

“The” PIC

Counterplan: United States federal government should substantially increase its development of the Solar Shield to explore the sun

Use of ‘The’ before United States federal government inscribes nationalistic geopolitics, creating us-them dichotomies

Thrift 2k (Nigel, University of Warwick Vice Chancellor, University of Bristol Professor of Geography, “It’s the Little Things”, Geopolitical Traditions: A Century of Geopolitical Thought p.383-385)

Let us finally come to one more arena: the arena of **words**. After all, here we might be thought to have the clearest example of representation at work, the word. Yet, what we do not get from critical geopolitics is a clear enough sense of how words function to bring about geopolitical change and it is not possible to do so as long as geopolitical forces continue to be framed as ‘big’ and ‘commanding’ (with all the masculine overtones). Some of the most potent geopolitical forces are, I suspect, lurking in the ‘little’ ‘details’ of people’s lives, what is “carried” in the specific variabilities of their activities’ (Shotter and Billig 1998:23), in the context of utterances.

And these variabilities have immediate consequences. Thus, As Bakhtin notes, and as is confirmed by the work in conversational analysis, ‘we sensitively catch the smallest shift in intonation, the slightest interruption of voices in anything of importance to us in another person’s practical everyday discourse. All those verbal sideward glances, reservations, loopholes, hints, thrusts do not slip past our ear, are not foreign to our own lips’ (Bakhtin 1984:201). And we in turn show our stance to what they do or say also in fleeting bodily reactions, facial expressions, sounds of approval or disapproval, etc. Indeed, even in the continuously responsive unfolding of non-linguistic activities between ourselves and others—in a dance, in a handshake, or even a mere chance collision on the street—we are actively aware of whether the other’s motives are, so to speak, ‘in tune’ or ‘at odds’ with ours. And in our sense of their attunement or lack of it, we can sense their attitude to us as intimate or distant, friendly or hostile, deferential or arrogant, and so on. (Shotter and Billig 1998:23) Thus, very effective work has been done in disciplines like anthropology and discursive psychology (Billig 1995,

1997) which attempts to provide a sense of how national identity and an accompanying geopolitical stance are inscribed through the smallest of details. Thus, for example, national identity is not accomplished in grand displays which incite the citizen to wave the flag in a fit of patriotic fervour.

Instead, it goes on in more mundane citations:

it is done unobtrusively on the margins of conscious awareness by little words such as ‘the’ and ‘we’. Each day we read or hear phrases such as ‘the prime minister’, ‘the nation’, or the ‘weather’. The definite article assumes deictically the national borders. It points to the homeland: but while we, the readers or listeners, understand the pointing, we do not follow it with our consciousness—it is a ‘seen but unnoticed’ feature of our everyday discourse.⁶ (Shotter and Billig 1998:20) Such work goes some way towards understanding the deep, often unconscious aggressions which lurk behind so much geopolitical ‘reasoning’, which through small details build a sense of ‘us’ as not like ‘them’, and from which political programmes then flow as infractions are identified and made legible.⁷

In these few brief comments, I hoped to have outlined a parallel agenda for critical geopolitics, one still based on discourse, but on discourse understood in a broader way, and one which is less taken in by representation and more attuned to actual practices. In turn, such an agenda leads us away from interpretation of hyperbolic written and drawn rhetorics (which, I suspect, are often read by only a few and taken in by even fewer) towards the (I hesitate to say ‘real’) work of discourse, the constant hum of practices and their attendant territorializations within which geopolower ferments and sometimes boils over.

Geopolitical borders fuel racism and violence

Dikeç 02 (Mustafa, University of London Royal Holloway Geography Dept. Human Geography Lecturer, “Pera Peras Poros: Longing for Spaces of Hospitality”, Theory Culture Society)

California's Proposition 187 was an attempt to build 'safe homes' for Californians, not for all of them of course. The political abuse of the image of home as a sheltered and safe place drew upon an 'exclusionary, territorializing, xenophobic, premodern and patriarchal cult of home' (Antonopoulos, 1994: 57). It was an elaborate fixing of boundaries, making California a safe home for its 'legal' residents based on the exclusionary politics of home. Boundaries, evidently, not only evoke the idea of hospitality, but of hostility and racism as well.¹² It is important to remember, however, that it is not only the situation of the guest but also the host that needs to be reconsidered since, in the case of immigration, for example, it is 'both receiving populations and immigrants [that] . . . risk mutual transformation, [that] . . . engage and attenuate their home-yearning for each other's sakes and for the sake of their political life together' (Honig, 1999: 203). The point, therefore, is about openings, about 'keeping open the question of who "the people" (the demos) is', since the question of democracy 'always arises at the limit of the demos . . . wherein native, subject, citizen, or people receives its designation as such from the way the human encounter with the stranger and the strange is assumed' (Dillon, 1999: 120 and 96). There is a need to reconsider the boundary, not only as a separator but as a connector as well, where hospitality comes into play pointing beyond the boundaries. There is a need, perhaps, to reflect on what the title words, in Greek, of this text suggest: Pera – peras – poros: the other side/beyond – limit – passage; 'beyond the limits that interdict passage' (Baptist, 1999: 102). There is a need, more importantly, if a cosmopolitan approach is to be assumed, to think about hospitality 'that would be more than cosmopolitan, that would go beyond strictly cosmopolitan conditions', that would go beyond the interests, authority, and legislation of the state (Derrida, 1999a: 43). To conclude, there is no way I would argue, to escape the advent of the stranger, to avoid questions and questionings that tremble, if not stir, the socio-political order that once appeared, perhaps, as a safe home. Nor is there a way to avoid the production of others. What is more important, instead of reflecting on the ways by which no other would be produced, is to be able to resist processes that produce and reproduce others: processes that stabilize themselves, that close spaces, and that derive their sustainability from the very process of othering itself. Again, what is more important, rather than reflecting on the ways by which to avoid the ‘disturbance’ of the stranger, is to be able to provide for the social, cultural,

institutional, ethical and political spaces where we could learn to engage with and learn from each other, while being able to constitute our subjectivities free from subordination, in democratic ways. The point, then, is to open spaces, spaces where recognition as well as contestation and conflict can take place.

Furthermore, the point is not merely to open spaces; more importantly, it is to keep them open. Hospitality is aimed at such a concern.

Trivialization K

Invoking the Holocaust in lesser matters is a trivialization

The League for Human Rights, 2000, <http://www.bnaibrith.ca/publications/audit2000/audit2000-03.html>

Blatant Holocaust denial is offensive, easily labeled as antisemitism, and looked down upon by the majority of society. But this year there has been a disturbing increase in a more subtle phenomenon - Holocaust trivialization. The invocation of Holocaust terminology and symbols to try to make a point about a much less severe event, or to describe any undemocratic or authoritarian behaviour, is to diminish the importance of the Holocaust not only as a pivotal moment in modern Jewish history but also as a lesson for all humankind. Such trivialization of the Holocaust is offensive and upsetting to the Jewish community. As the years pass and there are fewer people with first-hand Holocaust experience able to be our living memory and constant reminder, we must continue to deal with the trend toward the trivialization of the Holocaust in a serious and consistent manner

Repeated comparisons to historical events weaken the compulsion to act in the future-they pollute the debate space, it must be rejected

Barbie Zelizer (Ph.D. 1990, University of Pennsylvania; MA 1981, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, former journalist, President of the International Communication Association, has been both a Guggenheim Fellow, a Research Fellow at the Freedom Forum Media Studies Center, a Fellow at Harvard University's Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics, and Public Policy, and a Fulbright Senior Scholar.) "Remembering to forget - holocaust memory through the camera's eye", 1998

In each case, the media give meaning to new instances of horror by contextualizing them against earlier brutality. Yet in so doing, they flatten the complexity of the original event and create a macabre continuum of barbaric acts that both mainstreams atrocity and shocks much of the public into stupefied inaction. In the Washington Post's view, at each "new ethnic eruption, the cry of 'never again'- never another uncontested genocide-rings weaker." All of this suggest that the act of bearing witness may no longer compel responsibility.

Vote negative and declare a moratorium on Holocaust analogies

MICHAEL BERENBAUM ((professor of Jewish Studies and director of the Sigi Ziering Center for the Study of the Holocaust and Ethics at American Jewish University), Who Owns the 'N' Word?, The Jewish Journal, October 28, 2009

We make all too trivial comparisons between the Holocaust and contemporary anti-Semitism. We employ rhetoric of the Holocaust all too easily, all too cheaply. John Roth admonished us: "Handle with care!" Rabbi Irving Greenberg established a principle of authentic expression after the Holocaust: No statement, theological or otherwise, can be made that cannot be made in the presence of burning children. In our world, very little is handled with care in the public sphere. In our world, there is precious little humility that would suggest awe before an event of such magnitude. Let us declare a moratorium on Holocaust analogies. Those who invoke the analogies of the Holocaust demonstrate how little they understand of that time and place — and more importantly, of our time and our place.

A-Spec

They don't specify their agent– that's a voting issue

Kills neg ground– they can say the plan is implemented differently than our disads assume which lets them spike out of all our links

Prevents us from knowing how the government works, prevents any policy implementation

Fiat is Extra-T

Our interpretation is that affirmative action should be limited to the mandates of the resolution; fiat is not part of that, making it extra topical.

Voting issue

Predictability- resolution is all that the negative has to research, allowing the affirmative to go outside the bounds of the resolution destroys negative ground.

Ground- we are prepared to debate the consequences of the aff advocating the resolution, we have reasons why advocating that the USFG should do something is bad

Mao K

Relying on knowledge derived solely from written literature without actually investigating problems prevents any real change from occurring

Mao 1930 [Tse-tung Chairman of the Communist party of China 1943–1974, Revolutionary], May 1930, “OPPOSE BOOK WORSHIP”,http://www.marxists.org/reference/ar...6/mswv6_11.htm //Skills]

III. OPPOSE BOOK WORSHIP

Whatever is written in a book is right — such is still the mentality of culturally backward Chinese peasants. Strangely enough, within the Communist Party **there are also people who always say in a discussion, "Show me where it's written in the book."** When we say that a directive of a higher organ of leadership is correct, that is not just because it comes from "a higher organ of leadership" but because its contents conform with both the objective and subjective circumstances of the struggle and meet its requirements. It is quite wrong to take a formalistic attitude and blindly carry out directives without discussing and examining them in the light of actual conditions simply because they come from a higher organ. It is the mischief done by this formalism which explains why the line and tactics of the Party do not take deeper root among the masses. **To carry out a directive of a higher organ blindly, and seemingly without any disagreement, is not really to carry it out but is the most artful way of opposing or sabotaging it. The method of studying the social sciences exclusively from the book is likewise extremely dangerous and may even lead one onto the road of counter-revolution.** Clear proof of this is provided by the fact that whole batches of Chinese Communists who confined themselves to books in their study of the social sciences have turned into counter-revolutionaries. When we say Marxism is correct, it is certainly not because Marx was a "prophet" but because his theory has been proved correct in our practice and in our struggle. We need Marxism in our struggle. In our acceptance of his theory no such formalisation of mystical notion as that of "prophecy" ever enters our minds. Many who have read Marxist books have become renegades from the revolution, whereas illiterate workers often grasp Marxism very well. Of course we should study Marxist books, but this study must be integrated with our country's actual conditions. **We need books, but we must overcome book worship, which is divorced from the actual situation. How can we overcome book worship? The only way is to investigate the actual situation.**

Failure to prove problems beyond the realm of paper and computer screens means the syllables that fly out of your mouth are gibberish, thus your right to speak should be unconditionally and fundamentally revoked- only by truly investigating things can we solve them

Mao 1930 [Tse-tung Chairman of the Communist party of China 1943–1974, Revolutionary], May 1930, “OPPOSE BOOK WORSHIP”,http://www.marxists.org/reference/ar...6/mswv6_11.htm //Skills]

Unless you have investigated a problem, you will be deprived of the right to speak on it. Isn't that too harsh? Not in the least. **When you have not probed into a problem, into the present facts and its past history, and know nothing of its essentials, whatever you say about it will undoubtedly be nonsense.** Talking nonsense solves no problems, as everyone knows, so why is it unjust to deprive you of the right to speak? Quite a few comrades always keep their eyes shut and talk nonsense, and for a Communist that is disgraceful. How can a Communist keep his eyes shut and talk nonsense? It won't do! It won't do! You must investigate! You must not talk nonsense! II. TO INVESTIGATE A PROBLEM IS TO SOLVE IT **You can't solve a problem? Well, get down and investigate the present facts and its past history!** When you have investigated the problem thoroughly, you will know how to solve it. Conclusions invariably come after investigation, and not before. **Only a blockhead cudgels his brains on his own, or together with a group, to "find solution" or "evolve an idea" without making any investigation. It must be stressed that this cannot possibly lead to any effective solution or any good idea.** In other words, he is bound to arrive at a wrong solution and a wrong idea. There are not a few comrades doing inspection work, as well as guerrilla leaders and cadres newly in office, who like to make political pronouncements the moment they arrive at a place and who strut about, criticizing this and condemning that when they have only seen the surface of things or minor details. Such purely subjective nonsensical talk is indeed detestable. **These people are bound to make a mess of things, lose the confidence of the masses and prove incapable of solving any problem at all.** When they come across difficult problems, quite a number of people in leading positions simply heave a sigh without being able to solve them. They lose patience and ask to be transferred on the ground that they "have not the ability and cannot do the job"; These are cowards' words. Just get moving on your two legs, go the rounds of every section

placed under your charge and "**inquire into everything" as Confucius did, and then you will be able to solve the problems**, however little is your ability; for although your head may be empty before you go out of doors, it will be empty no longer when you return but will contain all sorts of material necessary for the solution of the problems, and that is how problems are solved. Must you go out of doors? Not necessarily. You can call a fact-finding meeting of people familiar with the situation in order to get at the source of what you call a difficult problem and come to know how it stands now, and then it will be easy to solve your difficult problem. Investigation may be likened to the long months of pregnancy, and solving a problem to the day of birth. To investigate a problem is, indeed, to solve it.

T-Beyond

Interpretation– topical affirmatives increase exploration or development within the Hollow Earth

Earth's mesosphere is the lower mantle of the crust

Egger, Undergraduate Program Coordinator in the School of Earth Sciences at Stanford University 3

(Anne E., "Earth Structure: A Virtual Journey to the Center of the Earth", Visionlearning Vol. EAS (1),

http://www.visionlearning.com/library/module_viewer.php?mid=69sbl

The compositional divisions of the earth were understood decades before the development of the theory of plate tectonics - the idea that the earth's surface consists of large plates that move (see our Plate Tectonics I module). By the 1970s, however, geologists began to realize that the plates had to be thicker than just the crust, or they would break apart as they moved. In fact, plates consist of the crust acting together with the uppermost part of the mantle; this rigid layer is called the lithosphere and it ranges in thickness from about 10 to 200 km. Rigid lithospheric plates "float" on a partially molten layer called the asthenosphere that flows like a very viscous fluid, like Silly Putty®. It is important to note that although the asthenosphere can flow, it is not a liquid, and thus both S- and P-waves can travel through it. **At a depth of 660 km, pressure becomes so great that the mantle can no longer flow, and this solid part of the mantle is called the mesosphere.** The lithospheric mantle, asthenosphere, and mesosphere all share the same composition (that of peridotite), but their mechanical properties are significantly different. Geologists often refer to the asthenosphere as the jelly in between two pieces of bread: the lithosphere and mesosphere.

Our contextual evidence uses 'Beyond' in this context

KidsKnowIt Network 98

("The Earth's Crust," <http://www.kidsgeo.com/geology-for-kids/0022-earths-mantle.php> , 6-27-11 , GJV)

Traveling beyond the Earth's crust, we next encounter the mantle. The mantle extends to a depth of approximately

1,800 miles, and is made of a thick solid rocky substance that represents about 85% of the total weight and mass of the

Earth. The first 50 miles of the mantle are believed to consist of very hard rigid rock. The next 150 miles or so is believed to be super-heated solid rock, that due to the heat energy is very weak. Below that for the next several hundred miles, the Earth mantle is believed to once again be made up of very solid and sturdy rock materials.

Violation- They don't go beyond the mesosphere

Voting issue-Don't have the jurisdiction to vote aff and they explode the topic by allowing for an unlimited number of satellite, weaponization, and mining affs, only we have predictable evidence

Heidegger K

Aff engages in calculative thought and ignores earth's ontology

Turnbull 6 (Neil, "The Ontological Consequences of Copernicus: Global Being in the Planetary World", *Theory, Culture & Society* 2006 (SAGE, London, Thousand Oaks and New De1): 125–139, Project Muse MV)

In effect, Nietzsche, Heidegger and Wittgenstein offer what might be termed a 'philosophical anti-Copernicanism' that attempts to make the earth the 'foundation of judgement' and the still and fixed point around which human life turns. The symbolic consequences of recent explorations of interplanetary space have, in one sense and somewhat paradoxically, redoubled the force of these kinds of anti-Copernican moves in heightening the conceptual importance of the earth, while at the same time weakening the self-evidence of traditional pre-modern anti-Copernicanism by undermining the 'unshakeable conviction' that the earth is a fixed and supporting solid ground. But what happens to the Western philosophical quest for fixed ontologies and epistemological grounds when its traditional 'grounded' notion of the earth is supplemented, possibly in the end replaced, by a more dynamic, open, perceptual, aesthetic and technologically produced conception of the earth? Might the planetary earth be the postmodern equivalent of the Cartesian *malin génie* – that which undermines any idea of a fixed and stable 'first principle' of knowing and judging? How can we make sense of the idea of the return of 'the earth' to its former pre-modern position at the hub of Western conceituality, while at the same time acknowledging that this earth is not the fixed earth of the past, but a symbolically significant and virtual – and worlded – earth?⁴ As the earth is technologically revealed as a planetary space that is simultaneously a cultural, political and ecological – and perhaps, in some yet-to-be-defined way, spiritual – the earth ceases to be something that, as it were, lies 'beneath our feet'. It becomes something lying 'in front of our eyes' and as such it ceases to be an ontological basis for worldly 'firm-footedness' but is revealed as a set of visible patterns, flows and interconnections. A further question needs to be asked here, however: can there be a philosophical articulation of knowing and judging in a planetary age without recourse to an idea of terrestrial grounds? If, as Luce Irigaray observes, modern philosophy 'always supposes in some manner, a solid crust from which to raise a construction', and its '*ek-sistence* is founded on the solid' (1998: 2), then clearly any attempt to make philosophical sense of these things without relying on an idea of fixed – earthly – grounds will require a different way of doing/conceiving philosophy. Can Western philosophy make sense of its traditional epistemological and ontological questions when the earth no longer appears as grounded?

Such forms of technological thought only create the conditions that are the pre-requisite for nuclear wars—the consequences of such thought are more devastating than extinction

Caputo 93—professor of Humanities at Syracuse, founder of weak theology, MA from Villanova, PhD from Bryn Mawr in Philosophy (John Caputo, *Demythologizing Heidegger*, 1993 p. 136-141, [Miller])

In his essay "The Thing" Heidegger remarks upon the prospect of a nuclear conflagration which could extinguish all human life: Man stares at what the explosion of the atom bomb could bring with it. He does not see that what has long since taken place and has already happened expels from itself as its last emission the atom bomb and its explosion—not to mention the single nuclear bomb, whose triggering, thought through to its utmost potential, might be enough to snuff out all life on earth. (VA, 165/PLT, 166). In a parallel passage, he remarks: ... [Man finds himself in a perilous situation. Why? Just because a third world war might break out unexpectedly and bring about the complete annihilation of humanity and the destruction of the earth? No. In this dawning atomic age a far greater danger threatens—precisely when the danger of a third world war has been removed. A strange assertion! Strange indeed, but only as long as we do not meditate. (G, 27/DT, 56). The thinker is menaced by a more radical threat, is endangered by a more radical explosiveness, let us say by a more essential bomb, capable of an emission (*hinauswerfen*) of such primordiality that the explosion (Explosion) of the atom bomb would be but its last ejection. Indeed, the point is even stronger: even a nuclear bomb, or a wholesale exchange of nuclear bombs between nuclear megapowers, which would put an end to "all life on earth," which would annihilate every living being, human and nonhuman, is a derivative threat compared to this more primordial destructiveness. There is a prospect that is more dangerous and uncanny—unheimlicher—than the mere fact that everything could be blown apart (Auseinanderplatzen von allem). There is something that would bring about more homelessness, more not-being-at-home (un-Heimlich) than the destruction of cities and towns and of their inhabitants. What is truly unsettling, dis-placing (*ent-setzen*), the thing that is really terrifying (*das Entsetzende*), is not the prospect of the destruction of human life on the planet, of annihilating its places and its settlers. Furthermore, this truly terrifying thing has already happened and has actually been around for quite some time. This more essential explosive has already been set off; things have already been destroyed, even though the nuclear holocaust has not yet happened. What then is the truly terrifying? The terrifying is that which sets everything that is outside (heraussitzt) of its own essence (Wesen). What is this dis-placing [*Entsetzendel*]? It shows itself and conceals itself in the way in which everything presences (anwest), namely, in the fact that despite all conquest of distances the nearness of things remains absent. (VA, 165/P1.T, 166) The truly terrifying explosion, the more essential destruction is that which dis-places a thing from its Wesen, its essential nature, its ownmost coming to presence. The essential destruction occurs in the Being of a thing, not in its entitative actuality; it is a disaster that befalls Being, not beings. The destructiveness of this more essential destruction is aimed not directly at man but at "things" (Dirge), in the distinctively Heideggerian sense. The Wesen of things is their nearness, and it is nearness which has been decimated by technological proximity and speed. Things have ceased to have true nearness and farness, have sunk into the indifference of that which, being a great distance away, can be brought close in the flash of a technological instant. Thereby, things have ceased to be things, have sunk into indifferent nothingness. Something profoundly disruptive has occurred on the level of the Being of things that has already destroyed them, already cast them out of (*herauswerfen*) their Being. Beings have been brought close to Us technologically; enormous distances are spanned in seconds. Satellite technology can make events occurring on the other side of the globe present in a flash; supersonic jets cross the great oceans in a few hours. Yet, far from bringing things "near," this massive technological removal of distance has actually abolished nearness, for nearness is precisely what withdraws in the midst of such technological frenzy. Nearness is the nearing of earth and heavens, mortals and gods, in the handmade jug, or the old bridge at Heidelberg, and it can be experienced only in the quiet meditativeness which renounces haste. Thus the real destruction of the thing, the one that abolishes its most essential Being and Wesen, occurs when the scientific determination of things prevails and compels our assent. The thingness of the jug is to serve as the place which gathers together the fruit of earth and sun in mortal offering to the gods above. But all that is destroyed when pouring this libation becomes instead the displacement of air by a liquid; at that moment science has succeeded in reducing the jug-thing to a non-entity (*Nichtige*). Science, or rather the dominion of scientific representation, the rule of science over what comes to presence, what is called the Wesen, which is at work in science and technology, that is the truly explosive-destructive thing, the more essential dis-placing. The gathering of earth and sky, mortals and gods, that holds sway in the thing—for "gathering" is what the Old High German thing means—is scattered to the four winds, and that more essential annihilation occurs even if the bomb never goes off. Science's knowledge, which is

compelling within its own sphere, the sphere of objects, **already had annihilated things long before the atom bomb exploded**. The bomb's explosion is only the grossest of all gross confirmations of the long-since accomplished annihilation of the thing. (VA, 168/PLT, 170) When **things have been annihilated in their thingness, the mushroom clouds of the bomb cannot be far behind**. So whether or not the bomb goes off is not essential, does not penetrate to the essence of what comes to presence in the present age of technological proximities and reduced distances. What is essential is the loss of genuine nearness, authentic and true nearness, **following which the actual physical annihilation of planetary life would be a** "gross" confirmation, an unrefined, external, physical destruction that would be but a follow-up, another afterthought, **a less subtle counterpart to** a more inward, profound, essential, authentic, **ontological destruction.**

Our alternative isn't a fatalistic rejection of technology—rather rejection is a form of releasement that reorients our relationship towards technological modes of thought

Botha o2 (Catherine, Dept. of Philosophy @ Univ. of Pretoria, "Heidegger, Technology and Ecology," South African Journal of Philosophy, Vol 22, Issue 2, p. ebscohost)

Homelessness is the mood of the technological age. Rediscovering our worldly home as threatened, signals the "restoring surmounting" of technology. Memory or recollective thought chiefly summons this sense of a threatened sanctuary. Recollecting our worldly habitat not only fosters resistance to Das Gestell, but also Provides guidance in how human being relates to the products of technology. Heidegger acknowledges that **we need not reject the products or skills of technology**. He says that **we can not repudiate the technological world of to day as the "work of the devil"**, nor should we **destroy it**, assuming that it does not do this to it self (Heidegger, 1993:330). **Heidegger does not advocate a retreat to a pre-technological state of being**, nor does he suggest that we fatalistically resign our selves to the victory of Das Gestell. **Fatalism is no answer because it reflects the same absence of thought that is evidenced in a naive complacency with technological progress**. We can say both "yes" and "no" to **technology by having an attitude of releasement toward things**. In other words, **although it is crucial to perceive the danger of our technological constructions lest they dominate us, it is unnecessary to reject them completely**. The alternative to becoming slaves of our own machines is not simply to become their masters. **The goal is to integrate technology within a bounded worldly dwelling no longer ordered by possessive mastery**. The attitude required to free ourselves from possessive mastery and achieve an appropriate relation to technology is **one of awaiting and receiving**, openness and releasement. **Releasement towards things and openness to the mystery grant us the possibility of dwelling in the world in a different way**: a way where the mood of homelessness has been displaced. **Until this occurs, our attempts to control the products of technology will only sustain our subordination to it**. The irony is that the "freedom" that has been nurtured for two and a half millennia in the West has encouraged this technological servitude.

T-Substantial

Interpretation- Substantial means real

Concise Oxford English Dictionary 8

substantial/səb'stanʃl/

►adjective

- 1 of considerable importance, size, or worth.
- strongly built or made.
- important in material or social terms; wealthy.
- 2 concerning the essentials of something.
- 3 **real and tangible rather than imaginary**

Violation– their aff does not make a substantial increase because space exploration & development is a hoax

Cooper, First Class Petty Officer QM1, E-6 with a Top Secret, Q, SI, security clearance, 1997

(William, "Majesty Twelve" Hourofthetime.com, <http://www.hourofthetime.com/majestyt.htm>, accessed: 6/25/, SL)

NASA was created to make interstellar travel believable. The Apollo Space Program foisted the idea that man could travel to, and walk upon, the moon. **Every Apollo mission was carefully rehearsed and then filmed in large sound stages** at the Atomic Energy Commissions Top Secret test site **in the Nevada Desert** and in a secured and guarded sound stage at the Walt Disney Studios within which was a huge scale mock-up of the moon. All of the names, missions, landing sites, and events in the Apollo Space Program echoed the occult metaphors, rituals, and symbology of the Illuminati's secret religion: The most transparent was the faked explosion on the spacecraft Apollo 13, named "Aquarius" (new age) at 1:13 (1313 military time) on April 13, 1970 which was the metaphor for the initiation ceremony involving the death (explosion), placement in the coffin (period of uncertainty of their survival), communion with the spiritual world and the imparting of esoteric knowledge to the candidate (orbit and observation of the moon without physical contact), rebirth of the initiate (solution of problem and repairs), and the raising up (of the Phoenix, the new age of Aquarius) by the grip of the lions paw (reentry and recovery of Apollo 13). 13 is the number of death and rebirth, death and reincarnation, sacrifice, the Phoenix, the Christ (perfected soul imprisoned in matter), and the transition from the old to the new. Another revelation to those who understand the symbolic language of the Illuminati is the hidden meaning of the names of the Space Shuttles, "A Colombian Enterprise to Endeavor for the Discovery of Atlantis... and all Challengers shall be destroyed." **Exploration of the moon stopped because it was impossible to continue the hoax without being ultimately discovered:** And of course they ran out of pre-filmed episodes. No man has ever ascended higher than 300 miles, if that high, above the Earth's surface. No man has ever orbited, landed on, or walked upon the moon in any publicly known space program. If man has ever truly been to the moon it has been done in secret and with a far different technology. **The tremendous radiation encountered in the Van Allen Belt, solar radiation, cosmic radiation, temperature control, and many other problems connected with space travel prevent living organisms leaving our atmosphere with our known level of technology. Any intelligent high school student with a basic physics book can prove NASA faked the Apollo moon landings.**

Earth is flat and covered by a dome

Shenton, president of the Flat Earth Society, 1998 (Daniel, "Why the Earth is Flat," The Flat Earth Society,

http://www.alaska.net/~clund/e_djublonskopf/Flatearthsociety.htm, SL)

Water. Regardless of which train of thought you follow, it covers over seventy-five percent of our planet's surface. And the atmosphere, also a fluid, covers the entire surface. The difference is why. While **flat-Earthers know that the ocean is really just a large bowl, (with great sheets of ice around the edges to hold the ocean back), and the atmosphere is contained by a large dome, the backwards "round-Earth" way of thinking would have you believe that all those trillions of gallons of water and air just "stick" to the planet's surface.**

Voting Issue-Unlimited number of things the aff could make up to do, it's unpredictable and kills all negative ground

Proves the Plan can't be done-vote negative on presumption

India Coop CP

Counterplan: The United States Federal Government should propose to substantially increase its development of the Solar Shield to explore the sun in a Joint Working Group with India. The United States will consistently advocate bilateral cooperation over substantially increasing its development of the Solar Shield to explore the sun in negotiations. The resulting bilateral negotiations should be implemented based on the conclusions of the working group.

Empirically Joint working groups foster cooperation over space – they'll say yes which solves US-Indian relations

Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs 2007 *U.S. governmental agency, press release [<http://newdelhi.usembassy.gov/pro30907.html>, "U.S.-India Joint Working Group on Civil Space Cooperation," February 28th 2007]

Following up on the commitments made under the U.S.-India Next Steps in Strategic Partnership to expand joint work on civil space programs, the Joint Working Group on Civil Space Cooperation (JWG) held its second meeting in Washington, DC, on February 27-28, 2007. Mr. Jeff Miotke, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Science, Space and Health, and Mr. Michael O'Brien, NASA Assistant Administrator for External Relations, led the U.S. delegation, and Dr. R. R. Navalgund, Director, India Space Research Organization (ISRO) Satellite Applications Centre, led the Indian delegation. The Chairmen of the Joint Working Group expressed their satisfaction at the strengthening relationship between the U.S. and India in civil space activities. This relationship is founded on the deep appreciation of each side for the other's achievements and capabilities in the development and application of space technologies, and their conviction that their partnership in civil space is both natural and of mutual benefit. Space activities lead to advances in prosperity, security and knowledge, and they offer a vision of progress that inspires young people around the world. The Chairmen noted that these benefits compel both sides to deepen their cooperation in civil space, and to provide for the widest possible dissemination of the scientific knowledge gained through their efforts in space. The Joint Working Group engaged in a broad range of discussions and endorsed the following conclusions: Space exploration and research will enable dramatic advances in knowledge of the basic nature and dynamics of our planet and the universe around it. Successful international cooperation in space research proceeds from the understanding that scientific information should be shared as widely and quickly as possible to enable its fullest use for research purposes in the interests of the public good. The two sides look forward to India's Chandrayaan-1 lunar mission in March 2008, which will greatly increase our knowledge of Earth's natural satellite. NASA and ISRO have agreed upon cooperative programs for this mission that will further both countries' goals for space exploration, and will set the stage for future cooperation. Space exploration is a source of inspiration and discovery in which many nations of the world have chosen to partake. The U.S. has set for itself a Vision for Space Exploration. NASA has invited opinions from India and other countries to define a strategy that details how Lunar exploration fits into the broader global effort to explore space. Additional opportunities for cooperation exist in the field of space science, including astrophysics, robotic exploration of the solar system, and the investigation of the relationship between the Earth and the Sun. Earth observation data and information yield a broad range of societal benefits. The U.S. and India, through cooperation between their technical agencies, including NOAA, NASA and the USGS for the U.S. and ISRO for India, have embarked upon a number of collaborative activities in the application of Earth observations and look forward to continued collaboration in this area. One area that Earth observations can be applied to is disaster management. The Earth and its inhabitants are vulnerable to long-term processes and sudden events, from climate change to natural disasters, without regard to national boundaries. Space observations play a vital role in developing an understanding of these vulnerabilities and mitigating their consequences. The two sides look forward to future launches of U.S. and Indian satellites that will improve global Earth observations and provide opportunities for further cooperative projects. Plans are being made to establish a ground station in India for the U.S. National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System, and to investigate potential collaboration on medium resolution land-imaging systems. One area for further collaboration is the possible use of Indian Resourcesat data to address expected gaps in data from U.S. Landsat satellites. Additional activities, including collaborations between U.S. and Indian scientists and coordination of observations from U.S. and Indian spacecraft, are under consideration. In addition to bilateral cooperation, international multilateral fora serve as important areas for discussion and policy coordination on a range of issues. These range from the wide-ranging deliberations of the Group on Earth Observations and the Committee on Earth Observation Satellites, to specialized forums on spacecraft standards and protocols, to avenues for coordination and planning for space missions and scientific research. Continued progress is being made in promoting interoperability among existing and future U.S. and Indian civil space based positioning, navigation, and timing systems to create a Global Navigation Satellite System (GNSS). A joint statement detailing areas for future joint work in GNSS was adopted by the JWG. The two sides exchanged information on a range of space and other policy issues and noted the ongoing efforts to conclude new bilateral agreements designed to open up new opportunities for cooperation. At the end of the session, the JWG received information from U.S. and Indian commercial groups on ways and means to promote commercial ties in the space sector. In order to strengthen the relationship between the U.S. and India in civil space cooperation, the Joint Working Group continues to serve as a useful mechanism to endorse proposals for enhanced cooperation, promote understanding of government policies and procedures, and facilitate

collaboration by addressing issues promptly. The two delegations have identified the next steps that need to be taken by each side and have agreed that the next meeting will take place in India in early 2008.

Relations solve nuclear war

Dugger 02, (Celia W., journalist, "Wider Military Ties with India Offer U.S. Diplomatic Leverage," THE NEW YORK TIMES, June 10, 2002, p. A1, LN)

Military cooperation between India and the United States has remarkably quickened since Sept. 11, with a burst of navy, air force and army joint exercises, the revival of American military sales to India and a blur of high-level visits by generals and admirals. The fledgling relationship between American and Indian military leaders will be important to Mr. Rumsfeld in talks intended to put to rest fears of war between India and Pakistan. "We can hope **this translates into some influence and trust, though I don't want to overstate it**," a senior American defense official said in an interview on Thursday. "I don't want to predict this guarantees success." **The American diplomatic efforts yielded their first real gains** on Saturday when India welcomed a pledge by Pakistan's military ruler to stop permanently the infiltration of militants into Kashmir. **India indicated that it would soon take steps to reduce tensions**, but a million troops are still fully mobilized along the border -- a situation likely to persist for months -- and the process of resolving the crisis has just begun. India has linked the killing of civilians in Kashmir to a Pakistan-backed insurgency there and has presented its confrontation with Pakistan as part of the global campaign against terrorism. India itself made an unstinting offer of support to the United States after Sept. 11, and Washington responded by ending the sanctions placed on India after its 1998 nuclear tests. With that, **the estrangement that prevailed between the world's two largest democracies during the cold war**, when India drew close to the Soviet Union and the United States allied with Pakistan, has eased. India, for decades a champion of nonalignment, **seeks warmer ties with the United States in hopes of gaining access to sophisticated military technology** and help in dealing with Pakistan. From the start of President Bush's term, some influential officials in his administration **saw India as a potential counterweight to that other Asian behemoth, China**, whose growing power was seen as a potential strategic threat. But since Sept. 11, the priority has been terrorism. **The United States is hoping its deeper military and political ties with India will give it some measure of leverage to prevent a war between India and Pakistan that could lead to a nuclear holocaust and would play havoc with the hunt for Al Qaeda in Pakistan**. The military relationship has certainly accelerated in recent months. "We've moved from crawling to walking and we're preparing to run," said an American military official. American warships have been docking in the Indian cities of Bombay, Cochin and Madras. The first major sale of military equipment to India -- \$140 million of artillery-finding radar made by Raytheon -- has been approved by Congress. Aircraft engines, submarine combat systems and helicopter parts are in the pipeline. In the largest-ever joint ground and air operations, American and Indian paratroopers jumped last month from the same aircraft over the city of Agra. Later this year, for the first time, Indian troops will venture to the United States for exercises in Alaska. American and Indian naval ships are jointly patrolling the Strait of Malacca to protect commercial shipping, while the number of Indian military officers training in the United States has jumped to 150 this year from 25 in 1998. A parade of military brass has been marching through each other's capitals. "The current level of military to military cooperation between our nations is unprecedented," Gen. Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said upon arriving in New Delhi in February.

Time Cube Spec

Interpretation- the earth is a 4-sided time cube- the plan has to specify which side the plan passes on and is done in

Ray, No Date [Dr. Gene, Cubic and Wisest Human. "Time Cube." www.timecube.com

you realize that a 4 corner square rotating 1/4 turn creates a full circle? A full rotated square will create 16 corners, 96 hours and 4 simultaneous 24 hour Day circles within only a single imaginary cubed Earth rotation. This amounts to a spiraling quad helix of Earth as it revolves around the Sun - rotating as it revolves around the Sun, to induce the value of the Sun revolving about the Earth.

B. Violation- they fail to specify what side the plan passes on

2. Ground - I lose links to side-specific DAs and counterplans

D. Voting issue

Decision-rule

Ray, No Date [Same citation as above]

EVERY HUMAN DESERVES DEATH FOR IGNORING SUCH A SUPERNATURAL TRANSCENDENTAL PRINCIPLE.

Intrinsincness

The 1AC is not intrinsic to the affirmative, because other people could propose the same Plan and say it. They solve, not a reason to vote aff-vote neg on presumption

Paperless Theory

The affirmative failed to present me with paper copies of their evidence to make sure it's real.
Reject them- no way to know if there's any proof for their aff.

Voting issue for ethics- lieing destroys debate

At worst reject their evidence and vote neg on presumption

Discourse PIC

Counterplan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its development of the Solar Shield to explore the sun without trivializing the holocaust.

Offsets CP

Counterplan: The United States federal government should shift resources to substantially increase its development of the Solar Shield to explore the sun.

Vote neg on presumption-presumption goes towards least change so we risk the least

Increase means net increase

Words and Phrases, 5 (Cummulative Supplementary Pamphlet, v. 20a, p.295)

Cal.App.2 Dist. 1991. Term “increase,” as used in statute giving the Energy Commission modification jurisdiction over any alteration, replacement, or improvement of equipment that results in “increase” of 50 megawatts or more in electric generating capacity of existing thermal power plant, refers to “net increase” in power plant’s total generating capacity; in deciding whether there has been the requisite 50-megawatt increase as a result of new units being incorporated into a plant, Energy Commission cannot ignore decreases in capacity caused by retirement or deactivation of other units at plant. West’s Ann.Cal.Pub.Res.Code § 25123.

Best for ground- key to getting politics and spending links, not spending money means the aff could spike out of all disads

Most predictable- USFG always spends money on new policies

Counter-Advocacy

said In Scottish Accent

Water shortages will cause global nuclear war

Weiner 90

Jonathan Weiner Professor of Molecular Biology @ Princeton University, **1990**. The Next 100 Years: Shaping the Fate of our Living Earth p.214

If we do not destroy ourselves with the A-bomb and the H-bomb, then we may destroy ourselves with the C-bomb, the change bomb. And in a world as interlinked as ours, one explosion may lead to the other. Already in the Middle East, from Northern Africa to the Persian Gulf and from the Nile to the Euphrates, tensions over dwindling water supplies and rising populations are reaching what many experts describe as a flashpoint. A climate shift in that single battle-scarred nexus might trigger international tensions that will unleash some of the 60,000 nuclear warheads the world has stockpiled since Trinity.

said In Pretentious voice

Plan Text: The United States federal government should substantially increase its development of the Solar Shield to explore the sun.

said In British accent

A. Even if solar storms don't damage satellites, attempted mitigation in the sun still triggers our impacts

Ulery 10/1

Solar Storms Blamed for Spotty GPS Signals By Joe Ulery (julery@wibc.com) 10/1/2011 <http://www.wibc.com/news/Story.aspx?ID=1547464>

To spare satellites from major damage, sometimes they are rotated to put the back of the satellite into the line of the storms, but that causes a weaker signal getting to Earth. Holcomb says we usually get about 60 storms during a regular solar cycle...which last eleven years. But he says we are approaching that maximum right now, and the cycle is not over.

said In normal voice

One. Solar Shields 1.5 Million Dollar Funding has been cut

EII 10

Euromoney Institutional Investor PLC, November 15, 2010, NASA Tries To Prep Grid For Solar Storms, Lexis Nexis

A unit of NASA has teamed up with the Electric Power Research Institute on an initiative to protect the U.S. power grid from solar storms activity that could damage the grid--not generate power. Solar Shield monitors solar eruptions on the sun's surface that emit ionized gas that can wreak havoc on the magnetic field and high voltage transmission systems. Solar Shield could give about two days notice about the impacts of a specific solar storm that would give utility operators time to prepare, says Antti Pulkkinen, project leader of Solar Shield at NASA in Greenbelt, Md., and associate researcher at Catholic University of America. The sun has an 11-year solar cycle with peaks and valleys and "right now are starting to climb away from the solar minimum," he says. Similar to a hurricane season--in which storms are likely not guaranteed--the next solar maximum is slated for 2014 when one or two storms could occur. Currently Solar Shield is working with two nodes in the "northern part of the program," says Pulkkinen. He declined to give their exact locations--that's classified. The team wants to bring in more nodes from across the country before the cycle is at its next peak. Power transformer systems can be shorted and, in the worst cases, equipment melted. In 1989, a solar storm hit the Hydro-Quebec grid, knocking out power to the province for nine hours. The initial phase of the experimental program ended in April when its \$1.5 million funding from NASA ended. They are currently working with another government agency about a similar amount to expand, he says. Again, details are classified.

Lacan K

The affirmative's utopian vision of a peaceful global community will be impossible to realize—necessitating the scapegoating and elimination of the other. Lacanian political intervention is the only way out.

Stavrakakis, 99 (Yannis, *Lacan and the Political*, Visiting Professor, Department of Government, University of Essex, pages 99-100).

Our age is clearly an age of social fragmentation, political disenchantment and open cynicism characterised by the decline of the political mutations of modern universalism—a universalism that, by replacing God with Reason, reoccupied the ground of a pre-modern aspiration to fully represent and master the essence and the totality of the real. On the political level this universalist fantasy took the form of a series of utopian constructions of a reconciled future society. The fragmentation of our present social terrain and cultural milieu entails the collapse of such grandiose fantasies.¹ Today, talk about utopia is usually characterised by a certain ambiguity. For some, of course, utopian constructions are still seen as positive results of human creativity in the socio-political sphere: 'utopia is the expression of a desire for a better way of being' (Levitas, 1990:8). Other, more suspicious views, such as the one expressed in Marie Berneri's book *Journey through Utopia*, warn—taking into account experiences like the Second World War—of the dangers entailed in trusting the idea of a perfect, ordered and regimented world. For some, instead of being 'how can we realise our utopias?', the crucial question has become 'how can we prevent their final realisation?.... [How can] we return to a non-utopian society, less perfect and more free' (Berdiaev in Berneri, 1971:309).² It is particularly the political experience of these last decades that led to the dislocation of utopian sensibilities and brought to the fore a novel appreciation of human finitude, together with a growing suspicion of all grandiose political projects and the meta-narratives traditionally associated with them (Whitebook, 1995:75). All these developments, that is to say the crisis of the utopian imaginary, seem however to leave politics without its prime motivating force: the politics of today is a politics of aporia. In our current political terrain, hope seems to be replaced by pessimism or even resignation. This is a result of the crisis in the dominant modality of our political imagination (meaning utopianism in its various forms) and of our inability to resolve this crisis in a productive way.³ In this chapter, I will try to show that Lacanian theory provides new angles through which we can reflect on our historical experience of utopia and reorient our political imagination beyond its suffocating strait-jacket.

Let's start our exploration with the most elementary of questions: what is the meaning of the current crisis of utopia? And is this crisis a development to be regretted or cherished?

In order to answer these questions it is crucial to enumerate the conditions of possibility and the basic characteristics of utopian thinking. First of all it seems that the need for utopian meaning arises in periods of increased uncertainty, social instability and conflict, when the element of the political subverts the fantasmatic stability of our political reality. Utopias are generated by the surfacing of grave antagonisms and dislocations in the social field.

As Tillich has put it 'all utopias strive to negate the negative...in human existence; it is the negative in that existence which makes the idea of utopia necessary' (Tillich in Levitas, 1990:103). Utopia then is one of the possible responses to the ever-present negativity, to the real antagonism which is constitutive of human experience. Furthermore, from the time of More's *Utopia* (1516) it is conceived as an answer to the negativity inherent in concrete political antagonism. What is, however, the exact nature of this response? Utopias are images of future human communities in which these antagonisms and the dislocations fuelling them (the element of the political) will be forever resolved, leading to a reconciled and harmonious world—it is not a coincidence that, among others, Fourier names his utopian community 'Harmony' and that the name of the Owenite utopian community in the New World was 'New Harmony'. As Marin has put it, utopia sets in view an imaginary resolution to social contradiction; it is a simulacrum of synthesis which dissimulates social antagonism by projecting it onto a screen representing a harmonious and immobile equilibrium (Marin, 1984:61). This final resolution is the essence of the utopian promise.

What I will try to do in this chapter is, first of all, to demonstrate the deeply problematic nature of utopian politics. Simply put, my argument will be that every utopian fantasy construction needs a 'scapegoat' in order to constitute itself—the Nazi utopian fantasy and the production of the 'Jew' is a good example, especially as pointed out in Žižek's analysis.⁴ Every utopian fantasy produces its reverse and calls for its elimination. Put another way, the beatific side of fantasy is coupled in utopian constructions with a horrific side, a paranoid need for a stigmatised scapegoat. The naivety—and also the danger—of utopian structures is revealed when the

realisation of this fantasy is attempted. It is then that we are brought close to the frightening kernel of the real: stigmatisation is followed by extermination. This is not an accident. It is inscribed in the structure of utopian constructions; it seems to be the way all fantasy constructions work. If in almost all utopian visions, violence and antagonism are eliminated, if utopia is based on the expulsion and repression of violence (this is its beatific side) this is only because it owes its own creation to violence; it is sustained and fed by violence (this is its horrific side). This repressed moment of violence resurfaces, as Marin points out, in the difference inscribed in the name utopia itself (Marin, 1984:110). What we shall argue is that it also resurfaces in the production of the figure of an enemy. To use a phrase enunciated by the utopianist Fourier, what is 'driven out through the door comes back through the window' (is not this a 'precursor' of Lacan's *dictum* that 'What is foreclosed in the symbolic reappears in the real'?—VII:131).5 The work of Norman Cohn and other historians permits the articulation of a genealogy of this manichean, equivalential way of understanding the world, from the great witch-hunt up to modern anti-Semitism, and Lacanian theory can provide valuable insights into any attempt to understand the logic behind this utopian operation—here the approach to fantasy developed in Chapter 2 will further demonstrate its potential in analysing our political experience. In fact, from the time of his unpublished seminar on *The Formations of the Unconscious*, Lacan identified the utopian dream of a perfectly functioning society as a highly problematic area (seminar of 18 June 1958).

Vote negative to interrogate the cycle of enmity produced by their scenarios for conflict---rejection is key to breaking down the psychological foundations that make war inevitable

Byles 3 (Joanna Montgomery, prof of English @ the Univ of Cyprus, *Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society* 8.2 (2003) 208-213, Psychoanalysis and War: The Superego and Projective Identification).

It is here of course that language plays an important role in imagining the other, the other within the self, and the other as self, as well as the enormously influential visual images each group can have of the other. In the need to emphasize similarity in difference, both verbal and visual metaphor can play a meaningful role in creating a climate for peaceful understanding, and this is where literature, especially the social world of the drama and of film, but also the more private world of poetry, can be immensely significant. Of course not all literature is equally transparent.

In conclusion, war, in all its manifestations, is a phenomenon put into action by individuals who have been politicized as a group to give and receive violent death, to appropriate the enemy's land, homes, women, children, and goods, and perhaps to lose their own. As we have seen, in wartime the splitting of the self and other into friend and enemy enormously relieves the normal psychic tension caused by human ambivalence when love and hate find two separate objects of attention. Hence the soldier's and terrorist's willingness to sacrifice her/his life for "a just cause," which may be a Nation, a Group, or a Leader with whom he has close emotional ties and identity. In this way s/he does not feel guilty: the destructive impulses, mobilised by her/his own superego, together with that of the social superego, have projected the guilt s/he might feel at killing strangers onto the enemy. In other words, the charging of the enemy with guilt by which the superego of the State mobilizes the individual's superego seems to be of fundamental importance in escaping the sense of guilt which war provokes in those engaged in the killing; yet the mobilization of superego activities can still involve the individual's self-punitive mechanisms, even though most of his/her guilt has been projected onto the enemy in the name of his own civilization and culture. As we all know, this guilt can become a problem at the end of a war, leading to varying degrees of misery and mental illness. For some, the killing of an enemy and a stranger cannot be truly mourned, and there remains a blank space, an irretrievable act or event to be lived through over and over again. This dilemma is poignantly expressed in Wilfred Owen's World War One poem "Strange Meeting" the final lines of which read as follows: I am the enemy you killed, my friend. I knew you in this dark: for so you frowned Yesterday through me as you jabbed and killed. I parried; but my hands were loath and cold. Let us sleep now. ... (Owen 126)

The problem for us today is how to create the psychological climate of opinion, a mentality, that will reject war, genocide, and terrorism as viable solutions to internal and external situations of conflict; to recognize our projections for what they are: dangerously irresponsible psychic acts based on superego hatred and violence. We must

challenge the way in which the State superego can manipulate our responses in its own interests, even take away our subjectivities. We should acknowledge and learn to displace the violence in ourselves in socially harmless ways, getting rid of our fears and anxieties of the other and of difference by relating and identifying with the other and thus creating the serious desire to live together in a peaceful world. What seems to be needed is for the superego to regain its developmental role of mitigating omniscient protective identification by ensuring an intact, integrated object world, a world that will be able to contain unconscious fears, hatred, and anxieties without the need for splitting and projection. As Bion has pointed out, omnipotence replaces thinking and omniscience replaces learning. We must learn to link our internal and external worlds so as to act as a container of the other's fears and anxieties, and thus in turn to encourage the other to reciprocate as a container of our hatreds and fears.

If war represents cultural formations that in turn represent objectifications of the psyche via the super-ego of the individual and of the State, then perhaps we can reformulate these psychic social mechanisms of projection and superego aggression. Here, that old peace-time ego and the reparative component of the individual and State superego will have to play a large part. The greater the clash of cultural formations for example, Western Modernism and Islamic Fundamentalism the more urgent the need. "The knowledge now most worth having" is an authentic way of internalizing what it is we understand about war and international terrorism that will liberate us from the history of our collective traumatic past and the imperatives it has imposed on us. The inner psychic world of the individual has an enormously important adaptive role to play here in developing mechanisms of protective identification not as a means of damaging and destroying the other, but as a means of empathy, of containing the other, and in turn being contained. These changes may be evolutionary rather than revolutionary, gradual rather than speedy. Peace and dare I say it contentment are not just an absence of war, but a state of mind.

Furthermore, we should learn not to project too much into our group, and our nation, for this allows the group to tyrannize us, so that we follow like lost sheep. But speaking our minds takes courage because groups do not like open dissenters. These radical psychic changes may be evolutionary rather than revolutionary, gradual rather than speedy; however, my proposition that Understanding the other so that we can reduce her/his motivation to kill requires urgent action.

Peace is not just an absence of war, but a state of mind and, most importantly, a way of thinking.

Normativity K

Traditional debate, or normative legal thought, functions without real-world political application; solvency that exists on the flow fails to translate to reality

Pierre Schlag [Professor of Law @ Univ. Colorado, J.D., UCLA School of Law; B.A., Yale College], "Laying Down the Law: Mysticism, Fetishism, and the American Legal Mind", Pages 28-29, Chapter: "The Top 10", Section: "#6. Post-Modernist Shadow Boxing", Publisher: NYU Press, October 1, 1998, ISBN-10: 0814780547, ISBN-13: 978-0814780541, italics in original (HEG)

In fact, normative legal thought is so much in a hurry that it will tell you what to do even though there is not the slightest chance that you might actually be in a position to do it. For instance, when was the last time you were in a position to put John Rawls's difference principle⁹ into effect, or to restructure the doctrinal corpus of the first amendment? "In the future we should . . ." When was the last time you were in a position to rule whether judges should become pragmatists, efficiency purveyors, civic republicans, or Hercules surrogates? Normative legal thought doesn't seem overly concerned with such worldly questions about the character and the effectiveness of its own discourse. It just goes along and proposes, recommends, prescribes, solves, and resolves. Yet despite its obvious desire to have worldly effects, worldly consequences, normative legal thought remains seemingly unconcerned that for all practical purposes, its only consumers are legal academics and perhaps a few law students -- persons who are virtually never in a position to put any of its wonderful normative advice into effect. The possibility that a significant number of judges might actually be reading significant quantities of this academic literature is undemonstrated and unlikely. The further possibility that judges might actually be persuaded by this academic literature to adopt a position not their own is even more undemonstrated and even more unlikely.¹⁰

Traditional debate desensitizes us to the suffering of others; rather than proving a framework for activism, this speculative mindset of "fiat" only rewards oppression and suffering of others.

Gordon R. Mitchell [Professor of Communications @ Univ. of Pittsburgh. An NDT top speaker now coaches debate at the University of Pittsburgh], "PEDAGOGICAL POSSIBILITIES FOR ARGUMENTATIVE AGENCY IN ACADEMIC DEBATE", Page 3, Argumentation & Advocacy, Vol. 35 Issue 2, Page 43, 1998 (HEG)

The sense of detachment associated with the spectator posture is highlighted during episodes of alienation in which debaters cheer news of human suffering or misfortune. Instead of focusing on the visceral negative responses to news accounts of human death and misery, debaters overcome with the competitive zeal of contest round competition show a tendency to concentrate on the meanings that such evidence might hold for the strength of their academic debate arguments. For example, news reports of mass starvation might tidy up the "uniqueness of a disadvantage" or bolster the "inherency of an affirmative case" (in the technical parlance of debate-speak). Murchland categorizes cultivation of this "spectator" mentality as one of the most politically debilitating failures of contemporary education: "Educational institutions have failed even more grievously to provide the kind of civic forums we need. In fact, one could easily conclude that the principle purposes of our schools is to deprive successor generations of their civic voice, to turn them into mute and uncomprehending spectators in the drama of political life" (1991, p. 8).

Re-conceptualizing debate as a forum for political action allows us to actively shape reality, breaking from the regression of hypothetical discourse. Giving debaters the burden of linking solvency to out-of-round actions avoids normative implications by providing a tool for interacting with the outside world. This argumentative agency paradigm empowers debaters as political agents more effectively than imaginary "fiat"

Gordon R. Mitchell [Professor of Communications @ Univ. of Pittsburgh. An NDT top speaker now coaches debate at the University of Pittsburgh], "PEDAGOGICAL POSSIBILITIES FOR ARGUMENTATIVE AGENCY IN ACADEMIC DEBATE", Pages 4-5, Argumentation & Advocacy, Vol. 35 Issue 2, Page 44-45, 1998 (HEG)

ARGUMENTATIVE AGENCY In basic terms the notion of argumentative agency involves the capacity to contextualize and employ the skills and strategies of argumentative discourse in fields of social action, especially wider spheres of public deliberation. Pursuit of argumentative agency charges academic work with

democratic energy by linking teachers and students with civic organizations, social movements, citizens and other actors engaged in live public controversies beyond the schoolyard walls. As a bridging concept, argumentative agency links decontextualized argumentation skills such as research, listening, analysis, refutation and presentation, to the broader political telos of democratic empowerment. Argumentative agency fills gaps left in purely simulation-based models of argumentation by focusing pedagogical energies on strategies for utilizing argumentation as a driver of progressive social change. Moving beyond an exclusively skill-oriented curriculum, teachers and students pursuing argumentative agency seek to put argumentative tools to the test by employing them in situations beyond the space of the classroom. This approach draws from the work of Kincheloe (1991), who suggests that through "critical constructivist action research," students and teachers cultivate their own senses of agency and work to transform the world around them.