health care. If he backs off of serious economic regulation, then he might get more support for social programs from Republicans.  Because gay civil rights struggles affect fewer individuals and relate to less quantifiable harms, it's hard to justify putting them at the top of the list.  The alternative is to reject the ranked priorities political model altogether.  There is **little evidence** that sway and support is finite in the American political system. Political capital relates to the actions of the leader, yes, but can be infinitely large or non-existent at any point in time. In some ways, the more you get done, the more the bowl of capital swells.  Ranking America's problems to conserve political influence is a **narrow minded approach** to solving this crisis. Putting banks at the top of the list avoids the plight of large employers (like car companies - as much as we love to hate their executives). Sending health care and other social programs to second or third place, leaves those immediately affected by the crisis with nothing to fall back on. Finally, ignoring the disenfranchisement of a segment of the population breeds discontent, encourages protest, boycotts (a definite harm in this economy) and violence. It divides families (especially those who are still unable to sponsor their partner into the United States), imposes higher tax burdens on gay couples, denies benefits to gay spouses in many employment situations and polarizes social conservatives and social liberals in a time when consensus is essential.

## Impact—North Korea

**Claims of Korean “instability” are rooted in exclusionary racism**

Tan See **Seng,** Prof of Security Studies @ IDSS Singapore, **‘2** [July, “What Fear Hath Wrought: Missile Hysteria and The Writing of America, IDSS Commentary No. 28, <http://www.sipri.org/contents/library/0210.pdf>]

Otherness, in Wolfowitz’s rendition, is also discursively constituted along a moral/immoral – or, alternatively, responsible/irresponsible – axis. Equally interesting is the notion that authoritarian or rogue-state leaders, besides lacking in rationality and viewing problem solving as a form of weakness, are “ruthless and avaricious” – an intentional, not accidental, choice of predicates. That (and here we are left to infer) “North Korea” or “Iraq” is ruled by such roguish elements can only mean that such states can, indeed they should, therefore be properly referred to as rogue states. Against these inscriptions of immorality or amorality stand, in diametric contrast, moral “America.” And here the unequal adoption by Wolfowitz’s discourse, in the case of “democracies,” of the analytical level of state/regime connotes that all America, and not only its leaders or certain individuals, is thereby kind, compassionate, altruistic – the polar opposite of all that rogue states, and possibly even China and Russia, represent. To be sure, nowhere in his words does Wolfowitz imply that there are as such no immoral or irresponsible Americans. Nor does he even hint that all citizens of rogue states are therefore roguish; political correctness, after all, is the norm in these enlightened times. But the discursive effect is such that we are left with the impression that leaders of rogue nations – Saddam Hussein, Kim Chong-il, and their ilk – epitomize the darkest of the dark metaphysics of human nature. And roguish as such are their foreign policies. In his evaluation of the missile threat from North Korea, the deputy CIA director asserted: Like everyone else, we knew the [Pyongyang] regime was brutal within its borders and a menace beyond. Its commando raids into South Korea and its assassination attempts against successive South Korean presidents – including the 1983 bombings in Rangoon that killed 21 people – were clear windows into the minds and morals of North Korean leaders.62 Again, it bears reminding that the argument here does not refuse the historical “reality” and tragic consequences either of Pyongyang’s oppressive policies at home or its ruinous forays abroad. In terms of exclusionary practices, however, interpretive conclusions concerning the brutality of the Pyongyang regime cannot be separated from the morality axis on which this particular statement turns. What, for instance, is the effect created by the use of the opening phrase, “Like everyone else”? To who exactly does “everyone” refer? That this analysis is intelligible at all depends upon the presupposition that this particular reading – an American reading, to be precise – is universally accepted by one and all. But this is clearly not the case as implied by the vociferous and potentially violent tide of militant Muslims in Pakistan and parts of the Middle East, who hold Washington in contempt for the latter’s alleged “brutality” and “menace” toward, say, the Iraqis, (by proxy) the Palestinians, or (most recently) the Afghans. As such, the discursive effect of the preceding constructions is the naturalization of the Pyongyang regime as immoral, irresponsible, or just plain evil given the damning evidence of dastardly deeds that proffer “clear windows into the minds and morals of North Korean leaders.” Further, that the enumerated acts above were those perpetrated by Kim Il-song and not by his son, Kim Chong-il, seems not to matter in this analysis, although it is the latter Kim’s government with whom the Bush Administration must deal. This is not to imply that this intelligence estimate on Kim was essentially all caricature and thereby shorn of “truth.” The CIA official continues in his assessment: It is easy to caricature Kim Chong-il – either as a simple tyrant blind to his dilemma or as a technocratic champion of sweeping change. But the extreme views of him tend to be the product of bias, ignorance, or wishful thinking. The reality is more complex… Like his father, he has been shrewd enough to make bad behavior the keystone of his foreign policy. He knows that proliferation is something we want to stop. Thus, Kim Chong-il has tried to drum up outside assistance by trading off international concerns about his missile programs and sales. He has – more subtly, of course – done much the same thing with foreign fears of renewed famine and the chaos that could accompany any unravelling of his regime.63 The evident attempt at nuance in the above analysis, however, does not preclude the continued deployment of representational practices along the axis of responsibility. “Like his father,” we are told, the “shrewd” Kim makes “bad behavior the keystone of his foreign policy” – an indication of chronic irresponsibility in North Korea’s international relations. We may note here the likely intrusive influence of another discourse, particularly that on nineteenth-century European diplomacy as it figures in American intellectual and popular culture. As historian Barbara Tuchman once noted, for most Americans the notion of diplomacy carries with it “all the wicked devices of the Old World, spheres of influence, balances of power, secret treatises, triple alliances”64 and other such forms of Machiavellian intrigue for which America, idealized as the New World – a seemingly virginal, innocent, and righteous identity – had no place. Indeed, just such a pristine identity is often adduced as the universal ideal to which all nations and peoples are presumed to aspire – a point made forcefully in the earlier cited “end of history” thesis popular in mainstream political debate at the close of the Cold War.65 In other words, what is good for America is obviously good for the whole world (or, at least those parts that are “rational,” “responsible,” “moral”). “Missile defense,” one congressman averred, “is for Americans, for Europeans, for Russians, and for all peace-loving peoples on the face of the Earth.”66 Without ignoring or denying North Korean complicity in the light of its sizeable transfers of missile technology to the Middle East, what those exclusionary practices produce is the materializing effect of a Pyongyang regime that, if anything, can be expected to harm the US at the slightest provocation – a representation of danger that finds easy resonance with American policymakers because of its familiarity rather than any likelihood of such an eventuation. Further, what is effaced or erased by the above statement are plausible illustrations of bad behaviour in American foreign policy: a policy orientation that, even by most orthodox accounts, has been realist – in both its prudential as well as Machiavellian aspects – throughout much of the Cold War period.67 Indeed, this effacement stands out starkly in the light of resistant discourses – mostly but not exclusively from European sources – which portray America as a rogue state68 given the apparent lack of “strategic restraint” in its post-Cold War foreign policy.69 Hence the tenuousness of such constructions of identity through excluding contradictions and tensions that are as much a part of Self as it is of the Other.

## Impact—Free Trade

Free trade authorizes infinite violence committed in its name—ups the antithesis of freedom as it requires the eradication of nations and ecosystems in the name of the global economy.

JENSEN, ‘4 M.F.A. in Creative Writing from Eastern Washington University AND FORMER EDITOR OF

TRANSITIONS (DERRICK, MAY 28, "Free TradeTM", http://www.derrickjensen.org/free.html)

Free trade. So benign sounding a phrase. A concept whose principles no reasonable person would challenge. Trouble is-- free trade as we know it, free trade as is pushed by those massing at Cancun in September, is far from free. Think about it. If it was truly free, would they put sanctions on those who don’t want to participate, and use police to violently put down protests by those who oppose it? Free trade is really just a euphemism, like ‘peacekeeping’, or ‘forest management’, that hides a far uglier, more brutal reality. Free trade is a brand -- Free Trade TM that sells a repackaged product no one in their right minds would buy if they knew what it really was.

So what is it? Prussian military theorist Karl von Clausewitz once wrote that war is the continuation of politics by other means. Free Trade is the continuation of colonialism by other means. Good old-fashioned colonialism, which my dictionary defines as “(a) control by one power over a dependent area or people; (b) a policy advocating or based on such control.”

Whether we like it or not, the fact remains that the rich of the world still control the former colonies -- although few are so impolite as to call them that anymore -- because many of the colonial structures they built up were simply left in place after “independence.” Corporate access to land, resources, and markets; debt peonage; tax structures favorable to those in power; commodity pricing aimed at driving small producers off their land; and the massive export of resources are often similar to conditions hundreds of years ago. Only the names describing these mechanisms have changed. And in some countries, poverty is much worse than it was under direct colonial rule.

Same old story

It’s a story as old as civilization. About which, the anthropologist Stanley Diamond noted that “Civilization originates in conquest abroad and repression at home.” This will not be news to the citizens of Iraq, Afghanistan, Grenada, Panama, Palestine, (and so on, ad nauseum) nor to those “at home” who’ve felt the pepper spray, batons, and rubber bullets of cops whose job it is to protect those in power.

They understand that those at the centre of empire have always needed to import resources to maintain and expand their empire. That’s why the trade our leaders will talk about and promote at Cancun isn’t and can never be “free”: if resources are needed by those in power, trade that is purely voluntary by all concerned will never be sufficiently reliable. That’s why anytime some community sits on a resource needed by those in power, and chooses not to sell this resource (at a price convenient for the powerful), the people are killed, the community destroyed, the resource stolen.

Far fetched? Those at the centre of empire have been killing people, destroying communities, and stealing resources, that is, expanding their region of control and exploitation, for some 6,000 years. At every step of the way, these conquistadors have not encountered vacant land but instead functioning human communities living in dynamic equilibrium with their landbases. Time and again these communities and landbases have been destroyed to serve those at the centre.

As psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton, probably the world’s foremost authority on the psychology of genocide, made clear in his extraordinary book The Nazi Doctors, before you can commit any mass atrocity you have to convince yourself that what you’re doing is not an atrocity but instead beneficial. Thus the Nazis weren’t committing genocide and murdering Jews (Gypsies, Slavs, Russians, and so on) they were “purifying the Aryan Race” and gaining lebensraum they needed to fulfill their destiny. Thus the Americans weren’t committing genocide and murdering Indians, they were fulfilling their own Manifest Destiny (gaining lebensraum, as it were). Similarly today, those in power aren’t destroying communities and committing ecocide, they are ‘growing the economy’, and ‘developing natural resources’, and ‘helping those in the Third World to develop their infrastructure’, ‘bringing to all the benefits of free trade capitalism’, (admittedly often at the point of a gun). No longer is the choice offered to those to be exploited Christianity or death, it has become Free Trade or death.

But wait a minute. How can I compare Free Trade™ to lebensraum? Isn’t trade a good thing? Isn’t free trade just the untrammeled exchange of items to the benefit of all? Isn’t that what happens when two kids trade baseball cards? I’ll give you a Pedro Martinez for a Barry Bonds, straight up.

Sure, free trade can be good, if all parties hold equal power. Negotiations aren’t possible when one side holds a gun and the other does not (the technical term for this sort of exchange is robbery). That is how the civilised were able to get Indians to sign treaties giving up their land for pennies or less per acre: the Indians knew if they didn’t sign they’d receive nothing but bullets, and bayonets to the throat.

Balance of power

From the beginning, those in power have recognised the impossibility of negotiations between parties of unequal power, and have done everything they can to magnify this disparity. Without access to land there can be no self-sufficiency: land provides food, shelter, clothing. If you can force people to pay just so they can be alive on this earth -- nowadays these payments are usually called rent or mortgage -- you’ve forced them into the wage economy.

The same holds true for forcing them to pay for materials the earth gives freely: the salmon, bison, huckleberries, willows, and so on that are central to the lives, cultures, and communities not only of indigenous peoples but to all of us, even if we make believe this isn’t the case. To force people to pay for things they need to survive is an atrocity: a community- and nature-destroying atrocity. To convince them to pay willingly is a scam. It is also, as we see around us -- or would see had we not been so thoroughly convinced -- to cause them to forget that communities are even possible.

Just as those in power must control access to land, the same logic dictates they must destroy all stocks of wild foodstuffs. Why would I go to Safeway if I could catch wild salmon in the stream outside my door? The same is true, obviously, for everything that is wild and free, for everything else that can meet our needs without us having to pay those in power. The push to privatize the world’s water helps make sense of official apathy surrounding the pollution of (free) water sources. You just watch: air will soon be privatized: I don’t know how they’ll do it, but they’ll certainly find a way.

But the destruction of wild foodstuffs doesn’t require some fiendishly clever plot on the part of those in power. Far worse, it merely requires the reward and logic systems of civilization to remain in place. And so long as the rest of us continue to buy into theses systems that value the centralisation of control over life, that value the production of things over life, that value empire over life, that value Free Trade™ over life, so long will the world that is our real and only home continue to be destroyed, and so long will the noose that is empire continue to tighten around our throats.

## Impact—China

**Their representations of China create an international hierarchy of nations legitimizing massive violence**

Tan See **Seng,** Prof of Security Studies @ IDSS Singapore, ‘**2** [July, “What Fear Hath Wrought: Missile Hysteria and The Writing of America, IDSS Commentary No. 28, http://www.sipri.org/contents/library/0210.pdf]

Let us turn briefly to recent statements involving the "China threat." As per usual, without any thoughtful appraisal of the millennia-long and rich histories of China(s), the specific struggles and tensions faced at different historical moments in ongoing contestations of Chinese identity, or the relatively long Sino-American relationship marked by mutual benefit as well as detriment, Republican Senator Jon Kyle, by no means a Sinologist and citing extensively from just one study on China, 73 recently submitted this "definitive" assessment: [T]he former [Clinton] administration believed that China could be reformed solely by the civilizing influence of the West. Unfortunately, this theory hasn't proven out - the embrace of western capitalism has not been accompanied by respect for human rights, the rule of law, the embrace of democracy, or a less belligerent attitude toward its neighbours... China is being led by a communist regime with a deplorable human rights record and a history of irresponsible technology sales to rogue states. Furthermore, Beijing's threatening rhetoric aimed at the United States and Taiwan, as well as its military modernization and buildup of forces opposite Taiwan, should lead us to the conclusion that China potentially poses a growing threat to our national security... We should also be concerned with China's desire to project power in other parts of the Far East. 74 In Kyle's discourse we encounter, first, the partisan criticism levelled against the previous administration for its evidently erroneous belief that China could be "reformed" by the "civilizing influence of the West." That this statement proceeds immediately from there to demonstrate why "this theory hasn't proven out" is not to imply that the senator from Arizona therefore thinks that the entirety of the Clinton Administration's purported logic is thereby flawed. Indeed, his discourse enacts precisely the same exclusionary practice, present in the logic that he has just criticized, so as to position China as a "lesser subject," so to speak, relative to the US. Again, Butler's thoughts are helpful here: "This exclusionary matrix by which subjects are formed thus requires the simultaneous production of a domain of abject beings, those who are not yet 'subjects,' but who form the constitutive outside to the domain of the subject. ,75 I would suggest that Butler's "abject beings... who are not yet 'subjects" may possibly be construed as what I have termed "lesser subjects." Hence, in much the same way that colonial or Orientalist discourses produced subaltern subjects in order to be known, domesticated, disciplined, conquered, governed, and of course civilized, 76 the figuration of "China" in Kyle's discourse, evoking a genre of Otherness most moderns prefer to think has disappeared with the passing of colonialism, is that of an uncivilized barbaric nation and people. The previous Democratic administration, according to Kyle, erred in believing that the Chinese can be reformed and civilized, but no such hope - and it is, after all, a liberal hope - need be entertained by conservatives who know better than to even attempt to civilize "the natives." This representation allows for the simultaneous production of the properly constituted subject, "America," where human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and a track record of good neighbourliness are fully embraced along with capitalism. Here we may note that although this inventory of criteria has long been associated with how Americans perceive themselves - and, to be sure, how the world perceives America, positively as well as negatively - their own national history, however, is littered with as many spectacular failures as there have been successes in these very areas. Further, what is interesting to note, in terms of the redeployment - or, to paraphrase Foucault, a "re-incitement" - of Orientalist tropes in security discourse, is the shift from the sorts of axiomatic and practical axes that structure interrelated discourses on communism during and prior to the Cold War, to the axes that configure contemporary readings of communism or, more precisely, the latest variant of "socialism with Chinese characteristics." As Campbell has pointed out, one of the dimensions upon which pivoted the construction of Soviet communism as the West's Other was that of the organizing of economic relations: notably, in its most simplistic terms, central planning and collectivisation on the part of the communist bloc; and, laissez faire cum mixed economy and private ownership on the part of the Free World. 77 In the case of Senator Kyle's narrative - which, in a key respect, reiterates and references norms and tropisms already present in security discourses on China during the Clinton presidency - that particular axis has become irrelevant in the wake of China's "embrace of western capitalism" and growing integration with the global economy. 78 For a replacement, contemporary security discourse has mobilized other representational resources that, as we have seen, function within the senator's discourse to domesticate and constitute China as a threat. And although China is described therein as "being led by a communist regime," the choice of this particular adjective, deliberately circulated to invoke past articulations of fear, no longer refers to the same thing, however. Hence, much as China has "embraced western capitalism," much as communism in its economic sense is no longer adhered to throughout all of China, the discursive construction of Otherness, to the extent that the figuration of communism is still being employed, now proceeds along the democratic/authoritarian axis, as well as along other axes (elaborated upon earlier) around which rogue states are constituted.