#### CONTENT WARNING: The video depicts CGI renderings of war from the video game *Metal Gear Solid 4: Guns of the Patriots*, however, the video will not be displayed in round, only the audio.

# 1AC – Metal Gear Solid



<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bVIQAl9hSus> (0:05 – 1:40)

**Transcript:** *"War... has changed. It's no longer about nations, ideologies, or ethnicity. It's an endless series of proxy battles fought by mercenaries and machines. War, and its consumption of life, has become a well-oiled machine.*[*War has changed*](https://tvtropes.org/pmwiki/pmwiki.php/Main/ArcWords)*. ID-tagged soldiers carry ID-tagged weapons, use ID-tagged gear. Nano-machines inside their bodies enhance and regulate their abilities. Genetic control, information control, emotion control... battlefield control. Everything is monitored and kept under control. War - has changed. The age of deterrence has become the age of control. All in the name of averting catastrophe from Weapons of Mass Destruction. And he who controls the battlefield, controls history. War has changed... When the battlefield is under total control, war becomes routine."*

— Solid "Old" Snake

#### Are you disturbed? You should be. Welcome to the world of Metal Gear Solid, a fantastically ominous 20th century video game featuring our narrator, Solid Snake, trapped in the acceleration of the war economy. From cyborgs, to nanomachines, to bipedal nuclear tanks, his world is very different from ours. In both this world and that of Metal Gear, civilians and politicians back military aid to authoritarian regimes because they are isolated from the true nature of war. The culture of mass media distortion coupled with the routineness of battle oversaturates the world with violence and desensitizes the masses to the atrocities committed by the war machine.

**Thomsen 18** [Thomsen, Dane. “Metal Gear Solid Analysis: The Proxy Trilogy.” *Script Routine*, 26 Oct. 2018, scriptroutine.com/metal-gear-solid-analysis-the-proxy-trilogy/. Videogames, Analysis, and Design] // JG

Solid Snake narrates the state of the world that opens Metal Gear Solid 4, his weary, grizzled voice telling us how war has changed as a shipment of rebels arrives in a PMC controlled part of the Middle East. **The battlefield has evolved into a system in which all action is monitored, analyzed, and controlled**, where the **human element of combat has been reduced to the point where it’s facilitated a**n amoral **war machine endlessly consuming life**. As a hooded Solid Snake jumps off the truck, we see a wrinkled face and grey hair. Snake has been many things, had many faces, but now he’s Old. In typical Kojima style, the metaphor stands on half a dozen levels, but it’s an important close for the theme of the series thus far. Because the Les Enfants Terribles project collected DNA from a middle-aged Big Boss, the clones are afflicted with advanced aging, with a remaining life expectancy of a year. We also discover a new cinematic device that is as simple as deep, flashing still shots from the previous games to contextualize the unfolding situation. In addition to acting as contextual references, these ‘memories’ add characterization for Snake, an old man remembering his life when confronted with the imminence of his death. But if you realize that these events made him the man he is today, cultivating in him a sense of intuition based on his experience and instinctual nature, then they helped make him into a great soldier. For the fight ahead, he’s going to need to be. **The war economy was the product of the conflict between weapons control system SOP and the advent of Private Military Companies.** In MGS2, soldier’s **weapons were fitted with ID tags that** would **only operate for the right owner and SOP turned it into a** ubiquitous **military** system, a societal **alternative to the** Cold War’s **strategy of mutual deterrence**. At the same time, **PMC’s**, elite rentable armies that **can be mobilized globally free of government and ideology**, **have become so common that the biggest rivals** even **the United States military**. This multinational corporation, resurrecting the Outer Heaven brand, is run by the four members of the Beauty and the Beast Unit, executives under their CEO Liquid Ocelot, the body of Revolver Ocelot completely overrun by the Liquid Snake persona. Through its gameplay, **MGS**2 **explored** [how mechanisms in **the social structure**](https://scriptroutine.wordpress.com/2014/11/23/metal-gear-solid-2-and-mass-producing-solid-snake/) can shape behaviors **of the population. By shifting and constricting** the range of **beliefs and thoughts an individual was allowed to have, the politics of the group would be molded.** In a similar fashion, MGS4 uses the combination of the ID system with **the PMC’s** to **create a self-enslaving war machine**, as **the only defense against the violent system was to** voluntarily **enter it**. When Snake finally tracks down Liquid, it’s in time to witness his first offensive against SOP. The result is chaos, with every soldier unleashing unrestrained emotion, laughing, raging, crying, and screaming. **Soldier’s nanomachines had been numbing them to the reality of their violence**, making them better warriors **through apathy**. As is often the reaction to regulation, a black market emerged allowing repurposed weapons to have their tags laundered. The first time we see the four members of the B&B, they have slaughtered a squadron of rebels, leaving in their wake a corridor of bodies and their guns shining like gold. There’s an undeniably dark cynicism in this scene and how **the war economy values weapons more than human life** but it shows how heroes have little choice but to become outlaw scavengers in order to fight back. When Snake makes contact with resistance forces under Big Mama, he finally meets Eva, who had been the surrogate mother for the Les Enfants Terribles project. She tells Snake how after The Boss died, **Major Zero** obtained the rest of the Philosophers Legacy, and with Big Boss, Ocelot, Sigint and Paramedic, formed the Patriots to make her ideals of a united world free of borders a reality. When the organization collapsed in disagreement on the interpretation of those ideals, Big Boss and Zero went to war, each believing they had the answer. One **decided to build a nation that would** provoke endless conflict, while the other chose to implement **invisible controls in the fabric of society to guide actions and beliefs.** The theme of transformation has been present since Old Snake’s reveal, but is explored with almost every character. Look at The Beauty and the Beast Unit; Laughing Octopus, Raging Raven, Crying Wolf, and Screaming Mantis, women ruled by the very emotions SOP was meant to curtail, each turned into animals by a horrific past, their mechanical exoskeletons juxtaposing the young, beautiful figures inside. A different but equally significant change happened with Raiden, utilizing the same technology to become the most advanced Cyborg Ninja yet, his organic parts replaced by implants and chrome. This is what **the war economy** does- it **strips people of their humanity and turns them into monsters**. The balance maintained between the two forces completely topples at the mid act two flip. In the background of **the first half** is a progression that **covers a** complete **military takeover** of invasion, subjugation, and occupation, instilling the fear that **every nation is being conquered systematically**. The concern turns real when Liquid finally hijacks SOP, locking down every modern gun save his own which he aims at the defenseless United Nations forces that have rallied to oppose him. The turn of events exposes the very real danger of centralizing power and puts the freedom of the entire world at stake. A second progression had begun to form in act three but was initiated before. There were many familiar characteristics about Laughing Octopus beside just sharing the codename with the FOX-HOUND agent- her tentacles and gun are similar to Solidus armaments and her elated laughter during combat are reminiscent of The Joy. The sense of déjà vu is reinforced in the 60’s era spy aesthetic of the third act and the motorcycle chase with Eva that harkens back to the Shagohod fight in Snake Eater. While it gives the strong appearance of going through a greatest hits remix of the series events, it’s more importantly about Snake reliving his past. Memories are the representation of a person’s history. The return to Shadow Moses to claim Rex’s pre-ID tagged railgun opens with a perfectly emulated version of the helipad from the Playstation’s original Metal Gear Solid in all its 32-bit glory. When Snake wakes from his dream, he’s being air dropped at the outskirts of the Alaskan military base rendered in hi-def on the PS3 hardware. Over the course of the decade between the two games, everything has changed. More than simply being commentary on the reliability of memories, it’s a sharp lesson on technological obsolescence and the march of time. But the steel beams of Shadow Moses have rusted over; it’s once state of the art systems woefully out of date. As MGS explored the concept of genetic manipulation, [it was implicitly aided by the Playstation’s tech](https://scriptroutine.com/2018/10/24/the-snakes-blueprint-an-analysis-of-metal-gear-solids-dna/) and the polygons that allowed for greater versatility than the 2D sprites it had relied on thus far. MGS4 contrasts the hardware powering these games to show how Solid Snake, and arguably the place that made him famous, are now cultural relics. By running Snake through his memories, the game is reminding you of the path that led you here and telling you it’s impossible to turn back. So far, each entry in the series has used its enemy squad as an element of the theme that must be defeated before Snake can tackle the final leader and complete his mission, and the design continues here, albeit in a different way. Every member of the B&B is a combination of the enemies from each of the previous games, creating an amalgamation of the threats ingrained in Snake’s memory. In a real sense, he is fighting his past. **Snake is fighting a war of proxy agents indirectly exerting their will over the population by strangling individual liberty.** In loose terms, a proxy is an agent that stands in and acts on another’s behalf, an example being a soldier fighting on behalf of a government. On a societal level, the Patriot A.I.s are proxies for Major Zero’s social structures as Liquid’s PMC’s are trying to realize Big Boss’ dream of a world united by battle. On an individual level, a person is a proxy for the components of biology, culture, and experience that shaped them. By unshackling himself from his past, **Snake is becoming free to oppose a social system that wants to control everyone**. With the executive level of Liquid’s corporation dismantled, Snake enters the final battle staged atop Outer Haven, the massive cruiser that contains the A.I. net that the old Russian had seized. Having infected the system with the anti-virus Fox-Alive, Solid Snake turned to his old nemesis and the final showdown their lives had culminated in. Punch for punch, the two old men waged their personal war. The one that would walk away triumphant was the one that had the will to change, to let go. Just as genes perish, memes are forgotten, and The Times change, bodies die, culture is displaced, and the river of history flows on. By looking back on his life, Solid Snake was not only able to find peace, but closure. And yet, as he still lives, so will his genes. Standing among the graves of fallen patriots, he reunites at last with Big Boss, a senile Zero in tow. And after taking Zero, Death came to collect Solid Snake, but was fooled when Big Boss stepped forward in his place, becoming his sons proxy in death to eradicate his destructive lineage, atoning for own his sins in the process. As the closing of the Solid Snake arc, Guns of the Patriots is about taking hold of the freedoms that allow you to be the person you want to be. And so, the hero Solid Snake sheds his codename so that the man named David can create new memories free of battle, with the time he has left.

#### In the Metal Gear Universe, the regime that started it all was Zanzibar Land. Being a military regime in central Asia, it used it’s position in the world to hide its resources and garner military aid from many Western countries, leading to its stockpiling of the Metal Gear.

**Morrissey** [Morrissey, Grant Alan. “A Complete Plot Summary & Analysis of The Metal Gear Series.” Junker HQ, http://junkerhq.net/MGS2/metal\_gear\_solid\_plot.txt] // JG

1999, **the world was facing** an energy **crisis**. It was obvious that the petroleum would run out faster than what was expected. However, the development of an alternative energy resource is far from completion. The price of petroleum has skyrocketed and the world economy in confusion. **The 21st century was** expected to be **one of chaos**. One man’s invention changed the entire situation. A Czech genius and biologist, Dr. Kio Marv, invented OILIX, a microorganism that refines petroleum to product a highly purified form of petroleum. The world was filled with hope upon the discovery of this messiah to solve the energy crisis, but at the same time the world entered a time of tension regarding this new alga. Just when the whole world’s attention was drawn to OILIX and Dr. Marv, he was abducted by someone and disappeared. Nations begun investigations immediately and a name soon appeared...'Zanzibar Land'... **Zanzibar Land was a** democratic **military regime that** suddenly **appeared in central Asia** in 1997. When their uprising took place, the CIS Army, formed around Russia, sent in a suppressive unit immediately. Zanzibar Land resisted by gathering a band of Mercenaries from nations around the world and fortifying most of its land. As a result, the CIS Army was repeatedly defeated, and Zanzibar Land declared its independence. Due to the active role mercenaries played, this war was called the 'mercenaries war' and Zanzibar Land was referred to as an armed fortress nation. **A military nation with a group of strong mercenaries, surrounded by a tough fortress**. According to the latest information, **Zanzibar** supposedly **was armed with Nuclear Weapons**. **The whole scenario was crystal clear. By obtaining OILIX in addition to nuclear weapons, Zanzibar Land was trying to establish its economic and military superiority over the entire world.** Concerned about the situation, the United States of America ordered Roy Campbell, Commander-in-Chief of high-tech special forces unit FOX-HOUND, to rescue Dr. Marv. Campbell was a former member of FOX-HOUND. He brought back **Solid Snake**, the man who single handedly **brought down the armed fortress nation of Outer Heaven** 4 years ago, and asked Snake to bring back Dr. Marv and OILIX. Successfully infiltrating Zanzibar Land and with help from CIA agent Horry and others, Snake was able to go deep into the fortress and meet again with Dr. Pettrovich, **the chief engineer of Metal Gear** from Outer Heaven. He too **was abducted** to Zanzibar Land **and forced to develop another Metal Gear**. He told to surprised Snake an even more shocking fact. Big Boss, the man Snake had defeated at Outer Heaven, turned out to be the General Commander of Zanzibar Land.

#### This is emblematic of Metal Gear Solid’s most deadly structure. Private Military Companies become the functional authoritarian regimes of the world since they control the direction of the global war economy, are motivated by solely profit, are liable to no one but their capitalist overlords, and manipulate their standing armies using nanomachines to quell resistance and control the emotional capacities of their soldiers. This form of authoritarian control is what the war economy drives it self on: the totalitarian consumption of life and all of its meaning.

**Iovanovici** [Iovanovici, Zoran. “Analysis: What Metal Gear Solid 4 Teaches Us About the War Economy.” *Gamasutra Article*, [www.gamasutra.com/view/news/120475/Analysis\_What\_Metal\_Gear\_Solid\_4\_Teaches\_Us\_About\_the\_War\_Economy.php](http://www.gamasutra.com/view/news/120475/Analysis_What_Metal_Gear_Solid_4_Teaches_Us_About_the_War_Economy.php).] // JG

Far from being eliminated at the conclusion of MGS2, the influence of **The Patriots resurface**s **as an even greater threat** in MGS4 in the form of The System. **The System is** not simply a term used to define a hypothetical collection of political, social, or economic institutions; it is a tangible cluster of AI (artificial-intelligence) supercomputers **developed** by The Patriots **to oversee and maintain the financial, political, and social stability of the United States from behind the scenes.** At some point between the events of MGS2 and MGS4, The Systems influence became so great that it began to have an impact on politics, technological development, and the global economy. At the very heart of **The Systems dominance is the establishment of the** games **war economy. The war economy in MGS**4 **is composed of many layers including the PMCs** **(private military companies)** **and soldiers that make up the majority of the worlds standing forces** along with the laws that regulate and keep the PMCs at center of economic stability. More importantly, **The System controls the entire weapons market from production to distribution to actual end-use. This control over the global economy is essentially what gives The System total global control.** The most important factor as it applies to gameplay in MGS4 is The Systems applied proliferation of ID locked weapons. In previous MGS games, players could acquire and procure weapons and ammunition from downed opponents or random weapon caches discovered throughout missions. In MGS4, however, this tactic is rendered obsolete as nearly all mass-produced weapons are digitally ID-locked by The System. Each weapon is assigned to a particular soldier and tied to them via nano-machine identification between the soldier and weapon. If a change in ownership takes place, it must first go through System checks and protocols. **This ID system has wide-ranging military and tactical implications**: it prevents raids on weapon caches by guerilla groups, it helps keep weapons out of the hands of terrorists, and it prevents the staging of armed revolutions. As a result, ID weapons become highly revered by the general public for creating what Colonel Campbell calls a cleaner, safer battlefield. At the same time, it helps The System control **who can use weapons and regulate how the weapons are used as only System sanctioned PMCs gain access to ID weapons**. MGS4s token arms dealer Drebin explains: ID guns can't be sold on the black market. **The System's practically a license for us arms dealers to print money.** The Implications of The System **While presented to the public as a safety measure, The Systems complete control over all weapons is really more of an economic stranglehold.** Weapons development, manufacturing, distribution, and use are all controlled and regulated by The System. Its a complete monopoly in every sense. In fact, **a major element of progress for PMC** soldiers in MGS4 **revolves around the economic structure of** weapon purchasing and upgrading. By proving themselves in battle, they are rewarded with better **weapons and items to kill** opposing forces in order **to gain even better weapons in an unending cycle of consumption.** Even the typical video game reward system seen in similar titles in the genre are nowhere to be seen soldiers dont fight for medals, prestige, or even promotions in rank; **they fight for access to superior ID locked weapons.** **This** in-game economy of weapon purchasing and unlocking **implies an outright capitalist system** and its the first time that players have had to directly deal with the issue of economy in the MGS series. As **Snake is not** officially **employed by a PMC**, **he is at the mercy of gun launderers** like Drebin who are willing and able to take the risk in dealing in rare non-ID weapons. However, Drebin doesnt offer this service simply out of good grace, he does it under the condition that Snake continually procure ID weapons and items on the battlefield. Drebin explains: You'll be picking up a lot of guns out in the field, I'm sure. I'll take and buy 'em off ya. That'll earn you points you can cash in for services. **Its a wholly capitalist arrangement on which Snake is utterly dependent on for survival**, and on which the player, in turn, is dependent on for progress. Even when Snake discovers a new weapon on the battlefield, he must pay Drebin a fee to unlock the weapon from System ID checks. Obligatory Participation There is yet another major gameplay component plays into this capitalist arrangement. The Mk. II device that Snake uses from the outset of the game is initially touted as an advanced self-cloaking robotic device capable of scouting the battlefield for reconnaissance while providing battlefield maps and real-time situational data. While this is certainly the case early on in the game, once Snake meets Drebin, the Mk. IIs primary function shifts from a battlefield support device to a tool used for economic advancement. Even Otacon, the man who created the Mk. II, encourages Snake to play into this business arrangement: "We'll use the Mk. II to deal with Drebin from here on out. The Mk.II can act as a kind of delivery boy - connect you with him. I'm adding a 'Drebin' menu item to the Mk.II's interface. Whenever you pick up multiple units of the same weapon, any extras will automatically be sold to Drebin on your next visit." Gaining more currency (in this case Drebin Points) in order to buy and unlock guns, mods, and supplies subsequently becomes a focal point of the game. As the game progresses, Snakes reliance on the Mk. II as a delivery mechanism for profit becomes increasingly prominent. It automatically picks up weapons and ammo that can later be bartered and sold for custom parts and upgrades. Its an unprecedented focus on commerce that the series has never seen before, and players are absolutely required to participate in this new monetary gameplay system. The fact that there is an economy in the game that stands in the way of the player/avatar succeeding is of particular interest as it solidifies the war economy as an inescapable element of society in MGS4 on both a gameplay and narrative level. This new age in history is explained by Campbell during the games initial mission briefing: "**The System has turned war into a form of economic activity. Analysts are calling it the 'war economy'** in that **it's picking up the slack for the downward-sloping oil market.** Because of **the military might of the PMCs and the effect they have on the economy**, war **is to the 21st century what oil was to the 20th**: the pillar that supports the global economy. **For PMCs, market expansion entails fanning the flames of war. The global community is concerned, but they're all too afraid of the war economy collapsing to do anything."** It is equally important to note how the player obtains currency in the game. They are rewarded monetarily for killing enemy soldiers and selling any ransacked weapons and equipment. As **Snake** exists outside of The System, he is not under the employ of any government organization or PMC and he receives no payment for the work he does, yet he **is still stuck within the confines of the global war economy**. War Is Life While the player takes on the role of Snake and the story is delivered largely through his point of view, the player is constantly haunted by the figure of the average PMC soldier as most of Snakes missions and objectives function in relation to them. The average PMC soldier in MGS4 can claim one thing with certainty: **life is war**. Even more disconcerting is just how expansive the PMCs are as Drebin explains: "The line between civilian and soldier is getting real blurry. Sooner or later, the whole damn human race is gonna be green collars. More like, we're all gonna be fighting proxy wars. But hey, this war economy puts the food on my table." Even before the game starts players are given a peek into the widespread popularity and influence of PMCs and the war economy in the form of cleverly directed faux commercials. These live-action commercials are the first thing players experience upon pressing the START button. They also play in loops whenever the player takes a break from the game or if they leave the game idle on the menu screen. **Its a well executed postmodern narrative technique that glamorizes PMC life and perpetuates the war is life ideology.** When compared to real-life military recruitment ads there is no mention of serving ones country or fighting to defend any nation; they are simply stylized montages depicting choreographed action sequences, women, and money. They allude to a life of freedom and success through economic enrichment. While the commercials presented at the opening of the game promote a wide variety of PMCs and suggest that potential PMC recruits can choose the company they will work for when they start their military careers, these choices are completely removed from which nation they will represent or which ideology they fight for in any given battle. **Its purely an economic lifestyle choice.** In essence, the PMC soldier is the embodiment of the PMC itself and fights for personal profit under a banner of a profiteering entity. They are treated as anonymous assets in random battles for random causes. Moreover, since The System largely controls and regulates the global economy (via the war economy), it influences the standard of living for the common individual as it plays a part in defining what career choices are viable. Unfortunately for the world in MGS4, the most profitable and readily available career choices involve participating in the global war economy via enlistment and recruitment into PMCs. If society deems that war is necessary, natural, and profitable, then **war becomes a cornerstone of human existence** and a commonplace for the majority of humanity. When it all boils down, MGS4 is a stark commentary on the disposable nature of human life in a commodity based culture where private military companies are at the heart of economic progress. Perhaps Big Bosss closing words at the end of the game are meant to be considered as a warning to any government, real or fictional, that may choose to walk down a similar path:

#### Thus, I affirm the Resolution Resolved: The United States ought not provide military aid to authoritarian regimes. I will defend implementation in the universe of Metal Gear Solid IV: Guns of the Patriots, however, it is not necessary for my Aff to function since my framework is concerned with the pedagogical orientation of the 1AC.

#### Military aid is an investment into a war without end, feeding the market of catastrophe and creating an addiction to the destructiveness of providing the means to battle. The Patriots, an organization that used the United States Federal Government as a puppet to provide military aid to regimes all over the world, utilize the production of Metal Gears to proliferate fear and “deterrence” across the globe. This creates strongholds of power in authoritarian regimes and functions as a conflict multiplier within the war economy, furthering the grasp the Patriots have on the course of geopolitics. The 1AC contains the only advocacy that would deconstruct U.S. imperial control.

**Weise** [Weise, Matthew "Sajon". “The Decline of Anti-Americanism in Metal Gear.” *Outside Your Heaven*, 12 Apr. 2012, outsideyourheaven.blogspot.com/2012/04/decline-of-anti-americanism-in-metal.html.] // JG

**The Metal Gear series** used to have a strong streak of anti-Americanism running through it, back when its political details **retained** their **connection with** reality. MGS4, with its slippery political vagueness, backpedaled away from this, and Peace Walker, while in certain ways **the most politically specific** game in the series, honors and expands the particular points MGS4 backpedaled on. Series director Hideo Kojima and his current writer, Shuyo Murata, keep changing their minds as to what Big Boss, the supposed villain of the series, represents... especially in terms of his motivation for creating the city-state Outer Heaven, which was the setting of Metal Gear 1 and has since become the **ideological centerpiece** of the series. MGS4, which purported to add closure to the main series storyline, revealed that Big Boss created Outer Heaven as a staging ground to overthrow the U.S., and that what he really wanted was to oust his old ally, **Major Zero**, who had **assumed control of the shadow group which dictated U.S. policy**, a group formerly **known as** 'The Philosophers' but rechristened by Zero as **'The Patriots'.** MGS4 took a political conflict and turned it into a personal one, between Big Boss and his old commanding officer. This contradicted earlier storylines, which had maintained (since Metal Gear 2 in 1990) that **Big Boss wanted to establish a “warrior state” where soldiers would be free of nations.** What exactly this meant — and what the exact moral code of this state was — was always ambiguous, which to me was one of the big strengths of the series, especially after MGS3. Looking back it was probably just wishful thinking, but I very much liked the idea that MGS3 — which took the series back in time to the 1960s and cast a young Big Boss as the protagonist — was an invitation to reassess the morality of all the previous games, to consider that perhaps Big Boss was not a villain. To me this seemed a logical step from the strident anti-Americanism of MGS2, the series installment that introduced The Patriots. If the lesson of MGS2 is that **the U.S. government** are a bunch of liars any lover of freedom ought to be fighting… then it **seemed** logical for MGS3 **to suggest that the “terrorist” arch-nemesis of the earlier games might not be so bad after all**. The fact that the middle was missing — the 30-year span where Big Boss turned from hero to terrorist — gave the player leverage to read him in different ways. You had to piece together an incomplete picture of who Big Boss was, and this is what made him interesting. Coming right out and saying “this is what he believed” diminishes him. MGS4 did come out and say these things, and in a way I didn’t like at all (though it had certain [interesting](http://outsideyourheaven.blogspot.com/2010/05/letting-world-be-inherent-politics-of.html) aspects). Peace Walker did it again, but in a way I dislike less. What’s strange about Peace Walker — though I suppose it has become typical of how Kojima/Murata approach the series — is how it bends over backwards to foreshadow past games while at the same time ignoring all their finer plot points. **The "warrior state" motivation is** back in Peace Walker, though **robbed of** some of **its ambiguity** when Kojima/Murata attempt to graft it onto some of MGS4's more absurd retcons. When the girl Paz betrays you at the end, she spouts some nonsense about how her true boss, Zero of course, plans to some day control human civilization with super computers. This is a reference to the absurd plot of MGS4, in which you discover **The Patriots' control of America (and by extension the world) is entirely** computer-**automated**. But she never mentions **The Patriots**. Instead she claims to work from some group called Cipher, who apparently **want** Big **Boss's apolitical warrior-state to serve as their global police force** — **the one-world military** for their one-world government. This is kind of an interesting notion, that The Patriots’ political anti-nationalism and Big Boss’s military anti-nationalism are in fact mirror images of each other. The problem with this idea is that The Patriots were a lot more interesting — that is to say, **politically resonant with our times** — when they were not anti-nationalist but nationalist, which is what they were in MGS2 and 3. The MGS2 pitch document, translated and released online a few years ago, makes this rather clear: **The evil in MGS**2 **is the American government**. However, **this does not refer to Americans** in general, nor to any particular persons, **but to the festering discharge that has built-up within the democratic state of America** over the years. **The intention is** not to defame any race, state or ethnicity, but rather **to look at the ‘monster’ that the country’s political structure has created.** It is an intangible entity yet at the same time a massive menace to the world. As originally conceived **The Patriots were a collective metaphor for those at the highest tier of the American power structure who function outside the democratic process, resembling what journalist Bill Moyers once called "The Secret Government"**. His so-entitled 1987 report centered around the Iran-Contra scandal, but discussed how it was only the latest example of our government's true contempt for democracy, tracing it back to our coup of Iran's democratically elected prime minister in 1953. By the time we get to Peace Walker The Patriots are a very different entity, much closer to the Illuminati than the [Straussian](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leo_Strauss) demagoges of MGS2/3. This may be the reason why the game doesn’t even call them The Patriots anymore but Cipher, because anything American about them has been downplayed to the point of non-existence. It's obvious that Kojima is back-pedaling away from the anti-Americanism of MGS2 (which was developed before 9/11 but released in its immediate aftermath) more and more with each new game, grafting new conspiracy theories onto the Metal Gear plotline that dilute MGS2's subversive implications. So instead of **a group of young idealists in the CIA** (The Philosophers) who, **through the moral corruption of the Cold War, slowly mutate into a self-righteous fascist coalition** (The Patriots)... we get some goofy Master Plan perpetrated by a single maniac (Zero) to control the world through the magic of computers. Kojima/Murata’s decision in MGS4 to claim that **The Patriots were** created/controlled by Major Zero (as opposed to being **a natural byproduct of America's failing democracy**) was bizarre. Major Zero was a minor character, introduced in MGS3, who utterly lacked the tyrannical mania MGS4 (and subsequently Peace Walker) paint him as having. It is this absence of characterization that, I guess, causes Kojima and Murata to regard him as an abstract concept, harping on his name — "zero" — as if it were some sort of cosmic principle that can explain… I dunno… everything. Not only are such explanations dumb, they gloss over any real world politics the series once had. Making everything abstract removes the story from any recognizable political context, a strategy omnipresent in MGS4. Unlike the previous games nothing is named. **We** only **hear of "regimes" and "countries" in** geography never more specific than **"The Middle East" or "South America"**. MGS4's calculated evasiveness on anything politically meaningful was a massive cop-out after the build-up of MGS2 and MGS3. **Both those** games **were exercises in world-building**, in creating and extending a fictional universe, **and connecting that universe to real world history** in interesting ways. They asked more questions than they answered, which fans found maddening but was also one of the main reasons they functioned so well as a mythology. Questions like ‘who are The Patriots?’ and ‘was Big Boss good or evil?’ are only interesting if they aren’t answered, and the same goes for the supernatural elements that permeated the series pre-MGS4. Ghosts, vampires, psychics, mysterious organizations, moral ambiguity—all these things used to be part of the same, hard-to-pin-down universe of Metal Gear, when Kojima and his previous co-writer, Tomokazu Fukushima, seemed more interested in befuddling expectations than meeting them. I find it suspicious that the Metal Gear universe took a turn for the worse when Fukushima mysteriously vanished after MGS3. Fukushima was not only the writer of MGS1, MGS2, and MGS3 (which may explain why they remain somewhat consistent) but he also wrote Metal Gear Ghost Babel, which is even more anti-American than MGS2 in some respects (**Its plot is a modern take on the Babel myth, with the U.S. in the role of God, promoting ethnic chaos as insurance against being dethroned by a unified Third World.**) which makes it doubly suspicious that the anti-Americanism of the main series took a nosedive at precisely at the moment Fukushima left. Metal Gear used to be interesting for a lot of reasons. For its excellent mechanics design, emergent gameplay, and clever self-reflexive moments. However, this isn't what made it my favorite series for most of the 00s. I liked MGS1, but I didn't really love the series until MGS2... when **it began to transform itself into a counter-mythology of the American 20th Century**. MGS3 completed this process, introducing The Philosophers (because that's what all "patriots" are to begin with), and in the process created an origin myth for the modern American Empire... a romantic, pop-art expression of how the U.S. became the sleeping monster that awoke on September 11th 2001. These sentiments are not gone from the series, just muddled by MGS4's stupid retcons. Peace Walker picks up the pieces and manages to repurpose them with some success, painting a Machiavellian picture of the CIA running amok in 1970s Costa Rica. South American bureau chief Coldman is a character right out of Dr. Strangelove or the Iran-Contra scandal: corrupt to the point of parody, and believing in political Darwinism so deeply he has it [tattooed](http://images.wikia.com/metalgear/images/3/33/Coldmantat.png) on his scalp. He is one of Bill Moyer's secret patriots if there ever was one... even if Kojima refuses to use the term anymore. More telling is **Peace Walker's sympathetic portrayal of the Communist Sandinistas**, going so far as to **compare** Big **Boss to** Augusto Sandino himself, **the movement's namesake who battled against** the **U.S.** [**occupation**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_occupation_of_Nicaragua) of Nicaragua. And this is to say nothing of the game's worship of Che Guevara, whom Kojima/Murata view as a hero, evoking Jean-Paul Satre's proclamation of him as "the most complete human being of our age", and beating the player over the head with the idea that Big Boss is Che reincarnated. Sandino and Guevara are only the latest in a long line of famous historical figures Big Boss has been compared to over the course of the Metal Gear series. MGS1, which pre-dates 9/11 by four years, featured an Iraqi Kurd who was convinced Big Boss was the reincarnation of Saladin, the Muslim leader who fended off the West during the Crusades. And even MGS4, spineless as it was, featured Morricone's "Here's to You" in the closing credits, drawing a connection between Big Boss (who is killed the moment before the credits roll, by The Patriots) and Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, the famous anarchists [executed](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sacco_and_Vanzetti) by the U.S. in the 1920s. **The** only **thing that links these people is their** status as symbols of **defiance against Western/American power**. That isn't to say that they all can be equated morally, or that they even wanted the same thing, but the fact that we as players are constantly asked to read Big Boss through the historical prism they form is no accident. **In a market culture where military** video **games** increasingly **function as propaganda Metal Gear** is still a fucking kick in the face... provided you can parse its dense nexus of political ideas. No other piece of popular entertainment at its level of budget and presentation **disbelieves in America as much as it does**, nor achieves its matter-of-fact pessimism about free-will. No other pop-cultural artifact occupies the space it does. **It is the only anti-establishment military blockbuster**, an [Adam Curtis documentary](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=K5lByw7kvS0) masquerading as a Michael Bay explosion-fest. At the end of Peace Walker, when Big Boss inaugurates Outer Heaven, he describes his warrior state as being a political and military tool for those who "have no other recourse". His ronin army offers first world might to third world causes, **threatening America's super-power status** and - most importantly - **undermines its image as the savior of the modern world, forged in a 20th century past** it created and sold to the world through its movies.

#### The Role of the Ballot is to endorse the debater that best performatively and methodologically opens up the debate space to the pedagogy of science fiction.

**Miller and Bennett 1** [Associate Director of the Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes, Associate Director and CoPI of the Center for Nanotechnology in Society, and Chair of the PhD Program in Human and Social Dimensions of Science and Technology at Arizona State University. He is also a Senior Fellow in the Center for World Affairs and the Global Economy at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He holds a PhD in electrical engineering from Cornell University AND PhD in biochemistry from Arizona State University in 2003 and today is an Assistant Research Professor in the Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes and the Center for Nanotechnology in Society at Arizona State University (October, Clark A. and Ira, “ Thinking longer term about technology: is there value in science fiction-inspired approaches to constructing futures? ” Science and Public Policy, 35(8), Ebsco)] // JG

Over time, the most important project may be to try to identify mechanisms through which **science fiction could be meaningfully integrated into society’s practices and institutions for public engagement** and technology assessment. This will not be easy. **American political culture is deeply oriented toward the present**, especially with regard to the framing of its regulatory gaze. As highlighted by the dissenting opinions to the recent Supreme Court ruling forcing the Environmental Protection Agency to regulate carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases, US regulatory culture is founded on the axiom that only harms that are actual or imminent are generally subject to regulation and redress. **Thinking prospectively about the kinds of technological risks we may face in the future is**, at best, **not central to the framing of US risk assessment or technology assessment enterprises**. And yet, it would seem that **finding ways to be more future-oriented would add substantial value to our assessment processes**. In some cases, growing attention is being given within assessments to the practice of **scenario-building** — which in many ways **is a form of science fiction writing.** Judicious mixing of **science fiction writing** sensibilities **into scenario writing practices could substantially enhance the public engagement** possibilities associated with scenarios. This fact was recognized by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, a major international scientific assessment, which used drama to communicate scenarios to a range of publics in Africa. We should learn from this experience. But science fiction can be more than just a communication tool. Citizens could be given new opportunities to contribute creatively to assessments through science fiction writing exercises, perhaps working with scenarios, perhaps in other ways. Experiments with citizens writing scenarios in an ecological assessment conducted by the University of Wisconsin showed that these **methods have considerable power in facilitating citizen buy-in to the assessment process, results, and policy recommendations**. They also shaped the scenarios in directions unexpected by the expert participants. Likewise, as a forerunner to a formal assessment process — such as the UK GM Nation exercise, where citizens were asked to meet and dialogue about their preferences with regard to genetically modified organisms — writers might be asked to develop multiple stories and dialogues that could be shared with the public alongside more technical reports.

#### Solid Snake’s recanting of the state of affairs is the disruption of the market of catastrophe needed to begin seeding revolution in the minds of civilians. The mode of storytelling through audio and video is more important than the specific details of the story.

**Miller and Bennett 2** [Associate Director of the Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes, Associate Director and CoPI of the Center for Nanotechnology in Society, and Chair of the PhD Program in Human and Social Dimensions of Science and Technology at Arizona State University. He is also a Senior Fellow in the Center for World Affairs and the Global Economy at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. He holds a PhD in electrical engineering from Cornell University AND PhD in biochemistry from Arizona State University in 2003 and today is an Assistant Research Professor in the Consortium for Science, Policy and Outcomes and the Center for Nanotechnology in Society at Arizona State University (October, Clark A. and Ira, “ Thinking longer term about technology: is there value in science fiction-inspired approaches to constructing futures? ” Science and Public Policy, 35(8), Ebsco)] // JG

**The** potential **power of science fiction** (and, arguably, fiction more generally) **to shape the public** imagination of science and technology **derives fundamentally from its form of narrative story-telling.** **This form of story-telling departs markedly from the forms of technical rationality common to more classic approaches to thinking longer term about technology.** ‘Why speculate about technological possibilities that cannot exist?’ these approaches seem to suggest. And yet, why not? In 1932, when Huxley wrote Brave New World, he imagined his story as taking place 600 years in the future. By 1946, when he wrote the preface to the paperback edition, he imagined it perhaps 100 years in the future. In 1932, by the standards of technical realism espoused in technological assessments today, **Brave New World would have been branded the most outlandish of fiction.** Watson and Crick wouldn’t identify the structure of DNA for another quarter century, while Dolly the sheep’s birth 60 years later would still take the world by surprise. Surely few in 1932 could have imagined the technical possibility of sequencing a human genome or the existence of a vast pharmaceutical industry devoted to the production of new drugs like Prozac. (Recall, the first blockbuster drug, penicillin, is a product of World War II). **What then did Huxley offer to his readers, besides speculation**? In our view, **the best science fiction accords careful attention to what it means to be human and to live in human societies.** **Science fiction stories are** just stories, myths, narratives, nothing more. And yet, writers like Orson Scott Card offer them as true5 — true in the sense of careful, **thoughtful representations of what it might be like to live in the kind of world we might get in the future; true in the deeper sense of reflecting enduring realities of human existence, meaning, and identity; true in the sense of illustrating fundamental moral dilemmas faced by individuals and communities when confronted by new and emerging technologies, and the struggles to grapple meaningfully with those dilemmas in the only ways humans know how.** So what does this alternative truth offer us?

#### Politics is influenced by science fiction – academic spaces ought to be utilized for analysis of the political representations of scientific futures.

**Weldes 1** [Senior Lecturer, Bristol University; PhD (Minn) (Jutta, “Popular culture, science fiction, and world politics: exploring inter textual relations” in “To seek out new worlds: science fiction and world politics” ed. Weldes, Palgrave Macmillan 2003, 1-5)] // JG

Why **examine science fiction if we are interested in world politics**? On the face of it, there seems to be little relation between the two. **World politics**, common sense tells us, **is** first and foremost **about life-and-death issues: war and peace, ethnic cleansing and genocide**, the global spread of AIDS, refugees, natural disasters, nuclear proliferation, terrorism and counter-terrorism, **global trafficking in arms**, drugs, and human beings, famines, free trade, rapacious corporations, globalization. World politics is serious business; **it is difficult policy choices and intractable differences of opinion** in “a domain of hard truths, material realities, and irrepressible natural facts” (Ó Tuathail and Agnew, 1992: 192). **Science fiction, in contrast, is precisely fictional. It is make-believe, and we** read it, watch it, **argue about it**, and poach on it for fun. 1 As everyone knows, **science fiction** (or SF) deals with imagined futures, alien landscapes, bizarre cityscapes, sleek ships for traveling through space, improbable machines for escaping time, encounters with fantastic creatures from other worlds or our own future, and radical transformations of societies and their inhabitants. Its hallmark, writes Darko Suvin, **is “an imaginative framework alternative to the author’s empirical environment**” (1979: 9) that, through strategies like extrapolation and estrangement, helps us to transcend our mundane environment. So what is the connection to world politics? The apparent great divide between the “hard truths” of world politics and the imagined worlds of SF is deceiving, however. **The dividing line between world politics’ material realities and natural facts and the fictional worlds and imaginative possibilities of SF is far from clear.** For instance: • NASA/Star Trek: As Constance Penley has shown, a pervasive connection exists between the discourse of the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and that of Star Trek (1997: 4; see also Nichols, 1994). It is perhaps best illustrated in the naming of the first U.S. space shuttle. Initially to be called The Constitution, it was in fact christened The Enterprise— in honor of Star Trek’s flagship— after U.S. President Gerald Ford, in the wake of a letter-writing campaign by Star Trek fans, directed NASA to change the name (18– 19). This same U.S. space shuttle Enterprise then found its way back to Star Trek: it appears in the succession of ships called Enterprise shown in the montage that opens each episode of the fifth Star Trek series, Enterprise. 2 SDI/Star Wars: On March 23, 1983, U.S. President Ronald Reagan delivered a nationwide television address calling for research into defenses that could “intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies,” thus rendering “nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete” (Reagan, 1983). The next day, SDI critics in the U.S. Congress lampooned Reagan’s vision of a defensive military umbrella, successfully relabeling it “Star Wars” after George Lucas’s block-buster SF movie (1977) (Smith, nd.). Hiroshima/Locksley Hall: U.S. President Harry Truman’s decision to drop the newly developed atomic bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki was apparently influenced by his belief that demonstrating the power of an “ultimate superweapon” could end the war. Truman had copied 10 lines from Tennyson’s poem Locksley Hall— lines that depict “ultimate aerial superweapons for the future, waging a terrible climactic war in the skies” (Franklin, 1990a: 157)—and carried them in his wallet for 35 years. In July 1945, realizing that he was about to gain control over just such a superweapon, Truman “pulled that now faded slip of paper from his wallet, and recited those lines... to a reporter” (ibid.). 3 Globalization/Spaceship Earth: **The Economist depicts liberal globalization using many SF references.** In particular, the magazine is awash in images of “spaceship Earth.” This ubiquitous trope constructs the increasingly globalized world as, on the one hand, “a sin gle totality, ‘the global village,’ making it appear easily accessible” while, on the other hand, positioning it “out there” on “the final frontier” of space (Hooper, 2000: 68). For The Economist, liberal globalization is made sensible “through imagery which integrates science, technology, business, and images of globalisation into a kind of entrepreneurial frontier masculinity, in which capitalism meets science fiction” (65). **The Revolution in Military Affairs/future war fiction**: The so-called Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) **might better be called “military science fiction.”** **This ideology** of the technological fix, **championed** in both official military futurology (e.g., U.S. Army’s Army Vision 2010 or U.S. Space Command’s Vision for 2020) and in a broader corpus of think tank projections (e.g., Shukman, 1996; O’Hanlon, 2000; Metz, 2000), aims to transform threat perceptions and the technological, doctrinal, and organizational basis of warfare. The RMA, however, tells us less about the future of warfare than about “contemporary cultural obsessions and **the continuing influence of powerful historical concerns**, pre-occupations, fixations, and desires” (Latham, 2001: 9). In fact, the RMA is better understood not as a rational response to objective changes in military technology or the geo-strategic environment but as a cultural artifact powerfully shaped by enduring SF fantasies of future war, such that **official military futurology mirrors SF’s characteristic “anxieties, desires**, fears, fetishes, insecurities, and cognitive **and affective predispositions**” (10). Neo-liberal globalization/Foundation: The neo-liberal discourse of globalization dominating public discussion is a self-fulfilling prophecy (Hay and Marsh, 2000: 9) that rests on a well-rehearsed set of narratives and tropes, including an Enlightenment commitment to progress, the wholesome role of global markets, a rampant technophilia, the trope of the “global village,” and the interrelated narratives of an increasingly global culture and an expanding pacific liberal politics. As I’ve argued elsewhere (Weldes, 2001), this discourse displays striking homologies to American techno-utopian SF (exemplified in Isaac Asimov’s classic Foundation novels [1951, 1952, 1953, 1982, 1986, 1988, 1993]). These homologies help to render neo-liberal globalization both sensible and seemingly “inexorable” (Gray, 1998: 206). Moreover, underlying Asimov’s Foundation universe lies a barely concealed authoritarian politics that alerts us to the covertly, but nonetheless demonstrably, un-democratic character of globalization and contemporary global governance. While some of the connections between world politics and SF illustrated here are superficial, others are more deeply rooted. For example, explicit references might be made from one domain to the other. NASA poaches from Star Trek, while SDI’s critics attempt to dismiss it as Star Wars (but even these relations turn out to be more complex). In other cases, deeper relations exist. Globalization and claims to a “global village” are made commonsensical through space-based images of “Spaceship Earth” that, although they became practically possible only in 1966, when the first photographs taken in outer space showed “planet Earth as one location” (Scholte, 1997: 16– 17), have long been a staple of SF. Similarly, in hoping that his new “superweapon” would bring an end to World War II, Truman was no different from many of his compatriots, “who had grown up in a cultural matrix bubbling with fantasies of ultimate weapons.” Such fantasies, Franklin explains, profoundly shaped “the nation’s conceptions of nuclear weapons and responses to them, decades before they materialized” (1990a: 157; 1988). A long history of fantastic enemies and sophisticated high-tech wars— from H. G. Wells’ The War of the Worlds (1898), through Robert Heinlein’s Starship Troopers (1959), to Roland Emmerich’s film Independence Day (1996)—renders desirable **a future of militarized security seemingly attainable through advanced weapons and information warfare.** Conversely, SF is rife with references to wars, empires, diplomatic intrigue, and so forth— the very stuff of world politics. The first chapter of the 1954 edition of Arthur C. Clarke’s Childhood’s End, 4 for instance, makes direct reference to contemporary politics. The context is explicitly the cold war, “the cleavage between East and West” (2). The U.S. carrier James Forrestal searches for Russian submarines off the Pacific island launch site of the Columbus, soon to be headed for Mars; the U.S. space program is spurred on by new intelligence that “the Russians are nearly level with us” (2); a Russian gloats that “In another month we will be on our way, and the Yankees will be choking themselves with rage” (3). **Many works of SF begin with**, make explicit reference to, and poach on **politics**, **including historical and contemporary events, situations, and characters from world politics.** **The relations between SF and world politics, then, are more numerous and more complex than is generally assumed.** Curiously, although we live in a time when “**the political and the cultural can no longer be decoupled**” (Dean, 2000: 2), this intimate relationship has rarely been examined. This is especially true of scholars of world politics or “International Relations,” who have generally devoted their attention to “high politics,” eschewing both the depths of low politics and the shallows of a frivolous popular culture. As Cynthia Weber put it: “Whether by neglect, by design, or by displacement, the politics of the popular is among the most under-valued and therefore under-analyzed aspects of international politics” (2001: 134). If it is unusual for popular culture in general to be studied in connection with world politics, it is even more so for world politics and SF to be studied together.

#### Politics and Science Fiction are co-productive – it is IMPOSSIBLE to analyze politics without its fictional undercurrents

**Weldes 2** [Senior Lecturer, Bristol University; PhD (Minn) (Jutta, “Popular culture, science fiction, and world politics: exploring inter textual relations” in “To seek out new worlds: science fiction and world politics” ed. Weldes, Palgrave Macmillan 2003, 15-16)] // JG

Crucial here is not only the reproduction, across the SF/world politics intertext, of similar images— whether of cyberspace, the post-modern city, or spaceship Earth. 18 These are the easiest relations to illustrate but, although central to the production of common sense, they are not ultimately the most significant aspect of the SF/world politics intertext. Instead, **what renders this intertext so crucial to our understanding of world politics is the deep metaphysical— epistemological and ontological— overlap across its constituent texts.** Their structural homologies, in other words, extend to their most basic assumptions: **the nature of Self and Other**, the character of knowledge, the possibilities of knowing the Self, or the Other, **the nature of** and relations between good and **evil, the possibilities for community**. The language of “inter-text” subtly implies that different texts are produced in different spaces/times/cultures. These different texts then have an interface: they meet and relate to one another. But if these texts already overlap at such fundamental metaphysical levels, then the notion of an “intertext” relies too heavily on an ontology of difference. Quite different texts— **the** constituent **elements of the SF/world politics intertext**— do get produced, but they **share deeply rooted assumptions**.

# ==================

# 1AR – Toolbox

## A2 Quiet

#### 1: No link- 1AC takes place in the world of Metal Gear IV- Quiet only exists in 5 which means I don’t cause the representation. This would be like reading a Saudi Disad on a US aff when I defend removing aid to Egypt because “all countries are the same”- MGS 4 and 5 are radically different games.

#### 2: There are massive amounts of sexism in the world- under your logic any defense of a world that has sexism in it would warrant a loss- you think what happens to Quiet is bad? Women are treated way worse in the status quo- Ford’s testimony and Kavanaugh’s almost immediate confirmation despite it prove that point which means your logic would make every aff lose

#### 3: The 1AC solves the root cause of sexism which is deployment and maintenance of certain characteristics because of the nature of war- Quiet was only put in this position because of the way militarization prioritizes forms of bodies in relation to violence.

#### 4: This proves science fiction is self-correcting- Quiet’s portrayal helps us understand how traditional structures paint womxn as docile objects meant for male consumption and that we’ve internalized those things which forces internal correction- after MGS 5 came out there was huge community backlash to her unjust treatment.

#### 5: MGS has multiple examples of empowering womxn and breaking down gendered tropes as well- outweighs it’s present in all games for womxn of all kinds.

[Worby, Mike. “Who's the Boss?: Ranking the Ladies of 'Metal Gear Solid'.” PopOptiq, PopOptiq, 25 Sept. 2015, [www.popoptiq.com/ranking-the-women-of-metal-gear-solid/](http://www.popoptiq.com/ranking-the-women-of-metal-gear-solid/).] // AS

**10) Mei Ling-***Metal Gear Solid*, *Metal Gear Solid 4: Guns of the**Patriots* Now, with the outright bad characters out of the way, let’s move on to the good ones. First up is Mei Ling. Serving as Solid Snake’s data analyst in *Metal Gear Solid*, Mei Ling offered quotes from Western literature and Chinese proverbs every time you contacted her to save the game. The **juxtapos**ition between her well-rounded knowledge, dually reflective of her **Chinese ancestry** **and** her **American upbringing**, and her schoolgirl crush on Solid Snake, make for a fun and memorable character, and, in terms of usefulness, it doesn’t hurt that she was weaponizing Philanthropy from her high-up military position all the way through to *Metal Gear Solid 4*. **9) Emma** Emerich**-*Metal Gear Solid 2: Sons of Liberty*** Even if she does spend much of her time in *Metal Gear Solid 2* as a damsel in distress, needing Raiden to take care of her and keep her alive (a task he does pretty well at…for a while), Emma remains an intricate and well-realized piece of Otacon’s past and the plot in general. Unsurprisingly, she **was** also **being used for her intellect and passion for science** by people who knew her better than she knew herself. This weakness, though, is fitting to her character, as a mirror for Otacon, and is a small trade-off for her relatable traits, typical of a bookish young girl, like flirting with Raiden or just wanting her older brother to finally see her as an adult. The fact that her brutal and unexpected demise serves as the emotional crux of *MGS2* only further cements her spot on the list. 8) Sunny Emmerich-Gurlukovich-*Metal Gear Solid 4: Guns of the Patriots*, *Metal Gear Rising: Revengeance* Sunny Emmerich, or Sunny Gurlokovich as she was earlier known is the daughter of *Metal Gear Solid 2*‘s Olga Gurlukovich, and later, the adopted daughter of Hal “Otacon” Emmerich in *Metal Gear Solid 4*. This is the form of Sunny we get to know best. A hyper intelligent and precocious child as the result of The Patriots experimentation, **Sunny flips back and forth between roles of an advanced scientist who can crack equations that even Otacon can’t hack, like the Guns of the Patriots system, to a protective and loving little girl who wants to impress her surrogate fathers by making eggs or convincing Snake to quit smoking**. Though her characterization can sometimes be a little thin, Sunny is a fun addition to the *MGS* cast, and has a matured role in the spin-off title *Revengeance* which further develops her into a talented young woman working for a tech company. **7) Fortune**-*Metal Gear Solid 2: Sons of* ***Liberty*** Deadcell’s resident femme fatale goes by the moniker of Fortune. The daughter of Scott Dolph, who was killed by Revolver Ocelot during the opening mission of *Metal Gear Solid 2*, Fortune has also lost her husband to the battlefield. As such, she has become despondent and malcontent, craving only the same sort of glorious and bloody death that her father and husband have received, and an end to her misery. Despite the fact that she is primarily defined by her relationship to male characters, she **remains a strong and well-developed character, and certainly the most realized character in the Deadcell gang. She’s also the only one present at the games finale, and it certainly doesn’t hurt that she carries a giant electric railgun and has a vampire boyfriend who calls her Queen. Fortune is one badass** gal. **6) Olga** Gurlukovich-*Metal Gear Solid 2: Sons of Liberty* Filling in the role of Gray Fox for *Metal Gear Solid 2*, Olga has almost as thankless of a job as Raiden, who is taking over for Solid Snake. The first boss introduced in *MGS2*, Olga **taught players how to use and master a whole host of new gameplay mechanics, and the straight forward nature of the fight, which simply takes place on an isolated section of a military brig, is incredibly refreshing**, as is Olga herself. Sporting a cropped military cut, pit hair that she doesn’t need to cut for anyone and **spending the majority of the game fighting in incredibly intense fashion to save her daughter from The Patriots, Olga Gurlukovich is perhaps Kojima’s most independent and feminist of characters**. **5) Meryl** Silverburgh-*Metal Gear Solid*, *Metal Gear Solid 4: Guns of the Patriots* Probably *Metal Gear Solid*‘s most memorable woman, even with standouts like Sniper Wolf and Naomi Hunter in the cast, Meryl leaves a serious mark on any gamer she comes in contact with. As Solid Snake’s only real love interest in the series, and a partner in the battle, Meryl both learns how to fight and how to love from the world’s greatest soldier, even if she cannot truly do either with such a damaged soul. Returning in *Metal Gear Solid 4*, she actually **leads her own platoon, called Rat Patrol, and finds love on the battle field once again, albeit with a character who has spent the majority of the series shitting himself on a regular basis**. But hey, you can’t choose who you love. **4)** SniperWolf-*Metal Gear Solid* Cold and calculating to a sub-zero degree, **Sniper Wolf may be the most brutal character in *Metal Gear Solid*. A psycho-sexually challenging and ridiculously talented markswoman, Sniper Wolf has the distinction of being the only boss to really get Snake where it hurts, by hurting him through his comrades**. The scene where she guns down Meryl a mere few feet from where Snake is hiding is perhaps the series’ most hardcore scene of violence and emotion, and that it is inflicted by a woman who knows exactly what she is doing makes it all the more devious. Even with this much fuel against her though, the player is never really able to hate Sniper Wolf, instead they simply pity her by the end, when her sad tale is revealed. A character with a strong connection to three of *Metal Gear Solid*‘s leading men, Solid Snake, Otacon, and Big Boss, Sniper Wolf is a defining member of the cast and has one of the best deaths in the series. **3)** EVA**-***Metal Gear Solid 3: Snake Eater*, *Metal Gear Solid 4: Guns of the Patriots* A master manipulator of men**, EVA is a very cunning woman, and someone who has no qualms about using her sexuality to get ahead and achieve her goals**. Pulling the strings of men like Volgin and Naked Snake is no mean feat, and her role as the Boss’s trusted confidant can not be under-stated. A Bond-like femme fatale, EVA gets away with the man, the money and the means at the end of *Metal Gear Solid 3*, before single-handedly dropping the two biggest bombshells in the game (no, I’m not talking about those bombshells). An intelligent and talented triple agent, **EVA reappears in *Metal Gear Solid 4* as a Boss surrogate to Solid Snake himself in Eastern Europe**, showing a motherly tender, but still tough, side as she goes out in a blaze of glory. The carrier of Les Enfants Terrible, EVA is one of the key figures in the *Metal Gear Solid* saga. **2) Naomi Hunter-***Metal Gear Solid*, *Metal Gear Solid 4: Guns of the Patr****iots*** Naomi Hunter first appeared as one of Snake’s many codec supports in *Metal Gear Solid*. **A brilliant geneticist and medical professional, Naomi advised Snake on a variety of subjects over the course of his journey between the occasional pointed question or two about the ethics of his occupation and past actions**. As a series of mysterious deaths occurred during the course of the Shadow Moses incident, though, and Naomi’s back story became increasingly unbelievable, it was later revealed that she was actually a sleeper agent for the Pentagon, who were intent on seizing Metal Gear Rex for themselves. She was also the adopted sister of Frank Jaeger, a man Snake had killed in a minefield during the events of *Metal Gear 2: Solid Snake*. Her intense hatred for Snake caused her to develop the FOXDIE virus, essentially making Snake a walking bio-weapon who would infect everyone he came into contact with before eventually succumbing to the disease himself. Regretting her actions in the aftermath, she advised Snake to make the best of the time he had left. Later in *Metal Gear Solid 4*, she aided Snake and Otacon in the fight against the Patriots before committing suicide at Shadow Moses after learning that Sunny had completed FOXALIVE. Naomi is a tragic and multi-faceted character, and were it not for one legendary soldier, she would certainly be at the top of the list. **1) The Boss-***Metal Gear Solid 3: Snake Ea****ter*** Who’s the boss? Well, The Boss of course! The key to the entire mythology and the progenitor of much of the series’ events, The Boss **is maybe the most important character in the entire *Metal Gear* universe**. A legendary warrior, The Boss fell in love with a member of her Cobra unit, The Sorrow before being forced to gun him down by the Patriots after World War II. Their child, Adam/Revolver Ocelot would go on to become a devious double dealer for the majority of the series. The mentor of Naked Snake/Big Boss, and the reason for his receipt of that moniker, **The Boss was the ultimate loyalist and a true patriot in every sense of the word**. **Taking responsibility after a mission she was sent on spun wildly out of control, she set Big Boss up to kill her and went down in history as a terrorist and war criminal in order to avoid an international incident during the Cold War**. The revelation of this truth is what set Big Boss down his path to start Outer Heaven, his soldier’s haven, and eventually come into conflict with Solid Snake. The Boss is a brave, selfless, and highly skilled Valkyrie huntress, and her complex relationship with Big Boss, in which she fulfilled surrogate roles of mother, lover, sister, and friend, is one loaded with gravitas. Is there any moment more powerful in the series than their final battle in a field of flowers? Any moment more brimming with pain than Big Boss’ final salute at her grave? **The Boss is easily the most effective female character ever created by Kojima, and she stands firmly in the upper echelon of the greatest characters in gaming history.**

#### 6. THIS EVIDENCE IS ROUND-ENDING. QUIET DOESN’T SPEAK ENGLISH, BUT SHE CAN SPEAK ANY OTHER LANGUAGE. SHE CAN’T WEAR CLOTHES BC THAT’S HOW SHE BREATHES. QUIET BREATHES THROUGH HER SKIN.

**Schreier 15** [Schreier, Jason. “Why Quiet Wears That Skimpy Outfit In Metal Gear Solid V.” *Kotaku*, Kotaku.com, 8 Sept. 2015, kotaku.com/why-quiet-wears-that-skimpy-outfit-in-metal-gear-solid-1729329735.] // JG

In September of 2013, not long after the reveal of Metal Gear Solid V’s scantily-clad sniper, Quiet, **director Hideo Kojima** took to Twitter to talk about one of his latest creations. “I know there’s people concerning about ‘Quiet’ but don’t worry,” he **wrote** in [a series of messages](https://twitter.com/HIDEO_KOJIMA_EN/statuses/376424398023962624). “**I created her character as an antithesis to the women characters appeared in the past fighting game who are excessively exposed.** ‘Quiet’ who doesn’t have a word will be teased in the story as well. But **once you recognize the secret reason for her exposure, you will feel ashamed of your words & deeds.**” For a long time [people theorized](http://kotaku.com/three-theories-as-to-why-metal-gear-solid-vs-sniper-is-1276826053) about this “secret reason for exposure.” Now that the game is out, and **we’ve learned the explanation behind her outfit**, are we ashamed of our words and deeds? Well… So. **The reason Quiet wears that bikini outfit is that she breathes through her skin, using photosynthesis to absorb air, water, and nutrients. She has to do this because her body is infested with parasites**. At the beginning of the game, the villain Skull Face sends his soldier Quiet—in standard military fatigues—to assassinate Snake. She fails. Snake’s hospital roommate, Ishmael, manages to set her on fire, and she falls screaming from the hospital window. As we find out later, Skull Face was able to save her life by infecting her body with magical parasites that both give her special abilities and turn her into a bioweapon. **Parasites—the new nanomachines**!—are a key part of the plot in Metal Gear Solid V, and I won’t go too much into detail here, but to sum it up: **Because of these parasites, Quiet can’t speak in English, and she can’t wear normal clothing.** During one scene later in the game, **soldiers have forced her to put clothes over her bikini, and you see her come close to suffocating.** It’s never quite clear why these parasites affect different characters in different ways, though. Sometimes they kill people right away; other times they heal wounds and give their hosts special abilities.

#### Outweighs

#### 1: Holistic evaluation- looks @ multiple womxn from multiple MGS games and shows how they’re empowered and subvert tropes

#### 2: Relevancy- The majority of the womxn who have meaningful portrayals are from MGS 4 which is the game I endorse- that outweighs it’s what I directly support.

#### 3: Scope- the most important characters in the game are womxn- the ones who have the biggest impact on the story and Snake are womxn.

# 1AR to Theory/T

## OV (General)

### Weigh Case

#### The aff gets to weigh the case against T ---

#### A: Strategy – T forces a 1AR restart that moots the entire affirmative. That structurally favors the negative because of 1AR time skew and the negatives unique ability to read T and conditional advocacies – that outweighs any substantive harm from our cross-application.B: It’s nonsensical – Saying that we don’t know if the affirmative is true because of abuse is ludicrous because in debates we assume a statement is true if it goes conceded, regardless of why it was conceded. Your logic justifies not evaluating an advantage just because the Aff reads a NIB. C: T vs K Aff debates forces methodology debates that incentivizes interdisciplinary research and more in depth discussions – that’s key to portable skills which o/w because they are the only thing that leaves the debate round, which also warrants education as a voter and that it comes 1st.

#### D: I control uniqueness on the value to debate –your ballot signifies acceptance of symbolic relations embedded in that discourse. This means even if fairness is relevant, we can’t conceptualize fairness without an understanding of how the symbolic dominates praxis. Means only the 1AC controls an internal link to any conception of fairness.

### T Definitions (General)

#### Topicality and the definitions they read is not a rule – it’s a contingent norm proven by things like hypo-testing at the NDT, phil and values debate in the past – nowhere in the tournament invite does it define words in the resolution – which means reading topicality operates as a safety valve for speed elitist debate – the ability to interpret rules for their own benefit is the logic of xenophobic republicans who used 9/11 to justify the war on terror – a fear of the unknown radiating from the securitized anxiety of the west

### ROTB before Theory

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

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

#### 3.Pedagogy- the ROB proves my pedagogy is good in debate space which means it should come before theory since there’s no guarantee of norm-setting but there is guarantee of pedagogical value

#### 4.Scope- the ROB methodology makes descriptive claims about the world and thus how to operate within that world which applies and can motivate action outside of the debate space while theory only operates inside debate making my ROB more valuable

#### 5.Side Constraint- the kritik sets out a problem in society and the ROB attempts to resolve it otherwise that societal bias can never be solved and influences theory meaning it’s a side constraint on effective theory

### A2 Theory before K

#### A] The neg seems to assume absent OPTIMAL testing you can't test something- but that’s false, for example, people use things like cheap pregnancy tests all the time to determine if they're having a kid- which means you only need partial tests to determine the validity of a claim- if i prove you have ground it means you can test the argument - if i prove you have multiple kinds of ground you can test the aff from multiple angles- there's no reason why you need access to every form of testing to see if im accurate or not

#### B] The 1NC is infinitely regressive – the Aff makes claims that your fairness and pedagogy arguments are also biased in favor of you and your pedagogy, for example people who read T-Implementation or T-USFG are biased towards normal policymaking and against new temporalities of policy, which means you saying you preclude the 1AC is just self-serving because it's imposisble to evaluate either claim because of your own epistemic bias.

#### C] Small imbalances in fairness don't destroy someone’s ability to verify who was better at debate- for example if we were both racing each other and i had a 5 second head start and beat you by 2 minutes- no one would say i was the worse racer because 5 seconds does not equal 2 minutes.

### (Predictive) vs Katy Taylor AP sitch

#### CI: The Affirmative Debater does not have to verbally or digitally specify which constructive will be read if there is only one Aff disclosed on the 2018-2019 NDCA Wiki and it is open sourced with highlights.

#### I meet

#### Prefer: Even if I don’t specify if the Aff is new or not, not spending your time meaningfully investing in writing answers. Punishing the Aff for reading an open sourced aff with highlights doesn’t solve because until notified otherwise, since 30 minutes before the round had not occurred, you could prep for the Aff with however many coaches you have.

#### Also, even if the aff was new, there’s no impact because I wouldn’t have given it to you anyway. Your interp fails. You and your coach(es) could’ve done a lot.

#### Empirically Verified – Claudia asked me for the Aff. even if you were waiting for verbal confirmation, one of yall really coulda got on that mf grind since my Aff has been open sourced since Round 1. Screenshots included in the doc.



#### OW’s on norms – your wiki has no round reports, open source, or even identification of opponents, judges, or TOURNAMENTS. My has all of that and more, with ONLY ONE JANFEB AFF DISCLOSED. Downing people for not meeting a norm like email communication becomes incoherent. Screenshots included in the doc.



## A2 T/Theory INTERPS

### Implementation (T-Framework)

#### 1] We meet: We defend that public colleges and universities should not restrict and speech that’s an implementation. We meet that affirmative offense must come from the defense of the affirmative resolution, public colleges restricting speech inhibits the killjoy so we defend that there should not be a restriction.

#### 2] CI:

### T – USFG

### T – Military Aid

#### Military Aid is by definition open to interpretation; it can include the distribution of Metal Gears, nanomachines to PMCs, and more. Furthermore, any definition the Neg puts on military aid is arbitrary because a huge sum of military aid the ACTUAL U.S. provides is obscured by its classified nature.

**CPI 07** [“A Citizen's Guide to Understanding U.S. Foreign Military Aid – Center for Public Integrity.” *Center for Public Integrity*, 22 May 2007, publicintegrity.org/national-security/a-citizens-guide-to-understanding-u-s-foreign-military-aid/.]

**There is no single, accepted definition of the terms** “foreign aid” or even “foreign **military aid**” or “military assistance.” **For** a government as large as that of **the United States**, **it’s** virtually impossible **to track all of the various federal agencies’ programs across countries and sectors to** arrive at a single number that **captures the true amount** of U.S. taxpayer dollars **going to foreign governments**, **or** even just their **militaries**.

**THEY CONTINUE**

Funds appropriated to the State Department and Defense Department represent the vast majority of unclassified military aid and assistance. This report does not attempt to track smaller overseas programs where funding is appropriated to the Justice Department, Drug Enforcement Agency, or Department of Homeland Security. **The public does not have any way of tracking classified programs administered by the U.S.** intelligence community. **These classified programs likely command large amounts of funding, especially after the 9/11 attacks, and oversight is limited to members of congressional intelligence committees.**

### T – Authoritarian

#### Merriam Webster Defines Authoritarian

[“Authoritarian.” *Merriam-Webster*, Merriam-Webster, [www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/authoritarian](http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/authoritarian).] // JG

Definition of authoritarian

1: **of, relating to, or favoring blind submission to**[**authority**](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/authority) / had authoritarian parents

2: **of, relating to, or favoring a concentration of power in a leader or an elite not constitutionally responsible to the people** / an authoritarian regime

#### Cambridge Dictionary Defines Authoritarian

[“Definition of ‘Authoritarian’ - English Dictionary.” *Cambridge Dictionary*, dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/authoritarian.] // JG

adjective

US ​ /əˌθɔr·əˈteər·i·ən, -əˌθɑr-/

[**demanding**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/demanding)[**total**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/total)[**obedience**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/obedience)**to those in**[**positions**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/position)**of**[**authority**](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/authority):

an authoritarian [ruler](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/ruler)/[parent](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/parent)

### T – Regimes

#### “Regime” means either a government or a system or mindset imposed from above.

Googlehttps://www.google.com/search?q=%22regime%22+definition&rlz=1C1GCEU\_enUS820US820&oq=%22regime%22+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60j69i65j69i59l2.2860j0j1&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8

re·gime /rəˈZHēm,rāˈZHēm/Submit noun 1. a government, especially an authoritarian one. synonyms: government, system of government, authorities, rule, authority, control, command, administration, leadership "members of the former military regime" 2. a system or planned way of doing things, especially one imposed from above. "detention centers with a very tough physical regime" synonyms: system, arrangement, order, pattern, method, procedure, routine, course, plan, program "a health regime"

### Must Spec

#### One- infinitely regressive. There’s always more I could spec or less. Impacts:

#### A: Means your interp sets an arbitrary limit- this means you don’t solve abuse, make theory a tool as opposed to a check on the abuse, and sets up a brightline of if you can clarify the question in cross ex within 15 seconds it should be fine- this also puts you in a double bind either 1- the offense you get is minimal so you wouldn’thave asked it in the first place or 2- the offense you get is huge so 15 seconds is a small time commitment

#### B:Causes theory prolif- crows out all substance education which outweighs because theory can always be debated but we only have 2 months for substance-means even if fairness first- you crowd out all education which makes your interp awful because otherwise debate without education would just be a coinflip activity.

### No Impact-Justified ROTB

#### Counter-interpretation: Debaters may read standards or role of the ballots in which the offense consists of descriptive facts about current states of affairs.

#### I meet:

#### Standard: Ground – every framework relies on descriptive claims—i.e., all uniqueness claims for ends-based advantages is a description of the squo, all statistical evidence that’s comprised of empirical facts, and all means-based frameworks test consistency with some principle. The implication of their interp is that we can never make factual claims—that denies a fundamental component. Impact is a) link turns their qualitative ground arguments since they restrict the possible selection of arguments to nil, b) their interp is terrible for education since we can’t read any offense from the real world—real world education is the most portable skill in debate, and c) excludes philosophical education, which is key to fairness since there’s no consensus on the best ethical theory so there’s always something to talk about, but topic lit under a specific standard always flows more toward one side; also key to education—it fosters higher-level critical thinking.

#### Voter: 1) Cross-apply the fairness voter. 2) Education – it’s the constitutive aim of the activity and schools fund participation on the basis of education, so it’s necessary for debate to exist at all.

### Can’t play YT video

#### CI: Debaters may garner offense from the audio of YouTube video if the words spoken in the video are written down in a transcript in the 1AC speech doc and disclosed along with the Affirmative case on the 2018-2019 NDCA wiki.

#### CI:

## A2 T/Theory STANDARDS & VOTERS

### Education First

### A2 Can’t Weigh Case

#### They have to draw a line between what counts as case. The implication is that this creates even more of a time skew bc if I am not allowed to cross apply framework read in the 1AC then I have to read new fw in the 1AR, justify it and extend it. Also, we aren’t cross applying case we are cross applying fw, its not substance about military aid and regimes we are cross applying evidence about sci fi pedagogy as praxis in debate.

### A2 Fairness

#### 1. Non-unique – coaching and resource disparities + differences in ability and skill as well as un-reciprocal structure of the event.

#### 2. Not an impact – it’s not portable the way our subject formation is, and it’s empirically denied as key to the game – people do cheaty shit but we still learn things.

#### 3. I get to weigh the aff –

#### a. All their reasons idea testing is good are reasons we should get the aff to test the shell.

#### b. Begs the question of what we lose – if their model of debate excludes the 1AC, I should get to weigh the aff to justify my model.

#### 4.

### A2 Ground

#### 1. No Abuse – you get all the same DAs, CPs, and NCs, and there are tons of method Ks you could read – there’s no god-given right to politics.

#### 2. Turn – the ground you lose assumes My alternate model reshapes debate as performative pedagogy along with a revitalization of policymaking through science fiction. ANY advantage my ROTB or pedagogy means an Aff ballot. If I win that my model of education is better, then there’s zero abuse.

#### 3. My reframing means both sides lose access to the same ground, so its reciprocal. Even if you win fairness comes first, I am ALWAYS the MOST fair.

#### 4. You get MORE ground – you literally have to prove that science fiction is bad to impact turn the aff.

### A2 Limits

#### OV to the Limits Debate: This is only an internal link to ground, not an independent reason to reject. If I win any defense on ground then there is no impact to limits.

#### 1. The 1AC sets a functional limit – still uses the topic as a stasis but opens up new discussion.

#### 2. Making research harder isn’t an impact – if you wanna win the TOC you gotta get good.

#### 3. Your Limits are absolutely arbitrary

4. People are always stopped from

### A2 Paradigm Issues (DtD, CI, No RVIs)

#### Drop the Debater is incoherent – dropping the debate doesn’t deter people from reading jank positions, people still read Tricks, NIBs, skep, multiple codo PICS, etc.

# 1AR to LARP/Policymaking (CP, DA, PIC)

## PICs

Picing out allows for the patriots to win

## Grace

**One: fiat is illusory- nothing ever leaves the room which means nothing happens. My methodology allows us to understand our own subject positions which means it outweighs**

**Two: other rounds solve- I learn about policy from other rounds on the topic as do you – which means it begs the uniqueness of your education**

**Three: More advocacy- not all debaters have public policy influence so allow reinvention of advocacies through social movements is key to liberation on an individual level**

**Four: Micropolitical movements are key to rupturing overdetermined notions of politics right now- uniqueness is on my side – look to my framework**

## Weighing

#### The Aff is a question of normative policymaking representations and procedures in debate. It is a K of the Neg’s starting point. Don’t let them weigh their CP or DA offense because Aff evaluation comes prior to even evaluating the method of the policymaking which is where they draw offense. Filter the 1NC through the lens of the Aff. For example, you wouldn’t let someone weigh their Kant NC offense from the method against an antiblackness aff that claimed Kant was antiblack because their antiblack reps would be a starting point question for evaluation. The same applies to to my Aff.

https://waypoint.vice.com/en\_us/article/gvvqxq/the-scary-political-relevance-of-metal-gear-solid-2

## A2 Fiat

#### Fiat is science fiction – the process of imagining “what if” is a subset of the SF genre

**LAZ 1996** [Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Southern Maine (Cheryl, “Science Fiction and Introductory Sociology: The "Handmaid" in the Classroom.” Teaching Sociology, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Jan., 1996), pp. 54-63, JSTOR)]

Sociology often has an eye to the future, in terms of either social change, preserving the status quo, or (in less an obviously ideologi- cal way) simple prediction. SF, aside from the future setting of its stories, likewise looks ahead. But science fiction, Ursula Le Guin contends, is not about the future or about prediction. Rather, it is descriptive and speculative. Le Guin describes science fic- tion as "a thought experiment. Let's say (says Mary Shelley) that a young doctor creates a human being in his laboratory; let's say (says Philip K. Dick) that the Allies lost the sec-ond world war; **let's say this or that is such and so, and see what happens**..." (Le Guin 1976). **Much science fiction can be read in such "thought experiment" terms**. What if (Margaret Atwood asks in The Handmaid's Tale) some group wanted to take over the United States? How could they accomplish it? What if (Marge Piercy asks in He, She, andIt) cyborgs were programmed to acquire emotions and desires and to be self-correct- ing? What then would differentiate people from machines? Le Guin, however, believes that science fiction is not about the future. Despite the apparent futuristic quality of The Left Hand of Darkness (set in Ekumenical Year 1490-97 and peopled by androgynes), Le Guin argues, I'm merely observing in the peculiar, devious, and thought-experimental manner proper to science fiction, that if you look at us at certain odd times of day in certain weathers, we already are [androgy- nous]. I am not predicting, or prescribing. I am describing. I am describing certain aspects of psy- chological reality in the novelist's way, which is by inventing elaborately circumstantial lies (1976). SF authors thus create striking and un- usual thought experiments; they invent lies-fictions-to represent "reality" and to present "truth." As sociology teachers using SF, we create a classroom situation in which we ask students to apply sociological skepti- cism and sociological principles derived from "real" life to the world of what is, on the surface, fiction.

# 1AR to Kritiks

### Arun Responses to Kati

sexism in science fiction galvanizes responses and changes which means it's self correcting

quiet was a sexist form of science fiction and provoked long term movement from the commmunity to reform future games and start a larger discussion of women in gaming without quiet that discusison never woudl've happened it also proves science fiction and it's portrayal of people allows us to understand our own biases

## 1AR to Anti-Blackness

### OV

### Case

### K

**Link**

#### Ontological understandings of blackness are essentializing, impede any chance of societal progression, and delegitimize African-American achievements

Gordon 1999 (Lewis R. Gordon is an Afro-Jewish philosopher, political thinker, educator, and musician. Gordon’s research in philosophy is in Africana philosophy, philosophy of existence, phenomenology, social and political philosophy, philosophy of culture, aesthetics, philosophy of education, and philosophy of science, “Pan-Africanism and African-American Liberation in a Postmodern World: A Review Essay”) GNC

Like West, Anderson believes the danger faced by African-American communities does not lie in their failure to identify with the acculturative legacy of Africa. The danger lies, instead, in an absurd attachment to an episteme that has outlived its usefulness for all communities except those who are antipathetic to black communities. That episteme is the notion of ontological blackness. By ontological blackness, Anderson means the collapse of black identity into an essentialized being whereby black existence is foreclosed by narratives of necessity, homogeneity, and totalization. Like Young, Anderson offers methodological considerations for Africana religious thought. The notion of the episteme, for instance, announces a clear affinity to Foucauldian genealogical poststructuralism, where orders of knowledge manifest power relations in different ages. Ontological blackness is thus also a way of ordering blackness, a way that could be overcome by another way of ordering reality. Foucault, as is well known, also refers to these ways of ordering reality as "power/knowledge" because of the control and discipline (power) that stand symbiotically with knowledge. Anderson urges us to reject ontological blackness because it impedes the progress of African Americans. It locks African Americans into an essentialized narrative of suffering and analytically stratifies them in a constant negative relation to whites. In effect, he is criticizing the relational theory of race, which sets blacks in opposition to whites. The problem with this view, he suggests, is that even African Americans' achievements are rendered negative, analytically, by virtue of African Americans having achieved them, which is, in effect, to render the achievements void. This totalized narrative of negative location has dominated African-American theological reflection, Anderson argues, by constantly locating African Americans in the symbolic role of black suffering as Jesus on earth.6

**Impact**

**Alt**

### IF THEY AREN’T BLACK

#### Turn: Nonblack Debaters should not read afropessimism. This is a reason they should lose on the spot

Evans 15 (Rashad, JD Two-time first round debater. CEDA Champion, NDT Semifinalist, and Championship Head coach, “On Flipping Aff & Being Black,” July 31st, 2015, http://www.rwesq.com/on-flipping-aff-being-black/)

I walked away from debate camp this year thinking about a few interactions that I had with the students. This year’s HS debate topic is very interesting. There are many ways to discuss federal surveillance. My lab worked on two affirmative arguments: a critical affirmative to resist the TSA’s use of whole body imagine in airports and a policy affirmative to repeal the federal Real ID Act. In addition to these Affirmative’s we researched two negative positions: Black Nihilism and Settler Colonialism. The theme of the theory and criticism lab was to consider the resolution from the perspective of the Black people, Native people and Transgender people…whatever that means. It was obvious during the course of camp that the students struggled with the Settler Colonialism argument. The alternative required decolonization in a non-metaphorical sense including returning the land. The debaters did not fully understand this in their first debates choosing to argue for all kinds of decolonizing of the mind, the debate space or pedagogy and everything under the sun except giving the land back. When the true alternative was explained the debaters had extreme problems with advocating for giving the land back while being on the land or simply with thinking about giving the land back. They could not conceptualize the alternative (even though it seems simple) and they did not feel comfortable advocating it as a result. Despite having great specific link arguments (Smith ’15), a clear impact (genocide) and clear alternative it was sometimes an uphill battle convincing these debaters to run Settler Colonialism as their main Kritik argument. Such was not the case with Black Nihilism. The debaters actually picked this argument up with some ease. Of course, the argument beneath the Nihilism argument is afro-pessimism. This is a super popular debate argument already so I can see how it might be attractive to young debaters. However, I wonder why there was no similar cognitive dissonance for the debaters before arguing in favor of a radical Black argument which principally focuses on white violence and the necessity of a Black revolution. I listened to the debates just as I have listened to many college debates on the argument and it became clear to me that the kids did not get the argument. The argument had been reduced to: it sucks to be the Black body. I consistently hear debaters saying things like “the Back body can never…” “the Black body always…”"…to the Black body.” The is actually a reprieve from those debaters who would sometimes insert slave instead of Black body. In any event, non-Black debaters tend to use the pessimism argument to reduce Black people to a body or slave or simply an object. This is kinda the argument. But, this is the perversity of the argument in the hands of non-black debaters. One important move of afro-pessimism is to focus on anti-blackness as opposed to or in addition to white supremacy. The idea is that the world is anti-black and that anti-blackness is: (1) bigger than individual acts, (2) about more than white people and (3) foundational to humanity and civil society. In other words, all white people are implicated no matter how good or nice they are and so are non-white, non-Black people and no good can come of this world. However, that focus on anti-blackness and what makes the Black experience unique has also become an excuse for non-Black debaters to only focus on how “the Black body” is positioned by violence without theorizing about who is doing the positioning. In addition, if the world is always already anti-black then it can be difficult to see how any individual debater, judge or coach might be actually participating in anti-blackness, particularly as they engage with each other on the everyday. And, that humanity and civil society is fundamentally anti-black is merely an opportunity to explain why it has always sucked to be Black and not an opportunity to explain that the only way to affirm Blackness is to upend the entire world and at least includes a violent war against white people. Afropessimism is nothing if not an affirmation of blackness. It includes a negation of the world, but it is principally an affirming argument. For Black people. A white afropessimist makes no sense. White afropessimism is just anti-blackness. If you are a white afro-pessimist you should understand that your existence is complicit in violence against Black people and/or that your non-existence is a necessity to Black liberation. Under no circumstances should you understand your role to be to spread the gospel of pessimism further. Your engagement with the argument will always be theoretical (you have no relevant experience), redundant (you can never be additive to this conversation) and objectifying (reducing black people to objects of study). Afropessimism is an argument about why Black people should be the subjects of the debate. It is about how Black people are always already the subject of all debates but excluded from them as such. It is not about white people. All of this assumes that we are taking the argument seriously and not speaking in metaphorical terms, something Eve Tuck warns against in the context of settler colonialism. Both the Settler Colonialism and Black Nihilism arguments rely significantly on Fanon. And Fanon’s main point is that the native/colonialist and/or black/white cannot coexist. In practical terms, this meant that Black liberation in Africa required a violent war to the end. It’s an either/or life or death choice for both sides. But, understanding that anti-black violence is foundational is to understand that you have to fight back in literal terms. To end the world is to end the world. I am not certain that debaters fully understand the implications of such. If the students in my lab understood this they would have found the Black Nihilism argument as difficult as the Settler Colonialism argument. But they did not, partially because they were introduced to the argument from the perspective of Gramsci and a theory of civil society and not from Fanon and everyday anti-Black violence, but also because I didn’t take the time to explain the argument fully. Under no circumstances should non-Black debaters be taught to advocate for afro-pessimism from a non-Black person. And under no circumstances should two white boys think they have a better shot flipping negative and running afropessimism than reading their own Aff (something I had to explain before a quarters debate at the camp tournament). When that happens something has gone wrong.

## 1AR to Baudrillard

### OV

### K

**Bêty 16** [Bêty, Jean-Marc. “Metal Gear Solid V Et Hideo Kojima: Procédés De Transmission Et Rhétorique Auctoriale Procédurale.” *Papyrus: Institutional Repository*, Université De Montréal, Aug. 2016. TRANSLATED FROM FRENCH TO ENGLISH. I have the PDF with complete English translations, PM me for it.] // JG

Rather than addressing the subject of the sociological effects of media representation of violence to a given audience, an age-old discussion that will not certainly not its conclusion in this work, it seems to us more useful to explore the societal investment of violence as a sign. Boyle, trying to explain why violence is so much assumed and celebrated in contemporary media, the hypothesis that anxiety and insecurity are at the root of this phenomenon representative. Like many researchers, she finds that action films and horror movies pit protagonists against obstacles or antagonists symbolic that respond to real fears. So, American action movies, by example, are more inclined to present Russian, German or Arab antagonists, which echoes a long history of social insecurity. **As part of** a production such as **Metal Gear Solid**, we will not be surprised that **the subject of nuclear have a marked preponderance**. So, in every episode of the series, Metal Gear Solid V no exception, **we find the humanoid tank Metal Gear, a weapon capable of** unleash **nuclear attacks from anywhere on the planet.** The Metal Gear **serves** besides boss fight **in each new episode** of the series, **a clash that** generally **decides on the future of global security. Social anxiety manifests itself as a** more or less **concrete antagonist in media representations** contemporary, **which diffuses signs that resonate within various groups.** **The Metal Gear Solid franchise**, **using the subject of terrorism and nuclear weapons in addition to unfolding during various decades that have marked the collective imagination** (such the cold war during which Metal Gear Solid V ) takes place , thus succeeding in resonating with a lot of global fears, which explains some of the success of the series. In his sociology, **Baudrillard comes to a different reason for explaining the success of violence as a consumer vocabulary.** **According to him, advertising is** perhaps **the most remarkable medium of our time.** As a system of transmission whose sole role is to sell a sign-object, she manages to convince the individual that consumption represents the ultimate social accomplishment of his nobody. An advertisement certainly glorifies an object, but a continuous projection of commercials rather glorifies the consumer society in its entirety. The function of communication of mass advertising does not come from its contents or its modes of diffusion, nor of its manifest objectives, it stems rather from its very logic of an empowered medium that refers only to an empty sign whose sole purpose is to spread. The sign is empty because it is unreal, one of its most specific properties being rather conjure the said real. Some signs return more easily than others to our daily life, for example the image that often accompanies the newsletter or the article of newspaper, but the "real, we consume it in anticipation or retrospectively, of any remote way, distance which is that of the sign. (Baudrillard, 1970: 31) The sign makes always referring to a real fantasy, the vertigo effect of the spectacular being the real sensation in image consumption within a society governed by the news item (as is the consumer society). However, the sensation of vertigo is experienced only through the consumption of violence. To justify his new hedonistic conduct at the antipode of his cultural heritage generally voluntarist, the contemporary citizen is passionate about the disaster and the misfortune. This explains why the mass media are constantly looking for the new disasters to communicate: paradoxically, without this work, the individual does not could go further with its tranquility acquired thanks to the consumer society since the tension between the Puritan morality and the hedonistic morality that inhabits it would not be resorbed (at least, not in the present model of society). So, the daily life pacified feeds on allusive violence through the news, murder, terrorist threat, Atomic threat: The apocalyptic is the substance of the mass media. The repression of the probative nature of the individual resurfaces in a new form which is thus interested in dangers more or less real and immediate (transmitted in the form of signs) that populate the world. By its consumption of signs, the individual feels himself again a participant in the society. Thanks to the violent and historical context of the battlefields to which the player joined, not to mention the symbolic fiction of Metal Gear as a manifestation of the nuclear danger, Metal Gear Solid V allows the player to feel part of the story World. Even more concretely than a film or a journalistic column, the game gives the player the impression of becoming an important social player by taking part in dangerous situations that he resolves with his own hands. The video game uses the desire of the player to absorb the insoluble violence that surrounds him. As stated Baudrillard, "abundance and violence go together, they must be analyzed together. (Baudrillard, 1970: 280) The incessant consumption of violence becomes inevitable because of the society in which we live and the signs it transmits. conjure the said real. Some signs return more easily than others to our daily life, for example the image that often accompanies the newsletter or the article of newspaper, but the "real, we consume it in anticipation or retrospectively, of any remote way, distance which is that of the sign. (Baudrillard, 1970: 31) The sign makes always referring to a real fantasy, the vertigo effect of the spectacular being the real sensation in image consumption within a society governed by the news item (as is the consumer society). However, the sensation of vertigo is experienced only through the consumption of violence. To justify his new hedonistic conduct at the antipode of his cultural heritage generally voluntarist, the contemporary citizen is passionate about the disaster and the misfortune. This explains why the mass media are constantly looking for the new disasters to communicate: paradoxically, without this work, the individual does not could go further with its tranquility acquired thanks to the consumer society since the tension between the Puritan morality and the hedonistic morality that inhabits it would not be resorbed (at least, not in the present model of society). So, the daily life pacified feeds on allusive violence through the news, murder, terrorist threat, Atomic threat: The apocalyptic is the substance of the mass media. The repression of the probative nature of the individual resurfaces in a new form which is thus interested in dangers more or less real and immediate (transmitted in the form of signs) that populate the world. By its consumption of signs, the individual feels himself again a participant in the society. Thanks to the violent and historical context of the battlefields to which the player joined, not to mention the symbolic fiction of Metal Gear as a manifestation of the nuclear danger, Metal Gear Solid V allows the player to feel part of the story World. Even more concretely than a film or a journalistic column, the game gives the player the impression of becoming an important social player by taking part in dangerous situations that he resolves with his own hands. The video game uses the desire of the player to absorb the insoluble violence that surrounds him. As stated Baudrillard, "abundance and violence go together, they must be analyzed together. (Baudrillard, 1970: 280) The incessant consumption of violence becomes inevitable because of the society in which we live and the signs it transmits. individuals in order to share their own fears as signs that these do not to ask again and again because they feel they are part of real issues. Like Boyle and Baudrillard, George Gerbner believes that social values are now transmitted more by the media than by parents, religion or school. he believes in a real risk for the individual to begin to interpret media violence real, thus causing it to be wary of society as a whole because of the spectacularization of the mass media. Formerly, fairy tales, mythology and number of other stories more or less old used violence for purposes of teaching, each story containing a lesson, a moral, whose purpose was to allow the education of the individual. Nowadays, we are usually in front of a "happy violence" (Gerbner, 2006: 46) fast, spectacular and clean. Belligerence displayed by contemporary media drives the individual to experience strong emotions and stimulating that will not lead him to reflect on his existence or his society, such a reflection may be gloomy since violence can not lead to introspection or extraspections favorable to the status quo. So, nowadays, the representation of the violence has become a simple marketing strategy aimed at attracting maximum attention with as little artistic effort as possible. Here, Metal Gear Solid V stands out from the normal production of AAA video games by employing a thoughtful and meaningful violence that we will decipher step by step in the chapters following. For the moment, however, it is important to emphasize the importance of war, killing and fighting in advertising material surrounding the game. In videos in E3 2014 and E3 2015, Kojima Productions presented The Phantom Pain through montages of a few minutes. Separated from a year However, the two videos each reveal only scenes of fighting or very physical conflicts. The viewer sees dismembered bodies, torture, fighting hand-to-hand combat with rifles, riots, corpses and more. The video of the E3 2014 does not even contain the slightest word, being content rather to show a panoply of clashes with as sound accompaniment the Nuclear song by Mike Oldfield. Although the end result is a rather slow video presumably seeking to demonstrate the self-destructive reality of the battlefield, it still remains that graphic violence is, so to speak, the only constituent of advertisement. The 2015 video includes replicas helping us locate some rather rare themes in a production AAA (we will return to them in the next chapter), nevertheless we are again in front of a montage of scenes bloody despite the addition of a computed script presentation. With or without purposes artistic, the omnipresence of graphic violence serves as a supposed advertising engine attract the attention of as wide a public as possible, a marketing strategy as simple as effective.
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## 1AR to Nietzsche (NC and Kritik)

http://v1.escapistmagazine.com/articles/view/video-games/15318-What-Would-Friedrich-Nietzsche-Say-About-The-Metal-Gear-Series
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## 1AR to Undercomms

Undercommons are an alternative reading of the modern university, you collapse to science fiction proliferation because the only way to formulate horizons for new subjectivity is through pedagogical interaction. Imagining refusal and taking back to the undercommons are literally a temporality of fiction that wont leave this round, means any offense to the K is justification for the Aff.

## 1AR to Wynter

### OV

### Case

### K

#### Link

**NO LINK - The 1AC recognizes that certain processes and vectors are free flowing and natural- I merely criticize that fact that some processes have been ossified by the state and prevent actualizing potential. This means my 1AC is consistent with your criticism.**

#### Alt

#### Permutation: Do the alt then the aff

#### Permutation: Affirm life value and understand that there is potential inherent in all things, then do the aff to allow for the embracing of zoe by reconfiguring assemblages that make certain modes of being inaccessible for certain subjects. The net benefit is proper use of assemblages- we need to understand the intricacies of explicit policies, the operations of the state, and the way that gun culture pervades and forces expectations on individuals- this hijanks your assemblage arguments- identity is merely one part of the map of interactions- we need to understand the position of all subjects and events in order to understand how certain identities are created as majoritarian or minoritarian- this entails mapping out relations between all parties, deconstructing how those event spaces occur, and then creating lines of flight or particular actions to create new policies- this means the 1AC is a useful manifestation of what your alternative tries to do because it attempts to change the flow of disposability to let certain articulations of identity free flow

#### This is also terminal defense on your alternative- individuals don’t understand incoherence-ergo why it is incoherent- it means your pedagogy is useless to the subjects it’s meant to actually help- there’s a reason antihumanism has always failed in the real world- because it’s articulated in unhelpful ways. Recognizing humanism as historically contingent allows us to articulate harms in an understandable while also avoiding the pitfalls of your criticism.

#### This also proves context outweighs in terms of subject formation- the 1AC is an attempt to reconfigure the way that forces of the assemblage interact in order to allow minoritarian expressions to reveal themselves- this means I solve 100% of your impacts. The alternative by itself is doomed to failure- rejecting all categories makes it impossible to articulate things like agency or reponsiblity- uniquely takes out solvency because there’s no reason for any agent or event to refrain from destroying another. This means the 1AC is methodological pre-requisite to explaning how oppression and suffering happen in the world of the 1NC.

# 1AR to Framework NCs

## Vs Mouffe

#### Mouffe’s political theory makes violence inevitable.

Robinson, 5

[Andrew Robinson, Ph.D. in Political Theory at the University of Nottingham, 2005, “The Political Theory of Constitutive Lack: A Critique,” NC]
To take an example, Chantal Mouffe criticises deconstructive ethics for being ‘unable to come to terms with “the political” in its antagonistic dimension’; ‘what is missing’ from a politics of dialogue with others is ‘a proper reflection on the moment of “decision” which characterises the field of politics’ and which ‘entail[s] an element of force and violence’ (2000, 129-30). To this ostensibly incomplete politics, Mouffe adds an imperative about ‘coming to terms’ with the ‘nature’ of the social. One should seek a politics which ‘acknowledges the real nature of [the] frontiers [of the social] and the forms of exclusion that they entail, instead of trying to disguise them under the veil of rationality or morality’ (2000, 105). A failure to accept antagonism is a ‘dangerous liberal illusion’ and an ‘aversion to reality’ (1993, 127, 149). Mouffe therefore accepts social exclusion as a necessity, and opposes any attempt to resolve (rather than institutionalize or domesticate) conflict. Friend/enemy frontiers are necessary, and hostility, which is ontological and ineradicable, can be contained but never eliminated (1993, 3-4). In practice, this means directly favouring the existence of conflict and antagonism. In other passages, Mouffe expresses the ethics of antagonism more directly, labelling it as a value in its own right. Hence, equality and liberty ‘can never be… reconciled, but this is precisely what constitutes for [Mouffe] the value of liberal democracy’ (1993, 110). She also refers to division as an ‘ideal’ and an ‘urgent need’ (1993, 114, 118). In other words, negativity and conflict are given a positive value of their own, because they express what is taken to be the essence of social life: constitutive lack. One finds the same view expressed in works by other authors who use the Lacanian paradigm. Ernesto Laclau, for instance, claims that a ‘world in which reform takes place without violence is not a world in which I would like to live’ (1996, 114). He also calls for ‘a symbolisation of impossibility as such as a positive value’ (Butler, Laclau and Žižek, 2000, 199). Badiou, meanwhile, insists that ethics remain confined by the Real. ‘At least one real element must exist… that the truth cannot force’ (2001, 85).