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#### Interpretation: Topical affirmatives may only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation by governments that The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust

#### Resolved requires policy action

Louisiana State Legislature (<https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx>) Ngong

**Resolution**

**A legislative instrument** that generally is **used for** making declarations, **stating policies**, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution **uses the term "resolved".** Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### Appropriation

TIMOTHY JUSTIN TRAPP, JD Candidate @ UIUC Law, ’13, TAKING UP SPACE BY ANY OTHER MEANS: COMING TO TERMS WITH THE NONAPPROPRIATION ARTICLE OF THE OUTER SPACE TREATY UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LAW REVIEW [Vol. 2013 No. 4]

The issues presented in relation to the nonappropriation article of the Outer Space Treaty should be clear.214 The ITU has, quite blatantly, created something akin to “property interests in outer space.”215 It allows nations to exclude others from their orbital slots, even when the nation is not currently using that slot.216 This is directly in line with at least one definition of outer-space appropriation.217 [\*\*Start Footnote 217\*\*Id. at 236 (“Appropriation of outer space, therefore, is ‘the exercise of exclusive control or exclusive use’ with a sense of permanence, which limits other nations’ access to it.”) (quoting Milton L. Smith, The Role of the ITU in the Development of Space Law, 17 ANNALS AIR & SPACE L. 157, 165 (1992)). \*\*End Footnote 217\*\*]The ITU even allows nations with unused slots to devise them to other entities, creating a market for the property rights set up by this regulation.218 In some aspects, this seems to effect exactly what those signatory nations of the Bogotá Declaration were trying to accomplish, albeit through different means.219

#### Topicality is key to limits and ground---redefining portions of the resolution permits endless reclarification AND creates incentives for avoidance---only aligning research with agent and mechanism solves.

#### Two impacts:

#### 1---Fairness---an unlimited, unpredictable topic disparately raises the research burden for the negative -- treat this is a sufficient win condition because fairness is the logical structure that undergirds all impacts AND controls any benefit to debate.

**Dascal and Knoll** ’**11** [Marcelo and Amnon; May 18th; former Professor of Philosophy at Tel Aviv University, B.A. in Philosophy from the University of Sao Paulo; former Professor of Philosophy at Tel Aviv University; Argumentation: Cognition and Community, "'Cognitive systemic dichotomization' in public argumentation and controversies," p. 20-25]

He opposes positions whose ‘exclusionist’ outlook rejects the normative approach to the political sphere on the grounds that “normative statements can never be subjected to a reasonable discussion” (ibid.: 2), because—he argues—the discussion of politics “is an area of vital interest to all of us and should clearly not be excluded from argumentative reasonableness” (ibid.: 3)—a view with which we are prone to agree. Nevertheless, he admits that in the present situation critical discussion is far from being systematically and successfully applied to that vital area: “In representative democracies, however, the out-comes of the political process tend to be predominantly the product of negotiations be-tween political leaders rather than the result of a universal and mutual process of deliberative disputation” (ibid.). Political debates, therefore, are ‘quasi-discussions’, i.e., “monologues calculated only to win the audience’s consent to one’s own views”, rather than ‘genuine discussions’, i.e., serious attempts to have an intellectual exchange, which is typical of critical discussions (ibid.). In order to overcome this situation, “democracy should always have promoted such a critical discussion of standpoints as a central aim. Only if this is the case can stimulating participation in political discourse enhance the quality of democracy" (ibid.). This can be achieved, however, only by following “the dialectical rules for argumentative discourse that make up a code of conduct for political discourse [and] are therefore of crucial importance to giving substance to the ideal of participatory democracy” (ibid.: 4); thereby fully acknowledging that “education in processing argumentation in a critical discussion is indispensable for a democratic society (van Eemeren 1995: 145-146).

The reasons provided for the failure of the adoption of the critical discussion model in reality ranges from a general allusion to human nature (“in real-life contexts, it has to be taken into account that human interaction is not always automatically 'naturally' and fully oriented toward the ideal of dialectical reasonableness "; van Eemeren 2010: 4) to specific political sphere argumentation handicaps (unwillingness of people “to subject their thinking to critical scrutiny”; “vested interest in particular outcome”; “inequality in power and resources; “different levels of critical skills”; and “a practical demand for an immediate settlement”; van Eemeren 2010: 4). Although these causes may have some explanatory value in some cases, in our opinion their modus operandi is not accounted for and, what is more important, they do not cover the full spectrum of challenges that the successful use of critical discussion in the public and political spheres must face, as we have seen (cf. sections 2 and 3).

No wonder that van Eemeren himself raises the question “whether maintaining the dialectical ideal of critical discussion in political and other real-life contexts is not utopian” (ibid.), to which he replies by admitting that "[t]he ideal of a critical discussion is by definition not a description of any kind of reality but sets a theoretical standard that can be used for heuristic, analytic and evaluative purpose” (ibid.). This ideal seems to be so inspiring that it remains valid as a pure theoretical ideal, “even if the argumentative discourse falls short of the dialectical ideal” (ibid.).

In the light of the substantial gap between the normative ideal and the actual practices of public and political argumentation that PD’s description and explanation provides, a number of doubts arise: Are there structural, rather than merely contingent obstacles in idealized critical discussion that prevents even its approximate use in the public sphere? Can a theory that claims to be a praxis based normative system fulfill its promise if it sets up a threshold that no one who tries to apply it to the public sphere can reach? Doesn’t the very fact that argumentation is excessively idealized in the model PD proposes cause the gap by distancing people concerned by public issues from argumentation at all? All these doubts suggest that a powerful structural phenomenon like the existence of CSDs in the public sphere is perhaps overlooked by PD and requires, for its overcoming, a radically different approach.

4.2 Discrepancies between the PD approach and reasonable argumentation in the public sphere

The discrepancies in question have to do with basic parameters relevant to every argumentative process, namely:

(A) The discussants’ goals and targets: what do they expect to achieve through the argumentation process and what is it capable of providing.

(B) The preconditions for initiating a critical discussion: what are the discussants presumed to know and accept of these preconditions.

(C) The argumentative process that is supposed to lead to the achievement of the discussants’ goals.

(D) The influence of context and agents on the argumentative process.

4.2.1 Goals

Assuming that argumentation is a voluntary endeavor, the parties are presumed to engage in it if and only if: (i) the process will serve their goals; (ii) these goals cannot be achieved by different, better means.

PD describes as follows the aim of engaging in an argumentative process:

Argumentation is basically aimed at resolving a difference of opinion about the acceptability of a standpoint by making an appeal to the other party's reasonableness. (van Eemeren 2010: 1, with reference to van Eemeren & Grootendorst 2004: 11-18)

The difference of opinion is resolved when the antagonist accepts the protagonist's viewpoint on the basis of the arguments advanced or when the protagonist abandons his viewpoint as a result of the critical responses of the antagonist. (van Eemeren 2010: 33)

Simply put, the basic assumption is that a critical discussion’s aim consists in putting forth a certain position by one of the parties for the critical examination of the other, who calls it into question. The latter undertakes to refute the former’s position, while its proponent is committed to defend it. Four stages (see below) are supposed to ensure a valid performance of the refutation and defense tasks. The essential point is that at the end of the four stages the parties clearly agree whether the proponent’s position has been refuted or not and, accordingly, change their position (either retracting it or withdrawing from his questioning). In ‘mixed’ disagreements, in which the antagonist not only questions but also puts forth an opposed position, the same process takes place sequentially, i.e., at first one side (A) attacks trying to refute the other’s (B) position, and after this stage is concluded, they switch roles and the second side (B) proceeds to attack the first (A) in the same fashion.

Regardless of whether the described process is indeed capable to yield a conclusive decision about the refutation of a position, and of whether the linearity of the refutation process makes sense, it is obvious that debates in the public sphere are for the most part ‘mixed’. Furthermore, in so far as these debates involve dichotomous positions (rather than just opposed ones), it is necessary that at the end of the PD process one of the parties accept the position of the other.

It is also worth noticing that, contrary to deliberative democracy approaches, which in some cases approve the attempt to reach agreement in a (public) debate as a form of justification of political systems, PD claims that it is not a consensus theory at all. Instead, it conceives itself as a theory based on Popper’s critical rationality, i.e., as having as its principal goal to provide each party with the means—i.e., refutation attempts—to test critically its position:

[T]he conception of reasonableness upheld in pragma-dialectics insights from critical rationalist epistemology and utilitarian ethics conjoin … The intersubjective acceptability we attribute to the procedure, which is eventually expected to lend conventional validity to the procedure, is primarily based on its instrumentality in doing the job it is intended to do: re-solving a difference of opinion. … This means that, philosophically speaking, the rationale for accepting the pragma-dialectical procedure is pragmatic—more precisely, utilitarian [italics in quoted text]. … However, based on Popper's falsification idea, this is a ‘negative’ and not ‘positive’, utilitarianism. … Rather than maximization of agreement, minimization of disagreement is to be aimed for. (van Eemeren 2010: 34)

The distinction between maximization of agreement and minimization of disagreement purports to stress that PD doesn’t view agreement as the suitable end of the process, but just as “an intermediate step on the way to new, and more advanced, disagreements” (van Eemeren 2010: 26n). Nevertheless, no explanation is given of how these “more advanced disagreements” are engendered as a part of the dynamics of the critical process, nor what is the role or value of such disagreements in the public sphere or elsewhere. This may be due to the fact that PD’s ‘critical discussion’ is not tuned to the generation of new positions or ideas but only to the testing of extant ones, thus echoing once again Popper, now in his focus on the justification rather than on the discovery of theories (see sections 4.2.4 and 5).

In any case, it is quite clear that the only practical result of the critical discussion à la PD of opposed positions on a public issue is to determine whether one discussant succeeded in refuting the other’s position, thus obtaining the adversary’s agreement, who will then share his/her position, at least for some time. In this respect, PD’s critical discussion is close to Habermas’s ‘reasonable argumentation’, whose aim is to reach consensus.15 In spite of the apparent difference between a critical examination of a position aiming at its refutation or at its acceptance, even van Eemeren admits, to some extent, their similarity. He points out that “the pragma-dialectical procedure deals only with ‘first order’ conditions for resolving differences of opinion on the merits by means of critical discussion” (van Eemeren 2010: 34), and stresses that there are ‘higher order’ conditions, ‘internal’ and ‘external’, that are “beyond the agent’s control”, conditions that are similar to Habermas’s “ideal speech conditions” (van Eemeren 2010: 35n). Anyhow, whether according to PD the main goal of the critical discussion process in the public alliance is to create the opportunity for refutation or for agreement (meaning that one of the discussants acknowledges that his position is wrong), the essential assumption of this process is that the participants in it in the public sphere (or elsewhere) must be aware that one of them holds a wrong position and will have to explicitly acknowledge this.

Is such a goal, especially when conceived as the ultimate aim of the proposed argumentative process, feasible and acceptable in the public sphere?

In our opinion, there are at least four reasons for arguing that it is a utopian, hence unacceptable goal, if one takes seriously what should be expected from argumentative practice and theory in the public sphere. First, because PD deserves a critique similar to the one leveled against the Popperian version of critical rationalism it espouses,16 which defends a theory of knowledge “without a knowing subject” (Popper 1972); obviously, such a-contextual position becomes even more problematic if applied to the public and political spheres, where it must operate in a context essentially involved with practical rationality. Second, due to its analogy with theories such as Habermas’s that were discussed in this section as well as in 2.2—an analogy that deserves additional criticism because, unlike Habermasianism, PD overlooks the relationship between the political and public context and argumentative practice. Third, because of PD’s total overlooking of the role of CSDs in public argumentation (cf. 4.2.2). And fourth, due to unilateral value judgments of positions in the public sphere, which lead to simplistic criteria of refutation or acceptance in a domain where complexity is the rule (cf. 2.1.1 and 4.2.3).

(ii) Let us admit, for the sake of argument, that the refutation goal as claimed by PD is central, feasible, acceptable, and useful in public argumentation. Aren’t there better ways to achieve this goal?

The refutation and defense moves stipulated by the PD critical discussion model include, on the one side, the antagonist’s critical remarks or demands and on the other, the proponent’s replies. We believe that it must be assumed that neither the critique nor the replies are previously known to the contenders, which is why they have an interest in engage in the argumentation process: presumably, the expression of both, counter-arguments and defensive-arguments, is good to both sides. In spite of its usefulness in certain situations, this kind of exchange does not amount to the full manifestation of the dialectical critical process, wherein the context and co-text of the dialectical exchange, as well as the cognitive interaction that takes place and evolves throughout the exchange, play a decisive role in the design and ‘inner’ justification of each of the participants’ moves. Argumentation strategies that take into account these resources and make full use of their potential are no doubt setting up another, broader span of goals for the argumentative process, and are more likely to achieve these goals more effectively than they certainly would achieve their PD more limited counterparts (cf. 4.2.4 and 5).

4.2.2 Preconditions

The ideal PD critical discussion can only be realized if some preconditions are satisfied. The most important ones are a) a clear-cut identification of the standpoint that provokes the disagreement, b) the decision of the parties to engage in a discussion, and c) the participants’ commitment to obey the procedural rules. As we shall see, these preconditions share a common assumption, which calls into question the feasibility of using critical discussion in the public sphere.

(A) This precondition assumes that it is possible to isolate rigorously the subject matter of a critical discussion, so as to conduct a focused discussion that makes use only of relevant arguments. This precondition is quite strict, for whenever both discussants defend contrary standpoints, their disagreement should be treated as two separate fully fledged discussions: “… if another discussion begins, it must go through the same stages again—from confrontation stage to concluding stage” (van Eemeren 2010: 10n).

(B) This precondition subordinates the decision to engage in the discussion to the evaluation that the discussants share enough common ground to pursue it adequately: “After the parties have decided that there is enough common ground to conduct a discussion …” (van Eemeren 2010: 33).

(C) This precondition stresses the ‘contractual’ character of a critical discussion, which requires explicit mutual commitments by the discussants. Its rationale is that without such commitments the aim of the critical discussion, i.e., the resolution of the difference of opinions, will not be achieved, which makes engaging in the discussion pointless: “There is no point in venturing to resolve a difference … if there is no mutual commitment to a common starting point, which may include procedural commitments as well as substantive agreement” (van Eemeren and Grootendorst 2004: 60).

These ‘first order’ preconditions, as they are labeled in PD (cf. van Eemeren 2010: 33), are the conditions that candidates to participate in a critical discussion must fulfill if they intend to do so and can afford it personally (a ‘second order’ condition) and politically (a ‘third order’ condition).17 In addition, the first order conditions demand from the prospective discussants a clear, distinct, and detailed picture of the scope of the discussion that they are about to engage in. This means not mixing up the various differences of opinion that the discussion may involve, and being able to separate them properly as the subject matter for independent discussions; a further requirement is the anticipated identification of the pieces of the ‘substantive agreement’ forming the starting point in order to ensure that they are sufficient for conducting the discussion up to a satisfactory closure.

#### 2---Clash---forfeiting government action sanctions retreat from controversy and forces the negative to concede solvency before winning a link -- clash is the necessary condition for distinguishing debate from discussion, but negation exists on a sliding scale -- that jumpstarts the process of critical thinking, reflexivity, and argument refinement.

#### 3---Movement Lawyering Skills – contingent, focused debates around locus points of difference are key to develop activists skills for political justice.

Archer 18, Deborah N. "Political Lawyering for the 21st Century." Denv. L. Rev. 96 (2018): 399. (Associate Professor of Clinical Law at NYU School of Law)//Elmer

Political justice lawyers must be able to break apart a systemic problem **into manageable components**. The **complexity** of social problems, can **cause law students, and even experienced political lawyers, to become overwhelmed**. In describing his work challenging United States military and economic interventions abroad, civil rights advocate and law professor Jules Lobel wrote of this process: “Our foreign-policy litigation became a sort of Sisyphean quest as we maneuvered through a hazy maze cluttered with gates. Each gate we unlocked led to yet another that blocked our path, with the elusive goal of judicial relief always shrouded in the twilight mist of the never-ending maze.”144 Pulling apart a larger, systemic problem into its smaller components can help elucidate options for advocacy. An instructive example is the use of excessive force by police officers against people of color. Every week seems to bring a new video featuring graphic police violence against Black men and women. Law students are frequently outraged by these incidents. But the sheer frequency of these videos and lack of repercussions for perpetrators overwhelm those students just as often. What can be done about a problem so big and so pervasive? To move toward justice, advocates must be able to break apart the forces that came together to lead to that moment: intentional discrimination, implicit bias, ineffective training, racial segregation, lack of economic opportunity, the over-policing of minority communities, and the failure to invest in non-criminal justice interventions that adequately respond to homelessness, mental illness, and drug addiction. None of these component problems are easily addressed, but breaking them apart is more manageable—and more realistic—than acting as though there is a single lever that will solve the problem. After identifying the component problems, advocates can select one and repeat the process of breaking down that problem until they get to a point of entry for their advocacy. 2. Identifying Advocacy Alternatives As discussed earlier, political justice lawyering embraces litigation, community organizing, interdisciplinary collaboration, legislative reform, public education, direct action, and other forms of advocacy to achieve social change. After parsing the underlying issues, lawyers need to identify what a lawyer can and should do on behalf of impacted communities and individuals, and this includes determining the most effective advocacy approach. Advocates must also strategize about what can be achieved in the short term versus the long term. The fight for justice is a marathon, not a sprint. Many law students experience frustration with advocacy because they expect immediate justice now. They have read the opinion in Brown v. Board of Education, but forget that the decision was the result of a decades-long advocacy strategy.145 Indeed, the decision itself was no magic wand, as the country continues to work to give full effect to the decision 70 years hence. Advocates cannot only fight for change they will see in their lifetime, they must also fight for the future.146 Change did not happen over night in Brown and lasting change cannot happen over night today. Small victories can be building blocks for systemic reform, and advocates must learn to see the benefit of short-term responsiveness as a component of long-term advocacy. Many lawyers subscribe to the American culture of success, with its uncompromising focus on immediate accomplishments and victories.147 However, those interested in social justice must adjust their expectations. Many pivotal civil rights victories were made possible by the seemingly hopeless cases that were brought, and lost, before them.148 In the fight for justice, “success inheres in the creation of a tradition, of a commitment to struggle, of a narrative of resistance that can inspire others similarly to resist.”149 Again, Professor Lobel’s words are instructive: “the current commitment of civil rights groups, women’s groups, and gay and lesbian groups to a legal discourse to legal activism to protect their rights stems in part from the willingness of activists in political and social movements in the nineteenth century to fight for rights, even when they realized the courts would be unsympathetic.”150 Professor Lobel also wrote about Helmuth James Von Moltke, who served as legal advisor to the German Armed Services until he was executed in 1945 by Nazis: “In battle after losing legal battle to protect the rights of Poles, to save Jews, and to oppose German troops’ war crimes, he made it clear that he struggled not just to win in the moment but to build a future.”151 3. Creating a Hierarchy of Values Advocates challenging complex social justice problems can find it difficult to identify the correct solution when one of their social justice values is in conflict with another. A simple example: a social justice lawyer’s demands for swift justice for the victim of police brutality may conflict with the lawyer’s belief in the officer’s fundamental right to due process and a fair trial. While social justice lawyers regularly face these dilemmas, law students are not often forced to struggle through them to resolution in real world scenarios—to make difficult decisions and manage the fallout from the choices they make in resolving the conflict. Engaging in complex cases can force students to work through conflicts, helping them to articulate and sharpen their beliefs and goals, forcing them to clearly define what justice means broadly and in the specific context presented. Lawyers advocating in the tradition of political lawyering anticipate the inevitable conflict between rights, and must seek to resolve these conflicts through a “hierarchy of values.”152 Moreover, in creating the hierarchy, the perspectives of those directly impacted and marginalized should be elevated “because it is in listening to and standing with the victims of injustice that the need for critical thinking and action become clear.”153 One articulation of a hierarchy of values asserts “people must be valued more than property. Human rights must be valued more than property rights. Minimum standards of living must be valued more than the privileged liberty of accumulated political, social and economic power. Finally, the goal of increasing the political, social, and economic power of those who are left out of the current arrangements must be valued more than the preservation of the existing order that created and maintains unjust privilege.”154 C. Rethinking the Role of the Clinical Law Professor: Moving From Expert to Colleague Law students can learn a new dimension of lawyering by watching their clinical law professor work through innovative social justice challenges alongside them, as colleagues. This is an opportunity not often presented in work on small cases where the clinical professor is so deeply steeped in the doctrine and process, the case is largely routine to her and she can predict what is to come and adjust supervision strategies accordingly.155 However, when engaged in political lawyering on complex and novel legal issues, both the student and the teacher may be on new ground that transforms the nature of the student-teacher relationship. A colleague often speaks about acknowledging the persona professors take on when they teach and how that persona embodies who they want to be in the classroom—essentially, whenever law professors teach they establish a character. The persona that a clinical professor adopts can have a profound effect on the students, because the character is the means by which the teacher subtly models for the student—without necessarily ever saying so— the professional the teacher holds herself to be and the student may yet become. In working on complex matters where the advocacy strategy is unclear, the clinical professor makes himself vulnerable by inviting students to witness his struggles as they work together to develop the most effective strategy. By making clear that he does not have all of the answers, partnering with his students to discover the answers, and sharing his own missteps along the way, a clinical law professor can reclaim opportunities to model how an experienced attorney acquires new knowledge and takes on new challenges that may be lost in smaller case representation.156 Clinical law faculty who wholeheartedly subscribe to the belief that professors fail to optimize student learning if students do not have primary control of a matter from beginning to end may view a decision to work in true partnership with students on a matter as a failure of clinical legal education. Indeed, this partnership model will inevitably impact student autonomy and ownership of the case.157 But, there is a unique value to a professor working with her student as a colleague and partner to navigate subject matter new to both student and professor.158 In this relationship, the professor can model how to exercise judgment and how to learn from practice: to independently learn new areas of law; to consult with outside colleagues, experts in the field, and community members without divulging confidential information; and to advise a client in the midst of ones own learning process.159 III. A Pedagogical Course Correction “If it offends your sense of justice, there’s a cause of action.” - Florence Roisman, Professor, Indiana University School of Law160 In response to the shifts in my students’ perspectives on racism and systemic discrimination, their reluctance to tackle systemic problems, their conditioned belief that strategic litigation should be a tool of last resort, and my own discomfort with reliance on small cases in my clinical teaching, I took a step back in my own practice. How could I better teach my students to be champions for justice even when they are overwhelmed by society’s injustice; to challenge the complex and systemic discrimination strangling minority communities, and to approach their work in the tradition of political lawyering. I reflected not only on my teaching, but also on my experiences as a civil rights litigator, to focus on what has helped me to continue doing the work despite the frustrations and difficulties. I realized I was spending too much time teaching my students foundational lawyering skills, and too little time focused on the broader array of skills I knew to be critical in the fight for racial justice. We regularly discussed systemic racism during my clinic seminars in order to place the students’ work on behalf of their clients within a larger context. But by relying on carefully curated small cases I was inadvertently desensitizing my students to a lawyer’s responsibility to challenge these systemic problems, and sending the message that the law operates independently from this background and context. I have an obligation to move beyond teaching my students to be “good soldiers for the status quo” to ensuring that the next generation is truly prepared to fight for justice.161 And, if my teaching methods are encouraging the reproduction of the status quo it is my obligation to develop new interventions.162 Jane Aiken’s work on “justice readiness” is instructive on this point. To graduate lawyers who better understand their role in advancing justice, Jane Aiken believes clinics should move beyond providing opportunities for students to have a social justice experience to promoting a desire and ability to do justice.163 She suggests creating disorienting moments by selecting cases where students have no outside authority on which to rely, requiring that they draw from their own knowledge base and values to develop a legal theory.164 Disorienting moments give students: experiences that surprise them because they did not expect to experience what they experienced. This can be as simple as learning that the maximum monthly welfare benefit for a family of four is about $350. Or they can read a [ ] Supreme Court case that upheld Charles Carlisle’s conviction because a wyer missed a deadline by one day even though the district court found there was insufficient evidence to prove his guilt. These facts are often disorienting. They require the student to step back and examine why they thought that the benefit amount would be so much more, or that innocence would always result in release. That is an amazing teaching moment. It is at this moment that we can ask students to examine their own privilege, how it has made them assume that the world operated differently, allowing them to be oblivious to the indignities and injustices that occur every day.165 Giving students an opportunity to “face the fact that they cannot rely on ‘the way things are’ and meet the needs of their clients” is a powerful approach to teaching and engaging students.166 But, complex problems call for larger and more sustained disorienting moments. Working with students on impact advocacy in the model of political lawyering provides a range of opportunities to immerse students in disorienting moments. A. Immersing Students in “Disorienting Moments”: Race, Poverty, and Pregnancy Today, I try to immerse my students in disorienting moments to make them justice ready and move them in the direction of political lawyering. My clinic docket has always included a small number of impact litigation matters. However, in the past these cases were carefully screened to ensure that they involved discrete legal issues and client groups. In addition, our representation always began after our outside co-counsel had already conducted an initial factual investigation, identified the core legal issues, and developed an overall advocacy strategy, freeing my students from these responsibilities. Now, my clinic takes on impact matters at earlier stages where the strategies are less clear and the legal questions are multifaceted and ill- defined. This mirrors the experiences of practicing social justice lawyers, who faced with an injustice, must discover the facts, identify the legal claims, develop strategy, cultivate allies, and ultimately determine what can be done—with the knowledge that “nothing” is not an option. This approach provides students with the space to wrestle with larger, systemic issues in a structured and supportive educational environment, taking on cases that seem difficult to resolve and working to bring some justice to that situation. They are also gaining experience in many of the fundamentals of political lawyering advocacy. Recently, my students began work on a new case. Several public and private hospitals in low-income New York City neighborhoods are drug testing pregnant women or new mothers without their knowledge or informed consent. This practice reflects a disturbing convergence between racial and economic disparities, and can have a profound impact on the lives of the poor women of color being tested at precisely the time when they are most in need of support. We began our work when a community organization reached out to the clinic and spoke to us about complaints that hospitals around New York City were regularly testing pregnant women—almost exclusively women of color—for drug use during prenatal check ups, during the chaos and stress of labor and delivery, or during post-delivery. The hospitals report positive test results to the City’s Administration for Children’s Services (“ACS”), which is responsible for protecting children from abuse and neglect, for further action.167 Most of the positive tests are for marijuana use. After a report is made, ACS commences an investigation to determine whether child abuse or neglect has taken place, and these investigations trigger inquiries into every aspect of a family’s life. They can lead to the institution of child neglect proceedings, and potentially to the temporary or permanent removal of children from the household. Even where that extreme result is avoided, an ACS investigation can open the door to the City’s continued, and potentially unwelcome, involvement in the lives of these families. These policies reflect deeply inequitable practices. Investigating a family after a positive drug test is not necessarily a bad thing. After all, ACS offers a number of supportive services that can help stabilize and strengthen vulnerable families. And of course, where children’s safety is at risk, removal may sometimes be the appropriate result. However, hospitals do not conduct regular drug tests of mothers in all New York City communities. Private hospitals in wealthy areas rarely test pregnant women or new mothers for drug misuse. In contrast, at hospitals serving poor women, drug testing is routine. Race and class should not determine whether such testing, and the consequences that result, take place. Investigating the New York City drug-testing program immersed the students in disorienting moments at every stage of their work. During our conversations, the students regularly expressed surprise and discomfort with the hospitals’ practices. They were disturbed that public hospitals— institutions on which poor women and women of color rely for something as essential as health care—would use these women’s pregnancy as a point of entry to control their lives.168 They struggled to explain how the simple act of seeking medical care from a hospital serving predominantly poor communities could deprive patients of the respect, privacy, and legal protections enjoyed by pregnant women in other parts of the City. And, they were shocked by the way institutions conditioned poor women to unquestioningly submit to authority.169 Many of the women did not know that they were drug tested until the hospital told them about the positive result and referred them to ACS. Still, these women were not surprised: that kind of disregard, marginalization, and lack of consent were a regular aspect of their lives as poor women of color. These women were more concerned about not upsetting ACS than they were about the drug testing. That so many of these women could be resigned to such a gross violation of their rights was entirely foreign to most of my students. B. Advocacy in the Face of Systemic Injustice Although the students are still in the early stages of their work, they have already engaged in many aspects of political justice lawyering. They approached their advocacy focused on the essence of political lawyering— enabling poor, pregnant women of color who enjoy little power or respect to claim and enjoy their rights, and altering the allocation of power from government agencies and institutions back into the hands of these women. They questioned whose interests these policies and practices were designed to serve, and have grounded their work in a vision of an alternative societal construct in which their clients and the community are respected and supported. The clinic students were given an opportunity to learn about social, legal, and administrative systems as they simultaneously explored opportunities to change those systems. The students worked to identify the short and long term goals of the impacted women as well the goals of the larger community, and to think strategically about the means best suited to accomplish these goals. And, importantly, while collaborating with partners from the community and legal advocacy organizations, the students always tried to keep these women centered in their advocacy. In breaking down the problem of drug testing poor women of color, the students worked through an issue that lives at the intersection of reproductive freedom, family law, racial justice, economic inequality, access to health care, and the war on drugs. In their factual investigation, which included interviews of impacted women, advocates, and hospital personnel, and the review of records obtained through Freedom of Information Law requests, the students began to break down this complex problem. They explored the disparate treatment of poor women and women of color by health care providers and government entities, implicit and explicit bias in healthcare, the disproportionate referral of women of color to ACS, the challenges of providing medical services to underserved communities, the meaning of informed consent, the diminished rights of people who rely on public services, and the criminalization of poverty. The students found that list almost as overwhelming as the initial problem itself, but identifying the components allowed the students to dig deeper and focus on possible avenues of challenge and advocacy. It was also critically important to make the invisible forces visible, even if the law currently does not provide a remedy. Working on this case also gave the students and me the opportunity to work through more nuanced applications of some of the lawyering concepts that were introduced in their smaller cases, including client-centered lawyering when working on behalf of the community; large-scale fact investigation; transferring their “social justice knowledge” to different contexts; crafting legal and factual narratives that are not only true to the communities’ experience, but can persuade and influence others; and how to develop an integrated advocacy plan. The students frequently asked whether we should even pursue the matter, questioning whether this work was client- centered when it was no longer the most pressing concern for many of the women we met. These doubts opened the door to many rich discussions: can we achieve meaningful social change if we only address immediate crises; can we progress on larger social justice issues without challenging their root causes; how do we recognize and address assumptions advocates may have about what is best for a client; and how can we keep past, present, and future victims centered in our advocacy? The work on the case also forced the clinic students to work through their own understanding of a hierarchy of values. They struggled with their desire to support these community hospitals and the public servants who work there under difficult circumstances on the one hand, and their desire to protect women, potentially through litigation, from discriminatory practices. They also struggled to reconcile their belief that hospitals should take all reasonable steps to protect the health and safety of children, as well as their emotional reaction to pregnant mothers putting their unborn children in harms way by using illegal drugs against the privacy rights of poor and marginalized women. They were forced to pause and think deeply about what justice would look like for those mothers, children, and communities. CONCLUSION America continues to grapple with systemic injustice. Political justice lawyering offers powerful strategies to advance the cause of justice—through integrated advocacy comprising the full array of tools available to social justice advocates, including strategic systemic reform litigation. It is the job of legal education to prepare law students to become effective lawyers. For those aspiring to social justice that should include training students to utilize the tools of political justice lawyers. Clinical legal offers a tremendous opportunity to teach the next generation of racial and social justice advocates how to advance equality in the face of structural inequality, if only it will embrace the full array of available tools to do so. In doing so, clinical legal education will not only prepare lawyers to enact social change, they can inspire lawyers overwhelmed by the challenges of change. In order to provide transformative learning experiences, clinical education must supplement traditional pedagogical tools and should consider political lawyering’s potential to empower law students and communities.

#### TVA---States ought to ban appropriation of outer space by private actors---Advs about why space col, expansion, and mining is antiblack.

Eric Niiler 19, 7-11-2019, "Why Civil Rights Activists Protested the Moon Landing," HISTORY, <https://www.history.com/news/apollo-11-moon-landing-launch-protests>

More than a million people gathered along Florida’s Space Coast to watch the Apollo 11 lift off from Launchpad 39A on the sunny afternoon of July 16, 1969. The event was the culmination of a technological race started by President John F. Kennedy in 1963 with the goal of beating the Soviet Union to the moon. But not everyone was cheering that summer day. A group of 500 mostly African American protesters led by civil rights leader Ralph Abernathy arrived outside the gates of the Kennedy Space Center a few days before the launch. They brought with them two mules and a wooden wagon to illustrate the contrast between the gleaming white Saturn V rocket and families who couldn’t afford food or a decent place to live. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference's Poor People's marchers line up mules near the gates to the Kennedy Space Center on July 15, 1969. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference's Poor People's marchers line up mules near the gates to the Kennedy Space Center on July 15, 1969. Bettmann Archive/Getty Images Abernathy was one of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.’s closest aides. After King’s assassination in April 1968, Abernathy led the Poor People’s March on Washington that summer. A year later, as NASA prepared to launch Apollo 11, the Alabama preacher led a group of mostly Black Americans to show NASA and the assembled media that all was not well in America’s cities. “There was a debate about what America was at the time,” says Neil Maher, author of 2017’s Apollo in the Age of Aquarius, and a professor of history at the New Jersey Institute of Technology. Maher says the Apollo space program divided Americans among supporters who thought it would energize a country that had gotten lost, and those who believed that it represented a huge waste of money that instead should go to solving societal problems. “Was it a country to spend $20 billion to land two men on a dead rock in space or try to solve some of the problems closer to home on Earth?” Maher says. “A lot of grass roots movements argued to use the [NASA] money to solve problems here.” The protest began peacefully with Abernathy and the others gathered in front of the NASA gates for a candlelight vigil on the evening of July 14 followed by a march on July 15. As NASA administrator Thomas Paine came out to the NASA perimeter under a lightly falling rain to meet Abernathy and the others in an open field, the group began singing “We Shall Overcome” and media crews recorded the event. Protesters carried signs reading “$12 a day to feed an astronaut, we could feed a child for $8.” Reverend Ralph Abernathy, flanked by associate Hosea Williams stand on steps of a mockup of the lunar module displaying a protest sign while demonstrating at the Apollo 11 moon launch site. Reverend Ralph Abernathy, flanked by associate Hosea Williams stand on steps of a mockup of the lunar module displaying a protest sign while demonstrating at the Apollo 11 moon launch site. The two men—Paine the Stanford-educated engineer, and Abernathy the Alabama-born Baptist preacher (who also earned a bachelor’s degree in mathematics)—talked for a while. Paine later recorded his account: “One-fifth of the population lacks adequate food, clothing, shelter and medical care, [Rev. Abernathy] said. The money for the space program, he stated, should be spent to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, tend the sick, and house the shelterless.” Abernathy told Paine that he had three requests for NASA, that 10 families of his group be allowed to view the launch, that NASA “support the movement to combat the nation’s poverty, hunger and other social problems,” and that NASA technical people work “to tackle the problem of hunger.” “If we could solve the problems of poverty in the United States by not pushing the button to launch men to the moon tomorrow,” Paine said while holding a microphone, “then we would not push that button.” [NASA Administrator] Paine added that he hoped Abernathy would “hitch his wagons to our rocket, using the space program as a spur to the nation to tackle problems boldly in other areas, and using NASA’s space successes as a yardstick by which progress in other areas should be measured.” The meeting ended and the two men shook hands. Paine offered tickets to Abernathy’s group for the VIP viewing area to watch the moonshot on the following day. Abernathy then prayed for the safety of the astronauts and said he was as proud as anyone at the accomplishment. NASA Administrator Thomas Paine wears a miniature "hangman's noose" around his neck with a note that reads "I Helped Hang Poverty,"given to him by Reverend Ralph Abernathy on July 15, 1969. NASA Administrator Thomas Paine wears a miniature "hangman's noose" around his neck with a note that reads "I Helped Hang Poverty,"given to him by Reverend Ralph Abernathy on July 15, 1969. "On the eve of man's noblest venture, I am profoundly moved by the nation's achievements in space and the heroism of the three men embarking for the moon,” he said, according to a UPI report. But, he added, "What we can do for space and exploration we demand that we do for starving people." “The Abernathy protest was an example that Apollo did not happen in bubble,” said Teasel Muir-Harmony, author of Apollo to the Moon: A History in 50 Objects, and curator of space history at the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum. “It was very connected to everything else that was going on in the country.” In the months and years that followed the meeting, NASA tried to make good on the promises Paine made that day at Cape Canaveral. NASA engineers took sensors initially used to detect contaminants in space capsules and converted them to measure urban air pollution. Another project took spacecraft insulation and made new kinds of walls and windows for public housing. But Maher says the efforts didn’t amount to much. “It was more of an advertising effort,” he said. The Apollo 11 moon landing on July 20, 1969, was for many people the apogee of NASA’s popular support. A year after the Apollo 11, Gil Scott-Heron released a spoken-word critique of the space missions “Whitey on the Moon” (a song featured in the 2018 film First Man.) And, in the months and years following Apollo 11, public and political support for space exploration waned. The nation’s focus had shifted to the Vietnam War, campus protests and movements focused on civil rights, women’s rights and the environment. By 1970, NASA officials scrubbed the final three moon landings and President Richard Nixon rejected a new NASA recommendation to build a station on the moon that could be used as a base for exploration of Mars. “We must build on the successes of the past, always reaching out for new achievements,” Nixon said on March 7, 1970. “But we must also recognize that many critical problems here on this planet make high priority demands on our attention and our resources.”The last astronaut to walk on the moon left in December 1972.’

Switch side debate solves all of their offense—there’s no specific reason why their arguments have to be read on the aff—that solves predictability and accesses their education impact turns because plans on the aff and Ks on the neg can challenge perspectives, stances, representations, and epistemologies

### 1NC – OFF

#### Statesought to call a global constitutional convention and establish a constitution reflecting intergenerational concern with exclusive authority to ban appropriation of outer space by private entities and bind participating bodies to its result by

#### That solves the aff – it addresses shared anxieties while building political consensus

Gardiner 14 1 [Stephen M. Gardiner, Professor of Philosophy and Ben Rabinowitz Endowed Professor of Human Dimensions of the Environment at the University of Washington, Seattle, “A Call for a Global Constitutional Convention Focused on Future Generations,” 2014, *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 28, Issue 3, pp. 299-315, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679414000379, EA]

A Constitutional Convention

In my view, the above line of reasoning leads naturally to a more specific proposal: that we—concerned individuals, interested community groups, national governments, and transnational organizations—should initiate a call for a global constitutional convention focused on future generations. This proposal has two components. The first component is procedural. The proposal takes the form of a “call to action.” It is explicitly an attempt to engage a range of actors, based on a claim that they have or should take on a set of responsibilities, and a view about how to go about discharging those responsibilities. The second component is substantive. The main focus for action is a push for the creation of a constitutional convention at the global level, whose role is to pave the way for an overall constitutional system that appropriately embodies intergenerational concern.

The substantive idea rests on several key ideas. Still, for the purposes of a basic proposal, I suggest that these be understood in a relatively open way that, as far as is practicable, does not prejudge the outcome of the convention, and especially its main recommendations. First, the convention itself should be understood as “a representative body called together for some occasional or temporary purpose” and “constituted by statute to represent the people in their primary relations.”14 Second, a constitutional system should be thought of in a minimalist sense as “a set of norms (rules, principles or values) creating, structuring, and possibly defining the limits of government power or authority.”15 Third, the “instigating” role of the convention should be to discuss, develop, make recommendations toward, and set in motion a process for the establishment of a constitution. Fourth, its primary subject matter should be the need to adequately reflect and embody intergenerational concern, where this would include at least the protection of future generations, the promotion of their interests (where “interests” is to be broadly conceived so as to include rights, claims, welfare, and so on), and the discharging of duties with respect to them. It may also (and in my view should) include some way of reflecting concern for past generations, including responsiveness to at least certain of their interests and views. However, I will leave that issue aside in what follows.

The proposal to initiate a call for a global constitutional convention has at least two attractive features. First, it is based in a deep political reality, and does not underplay the challenge. It acknowledges the problem as it is, both specific and general, and calls attention to the heart of that problem, including to the failures of the current system, the need for an alternative, and the background issue of responsibility. Moreover, though the proposal is dramatic and rhetorically eye-catching, it is so in a way that is appropriately responsive to the seriousness of the issue at hand, the persistent political inertia surrounding more modest initiatives, and the fact that (grave though concerns about it are) climate change is only one instance of the tyranny of the contemporary (and the wider perfect moral storm), and we should expect others to arise over the coming decades and centuries.

The second attractive feature of the proposal is that, though ambitious, it is not alienating. While it does not succumb to despair in the face of the challenge, neither does it needlessly polarize and divide from the outset (for example, by leaping to specific recommendations about how to fill the institutional gap). Instead, it acknowledges that there are fundamental difficulties and anxieties, but uses them to start the right kind of debate, rather than to foreclose it. As a result, the proposal is a promising candidate to serve as the subject of a wide and overlapping political consensus, at least among those who share intergenerational concern.

Selective Mirroring

To quell some initial anxieties, it is perhaps worth clarifying the open-ended and non-alienating character of the proposal. One temptation would be to view the call for a global constitutional convention as a fairly naked plea for world government, a prospect that would be deeply alienating—indeed anathema—to many. However, that is not my intention. Though it is possible that a global constitutional convention would lead in this direction, it is by no means certain.

At a minimum, no such body could plausibly recommend any form of “world government” without simultaneously advancing detailed suggestions about how to avoid the standard threats such an institution might pose. Moreover, it seems perfectly conceivable, even likely under current ways of thinking, that a global constitutional convention would pursue what we might call a selective mirroring strategy. Specifically, a convention would seek to develop a broader system of institutions and practices that reflected the desirable features of a powerful and highly centralized global authority but neutralized the standing threats posed by it (for example, it might employ familiar strategies such as the separation of powers). In all likelihood, one feature of a selective mirroring approach would be the significant preservation of existing institutions to serve as a bulwark against the excesses of any newly created ones. Whether and how such a strategy might be made effective against the perfect moral storm, and whether something closer to a “world government” would do better, would be a central issue for discussion by the convention.

#### It spills over to foster broader intergenerational representation, but independence is key

Gardiner 14 2 [Stephen M. Gardiner, Professor of Philosophy and Ben Rabinowitz Endowed Professor of Human Dimensions of the Environment at the University of Washington, Seattle, “A Call for a Global Constitutional Convention Focused on Future Generations,” 2014, *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 28, Issue 3, pp. 299-315, https://doi.org/10.1017/S0892679414000379, EA]

One set of guidelines concerns how the global constitutional convention relates to other institutions. The first guideline concerns relative independence:

(1) Autonomy: Any global constitutional convention should have considerable autonomy from other institutions, and especially from those dominated by factors that generate or facilitate the tyranny of the contemporary (and the perfect moral storm, more generally).

Thus, for example, attempts should be made to insulate the global constitutional convention from too much influence from short-term and narrowly economic forces.

The second guideline concerns limits to that independence:

(2) Mutual Accountability: Any global constitutional convention should be to some extent accountable to other major institutions, and they should be accountable to it.

Thus, for example, though the global constitutional convention should not be able to decide unilaterally that national institutions should be radically supplanted, nevertheless such institutions should not have a simple veto on the recommendations of the convention, including those that would result in sharp limits to their powers.

A third guideline concerns adequacy:

(3) Functional Adequacy: The global constitutional convention should be constructed in such a way that it is highly likely to produce recommendations that are functionally adequate to the task.

Thus, for example, the tasks of the global constitutional convention should not be assigned to any currently existing body whose design and authority is clearly unsuitable. In my view, this guideline rules out proposals such as the Royal Society’s suggestion that governance of geoengineering should be taken up by the United Nations’ Commission on Sustainable Development,20 or the Secretary-General’s recommendation of a new United Nations’ High Commissioner for Future Generations.21 Though such proposals may have merit for some purposes (for example, as pragmatic, incremental suggestions to highlight the importance of intergenerational issues), they are too modest, in my opinion, to reflect the gravity of the threats posed by climate change in particular, and the perfect moral storm more generally.

Aims

A second set of guidelines concerns the aims of the global constitutional convention. Here, the perfect moral storm analysis would suggest:

(4) Comprehensiveness: The convention should be under a mandate to consider a very broad range of global, intergenerational issues, to focus on such issues at a foundational level, and to recommend institutional reform accordingly.

(5) Standing Authority: Though the convention may recommend the establishment of some temporary and issue-specific bodies, its focus should be on the establishment of institutions with standing authority over the long term.

These guidelines are significant in that they stand against existing issue-specific approaches to global and intergenerational problems, and encourage not only a less ad hoc but also a more proactive approach. In particular, the global constitutional convention might be expected to recommend institutions that would be charged with identifying, monitoring, and taking charge of intergenerational issues as such. For example, such institutions should address not only specific policy issues (such as climate change, large asteroid detection, and long-term nuclear waste) but also the need to identify similar threats before they arise.

#### Proactive measures mitigate a laundry list of emerging catastrophic risks – extinction

Beckstead et al. 14 [Nick Beckstead, Nick Bostrom, Niel Bowerman, Owen Cotton-Barratt, William MacAskill, Seán Ó hÉigeartaigh, Toby Ord, \* Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, \*\* Director, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, \*\*\* Global Priorities Project, Centre for Effective Altruism; Department of Physics, University of Oxford, \*\*\*\* Global Priorities Project, Centre for Effective Altruism; Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, \*\*\*\*\* Uehiro Centre for Practical Ethics, University of Oxford, \*\*\*\*\*\* Cambridge Centre for the Study of Existential Risk; Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, \*\*\*\*\*\*\* Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology, Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford, “Policy Brief: Unprecedented Technological Risks,” 2014, *The Global Priorities Project, The Future of Humanity Institute, The Oxford Martin Programme on the Impacts of Future Technology, and The Centre for the Study of Existential Risk*, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Unprecedented-Technological-Risks.pdf, Accessed: 03/13/21, EA]

In the near future, major technological developments will give rise to new unprecedented risks. In particular, like nuclear technology, developments in synthetic biology, geoengineering, distributed manufacturing and artificial intelligence create risks of catastrophe on a global scale. These new technologies will have very large benefits to humankind. But, without proper regulation, they risk the creation of new weapons of mass destruction, the start of a new arms race, or catastrophe through accidental misuse. Some experts have suggested that these technologies are even more worrying than nuclear weapons, because they are more difficult to control. Whereas nuclear weapons require the rare and controllable resources of uranium-235 or plutonium-239, once these new technologies are developed, they will be very difficult to regulate and easily accessible to small countries or even terrorist groups.

Moreover, these risks are currently underregulated, for a number of reasons. Protection against such risks is a global public good and thus undersupplied by the market. Implementation often requires cooperation among many governments, which adds political complexity. Due to the unprecedented nature of the risks, there is little or no previous experience from which to draw lessons and form policy. And the beneficiaries of preventative policy include people who have no sway over current political processes — our children and grandchildren.

Given the unpredictable nature of technological progress, development of these technologies may be unexpectedly rapid. A political reaction to these technologies only when they are already on the brink of development may therefore be too late. We need to implement prudent and proactive policy measures in the near future, even if no such breakthroughs currently appear imminent.

#### Maintaining sustainable use of outer space is key to future generations

**Islam 18** [Mohammad Saiful Islam, Mohammad works for the Institute of Advanced Judicial Studies and the Beijing Institute of Technology. 4-27-2018, "The Sustainable Use of Outer Space: Complications and Legal Challenges to the Peaceful Uses and Benefit of Humankind," Beijing Law Review, <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201> accessed 12/12/21] Adam

4.2. Ensure the Rights of Future Generations in Outer Space

Sustainable development is the establishing principle for achieving present human needs without damaging the demands of future generations maintaining integrity and constancy of the natural systems. The modern idea of sustainable development is derived from the Brundtland Report in 1987. Generally considered in modern application and exploration of outer space, fundamental elements are the area must be dedicated to peaceful purposes; and the area must be preserved for future generations [(Heim, 1990)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref17). It is an indispensable and inordinate challenge to confirm uphold the healthy environment and make sure development without destroying the rights of future generations in space. Article IX of The Outer Space Treaty provided, in the exploration and use of outer space, States should pursue studies and conduct exploration of outer space so as to avoid harmful contamination and also adverse changes in the environment of the Earth [(Outer Space Treaty, 1967)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref35). The issues of what constitutes harmful contamination in Earth’s environment have yet to be interpreted. The legal definition of “adverse” and “harmful” will also modification as Earth, indigenous sciences progress, separately or in concert, with the planetary exploration space sciences [(Robinson, 2005)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref38). As a result of multifaceted political, economic, scientific, technological, educational, and other global problems, there has been practicing exclusively only international cooperation for sustainable space development among the developed countries [(Noichim, 2005)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref34). The space faring nations should promote a supportive environment for peaceful and sustainable use of space, decrease environmental effects on Earth and protect the terrestrial environment. We should escape a regime that will ultimately reflect the over-exploitation of resources and environmental havoc [(Fountain, 2002)](https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation.aspx?paperid=85201#ref9).

### 1NC – OFF

#### Defining space as “mass exploitation” substitutes the colonizer’s vision of space for the Black vision---instead, Blackness should validate space on its own terms, an act of reclamation

Morgan, 18 – Professor, Santa Clara Department of English, specializes in African-American literature in the 20th and 21st centuries

Dr. Danielle Fuentes Morgan, “Looking Forward, Looking Back: Afrofuturism and Black Histories in Neo-Slave

Narration,” Journal of Science Fiction. Volume 2, Issue 3, July 2018

Remembering Otherwise and Fluidity of Time

Both The Slave and Kindred begin with a prologue spoken in the voice of the black protagonist. This convention is especially significant because it revamps and reimagines the traditional “preface to blackness” found in slave narratives where the story is validated through the words of a white abolitionist who speaks to the legitimacy of the text and the decency of its author. In The Slave and Kindred, however, the expected “preface to blackness” becomes “blackness as preface.” Blackness now has the opportunity to stand alone and validate itself – it need not be situated in anything other than itself. Likewise, Baraka and Butler implicate their readers as they wonder how personal slavery must be for its impact to be recognized in the present. Dana ultimately kills Rufus as he – no longer the little boy she nurtured, helped to raise, and saved countless times – attempts to rape her on her last trip to antebellum Maryland. As he falls on her while she suddenly travels back to 1976, her arm is caught within the plaster of her own home as it rematerializes. She is literally and figuratively forever scarred by her engagement with slavery – the weight of slavery and the slave master lingering forever as acute trauma – and she struggles to understand what she has experienced. As she and Kevin travel to Maryland in their present day to research her ancestry, she nervously ponders why she is interested. Kevin gently posits, “You probably needed to come for the same reason I did… To try to understand. To touch solid evidence that those people existed. To reassure yourself that you’re sane” (Butler, 1976, p. 264). His assertion holds echoes of the white male supremacy he has come to more overtly embody – the idea that Dana, who will bear a lost arm as remnants of her time in the antebellum period, needs concrete evidence is not only absurd but damning evidence of his inability to empathize with Dana’s experience in any effectual way. He finishes both his statement and the novel itself by saying, “And now that the boy is dead, we have some chance of staying that way” (Butler, 1976, p. 264). This is certainly a statement about slavery, but also a statement about living in a society with slavery couched in its past. It is telling that the novel ends with Kevin’s certainty that they may now remain sane because Rufus’s death seems to insure that Dana won’t be summoned back against her will. Yet Dana never articulates this same comfort in predicted sanity, or even the possibility of sanity. As a black woman, she has been forever changed by slavery. Her scars are notable and distracting – what further “evidence” might she need? While Kevin bears a scar on his forehead, Dana loses an arm, retains the scars from whippings on her back, and suffers from Post Traumatic Slave Syndrome in the most literal sense. For Kevin, this is mere inconvenience. He forgets that in their 20th century context, “the boy” has always been dead, and they’ve still had no chance of moving past this racialized trauma, on either ancestral or national levels, whether they physically return to the present or not.

Ultimately, the Afrofuturist mode reasserts humanity through neo-slave narratology by depicting a not-so-distant past that isn’t, in fact, even past. The connection to slavery and the necessity of remembering it, and remembering it otherwise, grows more insistent and more acute as a response to the neoliberal impulse to be rid of race, thereby somehow eradicating racism – as if it is race, rather than racism, that merits our condemnation. Afrofuturism posits the permanence of race while refusing race itself as an inherent social ill. Instead, it acknowledges racism as an inherent evil and opens up space for black autonomy that pushes the boundaries of the present day parameters of racialization. For this reason, the slave remains a necessary context for considering black personhood in a variety of evolving art forms. I am reminded here of Janelle Monáe’s album and subsequent performances as The Electric Lady (2013), the pure embodiment of black liberatory spirit in both human and mechanical form. Grace D. Gipson (2016) argues that when Monáe takes on the persona of Cindi Mayweather, an android sent from the distant future to our near future to emancipate the citizens from a society without love – because aren’t these conversations about emancipation and liberation and liberatory love tantamount to the black experience itself? – it is the Afrofuturist mode itself that allows her “to present new and innovative perspectives and pose questions that are not typically addressed in canonical works” (p. 92). In Monáe’s articulation, futurity closely resembles the past and present, where there is no utopic sense of post-racialization or inherent equality. Ultimately, the figure of the android stands in for new neoliberal ways to marginalize beyond overt declarations of race and racism and new realms for the Other to emerge; it also represents new possibilities for revolution and freedom in the changing same of black identity. Indeed, this Afrofuturist mode opens up a space for Monáe to imagine, like Baraka, how the articulated black self might beget revolution and, like Butler, what it might mean to embrace intersectional narratives and dwell in the interstices of blackness and womanhood as revolution begins.

Saidiya Hartman (1997) argues convincingly that after emancipation,

On one hand, the constraints of race were formally negated by the stipulation of sovereign individuality and abstract equality, and on the other, racial discriminations and predilections were cherished and protected as beyond the scope of law. Even more unsettling was the instrumental role of equality in constructing a measure of man or descending scale of humanity that legitimated and naturalized subordination (p. 121).

With abolition, American society ostensibly embraced notions of comparative and tacit equality while systematically marginalizing blackness and criminalizing black bodies. As society moved further away from the chattel system, the roots of this marginalization were lost and replaced by a comfortable cultural amnesia that instead suggests that a distantly sympathetic perspective will suffice in consideration of slavery – no one is accountable, no one presently benefits, and no one need consider any lasting ramifications or significance. These works seek to redeem traditionally marginalized blackness through an Afrofuturistic mode that overtly parallels slavery with black experiences in the 20th century and beyond – in this way, they emphasize that slaves resisted and had a sense of black pride that is often overlooked contemporarily. Through their utilization of the past and weighty consideration of the present, both authors are attempting to elevate the overlooked humanity of African Americans by connecting the black experience through the centuries. In this way, when these neo-slave narratives are engaged through Afrofuturism, they reestablish slavery not as an overdetermining facet of black life, but instead as an inescapable reality of black existence within the national imaginary. Indeed, as these works demonstrate, there can be no black futurity without necessarily acknowledging slavery’s impact and continued reach.

#### Outright refusal of space forecloses alternative, non antiblack futures---the alternative refuses the 1AC’s refusal as a gesture towards afrofuturist uses of space are an act of reclamation that creates alternate spaces for Black life within antiblack structures

Hamilton, 17 - An assistant professor at Fort Valley State University. Her research interests include Afrofuturism and feminism as they relate to art history

Elizabeth C. Hamilton, “Afrofuturism and the Technologies of Survival.” African Arts, Volume 50, Number 4, Winter 2017. Pp. 18-23. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/677241/pdf>

Situating the Afronaut in contemporary art and Afrofuturism is very much about ­finding safe spaces for black life. It is about exploring and protecting and preparing the body for hostile environments. In an Afrofuturist vision that stakes out black space in the future, black life is often obscured and simultaneously endangered. This obscurity is the result of the overdetermination of the past on black future spaces, namely the baggage of colonialism and apartheid, slavery and Jim Crow, and legacies of displacement. through the image of the Afronaut, artists are making defi­nitive statements about current situations of liberation, freedom, and oppression, while simultaneously referencing the past and staking a place for black life in the future. Tegan Bristow, interestingly, situates the Afrofuturist legacy within the trajectory of “the black man in space” (Bristow 2012). Several other theorists, such as J. Grith Rollefson, also adopt this trajectory, acknowledging Sun Ra and Parliament Funkadelic (P-Funk) as the progenitors of Afrofuturist thought. Bristow notes that “by placing the black man in space, out of the reach of racial stereotypes, Afrofuturism allows for a critique of both Western culture and technoculture” (Bristow 2012:26). I do not want to reduce Bristow’s article to just “the black man in space.” She also makes interesting claims about the relationship Afrofuturism has to art in Africa, but notes its potential to be global and not centered on the West. She points out the centrism of the United States in theories of Afrofuturism. She is correct in this assessment, but it is not because Afrofuturism doesn’t apply to the arts of Africa. Addressing technoculture broadly and technology as a medium especially in music, Bristow notes the potential for a global theory that reects the hybridity of African experience as well as the opportunity to decentralize identity and the totalizing views of African culture.

Afrofuturist thinkers, such as Kodwo Eshun and Alondra Nelson, have indicated the overwhelming tendency of Western visions of Africa to indicate impending doom and disaster. e tendency has also been to disqualify Africa from claims of technological invention and innovation in favor of a discourse of tradition. Elsewhere I wrote about how this tendency has more to do with the validity and prosperity of art markets as they trac in authenticity and tradition (almost fetishizing the possibility) and the stubborn persistence of imposing a chronologically driven canon upon African art. I would like to address technology as a subject recurring in the various costumes of the Afronaut depicted across the Diaspora in various media and formats.

J. Grith Rollefson argues that “Afrofuturism is most prominent in music … because a number of its artists have continually highlighted the mythic qualities of both historical tropes of magic and futuristic narratives of science through the seemingly paradoxical ­gure of the soulful spaceman” (2008:86–87). He thereby centers the “soulful spaceman” as icon in Afrofuturism. The “black man in space” is a signi­cant symbol and signal ubiquitous in music of the 1970s, but is making a resurgence in the twenty-­rst century as the Afronaut in contemporary art of Africa and the African Diaspora. I contend that this resurgence is a response to current oppressive conditions, such as extrajudicial killings of black people in the United States and continued human rights disparities based on race elsewhere in the world. Artists are asking through these works containing Afronauts: What are the technologies of survival? e artists parallel these images of technologies with black people’s predicament in a white supremacist society.

e word “Afronaut” is a neologism, so it is dicult to pin down its roots or know when and where it was ­rst used. For the purposes of this research, the Afronaut is a person of African descent who travels through outer space. e term seems to have gained popularity with the advent of African space programs, like the one in Zambia in the 1960s (De Middel 2012). As the race for space by countries like Nigeria continues and the ­rst South African-born astronaut will be launched into space, the term gets more popular, fascinatingly, through artists’ imaginings of the Afronaut (Monks 2016, “Mandla Maseko” 2014).

Several artists, such as Daniel Kojo Schrade, Gerald Machona, and Robert Pruitt, have adopted the term “Afronaut” to describe the subjects in their projects, while others have applied the label loosely to those subjects in art that convey the theme of space travel. I made this determination from the most obvious accoutrement—space suits, helmets, boots, rockets, ships—which are ubiquitous in the work I examine. ere is also a conscious naming of the artwork that classi­es the subjects as Afronauts (Nick Cave’s and Yinka Shonibare’s work is less obvious in this sense).

Afronaut is an obvious play on astronaut that reveals the ethnic identity of the space traveler. ere are deeper implications, which also indicate an eternal tension between African identity and technological stasis. In a linguistic sense, the Afronaut is a tense construction, an oxymoron in a sense: afro–naut, when taken in consideration with stereotypical notions of African-ness and technological advancement. Alondra Nelson (2002) indicates this in her now-canonical Social Text issue about Afrofuturism. is tension between blackness and technology is also evident in the conversation between Mark Dery, Tricia Rose, Greg Tate and Samuel Delaney (Dery 1993). Whereas Dery believes that black artists will shun technology, Rose, Tate, and Delaney challenge this assumption.

Elsewhere, I have written that Afrofuturism is the injection of futurity, fantasy, and technology in the arts of Africa and the African Diaspora (Hamilton 2013). is de­nition has expanded tremendously, as contemporary situations in art and contemporary events are in constant ux. Presently, I defi­ne Afrofuturism as a mechanism for understanding the real world situations of oppression in the contemporary world in the context of the ever-present past, while charting the future situation through the arts. My prior de­nition was bogged in recovery and optimism; I am open to the possibility that neither of these exist as options. To understand Afrofuturism as a mechanism, I developed a visual, a casual graph, that addressed the interdependence of certain terms to Afrofuturist thought in the visual arts (Fig. 1). In this graphic, Afrofuturism as a mechanism relies on not just the injection of futurity, fantasy, and technology, but also an ever-present orientation toward black liberation that draws its strength from liberation movements in the past. ere is a tendency to romanticize here, though. Other characteristics that keep Afrofuturistic visual arts grounded are the reliance on the material (materiality), the manipulation of temporality, and the impetus for artists to demonstrate all sorts of transformations.

e former de­nition is still relevant. However, an expansion is needed to accommodate the moving target that visual speculation and visual science ­ction narratives encompass. By its very nature, these types of narratives—whether in cinematic, literary, or visual art—progress, evolve, and artists are constantly innovating.

An insistence on materiality, rather than a nebulous reliance on concept, is remarkable in Afrofuturist works. e material does not by any means subordinate the subject, but it is signi­- cant to the understanding of each work of art. e transformative nature of Afrofuturist art addresses not only the subject, but also the audience. Afrofuturist art is a mechanism for understanding and making meaning for audiences—transforming them in the process is its goal. e artwork I examine is overwhelmingly ­gural; therefore, the subjects are always going through profound physical changes that have some eect on their spiritual or mental states. Temporality is in constant ux with time travelers and artists as temporal interlopers. As temporal interlopers, artists are constantly making useful space for the past to make a stake in the present or the future.

From the time the notion of Afrofuturism was ­rst conceptualized—by Mark Dery in 1993 and expounded upon a decade later by Alondra Nelson—the situation of the alien and the outsider have played prominently. Afrofuturism seemed like the natural way to discuss the ri‑ that black people felt with the dominant culture in the United States. However, theorizing about Africa was le‑ by the wayside even though the interfaces are fruitful and ripe for the picking.

e art of Yinka Shonibare, Nick Cave, and Gerald Machona demonstrates trends of the Afronaut across the diaspora as well as the overlaps of experiences of people of African descent across the globe. They expand the idea of the black man in space with the notion that we are already in alien environments. e three artists discussed here are male, and the overwhelmingly masculine ­gures they create are worth noting, considering that the black female body is also in danger in a white supremacist society. eir ­gurative works of various media adorn the black human ­gure in the technologies that are needed to survive, but the absence of the woman in space as Afronaut is a glaring omission in the artworks discussed in this paper.

Yinka Shonibare is a British-Nigerian artist whose conceptual project relies on the duplicitous messages communicated through fabrics deemed “African” by European textile merchants. Speci­cally, Dutch wax print fabric is brightly colored, elaborately designed cotton marketed to countries in Africa. It has been adopted as an exemplar of African culture, even though it has no origins in the countries to which it is marketed. is duplicity is what interests Shonibare and why he uses Dutch wax print fabrics, as they are ubiquitous in his oeuvre of (usually) headless human forms. e fabric communicates the constructed-ness of identity and cultural heritage and its inherent diculties in “pinning down” origins in a global society. With the fabric, Shonibare is able to address important issues about creativity and identity (speci­cally African) and the notions of authenticity that o‑en bog down understanding of African art and ideas of belonging that plague the diasporic, nomadic artist.

Shonibare’s biographers have addressed the idea of the alien in Shonibare’s work, but this seems awkward to me. is is where the astronaut, the particularity of the Afronaut especially, comes into play. Shonibare’s diverse media and ways of working in his Afronaut works are very much about mediating the spatial, not so much the temporal. Human subjects in astronaut accoutrement are not traveling though deep space; they are navigating Earth utilizing the technologies of survival needed to engage the problems associated with immigration, exile, colonialism, and the attendant xenophobia and racism.

Shuttling between Britain and Nigeria is not necessarily alien when one considers the spatial slippages resulting from the legacies of colonialism. Place is rather arbitrary considering those legacies of conquest. e made-up, politically imposed boundaries make and mark identities in the same arbitrary ways that the Dutch wax print makes something authentically African. But the boundaries are signi­cant, nonetheless, and have real-life consequences, especially for refugees and migrants, those vulnerable to the spatial slippages and violence that results. e violence does manifest itself through racist and xenophobic policies that create outsiders and noncitizens. Consequently, I believe the Afronaut is a more cogent symbol than the alien for communicating the situation of the refugee and the migrant. Shonibare’s installations depicting astronauts demonstrate the strength of this symbol.

e ­gure of the Afronaut seems to begin in Shonibare’s work at the turn of the century. Into the new millennium, Shonibare began a conversation about futurity, fantasy, and technology that is in concert with space exploration. e ­gures are all costumed in African wax print fabric, helmets, and space boots. Various accoutrement for travel makes each installation distinct.

Cloud 9 (2000)1 consists of a mannequin in an astronaut’s costume made of Dutch wax print fabric. e ­gure stands beside a ag made from a dierent print of Dutch wax print fabric. e installation photograph is reminiscent of Neil Armstrong’s “conquest” of the moon. e image also brings to mind themes of conquest and colonization on Earth, speci­cally on the African continent.

Vacation (2002)2 depicts a family of astronauts, two adults and two children, who are attached to what appears to be oxygen packs. ey wear helmets and boots also. eir helmets are all oriented towards the ground, as if they are searching for something. e title denotes a leisure activity, but the astronaut suits and the searching complicate the assumptions of leisure. One child is seemingly separated from the rest of the family and his suit fabric is dierent. Perhaps this installation demonstrates Shonibare’s own anxieties about being a cosmopolitan nomad— someone who traverses continents eortlessly, but whose identity requires more eort to “pin” down. But pinning down isn’t the goal for Shonibare. e opposite seems to be true. roughout his body of work he is interested in the uidity of identity and the sometimes dubious implications of ethnic content in his work. e astronaut ­gures are no dierent, but they speak to the sustained feeling of isolation and otherness that people of color feel when traversing white spaces. e environments are sometimes hostile; so, the technologies that they wear are a necessity.

Space Walk (2002)3 demonstrates the drive for survival in a hostile and alien environment. Shonibare’s artistic process diers in this installation, because he designed and created the silkscreened fabric himself as an artist in residence at the Fabric Workshop and Museum in Philadelphia. e installation includes two figures dressed in the trademark fabrics of Shonibare’s oeuvre. e fabric features vocal artists native to Philadelphia and responsible for the so-called Philly Sound. e ­gures are suspended from the ceiling along with a half-size replica of the Apollo 13 shuttle, which is made from ­berglass and wood. e ­gures wear backpacks, helmets, and boots. eir suits are attached to the replica of the space ship with tubes covered in the colorful fabric.

Refugee Astronaut (2012)4 features a single ­gure dressed in a Dutch wax print astronaut’s suit. A net full of survival items burden this astronaut’s back. Pans, ropes, and a lantern are visible through the net. e items tell the story of an itinerant astronaut, who has yet to ­nd home. Instead, he travels with his most important belongings from place to place. e tubes that are connected to the spaceship in Space Walk are connected back into the astronaut’s suit in Refugee Astronaut. e latter installation emphasizes a sense of homelessness with the placement of the tubes and a notable lack of the mothership that we see in the former installation. A cool sky blue dominates the costume that is interspersed with ­ery orange and red forms. e contrast brings to mind the conicting situations of actual refugees. All of these astronaut-themed installations point to Afrofuturism and technologies of survival for people of color in Europe in the United States.

Nick Cave is a multimedia artist from the United States who made his ­rst Soundsuit in 1992 in response to the Rodney King beating. King was an unarmed citizen whose brutal and sustained beating during a trac stop by the Los Angeles Police Department was caught on videotape and disseminated to the media, causing a public outcry that led to a trial and subsequent acquittal of the oending ocers. Cave’s feelings of vulnerability as a black man in a white supremacist society guided the construction of a protective apparatus that he called a Soundsuit for its kinetic and sonic qualities. e Soundsuit is an Afrofuturist project that adopts the themes of fantasy to create safe spaces for black bodies. Moreover, the performers in the suits function like the Afronaut, who need a protective layer in a hostile environment. In a world where black people can be beaten, and even killed, without legal retribution, Cave desired “a kind of outerwear to protect (his) spirit,” he says.5 e ­rst Soundsuit was made from detritus to reect the ways that black people and their true identities are discarded and dismissed through racial pro­ling. e collection of found objects are assembled to form a suit of armor that protects against the outside world and its racism.

For over two decades, Cave has continued to make the Soundsuits and they continue to maintain their relevance to current events in the United States. Cave’s Soundsuits have been compared to synthesized versions of African masquerade performances. e Soundsuits do not just function visually, but have kinetic and sonic functions that support this claim. When they are worn, they are activated in ways that harness “the power within the black male, that intimidation and scariness” in addition to preliminary protective function.6 Although this quote from Cave emphasizes the masculinity of the Soundsuit’s function, history demonstrates that women are also vulnerable and are in need of a similar harnessing of power. In some ways, that intimidation and scariness becomes its own performer and takes on a life of its own in narratives about black people in interactions with police. e fantastical nature of the costumes mimics the imaginary nature of the presumed deviance and violence of black people.

While his messages and meanings remain consistent, Cave’s materials and messages have changed throughout his history as an artist. e labor-intensive process of assembling found objects to create Soundsuits is now the work of multiple assistants who commit Cave’s visions to reality. How he ­nds objects has also changed. e objects are not simply discarded, but also constructed by artisans and bought from thri‑ shops. is alters the process of ­nding and repurposing discarded items. Cave claims that through the objects that he carefully chooses for his Soundsuits the viewer can come to an understanding of the world and how to navigate it through her relationship to memory.

is mnemonic process is evident in Cave’s Soundsuit for Trayvon Martin, titled TM 13 (Fig. 2). Martin was a teenager murdered by George Zimmerman a‑er visiting a store to buy a so‑ drink and candy. Zimmerman was acting under the auspices of the neighborhood watch and was subsequently acquitted with the aid of Florida’s Stand Your Ground Law, which allows armed citizens judicial leniency for self defense. e acquittal led to the rallying cry and movement: “Black Lives Matter.” In Cave’s imagining of a Soundsuit for Martin, the body is shrouded in a protective net that is made of brightly colored beads that mimic and recall the Skittles that Martin never got to enjoy that fateful night. ough obscured by the beaded net, the costume underneath is equally compelling7 : a black mannequin wears sneakers, a hoodie, and jeans. Surrounding the mannequin are plastic yard decorations, typically used at Christmas and Halloween—a cherubic-looking Santa Claus and a costumed teddy bear. ese playful ­gures recall the innocence lost and the clothing reects a sort of vulnerability. Cave refers to the holiday ­gures as guardians. e net of beads in gold with red, black, and green, the colors of the black liberation ag. e net encases the body—traps it, yet protects it. rough the Soundsuits, Cave’s Afrofuturist project imagined a technology of survival that is performative and meditative on the materials that he chooses.

Gerald Machona’s Vabvakure (People from Far Away) (2013) is both a short ­lm and installation. Machona is a Zimbabweborn artist commenting on the collapse of Zimbabwe and the subsequent upheaval and migration of people into South Africa. With the works, Machona comments on the nature of migration and refugee status in South Africa for people from Zimbabwe. e life-size Ndiri Afronaut (I am an Afronaut) (2012), which is performed in the short ­lm, is made from decommissioned Zimbabwean dollars, foam padding, fabric, wood, Perspex, rubber, plastic tubing, nylon thread, and gold leaf. e migration was not without diculties, however. South Africans rejected the Zimbabwean refugees and created a racial and social hierarchy similar to apartheid.8

Vabvakure opens with a discombobulated Afronaut, trying to compose himself a‑er landing in a desert.9 His costume is disheveled—tubes are loose and a space boot is strewn to the side. He dizzily moves around and then begins to dance. As if remaking a scene from Neil Armstrong’s famous lunar landing, the Afronaut plants his ag, which resembles the ag of Zimbabwe, but Machona’s ag is metallic and has the same decommissioned Zimbabwean dollars as the astronaut suit. e Afronaut then ventures away from the landing site, which he has claimed with his ag. e suit functions as the Afronaut’s protection, but it also represents economic instability and, consequently, vulnerability in a foreign environment. e Afronaut’s intentions in the new place are its conquest despite that vulnerability communicated through the defunct currency.

Next, the Afronaut ­nds a plant specimen and puts it into a vessel. e plant is obviously alien and arti­cial and looks to be made of the same currency as the other items. e Afronaut ends up at an ATM, which is strange considering that his suit is made of money, but it emphasizes that the currency that comprises the suit is defunct. In the next scene, the Afronaut is carrying the plant specimen down the street. He arrives in front of a crowded store, where people stare, and he retrieves a shopping cart and places his plant specimen in it. e camera focuses on the uprooted plant in an alien environment as the Afronaut pushes it through the store. People stare and one can only compare the two—the plant and the Afronaut traversing the land as outsiders.

e Afronaut retrieves water from the store shelves, people point and stare, and then he heads to the cashier to pay for his purchase. He leaves the grocery store and stops in front of a fast food restaurant. At this point, the Afronaut opens the vessel of the plant specimen and pours in the water that he just purchased. He closes the vessel and places the plant specimen in his backpack. e Afronaut nourishes and protects the plant in ways that underscore its displacement. In this way, the specimen and the Afronaut are parallel.

To end the ­lm, Machona emphasizes the performative nature of the ­lm, by focusing on the audience screening and viewing the Afronauts costumes in the next scenes. Groups of people stoop over the suits, discussing them, and pointing, and touching and even trying to get into them. e technologies of survival in Machona’s work are in response to the abject violence against Zimbabweans who ed to South Africa, which came to a head in 2008, but persist presently.

What are these artists saying about the black body in their work? That it is fragile, permeable, and under attack. It is fungible and open to meanings that may destroy it. THrough Afrofuturism, the technologies of survival mitigate these dangers as the black body navigates space. The body and the attendant identity is in orbit, but not always freely navigating the space.

## Case

### 1NC – AT: Top-Level

#### 1] Framework – the role of the judge and ballot is to determine whether the plan is a good idea through evaluation of consequences.

#### A] Don’t let them weigh the sum total of their impact—they only get to weigh the unique amount solved by the affirmative. Filter the debate through scope of solvency—there’s no impact to root cause if they don’t solve it

#### B] No performative or methodological offense, only offense from the plan—reject it cuz it explodes predictable limits, spiking out of neg ground making any discussion qualitatively worse

#### C] Focus on large scale catastrophes is good and they outweigh – appeals to social costs, moral rules, and securitization play into cognitive bias and flawed risk calculus – 2020 is living proof

Weber 20 (ELKE U. WEBER is Gerhard R. Andlinger Professor in Energy and the Environment and Professor of Psychology and Public Affairs at Princeton University.), November-December 2020 Issue, "Heads in the Sand," Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2020-10-13/heads-sand> mvp

We are living in a time of crisis. From the immediate challenge of the COVID-19 pandemic to the looming existential threat of climate change, the world is grappling with massive global dangers—to say nothing of countless problems within countries, such as inequality, cyberattacks, unemployment, systemic racism, and obesity. In any given crisis, the right response is often clear. Wear a mask and keep away from other people. Burn less fossil fuel. Redistribute income. Protect digital infrastructure. The answers are out there. What’s lacking are governments that can translate them into actual policy. As a result, the crises continue. The death toll from the pandemic skyrockets, and the world makes dangerously slow progress on climate change, and so on.

It’s no secret how governments should react in times of crisis. First, they need to be nimble. Nimble means moving quickly, because problems often grow at exponential rates: a contagious virus, for example, or greenhouse gas emissions. That makes early action crucial and procrastination disastrous. Nimble also means adaptive. Policymakers need to continuously adjust their responses to crises as they learn from their own experience and from the work of scientists. Second, governments need to act wisely. That means incorporating the full range of scientific knowledge available about the problem at hand. It means embracing uncertainty, rather than willfully ignoring it. And it means thinking in terms of a long time horizon, rather than merely until the next election. But so often, policymakers are anything but nimble and wise. They are slow, inflexible, uninformed, overconfident, and myopic.

Why is everyone doing so badly? Part of the explanation lies in the inherent qualities of crises. Crises typically require navigating between risks. In the COVID-19 pandemic, policymakers want to save lives and jobs. With climate change, they seek a balance between avoiding extreme weather and allowing economic growth. Such tradeoffs are hard as it is, and they are further complicated by the fact that costs and benefits are not evenly distributed among stakeholders, making conflict a seemingly unavoidable part of any policy choice. Vested interests attempt to forestall needed action, using their money to influence decision-makers and the media. To make matters worse, policymakers must pay sustained attention to multiple issues and multiple constituencies over time. They must accept large amounts of uncertainty. Often, then, the easiest response is to stick with the status quo. But that can be a singularly dangerous response to many new hazards. After all, with the pandemic, business as usual would mean no social distancing. With climate change, it would mean continuing to burn fossil fuels.

But the explanation for humanity’s woeful response to crises goes beyond politics and incentives. To truly understand the failure to act, one must turn to human psychology. It is there that one can grasp the full impediments to proper decision-making—the cognitive biases, emotional reactions, and suboptimal shortcuts that hold policymakers back—and the tools to overcome them.

AVOIDING THE UNCOMFORTABLE

People are singularly bad at predicting and preparing for catastrophes. Many of these events are “black swans,” rare and unpredictable occurrences that most people find difficult to imagine, seemingly falling into the realm of science fiction. Others are “gray rhinos,” large and not uncommon threats that are still neglected until they stare you in the face (such as a coronavirus outbreak). Then there are “invisible gorillas,” threats in full view that should be noticed but aren’t—so named for a psychological experiment in which subjects watching a clip of a basketball game were so fixated on the players that they missed a person in a gorilla costume walking through the frame. Even professional forecasters, including security analysts, have a poor track record when it comes to accurately anticipating events. The COVID-19 crisis, in which a dystopic science-fiction narrative came to life and took everyone by surprise, serves as a cautionary tale about humans’ inability to foresee important events.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them. At best, people display “bounded rationality,” the idea that instead of carefully considering their options and making perfectly rational decisions that optimize their preferences, humans in the real world act quickly and imperfectly, limited as they are by time and cognitive capacity. Add in the stress generated by crises, and their performance gets even worse.

Because humans don’t have enough time, information, or processing power to deliberate rationally, they have evolved easier ways of making decisions. They rely on their emotions, which serve as an early warning system of sorts: alerting people that they are in a positive context that can be explored and exploited or in a negative context where fight or flight is the appropriate response. They also rely on rules. To simplify decision-making, they might follow standard operating procedures or abide by some sort of moral code. They might decide to imitate the action taken by other people whom they trust or admire. They might follow what they perceive to be widespread norms. Out of habit, they might continue to do what they have been doing unless there is overwhelming evidence against it.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them.

Humans evolved these shortcuts because they require little effort and work well in a broad range of situations. Without access to a real-time map of prey in different hunting grounds, for example, a prehistoric hunter might have resorted to a simple rule of thumb: look for animals where his fellow tribesmen found them yesterday. But in times of crisis, emotions and rules are not always helpful drivers of decision-making. High stakes, uncertainty, tradeoffs, and conflict—all elicit negative emotions, which can impede wise responses. Uncertainty is scary, as it signals an inability to predict what will happen, and what cannot be predicted might be deadly. The vast majority of people are already risk averse under normal circumstances. Under stress, they become even more so, and they retreat to the familiar comfort of the status quo. From gun laws to fossil fuel subsidies, once a piece of legislation is in place, it is hard to dislodge it, even when cost-benefit analysis argues for change.

#### 2] Vote neg on presumption – there’s no impact to voting aff given they’ve already propagated science fiction in the debate space – they need a model of debate that justifies why the ballot is key.

#### Whitey on the moon is already an idea that exists which means you can just negate on presumption

#### b. Knowledge proudction good -- Impact turn – climate change knowledge production is a good praxis for resolving material violence that affects hundreds of millions of people because it fights climate skepticism

#### 4] Debate good – loads of people have used debate to do good things like Laura Sjoberg the fem IR scholar, the judge who stopped Trump’s travel ban, and the Dartmouth debater who stopped Bush’s abuse of the War Powers Doctrine

#### 5] Debate Good Double bind – either a) I win debate good and you vote for me, or b) they win debate bad which means hack against them to recuse them from this evil space

The reid Brinkley – empirically disproven people have voted on affs like this all the time nothing has happened

#### Reducing existential risks is the top priority in any coherent moral theory

Plummer 15 (Theron, Philosophy @St. Andrews http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/05/moral-agreement-on-saving-the-world/)

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

#### Debates about space allows the creation of alternative realities that force inclusion of the oppressed---past failures should not foreclose the ability to reclaim futurism for liberation

Kilgore, 3 – Associate Professor of English in the IU College of Arts + Sciences.

De Witt Douglas Kilgore, “Astrofuturism: Science, Race, and Visions of Utopia in Space,” University of Pennsylvania Press. 2003. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fhrbs>

For much of the twentieth century, American dreams of space conquest reflected what Raymond Williams calls "the mood of a rising class, which knows down to detail, that it can replace the existing order."2 That mood is an index of the technical and political power that the United States enjoyed following the Second World War. But the posture of confidence assumed by the United States in the international arena was accompanied, and perhaps in part occasioned, by the nation's internal crisis of confidence. Even as it rose to global prominence as the bulwark of freedom, America harbored a political culture that mandated the unequal distribution of civil rights. The contradiction between rhetoric and practice was (and continues to be) an open secret that undermined the nation's credibility as it sought moral and political high ground in its ideological war with Soviet Russia. In the gap between promises made and then betrayed, we find the discontents that make a rising class or nation suspect its good fortune. Its members may believe they have no rival and yet fear catastrophic failure or experience the pain of soured expectations. In this nervous condition, they "create a new heaven because [their] Earth is a hell."3

Insofar as it has been the expression of a particular class, the spaceflight movement has always demonstrated vulnerability to social anxiety, alienation, and betrayal. In this project, I have used the motif of race to track a majority project's attempts to resolve contradictions between the rhetoric and practice of the American dream, predominantly by expelling all sources of conflict and homogenizing all evidence of alterity. Given its ideological debts, I have asked whether astrofuturism has the resources and the flexibility to serve as an instrument of aspiration and accomplishment for those it has traditionally excluded. Certainly the cold war astrofuturism that promised to extend American ascendancy in perpetuity exemplifies what George Lipsitz has called America's "possessive investment in whiteness." Lipsitz argues that nothing that has been gained or lost by the political and economic struggles of the past century can be understood without reference to the rewards and privileges our society reserves for whiteness. Read through this lens, astrofuturism becomes part of a cover deflecting attention from America's treatment of its racialized minorities and safeguarding the white nation's status as inheritor of Europe's colonial mantle and its standing as the vanguard of technological modernity. The exclusion of women and racial minorities from the pioneering astronauts corps of the 1950s and 1960s was a deliberate gesture whose significance was readily apparent: the segregations of contemporary American life were to be extended into the space future as part of what Lipsitz identifies as "the rewards and privileges of whiteness."4 The antiseptic interiors and routinized characters of Stanley Kubrick's 2007: A Space Odyssey (1968) are an ironic portrayal of the heroic white males valorized by the 1960s space program. The mystical transcendence and evolutionary leap offered in the film's final scene takes "the absolute value of whiteness in U.S. politics, economics, and culture" to its logical conclusion on the space frontier.5

And yet people of color continue to turn to science in general and to astrofuturism in particular to express their political aspirations and personal longings. Despite its troubling history and unwelcoming practices, this discourse somehow invites the affiliation of those seeking alternatives to a racialized status quo. Consider the example of Neil de Grasse Tyson, astrophysicist and Frederick P. Rose Director of the Hayden Planetarium of New York's Natural History Museum. When Tyson received his Ph.D. in astrophysics from Columbia University in 1991, he increased the number of black astrophysicists in the United States from six to seven.6 To do so, he climbed a racial mountain comprised of blacks and whites who insist that African Americans have no business pursuing advanced academic degrees in the sciences. The latter expect blacks to excel in music, sports, or other forms of entertainment, but never in fields that require significant intellectual effort. The former maintains that the political and economic condition of black people is such that those who have the resources and intelligence must enter practical professions that will uplift the race.7 Jeffrey Allen Tucker, an African American scholar specializing in science fiction, has noted "that for many people—black as well as white—science fiction and African American culture are mutually exclusive."8 Any African American interested in the pursuit of knowledge is vulnerable to these commonplace sentiments. To be interested in the dream of spaceflight is to reach beyond the boundaries of acceptability in our racialized culture. In post-King America, we may dream only the dreams fit for our race and class.

Fortunately, there are always those who oppose the segregations required by a remarkably obdurate core of vested interests. Family and teachers, black and white, fostered Tyson's interests in math and astronomy. The curators and lecturers of the American Museum of Natural History's Hayden Planetarium provided the courses that fed his curiosity and the role models that made it possible for him to imagine himself in their profession.9 And the Education Director of the Explorers Club advised him on scholarship programs and travel opportunities that helped him develop his concentration. When he went shopping for an undergraduate education, Carl Sagan invited him to visit Cornell and welcomed him with a compassionate interest that made academic astronomy an attractive career option.10

Tyson's education as an astrophysicist reveals the tension between the promise of science and the political reality that has curtailed African American participation in the sciences. Tyson dramatizes the pragmatic value of science in the everyday politics of race as he recounts taping an interview for Fox News on the physics of solar flares. He recalls his reaction upon seeing himself on television: "I had an intellectual out-of-body experience: on the screen before me was a scientific expert on the Sun whose knowledge was sought by the evening news. The expert on television happened to be Black. At that moment, the entire fifty-year history of television programming flew past my view. At no place along that time line could I recall a Black person (who is neither an entertainer nor an athlete) being interviewed as an expert on something that had nothing whatever to do with being Black" (117). Here, then, is the final frontier. "For the first time in nine years," Tyson continues, "I stood without guilt for following my cosmic dreams" (117). As Tyson indicates, his presence on television as a titled representative of science is a powerful statement. It stands for political hopes that place no part of human endeavor beyond the reach of aggrieved communities. It fulfills the social promise often made in the name of rational inquiry.

For Tyson, science is another country, an alternative to a nation in which the gap between rhetoric and practice is incoherent and cruel. His experience of science contrasts sharply with the frequently irrational suppressions of thought and person he sees as part of everyday life.11 By contrast, he writes, "the laws of physics apply everywhere on Earth and in the heavens and are independent of social mores. These same laws were beginning to serve as one of my intellectual anchors amid the irrationalities of society" (20). The disinterestedness and rationality of science evoke hope for an equally rational world in which rules apply without favor to everyone.

Tyson's critique of the 1960s space program complements that of prominent civil rights leaders, such as Ralph D. Abernathy, who protested its extravagance:

Space exploration is generally a good thing, but while my formative years were coincident with NASA's Mercury, Gemini, and Apollo programs, I am far from being a space zealot. I saw who was going into space. The astronauts were predominantly military officers representing the branches of the armed forces. There were no women anywhere in the pipeline, and the chosen ones all wore crew cuts at the same time the musical Hair! was enjoying 1,750 performances on Broadway. Furthermore, they all seem to have been selected for their steel nerves and their absence of emotional expression. As far as I could tell, the American agenda was not the exploration of space but the American conquest of space to gain military advantage. (45)12

A space program undertaken as a projection of a militarized white masculinity into heretofore untenanted territory held no appeal for a young man who was both African American and a budding scientist. Indeed, it held little interest for the liberal scientists, such as Carl Sagan, who were his intellectual and professional models.13 However, for Tyson, the conquest of space, no matter how vast its mobilization, does not exhaust the value of human inquiry into realms beyond our atmosphere. The cold war-era space program, socially illiberal in its implementation, also opened imaginative doors. Speaking for the liberal agendas of science education, Tyson argues that "nothing in this world has the power to inspire forward thinking and visions of the future the way the space program can" (46). He assumes that nestled in the gargantuan machinery of the rocket state is the knowledge that could free us all to participate in making and "imagining a reachable future" (46).

Tyson's criticisms and hopes are echoed by many fellow travellers in his generation, including the writers, scientists, and space advocates who comprise the third generation of American astrofuturism. The generation that came to prominence in the late 1980s and 1990s inherits a rich tradition of literary and scientific exploration. Many of its members, such as Terry Bisson in Voyage to the Red Planet (1990), lampoon the restricted political imaginations of their predecessors and condemn the cold war hypocrisy that used the rhetoric of freedom to mask the West's structural inequalities. However, they also honor the potential of the high frontier to provoke speculation about changes in the terrestrial status quo. To this end, astrofuturist writers of the last two decades have pursued postmodern futures that grapple with the claims of peoples whose role as active participants in the advance of human knowledge has been routinely devalued or ignored.

In this incarnation, the spaceflight project is harnessed to the creation of outer spaces that experiment with diversity and hybridity, and break with terrestrial powers that would fix human potential into bounded, governable forms. In these heterogeneous spaces, suppressed histories and talents can flower and the deferred dreams of aggrieved communities can be realized. Their designers seek to reclaim the radical roots of astrofuturism and to fulfill the prospects opened up by the social movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Instead of a perfectly realized "end of history," they imagine futures in various states of democratic constestation and fulfillment. They also reject the assumed superiority of the state-sponsored technological platforms that underwrote the modern astrofuturist vision. In lieu of massive technocratic institutions dedicated to securing a narrow range of race, class, and national interests, we now see technological proposals suited to the small scale of private university research institutes and citizen's space-advocacy groups. Popular narratives that rely on the reflected glory of military adventure make way for stories that explore the Utopian potential of science that is not entrained to corporate capital or the projection of national political power. Political hope is expressed neither as monolithic galactic empires and federations nor as racially pure, space-based bantustans whose distance from one another is supposed to guarantee the survival, peace, and prosperity of the species. Hope exists in the invention of heterotopias, spaces that escape the simple oppositions maintained by our possessive investments.

Following Foucault, I define heterotopia as a space that is always material and bounded, partial and transitional, hybrid and momentarily, if ever, homogeneous.14 Although utopia may never shake the charge of being nowhere at any time, heterotopia is distinguished by always being somewhere and at sometime. It is achievable through available means, and is inhabited by identities and agendas that mirror the complexity of our ordinary world. In heterotopic spaces, thought experiments are run that suspend ordinary rules long enough to allow us to consider alternative ways of being. In heterotopian astrofuturisms, we find fresh potential for space futures that do not depend on the imperatives that govern everyday life. Geographer Derek Gregory writes of Foucault's heterotopias as "marginal sites of modernity, constantly threatening to disrupt its closures and certainties."15 Third-generation astrofuturists create extraterrestrial heterotopias by changing the bodies and identities that inhabit space futures. In so doing, they extend the astrofuturist engagement with modern technological Utopia from a stance of postmodern skepticism. Thus, like the disaporic intellectuals valorized by Cornel West, they mount "an intense and incessant interrogation of power-laden discourses in the service of neither restoration, reformation, nor revolution but rather of revolt."16

Allen M. Steele, Vonda N. Mclntyre, and Kim Stanley Robinson have sought to reconfigure astrofuturism from the perspective of working class culture, antiracist feminism, and Marxist intellectual history respectively. Their thought experiments force an audit of the investments in whiteness, masculinity, and bourgeois primacy that elsewhere constitute the ordinary business of our culture. The incipient revolts of third-generation astrofuturists target race, gender, class, and nation as regulatory devices that stabilize the potential of bodies and identities in rigid hierarchies. The most promising development from these inheritors of the astrofuturist tradition is the move from Utopia to heterotopia; from singularity to multiplicity; from unidirectional growth to multiple space-based projects that answer to the many histories on earth. Writers such as Steele, Mclntyre, and Robinson turn away from uncritical celebrations of enlightenment science wielded by an elite, albeit benevolent, few. Instead, these authors imagine a more participatory culture of science and hence a greater spectrum of possible futures. In their novels, we find room for the inclusion of disenfranchised peoples, not as grateful recipients of the largesse of powerful scientists and capitalists, but as active developers of new worlds.

All three writers directly engage astrofuturism's conservative tendencies, either by satirizing its conventions or by troping them away from their intended meanings. Allen Steele, for instance, satirizes the class prejudices of early astrofuturists and the naivete of their deterministic faith in the beneficent effects of technological advance. His first two novels, Orbital Decay (1989) and Lunar Descent (1991), respond to one of the oldest dreams of liberal astrofuturism, articulated by Arthur C. Clarke in the 1950s: the creation of a satellite-based global communications network that will force the breakdown of old nationalisms, ease social divisions, end tyranny, and result in a grassroots, decentralized global democracy. Steele criticizes cold war astrofuturism's uncritical advocacy of space technology and its blindness to the dangers of supporting governmental, military, and corporate space projects. He recognizes, as Clarke and others of his generation did not, that space technology is more likely to be used as an instrument of political repression than as the basis for a global Utopia.

### 1NC – Scifi Bad

#### Scifi is exclusionary – racial violence is a D rule in 2021

Walter 14(Damien Walter, writer of fiction, stories have appeared on BBC radio, graduated Clarion Science Fiction and Fantasy workshop at UC San Diego in 2008, “Science fiction’s real-life war in the worlds,” May 30, 2014, <http://www.theguardian.com/books/booksblog/2014/may/30/science-fiction-real-life-war-worlds>, Accessed: 7/1/14, RH)

As Samuel Delany noted, at a time when he numbered among the very few black writers in the field, **prejudice within science fiction would "likely remain a slight force** – until, say, black writers start to number 13, 15, 20% of the total." Author NK Jemisin employed Delany's quote in her own Guest of Honour speech at WisCon. Her incendiary argument to **fight against bigotry comes at a the time when she and other writers of colour** including Aliette de Bodard, Sofia Samatar and Nalo Hopkinson command a higher profile in the genre than ever before. And the resistance Delany predicted has come true. It is no coincidence that, just as it outgrows its limiting cultural biases, **science fiction should also face protests from some members of the predominantly white male audience who believed it to be their rightful domain**. What the conservative authors protesting the Hugo awards perceive as a liberal clique is simply science fiction outgrowing them, and their narrow conception of the genre's worth. Of course, **if those authors really wanted to de-politicise science fiction, they could** easily help **to do so – by admitting the genre's historic bias** and applauding its growth. And by doing everything within their power to welcome new authors from diverse backgrounds, instead of agitating for protest votes to push them out. The real prize for science fiction is not diversity for diversity's sake (although I happen to believe that would be prize enough). We live in a world of seven billion human beings, whose culture has not been reflected or rewarded in 'the mainstream'. Science fiction – from cult novels that reach a few thousand readers, to blockbuster movies and video games that dominate contemporary culture – has the potential to talk across every remaining boundary in our modern world. That makes it, in my opinion, potentially the most important cultural form of the 21st century. To claim that potential, it cannot afford to give way to the petulant protests of boys who do not like to share their toys.

#### Science fiction conflates fantasy with fact—this uniquely undermines civic engagement and destroys scientific education

Kluger 11 **7/11/11** - senior writer for TIME (Jeffery, “ Scientific Illiteracy After the Shuttle: Are America's Smartest Days Behind Her?” <http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,2082213,00.html>)

The problem is, the land of the free and home of the brave is in danger of becoming — not to put too fine a point on it — the land of the dunderhead, and my trip to Cape Canaveral, Fla., drove that point home. It's no secret that as a people, we're rapidly losing the basic fund of knowledge we need if we're going to function well in a complex world. Just last week, another dispiriting poll was released revealing how little some of us know about our national history. Only 58% of Americans can say with certainty what happened on July 4, 1776 — a figure that falls to a jaw-dropping 31% in the under-30 cohort. Fully 25% of Americans who do know that we seceded from some country or another to become a nation don't know what that former parent country was. This follows on the heels of other polls showing similar numbers of folks believing that we fought the Russians in World War II and beat them with the help of our stalwart German allies. Being historically illiterate is bad. Being scientifically illiterate, however, is even worse — if only because **having a working knowledge of how the world operates is essential to understanding critical areas of national policy**. Type the words "global warming" and "hoax" into Google and you get an appalling 10.1 million hits. The polls are all over the map on this one, but they show that rising numbers of Americans think climate science is fraudulent or exaggerated — up to 41% in one survey. It's not merely opinion to say that those people are simply wrong. There may be raging debates among scientists about the precise severity, mechanisms and trajectory of global warming, but the basic science is established and accepted, whether you want to admit it or not. Then of course there are the 18% of Americans who believe the sun revolves around Earth and the 28% who think the moon landings were faked. Google that last one and you're taken to sites that profess to be forums for political debate. Political debate? About faking the moon landings? This isn't the Roman Senate, folks, it's fantasyland. What got me thinking about all this was a stop I made after the launch at the Kennedy Space Center Visitor Complex — a combination museum and theme park on the Cape Canaveral grounds. The center's special feature this season is called Sci-Fi Summer 2011 — and it delivers just what it promises. Adjacent to the rocket garden, with its full-size mock-ups of the U.S.'s most legendary boosters, is a massive maplike display comparing the sizes of the Saturn 1B, the Saturn 5, the Mercury Redstone, the space shuttle and the International Space Station to the Starship Enterprise. Which is fine, except that all the other spacecraft actually existed and the Enterprise, um, didn't. The spacesuits worn by Neil Armstrong, Gordon Cooper and other astronauts are similarly commingled throughout the exhibit with uniforms worn by the Klingons and Romulons. There is also an entire pavilion set aside for a Star Trek display. O.K., it's cranky to begrudge people a little fun and Star Trek is undeniably cool. But do we really not get enough fun and cool elsewhere? Is there anyone alive who thinks that what Americans need right now are more ways to divert and amuse ourselves? Mix Cooper with the Klingons or the shuttle Enterprise with the Starship Enterprise long enough and the kids who consume all this stuff will no longer be able to tell them apart. Scientific literacy is part of good citizenship. And when it comes to space science, you don't need a lick of fiction to make it fun. An engineer at NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory who works in the interplanetary program once explained why he loves his job by saying, "If you can't have a good time coming to work and building robots to send to Mars, give it up, man." The same used to be true of merely learning about such things. It must become true again if the U.S. is going to keep its edge.

#### Science is necessary for freedom and technological innovation

Taggart 10PhD and philosophical counselor, Andrew “With what authority does a public philosopher speak?” http://www.butterfliesandwheels.org/2010/with-what-authority-does-a-public-philosopher-speak/

Fourth, neither can he allude to some analogy between philosophy and science for ultimate support. As regards the question of modern legitimacy, science has no conceptual problem (by which I don’t mean that the science wars of the nineties were somehow unreal or that Americans’ general skepticism toward science will soon vanish) because science has demonstrable utility. Science manifests its power to change the everyday routines that govern our lives through paradigm-shifting technological innovations. What’s more, scientific discoveries have extended the realm of human freedom by means of predictability and control. In the scientific picture inaugurated during the scientific revolution and coming into full view some 400 years later, nature has become less unruly and mysterious and, in consequence, more amenable to human understanding as well as more subject to technological manipulation. Since philosophy has no such practical utility and since it exerts no such power over the physical world, it follows that philosophy cannot draw its reason for being from scientific sources.

#### Tech innovation key to prevent warming and biod loss

Cristiana Pasca Palmer 18 [MPA, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University; MSc in Systems Ecology and Management of Natural Capital, University of Bucharest; **PhD in International Relations**, Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. Formerly: various positions with local and international civil society organizations in Eastern Europe, with World Bank Group/IFC, and in **academia as a policy researcher and teacher, Harvard University** and the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy; Founder and President, Green Cross Romania; Country Director, Romania, Fauna & Flora International. 2010-11, Policy Analyst, European Commission’s Directorate-General for Climate Action. 2011-15, Head, Climate Change, Environment and Natural Resources Unit, European Commission’s Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development. 2015-17, Romania’s Minister for Environment, Waters and Forests; oversaw eight subordinated agencies, totalling approximately 30,000 staff and a $250 million annual budget. Since March 2017, Executive Secretary, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. **Former Vice-President, United Nations Environmental Assembly’s Bureau** (UNEA 1); one of two appointed **EU negotiators on behalf of the European Commission for the Rio+20 Summit** in 2012.] “Can Technology Save Life on Earth?” World Economic Forum. September 10, 2018. <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/09/can-technology-save-life-on-earth/> TG

The need for urgent action to protect biodiversity – to shift to new, sustainable ways of production and consumption and reorient economic development pathways towards an “economy within ecological boundaries” - has been gaining global recognition. At the same time, technological advancements are evolving at incredible speed and scale. Can then the Fourth Industrial Revolution help mitigate and reverse the Anthropocene’s effects?

Yes

Value is not intrinsic but contextual: it is the functionality and intentionality that we attach to things what ultimately shapes their value. While a development-fueled quest for increasing standards of living, by an ever-growing human population, has been driving biodiversity loss, we could shift this quest to also serve as a source of mitigation – provided we harness the technological [innovations that drive economic development to avert biodiversity destruction](http://issues.org/32-1/perspective-technologies-for-conserving-biodiversity-in-the-anthropocene/).

Technologies driving the Fourth Industrial Revolution include tools such as artificial intelligence, machine learning, advancements in quantum computing, encoding data into DNA, virtual reality, biotechnology, and new materials. When it comes to biodiversity, there are areas – such as land use, including for food production, conservation, restoration, as well as governance, communications, and community engagement – where these new technologies could help.

For example, in urban areas, vertical gardening could provide a shift in production and sourcing methods. In the future, AeroFarms – which germinates seeds in the air with a mist of nutrients – has the potential to transform the way people in cities procure and consume food. When we look at technological innovations that could affect data on the supply chain, blockchain emerges as a promising tool to trace the entire sourcing and supply chain.

New technologies could provide valuable support to conservation: hyperspectral imagery of landscapes, for example, could provide detailed information on a host of chemical and geological parameters and biological processes in both terrestrial and aquatic systems, with significant progress made in imaging techniques, data analysis, and modes of deployment. This type of remote sensing could help conservation biologists maintain healthy habitats and protect the life they harbor, while offering the possibility of rapid alert systems for failing food webs or trophic systems, as well as for excessive human interference.

Managing biodiversity is an important area of conservation where technology could also play a key role, and has become a priority in many countries around the world. Satellite tracking technology is an effective tool for analyzing and visualizing data on species with inaccessible environments, in order to identify areas where conservation practices are needed. New technologies are increasingly improving research on migration, human-wildlife conflict, relocation and re-introduction of species, and [predator-prey interactions](https://www.forbes.com/sites/federicoguerrini/2015/10/27/halting-biodiversity-loss-with-drones-and-smartphones-not-just-wishful-thinking/#709d02eb55ef). Technology could also be applied to strategically assess biodiversity hotspots where human interference should be limited.

Technologies also have the potential to transform the way we approach ecosystem restoration. Some companies have started to use drones to determine what species are needed and where, and then use that data to reforest, replant, and restore. Bioremediation techniques—e.g. the use of plants and microbes to extract metal contaminants—have advanced to an extent that allows us to use natural processes to help “re-wild” damaged habitats. Research shows that even the most damaged landscapes can recover if human activities are limited: for example, the area surrounding Chernobyl, Ukraine, has recovered remarkably following the nuclear disaster in 1986, with native fauna taking advantage of the absence of human activities to re-wild the exclusion zone.

Natural technologies are readily available, affordable, and scalable. Some countries are already harnessing opportunities to fuse natural infrastructure with technology, for example, to build infrastructure to enhance the adaptive capacity, strengthen resilience, and reduce vulnerabilities to climate change. In China, cities are being built as ‘sponges’, with two cities, in particular, investing over a billion dollars in natural infrastructure for flood control, water conservation and quality, and natural ecosystem protection. As a result, these cities have proven to be more resilient to typhoons and heavy storms. Increasingly, nature is also gaining support as the original carbon-capture technology, with the potential to be one third of the global climate solution by 2030.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution could also be harnessed for improving communications. Satellite and geo-tagged data can serve as critical mechanisms to provide a more holistic picture of nature, its pressures and trends. The application of global data layers such, as those from the Global Forest Watch, on deforestation over time, with additional datasets such as on infrastructure development over time, and trade in commodities over time, could help produce compelling stories about our impact on natural ecosystems. Stories are essential to raise awareness among the general public, decision makers, and the financial and the private sectors. They help engagement with different actors, inspiring them to align goals, actions and resources in order to reconnect with nature; shift unsustainable practices and lifestyle choices; and promote the use of natural technological solutions.

Another key area where technology can support the safeguarding of life on the planet is community participation. Technologies bring the possibility to engage not only amateurs and professionals, but also often overlooked communities when it comes to conservation, such as indigenous peoples, local communities, and tourists. As example, [an Australian startup created an app](https://medium.com/advance-queensland/technology-helps-maintain-our-natural-biodiversity-2052d91f1efb), Crosschecker, which allows everyone – from local communities to tourists – to perform a search on any property, returning all flora and fauna in relation to the site, with matching descriptions and pictures. The app brings together information from various technologies, it cross references it with policies, legislation and compliance information, and then presents it in one easily accessible place, to inform the user of protected plant life and thus enable protection of the site’s natural heritage.

#### Warming guarantees extinction

Specktor 19 [Brandon Specktor] “Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims.” Live Science. June 4, 2019. <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html> TG

[According to the paper](https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0_b2c0c79dc4344b279bcf2365336ff23b.pdf), climate change poses a "near- to mid-term existential threat to human civilization," and there's a good chance society could collapse as soon as 2050 if serious mitigation actions aren't taken in the next decade.

Published by the Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration in Melbourne (an independent think tank focused on climate policy) and authored by a climate researcher and a former fossil fuel executive, the paper's central thesis is that climate scientists are too restrained in their predictions of how climate change will affect the planet in the near future. [[Top 9 Ways the World Could End](https://www.livescience.com/36999-top-scientists-world-enders.html)]

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom.

How the world ends

What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions.

"Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of lethal heat conditions, beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized.

Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert. Entire ecosystems collapse, beginning with the planet's coral reefs, the rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets. The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees.

This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to stress the fabric of the world's largest nations, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in nuclear war, are likely.

The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."