### T-Open Source

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive speech docs open source with highlighting on the NDCA LD wiki within an hour after debating.

#### Violation – Graphical user interface, text, application, Word, email Description automatically generated

#### Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs.

Antonucci 5 [Michael (Debate coach for Georgetown; former coach for Lexington High School); “[eDebate] open source? resp to Morris”; December 8; http://cedadebate.org/pipermail/mailman/2005 December/060990.html]

a. Open source systems are preferable to the various punishment proposals in circulation. It's better to share the wealth than limit production or participation. Various flavors of argument communism appeal to different people, but banning interesting or useful research(ers) seems like the most destructive solution possible. Indeed, open systems may be the only structural, rule-based answer to resource inequities. Every other proposal I've seen obviously fails at the level of enforcement. Revenue sharing (illegal), salary caps (unenforceable and possibly illegal) and personnel restrictions (circumvented faster than you can say 'information is fungible') don't work. This would - for better or worse. b. With the help of a middling competent archivist, an open source system would reduce entry barriers. This is especially true on the novice or JV level. Young teams could plausibly subsist entirely on a diet of scavenged arguments. A novice team might not wish to do so, but the option can't hurt. c. An open source system would fundamentally change the evidence economy without targetting anyone or putting anyone out of a job. It seems much smarter (and less bilious) to change the value of a professional card-cutter's work than send the KGB after specific counter-revolutionary teams.

#### Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify before round that cards aren’t miscut – otherwise you could have highlighted unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### Fairness is a voter – its constitutive of any competitive activity based on skills, wins, and losses – unfair practices skew the judge’s ability to determine the better debater

#### Drop the debater to set a norm – if you lose you’ll open source from now on

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary and begs the question of what’s reasonable requiring judge intervention

#### No rvi – you don’t get a cookie for being fair

### T private

#### The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust in all instances except for Low Earth Orbit Satellite constellations.

#### Private entities ought to appropriate outer space ONLY for the deployment and maintenance of LEO Satellites. Governments ought to regulate the size and number of these commercial satellites to avoid light pollution

#### Solves broadband internet access which is key for Native communities.

**Venkatesan et al 20** (Aparna Venkatesan is a Professor in the Department of Physics and Astronomy at the University of San Francisco. James Lowenthal is a professor of Astronomy at Smith College. Parvathy Prem is a Planetary Scientist specializing in Planetary research at Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory. Monica Vidaurri works as a research scientist at NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, specializing in astrobiology, policy, and ethics. “The impact of satellite constellations on space as an ancestral global commons”. November 06, 2020.)

**Satellite constellations could greatly improve** communications and ongoing **monitoring of** Earth **phenomena ranging from** weather and **climate to disaster management. Such large constellations also** have the potential to **offer global connectivity through** low-cost high-speed **broadband** internet. In principle, **this could be the critical leap needed to bridge the very real digital divide**2, **especially for** the world’s most minoritized populations, including **Indigenous communities.** This divide has been exposed as a chasm during this pandemic year, affecting many millions of students and low-income workers. **Broadband internet has become essential for daily life**, especially **during a pandemic** year when remote forms of learning, teaching, work and even health (for example, telemedicine) have become the norm. In 2019, the FCC offered US$20 billion in subsidies over ten years to address the digital divide in rural communities in the United States, which was quickly followed by a number of filings for LEOsats. **LEOsat broadband may benefit rural communities** more than urban areas—these ‘last mile’ connections are still challenging to complete relative to concentrated (urban) populations where ground-based cable/fibre internet infrastructure is cheaper. **Large satellite constellations thus have the potential to bridge the digital chasm**, but time will tell whether the promise of low-cost high-speed internet worldwide is achieved, **and** what the financial costs to customers are. **This potential democratization of space is worth noting, even if it may not lead to fair participation in space.**

### Cap K

#### The 1AC begins its method at localized resistance which feeds neoliberal flows and corrupts radical agendas.

**Evans and Reid 14** [Brad Evans, professor of international relations at the University of Lapland, Finland and Julian Reid, senior lecturer in international relations at the University of Bristol, *Resilient Life*, 2014, p. 102-4]

The significance of linking self-worth and achievement to the ‘social norm’ cannot be underestimated as it allows us to illustrate the differences between the learning processes of resilience as compared to a properly critical pedagogy which would encourage children to question the fundamental tenets of power and inequality in the world. **Strategies of** resilience when applied to children take the form of training exercises which enable them to deal with the localized effects of their vulnerability and the forms of attachments and dependencies they have created which amplify the problems. The examples of youths falling into membership of inner-city gangs become a prime example of a vulnerable child that has fallen through the cracks. Countering this is the idea of ‘educational resilience**’**, defined as the ‘heightened likelihood of success in school and other life accomplishments despite environmental adversities brought about by early traits, conditions, and experiences’.20 But how exactly do we measure success? Is the educationally resilient the vulnerable subject who goes on to fulfill their neoliberal potential, or is it the subject who goes to war with the system that seeks to render them resilient as such? Resilience, as we have learned, is more a code for social compliance than a political ambition to transform the very sources of inequality and injustices experienced by marginalized populations. We find this in early educational theories where resilience is again conflated with strategies of resistance such that the resilient child, individualistically conceived, pathologically outlives its conditions of impoverishment to exhibit social achievement in ways that are altogether in tune with the normal functioning of society.21 Indeed, more than simply learning to cope in conditions of impoverishment and vulnerability, as Steven Condly succinctly puts it in an approving review of the prevailing mainstream educational approaches, the doctrine of resilience offers new ways to assess qualities, competences and capabilities, as ‘resilient children tend to possess an above average intelligence and have a temperament that endears them to others and that also does not allow them to succumb to self-pity’.22 What of course qualifies as ‘self-pity’ in another setting could easily be read as a conscious attempt to challenge that which is beyond the control or individual responsibility of the particular subject. Sheila Martineau is attuned to this and writes of the political dangers of resilience in education with considerable foresight: ‘Though resilience conveyed anomalous childhood behaviour in the context of traumatic events in the 1970s, it has become detached from the traumatic context … dangerously, resilience has become constructed as a social norm modelled on the behavioural norms and expectations of the dominant society’.23 Resilience, in other words, becomes a normalized standard for mapping out (ab)normal behaviours such that the very terms of success are loaded with moral claims to a specific maturity, wherein the maturity itself is qualified through one’s ability to connect to the liberal order of things and partake in the world such that to resist means, without contraction, that one successfully learns to conform. Or to put it in more critical terms, since the ‘solution’ is to teach children to overcome ‘obstacles’ to personal development without ultimately challenging wider relations of power, the resilient child (which, although said to include all children, overwhelmingly concentrates on those from poorer, culturally and racially distinct backgrounds) encounters policies which, instead of ‘treating the individual’, end up by virtue of its logic ‘blaming the victim’.24 Disadvantage as such becomes once again the means to author new forms of discrimination that plays the vulnerable card to remove any political claims that things could be otherwise. Today we can situate these earlier demands for resilience within the strategic context of what Henry Giroux calls the ‘war on youth’. Indicative of **the neoliberal** assault on the education **system** more generally, Giroux maintains that youth has become a privileged object for power in a way that seeks to strip away any sense of critical awareness and political agency at the earliest possible stages of intellectual development. As he wr**it**es, since ‘neoliberalism is also a pedagogical project designed to create particular subjects, desires, and values defined largely by market considerations’, questions of ‘destiny’ become ‘linked to a market-driven logic in which freedom is stripped down to freedom from government regulation, freedom to consume, and freedom to say anything one wants, regardless of how racist or toxic the consequences might be’.25 This has a profound bearing upon education policy as ‘Critical thought and human agency are rendered impotent as neoliberal rationality substitutes emotional and personal vocabularies for political ones in formulating solutions to political problems’**.**26 Hence, within this ‘depoliticized discourse, youths are told that there is no dream of the collective, no viable social bonds, only the actions of autonomous individuals who can count only on their own resources and who bear sole responsibility for the effects of larger systemic political and economic problems’. Whilst education therefore should have a pedagogical commitment to the globally oppressed, what takes its place is a substitution for education that produces vulnerable consumers whose very training renders the political impossible**.**

#### The drive of capital is the root cause of the dominating power of the west leading to settler colonial violence

**Chibber ‘13**--(Jonah Birch, a graduate student in sociology @ NYU, interviewing Vivek Chibber, an American academic, Marxist theorist, editor, and professor of sociology @ NYU, “How Does the Subaltern Speak?” 7/23/18, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2013/04/how-does-the-subaltern-speak/>)

Subaltern studies offers two distinct arguments for how and why the universalizing drive of capital was blocked. One argument comes from Ranajit Guha. Guha located the universalizing drive of capital in the ability of a particular agent — namely, the bourgeoisie, the capitalist class — to overthrow the feudal order and construct a coalition of classes that includes not only capitalists and merchants, but also workers and peasants. And through the alliance that is cobbled together, capital is supposed to erect a new political order, which is not only pro-capitalist in terms of defending the property rights of capitalists, but also a liberal, encompassing, and consensual order. So for the universalizing drive of capital to be real, Guha says, it must be experienced as the emergence of a capitalist class that constructs a consensual, liberal order. This order replaces the ancien régime, and is universalizing in that it expresses the interests of capitalists as universal interests. Capital, as Guha says, achieves the ability to speak for all of society: it is not only dominant as a class, but also hegemonic in that it doesn’t need to use coercion to maintain its power. So Guha locates the universalizing drive in the construction of an encompassing political culture. The key point for Guha is that the bourgeoisie in the West was able to achieve such an order while the bourgeoisie in the East failed to do so. Instead of overthrowing feudalism, it made some sort of compact with the feudal classes; instead of becoming a hegemonic force with a broad, cross-class coalition, it tried its best to suppress the involvement of peasants and the working class. Instead of erecting a consensual and encompassing political order, it put into place highly unstable and fairly authoritarian political orders. It maintained the rift between the class culture of the subaltern and that of the elite. So for Guha, whereas in the West the bourgeoisie was able to speak for all the various classes, in the East it failed in this goal, making it dominant but not hegemonic. This in turn makes modernity in the two parts of the world fundamentally different by generating very different political dynamics in the East and West, and this is the significance of capital’s universalizing drive having failed.

#### Capitalism causes war, violence, environmental destruction and extinction.

Robinson 18 (William I., Prof. of Sociology, Global and International Studies, and Latin American Studies, @ UC-Santa Barbara, “Accumulation Crisis and Global Police State” Critical Sociology) RE

Each major episode of crisis in the world capitalist system has presented the potential for systemic change. Each has involved the breakdown of state legitimacy, escalating class and social struggles, and military conflicts, leading to a restructuring of the system, including new institutional arrangements, class relations, and accumulation activities that eventually result in a restabilization of the system and renewed capitalist expansion. The current crisis shares aspects of earlier system-wide structural crises, such as of the 1880s, the 1930s or the 1970s. But there are six interrelated dimensions to the current crisis that I believe sets it apart from these earlier ones and suggests that a simple restructuring of the system will not lead to its restabilization – that is, our very survival now requires a revolution against global capitalism (Robinson, 2014). These six dimensions, in broad strokes, present a “big picture” context in which a global police state is emerging. First, the system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. We have already passed tipping points in climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and diversity loss. For the first time ever, human conduct is intersecting with and fundamentally altering the earth system in such a way that threatens to bring about a sixth mass extinction (see, e.g., Foster et al., 2011; Moore, 2015). These ecological dimensions of global crisis have been brought to the forefront of the global agenda by the worldwide environmental justice movement. Communities around the world have come under escalating repression as they face off against transnational corporate plunder of their environment. While capitalism cannot be held solely responsible for the ecological crisis, it is difficult to imagine that the environmental catastrophe can be resolved within the capitalist system given capital’s implacable impulse to accumulate and its accelerated commodification of nature. Second, the level of global social polarization and inequality is unprecedented. The richest one percent of humanity in 2016 controlled over half of the world’s wealth and 20 percent controlled 95 percent of that wealth, while the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just five percent (Oxfam, 2017). These escalating inequalities fuel capitalism’s chronic problem of overaccumulation: the TCC cannot find productive outlets to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to chronic stagnation in the world economy (see next section). Such extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge of social control to dominant groups. As Trumpism in the United States as well as the rise of far-right and neo-fascist movements in Europe so well illustrate, cooptation also involves the manipulation of fear and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that social anxiety is channeled towards scapegoated communities. This psychosocial mechanism of displacing mass anxieties is not new, but it appears to be increasing around the world in the face of the structural destabilization of capitalist globalization. Extreme inequality requires extreme violence and repression that lend themselves to projects of 21st century fascism. Third, the sheer magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as well as the magnitude and concentrated control over the means of global communication and the production and circulation of symbols, images, and knowledge. Computerized wars, drone warfare, robot soldiers, bunker-buster bombs, a new generation of nuclear weapons, satellite surveillance, cyberwar, spatial control technology, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare, and more generally, of systems of social control and repression. We have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society, a point brought home by Edward Snowden’s revelations in 2013, and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication and symbolic production. If global capitalist crisis leads to a new world war the destruction would simply be unprecedented. Fourth, we are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism, in the sense that there are no longer any new territories of significance to integrate into world capitalism and new spaces to commodify are drying up. The capitalist system is by its nature expansionary. In each earlier structural crisis, the system went through a new round of extensive expansion – from waves of colonial conquest in earlier centuries, to the integration in the late 20th and early 21st centuries of the former socialist countries, China, India and other areas that had been marginally outside the system. There are no longer any new territories to integrate into world capitalism. At the same time, the privatization of education, health, utilities, basic services, and public lands is turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital’s control into “spaces of capital,” so that intensive expansion is reaching depths never before seen. What is there left to commodify? Where can the system now expand? New spaces have to be violently cracked open and the peoples in these spaces must be repressed by the global police state.

#### Alternative: we should use this space to build the party. That requires discipline, organization, and priorities for changing the state and other institutions. It’s a big tent, but commitment to the party and transformation of the state are the litmus tests for effective politics moving forward.

Dean ‘16 (Jodi, Prof. of Political Science @ Hobart and William Smith, Crowds and Party, pp. 153-154)

How do and can we imagine political change under the conditions of communicative capitalism? Is political change just aggregated personal transformation, communism as viral outbreak or meme-effect, #fullcommunism? Do we think that autonomous zones of freedom and equality will emerge like so many mushrooms out of the dregs left behind in capital flight and the shrinking of state social provisioning? Or do we optimistically look to democracy, expecting (all evidence to the contrary) that communism, or even upgraded social democracy, will arise out of electoral politics? All these fantasies imagine that political change can come about without political struggle. Each pushes away the fact of antagonism, division, and class struggle as if late neoliberalism were not already characterized by extreme inequality, violence, and exploitation, as if the ruling class did not already use military force, police force, legal force, and illegal force to maintain its position. Politics is a struggle over power. Capital uses every resource—state, non-state, interstate—to advance its position. A Left that refuses to organize itself in recognition of this fact will never be able to combat it. In communicative capitalism, individual acts of resistance, subversion, cultural production, and opinion expression, no matter how courageous, are easily absorbed into the circulatory content of global personal media networks. Alone, they don’t amplify; they can’t endure. They are easily forgotten as new content rushes into and through our feeds. We indulge in fantasies of the freedom of our expression, our critical edge and wit, disavowing the way such individuated freedom is the form of collective incapacity. Against states and alliances wielded in the service of capital as a class, diverse and separate struggles are so many isolated resistances, refusals to undertake the political work of pulling together in organized, strategic, long-term struggle. The constant churn of demands on our awareness disperses our efforts and attention. What the Left should be doing is coordinating, consolidating, and linking its efforts so that they can amplify each other. We don’t need multiple, different campaigns. We need an organized struggle against capitalism capable of operating along multiple issues in diverse locations. Crowds push back. From the perspective of the party, we see them as the insistent people. Fidelity to the insistence of the egalitarian discharge demands that we build the infrastructure capable of maintaining the gap of their desire. The more powerful the affective infrastructure we create, the more we will feel its force, interiorizing the perspective of the many into the ego-ideal that affirms our practices and activities and pushes us to do more than we think we can. Radical pluralists and participatory democrats sometimes imply that there can be a left politics without judgment, condemnation, exclusion, and discipline. Denying the way that collective power works back on those who generate it, they suggest we can have the benefits of collectivity without its effects. But “working back” is an inextricable dimension of collectivity’s capacity to cut through the self-interest of individual needs and produce enduring bonds of solidarity. Collective activities always have effects in excess of their immediate goals. Rather than fearing these effects, rather than remaining stuck in the fantasy that an individual can change the world, and rather than remaining so gripped by fears of power that we fantasize a politics that can abolish it, we should confront the force of collectivity directly and take responsibility for generating it and using it. The party capable of building an affective infrastructure that can cut through the barriers of capitalist expectation will err. It is not, cannot be, and should not be believed to be infallible. Sometimes it may turn its immense energies on itself. If we can’t bear it, we aren’t the Left, the communists, we need. Anyone who is unwilling to talk about the party should not talk about political transformation.

### Case

#### 1] The aff only bans private companies in which case aff has no solvency because public entities such as the

#### government and NASA can still appropriate space which means that the aff

#### doesn’t disrupt settler colonialism, it just shifts it from Elon Musk and

#### Tesla to Joe Biden and the USFG

#### Their justification for “space extends settler colonialism” is that it is the same logic. No overarching colonialism claim explains space exploration. Evaluate specificity.

**Mindell et al** **08** (David A. Mindell directs the Space, Policy, and Society Research Group at MIT. He is Dibner Professor of the History of Engineering and Manufacturing, Professor of Engineering Systems, and Director of the Program in Science, Technology, and Society at MIT. He has two decades of experience in technology development for deep ocean exploration. His most recent book is Digital Apollo: Human and Machine in Spaceflight. This paper was written in conjunction with several members of the MIT Space Engineering Dept. “The Future of Human Spaceflight”. December 2008.)

We reject these arguments about essential qualities of human nature. **No** historical **evidence**, no social science evidence, and no genetic evidence **prove that human beings have an innate, universal compulsion to explore. In fact**, **space exploration is radically different from the kinds of geographical expansion that have marked human history because of its high degree of technical difficulty**, the environments’ extreme hostility to human life, **and** the **total lack of encounters with other human cultures.** Furthermore, **if there were some grand universal compulsion to explore**, **we would find no compelling reason** for the United States or any other nation **to act now**, as we would eventually migrate to the stars, **regardless of our** potentially fallible **political decision making.** The exploration of space will continue if and only if governments or other large entities consider it within their interests and means to do so. **Only a fraction of nations** have ever found exploration valuable, and only a smaller fraction **are** now **space faring**.

#### Their anti-privatization stance is encoded within a schematic of settler colonialism built from Native death. Their description of anti-privatization and settler colonialism as independently distinct is a trick of parasitic movements to make decolonization impossible. Turns the case.

**Tuck and Yang 12** (Eve Tuck is Associate Professor of Critical Race and Indigenous Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. She is Canada Research Chair of Indigenous Methodologies with Youth and Communities. Tuck is the founding director of the Tkaronto CIRCLE Lab. Wayne Yang is a professor of ethnic studies at the University of California, San Diego and Provost of John Muir College. “Decolonization is not a metaphor”. 2012.)

**Moves to innocence** VI: Re-occupation and urban homesteading The **Occupy** movement for many economically marginalized people **has been a welcome expression of resistance to the massive disparities in the distribution of wealth**; for many Indigenous people, Occupy is another settler re-occupation on stolen land. T**he rhetoric of the movement relies upon problematic assumptions about social justice** and is a prime example of the incommensurability between “re/occupy” and “decolonize” as political agendas. **The pursuit** of worker rights (and rights to work) and minoritized people’s rights in a settler colonial context can appear to be **anti-capitalist**, but this pursuit **is** nonetheless **largely pro-colonial**. That is, **the ideal of “redistribution of wealth” camouflages how much of that wealth is** land, **Native land.** In Occupy, the “99%” is invoked as a deserving supermajority, in contrast to the unearned wealth of the “1%”. It renders Indigenous peoples (a 0.9% ‘super-minority’) completely invisible and absorbed, just an asterisk group to be subsumed into the legion of occupiers For example, “If U.S. land were divided like U.S. wealth” (figure 1.1) is a popular graphic that was electronically circulated on the Internet in late 2011 in connection with the Occupy movement. The image reveals inherent assumptions about land, including: land is property; land is/belongs to the United States; land should be distributed democratically. **The beliefs that land can be owned** by people, and that occupation **is** a right, reflect a profoundly settling, anthropocentric, colonial view of the world. In figure 1.1, the irony of mapping of wealth onto land seems to escape most of those who re-posted the images on their social networking sites and blogs: Land is already wealth; it is already divided; and its distribution is the greatest indicator of racial inequality17. Indeed the current wealth crisis facing the 99% spiraled with the crash in home/land ownership. **Land (not money) is actually the basis for U.S. wealth**. If we took away land, there would be little wealth left to redistribute. Settler colonization can be visually understood as the unbroken pace of invasion, and settler occupation, into Native lands: the white space in figure 1.2. Decolonization, as a process, would repatriate land to Indigenous peoples, reversing the timeline of these images. As detailed by public intellectuals/bloggers such as Tequila Sovereign (Lenape scholar Joanne Barker), some Occupy sites, including Boston, Denver, Austin, and Albuquerque tried to engage in discussions about the problematic and colonial overtones of occupation (Barker, October 9, 2011). Barker blogs about a firsthand experience in bringing a proposal for a Memorandum of Solidarity with Indigenous Peoples,18 to the General Assembly in Occupy Oakland. The memorandum, signed by Corrina Gould, (Chochenyo Ohlone - the first peoples of Oakland/Ohlone), Barker, and numerous other Indigenous and non-Indigenous activist-scholars, called for the acknowledgement of Oakland as already occupied and on stolen land; of the ongoing defiance by Indigenous peoples in the U.S. and around the globe against imperialism, colonialism, and oppression; the need for genuine and respectful involvement of Indigenous peoples in the Occupy Oakland movement; and the aspiration to “Decolonize Oakland,” rather than re-occupy it. From Barker’s account of the responses from settler individuals to the memorandum, Ultimately, what they [settler participants in Occupy Oakland] were asking is whether or not we were asking them, as non-indigenous people, the impossible? **Would their solidarity with us require them to give up their lands, their resources, their ways of life, so that we** – who numbered so few, after all – **could have more**? Could have it all? (Barker, October 30, 2011) These **responses**, resistances by settler participants to the aspiration of decolonization in Occupy Oakland, **illustrate** the reluctance of some settlers to engage the prospect of decolonization beyond the metaphorical or figurative level. Further, they reveal **the limitations to “solidarity**,” without the willingness to acknowledge stolen land and how stolen land benefits settlers. “Genuine solidarity with indigenous peoples,” Barker continues, “assumes a basic understanding of how histories of colonization and imperialism have produced and still produce the legal and economic possibility for Oakland” (ibid., emphasis original).

#### Turn – interstellar exploration can be hijacked by indigenous people to unsettle white futurity and colonial imaginaries

Cornum 15 [Lou Cornum is a diasporic Dine writer, student, and space cadet. "The Space NDN's Star Map," the new inquiry, <https://thenewinquiry.com/the-space-ndns-star-map/> Jan 26, 2015]

Science/speculative fiction author Nalo Hopkinson, known for her use of creole languages and Caribbean oral stories in her works, writes that people of color engaging with SF “take the meme of colonizing the natives and, from the experience of the colonizee, critique it, pervert it, fuck with it, with irony, with anger, with humor and also, with love and respect for the genre of science fiction that makes it possible to think about new ways of doing things.” Perhaps because science fiction is so prone to reproducing colonial desires it has become seductive to the “colonizee” who finds pleasure and power in reversing the telescope’s gaze of who is exploring who. This reversal is no mere trick, though. It is a profound deconstruction of how we imagine time, progress, and who is worthy of the future. Following in the rocket trails of black authors such as Hopkinson, the space NDN is also in a long tradition of NDN interstellar exploration, using technologies such as creation stories and ceremony as her means of travel. For some, she is a startling and unsettling figure. As Philip Deloria argues in *Indians in Unexpected Places*, settlers are upset and confused when the seemingly contrasting symbolic systems of indigeneity and high-tech modernity are put in dialogue, as demonstrated in the shocked reactions to a 1904 photograph of Geronimo in a Cadillac. This estrangement arises from “a long tradition that has tended to separate Indian people from the contemporary world and from recognition of the possibility of Indian autonomy in the world.” In the colonial imaginary, indigenous life isnot only separate from the present time but alsoout of place in the future, a time defined by the progress of distinctively western technology. If colonial society cannot accept Geronimo in a Cadillac, it can hardly conceive of him in a space ship. The Indian in space seeks to feel at home, to undo her perceived strangeness by asking: why can’t indigenous peoples also project ourselves among the stars? Might our collective visions of the cosmos forge better relationships here on earth and in the present than colonial visions of a final frontier? Many of the ideas deemed strange or new-fangled in Western sci-fi come naturally to the space NDN. The all-pervasive “force” or similarly the super brain connecting all beings. The animism and agency of cyborgs, AI systems, and other non-human people. Alternate dimensions and understandings of non-linear time. These are things the space NDN knows intuitively. This is not the future but historical knowledge. The future is reclaiming these technologies not for domination but for new organizations aimed at better worlds. I am reminded of Octavia Butler’s words, “There is nothing new under the sun, but there are new suns.” Instead of imaging a future in bleak cities made from steel and glass teeming with alienated white masses shuffling under an inescapable electronic glow, indigenous futurists think of earthen space crafts helmed by black and brown women with advanced knowledge of land, plants, and language. Indigenous futurism seeks to challenge notions of what constitutes advanced technology and consequently advanced civilizations. As settler colonial governments continue to demand more and more from the Earth, indigenous peoples seek the sovereign space and freedom to heal from these apocalyptic processes. Extractive and exploitative endeavors are just one mark of the settler death drive, which indigenous futurism seeks to overcome by imagining different ways of relating to notions of progress and civilization. Advanced technologies are not finely tuned mechanisms of endless destruction. Advanced technologies should foster and improve human relationships with the non-human world. In many indigenous science fiction tales of the futures, technology is presented as in dialogue with the long traditions of the past, rather than representing the past’s overcoming. In the recent iteration of the constantly re-packaged tale of white men planting flags in space, *Interstellar*’s all-American space boy Matthew McConaughey stares into the distance and announces, “We are explorers, pioneers, not caretakers.” As if one cannot be both an explorer and a caretaker…For the space NDN the two roles are intertwined. The advanced technology of the space NDN does not separate technical from natural knowledge. Technology is not divorced from or forced upon land but develops in relation to lands and the many beings land supports. The space NDN’s disavowal of western progress makes clear the difference between indigenous futurism and early 20th century forms of futurism, which were compatible with the interests of fascist and oppressive governments. Unlike those futurists, who were in an antagonistic relation with their literary and cultural predecessors, indigenous futurism is centered on bringing traditions to distant, future locations rather than abandoning them as relics. Indigenous futurism does not care for speed so much as sustainability, not so much for progress as balance, and not power but relation. *God is the Red Planet* For many the image of the Indian in space is jarring not just because of the settler perception of indigeneity as antithetical to high tech modernity, but because Indian identity is tied so directly to specific earthly territories. What happens to indigeneity when the indigenous subject is no longer in the location that has defined them? This is not just a question of outer space. Already the majority of Native people in the U.S. and Canada live in cities away from their traditional territories. Of course at one point these places would also have been viewed as indigenous territories. While many nations have worked very hard to dispel the notion of nomadic Indian tribes, there is a history of movement among many of our peoples. Colonial forms such as reserves, reservations, nation-states and borders have madethese traditions of movement nearly impossible.And the need to defend our rights to live on our lands without harassment has created the political necessity of claiming our land-based political and cultural identities. But land-based does not have to mean landlocked. This insistence on indigenous people having to always be located on or closely connected to one particular area also erases those who are unable to return to their traditional territories, such as Mohawk women who are kicked out of their tribe for marrying non-Mohawk men or Afro-Indigenous people stolen from their lands. There is also the simple fact that NDNS may want to move around. There’s an old cliché that every Indian story is about going home. But what about the Indians who can’t go home, or simply want to go away? I sometimes describe myself as a diasporic Diné in order to bring the often disparate ideas of indigeneity and movement into closer proximity. Those we consider diasporic are often violently robbed of their indigeneity and those we consider indigenous are often on the move. The space NDN looks into the void and knows still who they are.Nanobah Becker shot the Mars scenes in *The 6th World* in Monument Valley, one of the sacred territories of the Diné. The red rock canyons and cliffs make a convincing Martian backdrop. They also offer a symbol of dynamic sacredness. These distant lands are connected. Just because the Diné have not lived on Mars since time immemorial, it does not mean our plants and teachings cannot take root there. I am reminded of the time before a ceremony on a college campus when we washed our hands in a drinking fountain. I am reminded of Betonie, the medicine manin Leslie Marmon Silko’s novel Ceremony,who makes medicine bundles from trash heaps. I am reminded ofpow-wow regalia ornamented with semiconductors.I am reminded of thedescendants of slaves telling and re-telling their stories on new, bloody ground.Finding ourselves in new contexts, we are always adapting, always surviving. This is the seed of many indigenous technologies: the ability tocontinue andsustain ourselves against all odds.The challenge of the space NDN is how to apply knowledge of the worlds toward non-destructive ends. Any form of travel or exploration comes with the dangers of exploitation and upheaval. Nobody knows this better than the inhabitants of those places constantly divvied up between colonial nation-states. The figure of the space NDN is not an attempt to simply put an indigenous face on the outer space colonizer. Indigenous futurist narratives try to enact contact differently. Not all encounters with the other must end in conquest, genocide or violence. The space NDN seeks new models of interaction. We do not travel to the distant reaches of space in order to plant our flags or act under the assumption that every planet in our sights is a terra nullius waiting for the first human footprint to mark its surface. Robert Sullivan’s poem “Star Waka” captures the complexities of indigenous space travel. Waka is the Maori term for a canoe and Sullivan’s epic poem relates the journey of this star waka to outer planets to find new homes for the Maori people. The crew of the ship wonder how their prayers will work in the cold vastness of the stars and how they can approach these distant worlds in a good way. The Indian in space does not abandon their home, their people, or their teachings. Dynamic traditions, themselves a type of advanced technology, help the space NDN to understand how to foster the kind of relationships that make futures possible. *All Our Interstellar Relations* For indigenous futurism, technology is inextricable from the social. Human societies are part of a network of wider relationships with objects, animals, geological formations and so on. To grasp our relationship with the non-human world here on Earth, we must also extend our understanding of how Earth relates to the entirety of the cosmos. We live on just one among millions of planets, each an intricate and delicate system within a larger, increasing complex structure. For the indigenous futurist endeavor, striving to understand the ever-multiplying connections linking us to the beginning of the universe and its constant expansion also entails unraveling the intricate relations that make up our Earthly existence. Zainab Amadahy, who identifies as a person of mixed black, Cherokee and European ancestry, grounds her writing practice in illuminating and understanding networks of relationships: “I aspire to write in a way that views possible alternatives through the lens of a relationship framework, where I can demonstrate our connectivity to and interdependence with each other and the rest of our Relations.” Her 1992 novel *The Moons of Palmares* examines the relationships, both harmful and collaborative, between indigenous peoples and descendants of slaves in an outer space setting that merges histories of the Black Atlantic with the colonial frontier. In a provocative bit of plotting, she casts an indigenous character, Major Eaglefeather, as an oppressive foreign force in the lives of an outer space labor population that has shaped its society in remembrance of black slave resistance in North/South America and the Caribbean. The story follows Major Eaglefeather’s decision to reject his ties to the corporate state and support a rebel group of laborers. The name Palmares is taken from a real-world settlement founded by escaped slaves in 17th-century Brazil, which is also known to have incorporated indigenous peoples and some poor, disenfranchised whites. In a chronicle written in the late 17th century, these *quilombos* are described as networks of settlements that lived off the land and were supplemented by raids on the slave plantations where the inhabitants were formerly held. It is said that in Palmares the king was called Gangasuma, a hybrid term meaning “great lord” composed of the Angolan or Bandu word *ganga* and the Tupi word *assu*. The word succinctly captures the mixture of cultures that banded together in Palmares to live together on the margins of a colonialist, slave-holding society. While Palmares was eventually destroyed in a military campaign, it lives on as a legend of slave rebellion and utopian possibility that Amadahy finds well suited for her outer space story about collaborative resistance to state power and harmful resource extraction processes. Outer space, perhaps because of its appeal to our sense of endless possibility, has become the imaginative site for re-envisioning how black, indigenous and other oppressed people can relate to each other outside of and despite the colonial gaze. Amadahy’s work is crucial for a critical understanding of the space NDN. The space NDN cannot allow him or herself to fall into the patterns of domination and kyriarchy that have for too long prevailed here on Earth as well as speculative narratives of outer space. Afrofuturists have looked to space as the site for black separatism and liberation. If the space NDN is truly committed to being responsible to all our relations, it is imperative for our futurist vision to be in solidarity with and service to our fellow Afrofuturist space travelers. Our collective refusal of colonial progress (namely, our destruction) means we must chart other ways to the future that lead us and other oppressed peoples to the worlds we deserve.*The Moons of Palmares* works toward this end by revealing the strong connections between indigenous and black histories, narratives and ways of living. Indigenous futurism is indebted to Afrofuturism: Both forms of futurism explore spaces and times outside the control of colonial powers and white supremacy. These alternative conceptions of time reject the notion that all tradition is regressive by narrating futures intimately connected to the past. SF and specifically the site of outer space give writers and thinkers the imaginative room to envision political and cultural relationships and the future decolonizing movements they might nourish. This focus on relationship, especially as posited by Amadahy, also accounts for those forms of indigeneity that persist among peoples either stolen from their lands or whose lands have been stolen from them. As the writer Sydette Harry recently posted on Twitter, “Black people are displaced indigenous people.” However, because of the processes of forced relocation and slavery and continuing anti-black racism, black people are often denied claims to indigeneity. There is also a pernicious erasure of black NDNs in America and Canada. In exploring outer space, black authors are also able to assert their own relationship to land both on Earth and in the cosmos. The Black Land Project (BLP), while not an explicitly futurist organization, fosters the kind of relationships to land on Earth that futurist authors and thinkers envision in outer space. In a recent podcast, *Blacktracking through Afrofuturism*, BLP founder and director Mistinguette Smith discusses how walking over the routes of the Underground Railroad brought forth alternate dimensions and understandings of time outside the settler paradigm of ownership. These are aspects of relating to land that the Afrofuturist and the space NDN (identities which can exist in the same person) bring with them on their travels. This focus on relationship rather than a strict idea of location speaks to the way in which the space NDN can remain secure in their indigenous identity even while rocketing through dark skies far from their origins. This is not to demean the work of land protectors and defenders who risk serious repercussions for resisting corporate and state encroachment on indigenous territories. The space NDN supports those who are able and choose to remain on the land, while also hoping to broaden understandings of indigeneity outside simple location. Locations of course are never simple. It is the settler who wishes to flatten the relation between place and people by claiming land through ownership. Projecting themselves forward into faraway lands and times, the space NDN reveals the myriad ways of relating to land beyond property.

**No link --** frontier **mythology won’t automatically apply to space—each frontier is unique and modern ideas distort the history of frontier expansion**

**Gray 99**

[D.M., “Space as a frontier - the role of human motivation,” Space Policy, August]

Frontiers have the reputation for generating a ‘Frontier Mentality’. This is generally thought of in terms of the American frontier mythos. The sturdy pioneer is seen as independent, self-sufficient, and highly motivated to provide a better life for his family. He is also portrayed as having little regard for any environmental devastation or for any indigenous society he might encounter. While there were no doubt pioneers with these qualities, these values reflect the unique mixing of the historic society and the realities of the resources being utilized on the frontier at that time. Further, our perception of the past is distorted by the ethics of our society and the historic, social and entertainment mediums by which the picture of the past is presented. If historic frontiers are studied in some detail, it soon becomes apparent that each has a unique set of values, ideals and mind-sets.

#### Turn - Traditional frontier ideology causes war—space channels territorial expansion into technological expansion which solves this

**GRAY 1999** (D.M., “Space as a frontier - the role of human motivation,” Space Policy, August)

The motivation of nations to expand their spheres of influence has historically been expressed in terms of imperialism, colonialism, hegemony and outright military conquest. In America in the 19th century it was most often expressed in terms of Manifest Destiny - the belief that the United States of America should extend across the continent from the Atlantic to Pacific. The movement was personified by folk heroes such a Daniel Boone, Kit Carson and Davy Crockett. However, on a larger scale it was expressed in a generationally driven agrarian and mining expansion from east to west until the Civil War and then a rebound back to the east into the interior from the Pacific in the post-War eras. In the 19th century and first half of the 20th century, the idea of a steadystate society was anathema to national prestige. Nations competed in a global land-rush with little regard for the indigenous societies. The American frontiersmen perceived the land to be empty and brushed away the native populations who could not compete with the technology, organizational structures and aggressive ideologies of the EuroAmerican society. Indeed, national ambition expressed in the expansion of physical borders continues to produce war and the threat of war. However, nationalistic expansion is given a more constructive venue when it is presented with a true wilderness in which it can grow. In the 20th century, physical frontiers were replaced by technological frontiers that provided arenas of expansionist opportunity with no native populations. The Wright Brothers, Henry Ford, Einstein, Yager, Glenn, Jobs and Gates became the new American folk heroes. They personified the expansion of the frontiers of technology and science. Instead of subjugating or pushing peoples aside, these technological frontiers tended to empower and provide new freedoms. The common man learned to put aside old ways of doing things and embrace new technologies. In 20th century America, the ideology of `Manifest Destiny’ came to be replaced with &You can't stand in the way of progress!'. Nationalistic goals motivated President Kennedy to declare during a speech at Rice University on September 12, 1962, &I believe this nation should commit itself, before this decade is out, to landing a man on the moon and return him safely to the earth'. The speech resulted in the spear thrust of Apollo that proved the USA's superiority over the Soviet technological machine. On Sunday, 20 July 1969, America's sphere of influence extended to the lunar surface as Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin planted the American flag on the Sea of Tranquillity. Having proved its superiority, America could be magnanimous in victory with the symbolic handshake of Apollo}Soyuz. Since America's retreat from the successes of Apollo, nationalistic interests in space have become less clear. The USA began to quietly concentrate on orbiting satellites. Military and security organizations in the government viewed space as the most practical means of providing information they deemed necessary to maintain national security. The USA's new symbol of superiority in space became the Space Shuttle which could take larger crews to space in airline-like comfort. The USA's expansionist policies had once again moved from the physical to the technological. With the fall of the Soviet Union, the USA had little reason to compete in space. Instead, it found more prestige in allowing other countries to participate in Shuttle missions and most recently in the International Space Station. For America's partners, participation in the station provided access to space without having to develop the means to travel there. For these nations, their space programs have become a focus of national pride. For example when SPAR of Canada recently sold its space robotics unit that manufactured the Shuttle's robot arm to a subsidiary of the American company Orbital Sciences, the SPAR stock holders arose to remove the board of directors that had made the decision [2].

#### The concept of the frontier can never be rejected but we can reshape it in space to encourage cultural harmony and intellectual expansion

**Billings 97**

[Linda Billings is a doctoral student in the Department of Communication Studies, Indiana University, “Frontier Days in Space: Are They Over?” Space Policy, August]

Patricia Nelson Limerick has recommended that the space community abandon the frontier metaphor. But at the same time she acknowledges that it is 'an enormously persistent and determining pattern of thought'. Ultimately, it may not be feasible to expunge the frontier metaphor from the public discourse about space exploration. But it certainly is possible, and practical, to re-examine it as a motivating force for space exploration. What is the space frontier? It might be useful to think of the space frontier as a vast and distant sort of Brazilian rainforest, Atacama Desert, Antarctic continent a great unknown that challenges humans to think creatively and expansively, to push their capabilities to the limits, a wild and beautiful place to be studied and enjoyed but left unsullied. Curiosity is what brought humans out of caves, took them across oceans and continents, compelled them to invent aeroplanes and now draws them towards the stars. The broad, deep public value of exploring the universe is the value of discovery, learning and understanding; thus the space frontier could be a school for social research, a place where new societies could grow and thrive. This is the space frontier: the vast, perhaps endless frontier of intellectual and spiritual potential. Consider the popularity of director Ron Howard's film Apollo 13. What appealed to audiences about this story was that it was about danger, risk, challenges, hard work, human ingenuity, turning failure to success, life triumphing over death. In his turn of the century essay, 'The moral equivalent of war', American philosopher William James wrote that 'without risks or prizes for the darer, history would be insipid indeed'. Space exploration offers tremendous opportunities to take extraordinary risks and thus it promises great challenges to the human mind and spirit. Intellectual and spiritual growth are more than worthy goals of future space exploration efforts.

### Turn (If Solves for Climate Change)

#### Indigenous peoples are most vulnerable to warming – also destroys their human rights and culture. Means the neg can alleviate actual material suffering.

**IWGIA 15** (International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, international non-government human rights organization, staffed by specialists and advisors, network of researchers and human right activists, “Climate change and indigenous peoples”, IWGIA, November 1, 2015, http://www.iwgia.org/environment-and-development/climate-change)

For indigenous peoples, climate change is not only an environmental issue but also a human rights issue and a question of cultural survival. Indigenous peoples are especially vulnerable to climate change Regional and global assessments confirm that the Earth's climate is changing. Current and projected levels of exposure to climate-related sensitivities, as well as limits and restrictions to adaptive capacity, mean that some environments and peoples are more exposed to climate change and are significantly more vulnerable to its impacts and long-term consequences than others. Indigenous peoples depend on natural resources for their livelihood and they often inhabit fragile ecosystems. At the same time, indigenous peoples are among the world's most marginalized, impoverished and vulnerable peoples. Hence, while indigenous peoples bear the brunt of climate change, they have minimal access to resources to cope with the changes. Climate change is a human rights issue When ecosystems change, indigenous peoples' customary uses of wildlife, plants and forests are affected. Culturally and economically important species and resources may become more sparse or extinct. To indigenous peoples, climate change is, however, not simply a matter of physical changes to the environments in which they live. Many consider climate change a threat to their livelihoods and they fear that their economy and resource use will be threatened, followed by an erosion of social life, traditional knowledge and cultures. Hence, to indigenous peoples climate change is not only an environmental issue but also a human rights issue. Despite the impact of climate change on indigenous peoples and their traditional knowledge, international experts most often overlook the rights of indigenous peoples as well as the potentially invaluable contributions that indigenous peoples' traditional knowledge, innovations and practices can bring to the global search for climate change solutions. As the global discourse on climate change focuses on understanding how we can scientifically and technologically adapt to, as well as mitigate climate change, indigenous peoples are faced with the prospect of climate change further challenging their abilities to adapt to and cope with environmental and social changes. Climate change mitigation initiatives Indigenous peoples can play a key role in mitigation of climate change. As guardians of large areas of forest, indigenous peoples can have a central role in stopping deforestation. Land titling in favor of indigenous peoples, strengthening of local governance structures and sustainable community forestry are proven tools to quickly halt deforestation. By managing their ancestral land, indigenous peoples help increase forest cover and biodiversity. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that in many cases, reforestation and renewable energy projects aiming at reducing greenhouse gas emissions pose an additional threat to indigenous peoples' tenure security, livelihoods and economies. The establishment of bio-fuel plantations, wind power project and hydroelectric dams on indigenous peoples' lands without their free, prior and informed content often lead to evictions and dispossession. Adding to the negative impacts of climate change itself on indigenous communities. It it thus crucial that mitigation initiatives make room for the inclusion and participation of indigenous peoples. That they respect indigenous peoples' rights and take into consideration their traditional knowledge. Indigenous peoples are actively engaging in national and international processes on climate change and mitigation policies, including the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and national REDD+ programmes.

### Reps

#### Focusing on representation ignores the material conditions that shape policy action

**Tuathail 96**

[Gearóid, Professor of Government and International Affairs, Virginia Tech, The patterned mess of history and the writing of critical geopolitics: a reply to Dalby, Political Geography 15:6/7, p 661-5]

While theoretical debates at academic conferences are important to academics, **the discourse and concerns of** foreign-policy **decisionmakers are** quite different, **so different that they constitute a distinctive** problemsolving, theory-averse, policy-making subculture. There is a danger that academics assume that the discourses they engage are more significant in the practice of foreign policy and the exercise of power than they really are. This is not, however, to minimize the obvious importance of academia as a general institutional structure among many that sustain certain epistemic communities in particular states. In general, I do not disagree with Dalby’s fourth point about politics and discourse except to note that his statement-‘Precisely because reality could be represented in particular ways political decisions could be taken, troops and material moved and war fought’-evades the important question of agency that I noted in my review essay. The assumption that it is representations that make action possible is inadequate by itself. **Political, military and economic** structures, **institutions**, discursive networks and leadership **are** all **crucial** in explaining social action and should be theorized together with representational practices. Both here and earlier, Dalby’s reasoning inclines towards a form of idealism. In response to Dalby’s fifth point (with its three subpoints), it is worth noting, first, that his book is about the CPD, not the Reagan administration. He analyzes certain CPD discourses, root the geographical reasoning practices of the Reagan administration nor its public-policy reasoning on national security. Dalby’s book is narrowly textual; the general contextuality of the Reagan administration is not dealt with. Second, let me simply note that I find that the distinction between critical theorists and poststructuralists is a little too rigidly and heroically drawn by Dalby and others. Third, Dalby’s interpretation of the reconceptualization of national security in Moscow as heavily influenced by dissident peace researchers in Europe is highly idealist, an interpretation that ignores the structural and ideological crises facing the Soviet elite at that time. Gorbachev’s reforms and his new security discourse were also strongly selfinterested, an ultimately futile attempt to save the Communist Party and a discredited regime of power from disintegration. The issues raised by Simon Dalby in his comment are important ones for all those interested in the practice of critical geopolitics. While I agree with Dalby that questions of **discourse are extremely important ones for political geographers to engage, there is a danger of fetishizing** this **concern with discourse** so that we neglect the institutional and the sociological, the materialist and the cultural, the political and the geographical contexts within which particular discursive strategies become significant. **Critical geopolitics**, in other words, **should not be a prisoner of the sweeping ahistorical cant** that sometimes accompanies ‘poststructuralism **nor convenient reading strategies like the identity politics narrative**; it needs to always be open to the patterned mess that is human history.