# 1NC v Tanya

## 1---T

Topicality

#### Interp: The 1AC must defend a policy action

#### Violation: Anything that garners offense external to the plan is extra-t and makes being neg impossible---explodes limits.

**1] Resolved---must defend the implementation of a policy action**

**Parcher 1,** [(Jeff, Fmr. Debate Coach at Georgetown University, February, <http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html>)] Sachin

Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constituent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision.  (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not. (5) The very terms 'affirmative' and 'negative' support my view. One affirms a resolution. Affirmative and negative are the equivalents of 'yes' or 'no' –which, of course, are answers to a question.

#### 2] Appropriation---neccesitates policy application.

Erickson 95, [Justice ERICKSON delivered the Opinion of the Court. Matter of Bd. of Cty. Com'rs, 891 P.2d 952 (Colo. 1995).] Sachin

We disagree with the water court's analysis. A conditional water right is, "a right to perfect a water right with a certain priority upon the completion with reasonable diligence of the appropriation upon which such water right is to be based." § 37-92-103(6), 15 C.R.S. (1990). Appropriation is defined as, "the application of a specified portion of the waters of the state to a beneficial use pursuant to the procedures prescribed by law...." § 37-92-103(3)(a).

#### 3] “Unjust” means against the law---they must end the practices declared unjust.

Waters 98, [H. FRANKLIN WATERS, Senior District Judge. Colonia Ins. Co. v. City Nat. Bank, 13 F. Supp. 2d 891 - Dist. Court, WD Arkansas 1998] Sachin

Arkansas law is clear on the issue that in the realm of unjust enrichment, the word "unjust" means "unlawful." "One is not unjustly enriched by receipt of that to which he is legally entitled. \* \* \* No recovery of money received can be based upon unjust enrichment when the recipient can show a legal or equitable ground for keeping it." Halvorson v. Trout, 258 Ark. 397, 403, 527 S.W.2d 573, 577 (1975) (quoting Whitley v. Irwin, 250 Ark. 543, 550-51, 465 S.W.2d 906, 910-11 (1971)). See also, Jackson County Grain Drying Coop. v. Newport Wholesale Electric, Inc., 9 Ark.App. 41, 46, 652 S.W.2d 638, 640 (1983) (no one shall be allowed to unjustly enrich himself at the expense of another; the word "unjustly" means "unlawfully").

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Vagueness---debates inevitably involve the AFF defending something, but only our interp forces that to be clearly defined that from the start. Their model leads to late-breaking debates that destroy ground, for example we won’t know if asteroid mining or space exploration are offense until the 1AR, which skews neg prep.

#### 2] Topic ed---specific policies teaches lets us go deep into the topic, uniquely important given the evolving character of space law – outweighs bc we only have 2 month topics, and phil ed is solved by free textbooks.

#### Topical version – end the colonization of space by private entities through policy action. SSD solves their offense.

#### T is DTD and No RVIs – The whole aff violates and its their burden to be topical---must proactively prove the aff is good since the entire debate follows it. We don’t get new DAs so DTA does nothing. Means T comes first---our abuse was because of theirs and it affects the largest portion of the debate. Anything else encourages baiting.

#### Use Competing Interps – Anything else lets the judge intervene and pick whatever def is best under their bs meter leading to a proliferation of abuse.

## 2---NC

Util NC

#### The roll of the ballot is to evaluate the consequences of a topical policy action. Anything else explodes limits, is arbitrary and self-serving, and begs the question of util

#### Util is the only egalitarian metric---anything else collapses cooperation on collective action crises and makes extinction inevitable

Khan 18 (Risalat, activist and entrepreneur from Bangladesh passionate about addressing climate change, biodiversity loss, and other existential challenges. He was featured by The Guardian as one of the “young climate campaigners to watch” (2015). As a campaigner with the global civic movement Avaaz (2014-17), Risalat was part of a small core team that spearheaded the largest climate marches in history with a turnout of over 800,000 across 2,000 cities. After fighting for the Paris Agreement, Risalat led a campaign joined by over a million people to stop the Rampal coal plant in Bangladesh to protect the Sundarbans World Heritage forest, and elicited criticism of the plant from Crédit Agricolé through targeted advocacy. Currently, Risalat is pursuing an MPA in Environmental Science and Policy at Columbia University as a SIPA Environmental Fellow, “5 reasons why we need to start talking about existential risks,” https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/01/5-reasons-start-talking-existential-risks-extinction-moriori/)

Infinite future possibilities I find the story of the Moriori profound. It teaches me two lessons. Firstly, that human culture is far from immutable. That we can struggle against our baser instincts. That we can master them and rise to unprecedented challenges. Secondly, that even this does not make us masters of our own destiny. We can make visionary choices, but the future can still surprise us. This is a humbling realization. Because faced with an uncertain future, the only wise thing we can do is prepare for possibilities. Standing at the launch pad of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the possibilities seem endless. They range from an era of abundance to the end of humanity, and everything in between. How do we navigate such a wide and divergent spectrum? I am an optimist. From my bubble of privilege, life feels like a rollercoaster ride full of ever more impressive wonders, even as I try to fight the many social injustices that still blight us. However, the accelerating pace of change amid uncertainty elicits one fundamental observation. Among the infinite future possibilities, only one outcome is truly irreversible: extinction. Concerns about extinction are often dismissed as apocalyptic alarmism. Sometimes, they are. But repeating that mankind is still here after 70 years of existential warning about nuclear warfare is a straw man argument. The fact that a 1000-year flood has not happened does not negate its possibility. And there have been far too many nuclear near-misses to rest easy. As the World Economic Forum’s Annual Meeting in Davos discusses how to create a shared future in a fractured world, here are five reasons why the possibility of existential risks should raise the stakes of conversation: 1. Extinction is the rule, not the exception More than 99.9% of all the species that ever existed are gone. Deep time is unfathomable to the human brain. But if one cares to take a tour of the billions of years of life’s history, we find a litany of forgotten species. And we have only discovered a mere fraction of the extinct species that once roamed the planet. In the speck of time since the first humans evolved, more than 99.9% of all the distinct human cultures that have ever existed are extinct. Each hunter-gatherer tribe had its own mythologies, traditions and norms. They wiped each other out, or coalesced into larger formations following the agricultural revolution. However, as major civilizations emerged, even those that reached incredible heights, such as the Egyptians and the Romans, eventually collapsed. It is only in the very recent past that we became a truly global civilization. Our interconnectedness continues to grow rapidly. “Stand or fall, we are the last civilization”, as Ricken Patel, the founder of the global civic movement Avaaz, put it. 2. Environmental pressures can drive extinction More than 15,000 scientists just issued a ‘warning to humanity’. They called on us to reduce our impact on the biosphere, 25 years after their first such appeal. The warning notes that we are far outstripping the capacity of our planet in all but one measure of ozone depletion, including emissions, biodiversity, freshwater availability and more. The scientists, not a crowd known to overstate facts, conclude: “soon it will be too late to shift course away from our failing trajectory, and time is running out”. In his 2005 book Collapse, Jared Diamond charts the history of past societies. He makes the case that overpopulation and resource use beyond the carrying capacity have often been important, if not the only, drivers of collapse. Even though we are making important incremental progress in battles such as climate change, we must still achieve tremendous step changes in our response to several major environmental crises. We must do this even while the world’s population continues to grow. These pressures are bound to exert great stress on our global civilization. 3. Superintelligence: unplanned obsolescence? Imagine a monkey society that foresaw the ascendance of humans. Fearing a loss of status and power, it decided to kill the proverbial Adam and Eve. It crafted the most ingenious plan it could: starve the humans by taking away all their bananas. Foolproof plan, right? This story describes the fundamental difficulty with superintelligence. A superintelligent being may always do something entirely different from what we, with our mere mortal intelligence, can foresee. In his 2014 book Superintelligence, Swedish philosopher Nick Bostrom presents the challenge in thought-provoking detail, and advises caution. Bostrom cites a survey of industry experts that projected a 50% chance of the development of artificial superintelligence by 2050, and a 90% chance by 2075. The latter date is within the life expectancy of many alive today. Visionaries like Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk have warned of the existential risks from artificial superintelligence. Their opposite camp includes Larry Page and Mark Zuckerberg. But on an issue that concerns the future of humanity, is it really wise to ignore the guy who explained the nature of space to us and another guy who just put a reusable rocket in it? 4. Technology: known knowns and unknown unknowns Many fundamentally disruptive technologies are coming of age, from bioengineering to quantum computing, 3-D printing, robotics, nanotechnology and more. Lord Martin Rees describes potential existential challenges from some of these technologies, such as a bioengineered pandemic, in his book Our Final Century. Imagine if North Korea, feeling secure in its isolation, could release a virulent strain of Ebola, engineered to be airborne. Would it do it? Would ISIS? Projecting decades forward, we will likely develop capabilities that are unthinkable even now. The unknown unknowns of our technological path are profoundly humbling. 5. 'The Trump Factor' Despite our scientific ingenuity, we are still a confused and confusing species. Think back to two years ago, and how you thought the world worked then. Has that not been upended by the election of Donald Trump as US President, and everything that has happened since? The mix of billions of messy humans will forever be unpredictable. When the combustible forces described above are added to this melee, we find ourselves on a tightrope. What choices must we now make now to create a shared future, in which we are not at perpetual risk of destroying ourselves? Common enemy to common cause Throughout history, we have rallied against the ‘other’. Tribes have overpowered tribes, empires have conquered rivals. Even today, our fiercest displays of unity typically happen at wartime. We give our lives for our motherland and defend nationalistic pride like a wounded lion. But like the early Morioris, we 21st-century citizens find ourselves on an increasingly unstable island. We may have a violent past, but we have no more dangerous enemy than ourselves. Our task is to find our own Nunuku’s Law. Our own shared contract, based on equity, would help us navigate safely. It would ensure a future that unleashes the full potential of our still-budding human civilization, in all its diversity. We cannot do this unless we are humbly grounded in the possibility of our own destruction. Survival is life’s primal instinct. In the absence of a common enemy, we must find common cause in survival. Our future may depend on whether we realize this.

## 3---CP

SpaceCol CP

#### CP Text: States ought to cooperate in the colonization of outer space by private and public entities. States should end mining, megaconstellations, and broader exploration that affects the way we view space.

#### Private sector is key---it’s the base of international coop---solves warming and tech

Stofan 17 – Ellen Stofan is the director of the Smithsonian National Air and Space Museum, 2017 (“When We Explore Space, We Go Together,” March 7th, Available Online at https://slate.com/technology/2017/03/space-exploration-requires-international-collaboration.html )

While the head of the European Space Agency has called for a “moon village” to be the exploration priority, NASA continues to set its sights on Mars, with a plan for the first crewed mission to Mars in the early 2030s. NASA does plan to put the precursor for a Mars transfer vehicle in orbit around the Moon in the mid-2020s, providing a stepping stone for international or commercial partners that want to venture down to the lunar surface. But Mars remains the priority goal, with the first orbital mission followed by astronauts to the surface in the late 2030s, to search for evidence of past life on Mars. The private sector will play a key role in this venture, with SpaceX planning to send an uncrewed Dragon capsule to the Martian surface in 2018 in partnership with NASA. SpaceX’s capability to land its first-stage rocket boosters back on Earth is helping them to develop the needed entry, descent, and landing capabilities for Mars.

Observing this planet is also a closely coordinated effort. The Committee on Earth Observation Satellites and the Group on Earth Observations provide forums for space agencies or offices from around the world to discuss open data policies, coordinate observations, inter-calibrate instruments, and allow data comparison and validation. These coordination efforts are becoming even more critical, as we cope with changing weather and patterns of growing food, and sea level rise due to human-caused climate change. There can be more immediate payoffs, too, particularly when it comes to disasters. During humanitarian crises and natural disasters, the space agencies (more than 15 of them right now) with Earth-observing satellites that have signed the International Charter for Space and Major Disasters can shift their focus and prioritize processing of satellite data to aid rescue and recovery efforts.

While people often think of space exploration as a way to promote national pride, the truth is that the future of space is international. These partnerships are expanding our knowledge of the universe, helping us search for life on other worlds, making critical observations of our own planet, and moving humans outward into space in a much more rapid time frame, and more comprehensively, than would be possible otherwise. In addition, innovations in technology and science are not restricted to one country. Diverse, innovative teams solve problems, and no one country or company can go it alone when it comes to the final frontier of space.

#### Legal reform exposes contradictions in settler colonialism which creates fissures in civil society that rupture the colonial order. Reinterpretation of liberal rights creates effective movements against capitalist oppression.

Brenna BHANDAR 12. Lecturer, Queen Mary School of Law. “Strategies of Legal Rupture: the politics of judgment.” *Windsor YB Access Just*. 30: 59. <https://windsor.scholarsportal.info/ojs/leddy/index.php/WYAJ/article/viewFile/4369/3446>.

Strategies of Rupture

In this article, my aim is to consider the use of law as a political strategy of rupture in colonial and post-colonial nation states. The question of whether and how to use law in order to transform and potentially shatter an existing political-legal order is one that continues to plague legal advocates in a variety of places, from Australia, to India, to Canada to Israel/Palestine. For example, the struggle for the recognition of indigenous rights in the context of colonial settler regimes has often produced pyrrhic victories. 21 The question of indigenous sovereignty is ultimately quashed, and aboriginal rights are paradoxically recognised as an interest that derives from the prior occupation of the land by aboriginal communities but is at the same time parasitic on underlying Crow n sovereignty; an interest that can be justifiably limited in the interests of settlement. 22 Thus, the primary and inescapable question remains: how does one utilise the law without re-inscribing the very colonial legal order that one is attempting to break down? 23 I argue that this is an inescapable dilemma; as critical race theorists and indigenous scholars have shown, to not avail ourselves of the law in an effort to ameliorate social ills, and to promote and protect the rights of oppressed minorities is to essentially abrogate one’s political responsibilities. Moreover, the reality of political struggle (particularly of the anti-colonial variety) is that it is of a diffuse and varied nature, engaging multiple different tactics in order to achieve its ends.

The notion of the ruptural defence emerges from the work of Jacques Vergès, a French advocate and subject of a film by Barbet Schroder entitled Terror’s Advocate. The film is as much a portrait of Vergès ’ life as it is a series of vignettes of armed anti-colonial and anti - imperial struggle during the decades between the late 1940s and the 1980s. I should say at the beginning that I do not perceive Vergès as a heroic figure or defender of the oppressed; we can see from his later decisions to defend Klaus Barbie, for instance, that his desire to reveal the violence wrought by European imperial powers was pursued at any cost. But in tracing the development of what Vergès called the ruptural defence, the film takes us to the heart of the inescapable paradoxes and contradictions involved in using law as a means of political resistance in colonial and post-colonial contexts. I want to explore the strategy of rupture as developed by Vergès but also in a broader se nse, to consider whether there is in this defence strategy that arose in colonial, criminal law contexts, something that is generalisable, something that can be drawn out to form a notion of legal rupture more generally.

To begin then, an exploration of Vergès’ ‘rupture defence’, or rendered more eloquently, a strategy of rupture. At the beginning of the film, Vergès comments on his strategy for the trial of Djamila Bouhired, a member of the FLN, who was tried in a military court for planting a bomb in a cafe in Algiers in 1956. Vergès states the following in relation to the trial:

The problem wasn’t to play for sympathy as left - wing lawyers advised us to do, from the murderous fools who judged us, but to taunt them, to provoke incidents that would reac h people in Paris, London, Brussels and Cairo...

The refusal to play for sympathy from those empowered to uphold the law in a colonial legal order hints at the much more profound refusal that lies at the basis of the strategy of rupture, which we see unf old throughout the film. In refusing to accept the characterisation of Djamila’s acts as criminal acts, Vergès challenges the very legal categories that were used to criminalise, condemn and punish anti - colonial resistance. The refusal to make the defendants’ actions cognisable to and intelligible within the colonial legal framework breaks the capacity of the judges to adjudicate in at least two senses. First, their moral authority is radically undermined by an outright rejection of the legal terms of refer ence and categories which they are appointed to uphold. The legal strategy of rupture is a politics of refusal that calls into question the justiciability of the purported crime by challenging the moral and political jurisdiction of the colonial legal order itself.

Second, the refusal of the legal categorisation of the FLN acts of resistance as criminal brought into light the contradictions inherent in the official French position and the reality of the Algerian context. This was not, as the official line would have it, simply a case of French criminal law being applied to French nationals. The repeated assertion that the defendants were independent Algerian actors fighting against colonial brutality, coupled with repeated revelations of the use of torture on political prisoners made it impossible for the contradictions to be “rationally contained” within the normal operations of criminal law. The revelation and denunciation of torture in the courtroom not to prevent statements or admissions from being admis sable as evidence (as such violations would normally be used) but to challenge the legitimacy of the imposition of a colonial legal order on the Algerian people made the normal operation of criminal law procedure virtually impossible. 24 And it is in this making impossible of the operation of the legal order that the power of the strategy of rupture lies.

In refusing to render his clients’ actions intelligible to a colonial (and later imperial) legal framework, Vergès makes visible the obvious hypocrisy of the colonial legal order that attempts to punish resistance that employs violence, in the same spatial temporal boundaries where the brute violence of colonial rule saturates everyday life. In doing so, this is a strategy that challenges the monopoly of le gitimate violence the state holds. Vergès aims to render visible the false distinction between common crimes and political crimes, or more broadly, the separation of law and politics. 25 The ruptural defence seeks to subvert the order and structure of the trial by re-defining the relation between accuser and accused. This illumination of the hypocrisy of the colonial state questions the authority of its judiciary to adjudicate. But more than this, his strategy is ruptural in two senses that are fundamental to the operation of the law in the colonial settler and post-colonial contexts. The first is that the space of opposition within the legal confrontation is reconfigured. The second, and related point, is that the strictures of a legal politics of recognition are shattered.

In relation to the first point, a space of opposition is, in the view of Fanon, missing in certain senses, in the colonial context. A space of opposition in which a genuinely mutual struggle between coloniser and colonised can occur is denied by spatial and legal - political strategies of containment and segregation. While these strategies also exhibit great degre es of plasticity 26, the control over such mobility remains to a great degree in the hands of the colonial occupier. The legal strategy of rupture creates a space of political opposition in the courtroom that cannot be absorbed or appropriated by the legal order. In Christodoulidis’ view, this lack of co-option is the crux of the strategy of rupture.

This strategy of rupture also points to a path that challenges the limits of a politics of recognition, often one of the key legal and political strategies utilised by indigenous and racial minority communities in their struggles for justice. Claims for recognition in a juridical frame inevitably involve a variety of onto-epistemological closures. 27 Whether because of the impossible and irreconciliable relation between the need for universal norms and laws and the specificities of the particular claims that come before the law, or because of the need to fit one’s claims within legal - political categories that are already intelligible within the legal order, legal recognition has been critiqued, particularly in regards to colonial settler societies, on the basis that it only allows identities, legal claims, ways of being that are always - already proper to the existing juridical order to be recognised by the law. In the Canadian context, for instance, many scholars have elucidated the ways in which the legal doctrine of aboriginal title to land im ports Anglo - American concepts of ownership into the heart of its definition; and moreover, defines aboriginality on the basis of a fixed, static concept of cultural difference. The strategy of rupture elides the violence of recognition by challenging the legitimacy of the colonial legal order itself.

In an article discussing Vergès’ strategy of rupture, Emilios Christodoulidis takes up a question posed to Vergès by Foucault shortly after the publication of Vergès’ book, De La Stratégie Judiciare, as to wh ether the defence of rupture in the context of criminal law trials in the colony could be generalised more widely, or whether it was “not in fact caught up in a specific historical conjuncture.” 28 In exploring how the strategy of rupture could inform practices and theory outside of the courtroom, Christodoulidis characterises the strategy of rupture as one mode of immanent critique. As individuals and communities subjected to the force of law, the law itself becomes the object of critique, the object that ne eds to be taken apart in order to expose its violence. To quote from Christodoulidis:

Immanent critique aims to generate within these institutional frameworks contradictions that are inevitable (they can neither be displaced nor ignored), compelling (they necessitate action) and transformative in that (unlike internal critique) the overcoming of the contradiction does not restore, but transcends, the ‘disturbed’ framework within which it arose. It pushes it to go beyond its confines and in the process, famously in Marx’s words, ‘enables the world to clarify its consciousness in waking it from its dream about itself’. 29

Christodoulidis explores how the strategy of rupture can be utilised as an intellectual resource for critical legal theory and more broadly, as a point of departure for political strategies that could cause a crisis for globalised capital. Strategies of rupture are particularly crucial when considering a system, he notes, that has been so successful at appropriating, ingesting and making its own, political aspirations (such as freedom, to take one example) that have also been used to disrupt its most violent and exploitative tendencies. Here Christodoulidis departs from the question of colonialism to focus on the operation of capitalism in po st - war European states. It is also this bifurcation that I want to question, and rather than a distinction between colonialism and capitalism, to consider how the colonial (as a set of economic and political relations that rely on ideologies of racial diff erence, and civilisational discourses that emerged during the period of European colonialism) is continually re-written and re-instantiated through a globalised capitalism. As I elaborate in the discussion of the Salwa Judum judgment below, it is the combination of violent state repression of political dissent that finds its origins (in the legal form it takes) during the colonial era, and capitalist development imperatives that implicate local and global mining corporations in the dispossession of tribal peoples that constitutes the legal - political conflict at issue.

After the Trial: From Defence to Judgment

In response to a question from Jean Lapeyrie (a member o f the Action Committee for Prison - Justice) during a discussion of De La Stratégie Judiciare published as the Preface to the second edition, Vergès remarks that there are actually effective judges, but that they are effective when forgetting the essence of what it is to be a judge. 31 The strategy of rupture is a tactic utilised to subvert the order and structure of a trial; to re-define the very terms upon which the trial is premised. On this view, the judge, charged with the obligation to uphold the rule o f law is of course by definition not able to do anything but sustain an unjust political order.

In the film Terror’s Advocate , one is left to wonder about the specificities of the judicial responses to the strategy deployed by Vergès. (Djamila Bouhired , for instance, was sentenced to death, but as a result of a worldwide media campaign was released from prison in 1962). While I would argue that the judicial response is clearly not what is at stake in the ruptural defence, I want to consider the potentia lity of the judgment to be ruptural in the sense articulat ed by Christodoulidis, discussed above. Exposing a law to its own contradictions and violence, revealing the ways in which a law or policy contradicts and violates rights to basic political freedoms , has clear political-legal effectsand consequences. Is it possible for members of the judiciary to expose contradictions in the legal order itself, thereby transforming it? Would the redefinition, for instance, of constitutional provisions guaranteeing r ights that come into conflict with capitalist development imperatives constitute such a rupture? In my view, the re-definition of the limitations on the guarantees of individual and group freedom that are inevitably and invariably utilised to justify state repression of rights in favour of capitalist development imperatives, security, or colonial settlement have the potential to contribute to the re-creation of political orders that could be more just and democratic.

We may be reluctant to ever claim a judgment as ruptural out of fear that it would contaminate the radical nature of this form of immanent critique. Is to describe a judgment as ruptural to belie the impossibility of justice, the aporia that confronts every moment of judicial decision - making? I want to suggest that it is impossible to maintain such a pure position in relation to law, particularly given its capacity (analogous to that of capital itself) for reinvention. Thus, I want to explore the potential for judges to subvert state violence engendered by particular forms of political and economic dispossession, through the act of judgment. In my view, basic rights protected by constitutional guarantees (as in the Indian case) have been so compromised in the interests of big business and develo pment imperatives, that re-defining rights to equality, dignity and security of person, and subverting the interests of the state- corporate nexus is potentially ruptural, in the sense of causing a crisis for discrete tentacles of global capitalism.

At this juncture, we may want to explicitly account for the specific differences between criminal defence cases and Vergès‘ basic tactic, which is to challenge the very jurisdiction of the court to adjudicate, to define the act of resistance as a criminal one, and constitutional challenges to the violation of rights in cases such as Salwa Judum . While one tactic seeks to render the illegitimacy of the colonial state bare in its confrontation with anti-colonial resistance, the other is a tactic used to re - define the terms upon which political dissent and resistance take place within the constitutional bounds of the post-colonial state.These two strategies appear to be each other’s opposite; one challenges the legitimacy of the state itself through refusing the ju risdiction of the court to criminalise freedom fighters, while the other calls on the judiciary to hold the state to account for criminalising and violating the rights of its citizens to engage in political acts of dissent and resistance. However, the common thread that situates these strategies within a singular political framework is the fundamental challenge they pose to the state’s monopoly over defining the terms upon which anti-colonial and anti-capitalist political action takes place. Here I will turn to consider a post - colonial context in which the colonial is continually being re - written, juridically speaking, in light of neo - liberal economic imperatives unleashed from the late 1980s onwards. A recent judgment of the Indian Supreme Court provides an opportunity to consider a moment in which capitalist development imperatives and the exploitation of tribal peoples by the state of Chattisgarh are put on trial by a group of three plaintiffs. The judgment provides, amongst other things, an opportunity to consider the strategy of the plaintiffs and also the judicial response. As I argue below, this judgment presents an instance of rupture precisely because the fundamental freedoms of the people of Chattisgarh are redefined by the Court in such a way as to challenge and condemn the capitalist development imperatives that have put their lives and livelihoods at risk.

#### Condo Good---proving a CP is bad doesn’t prove the plan is good, a logical policy maker can always choose not to act. Logic outweighs – it’s the basis of all rational arguments.

## 4---DA

SpaceCol DA

#### Warming leads to extinction---Inevitable.

**Kareiva 18**, [Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA, et al. (Peter, “Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back,” *Futures*, 102)] Sachin

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (climate change, global freshwater cycle, and ocean acidification) do pose existential risks. This is because of intrinsic positive feedback loops, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all directly connected to the provision of food and water, and shortages of food and water can create conflict and social unrest.

#### Space colonization solves otherwise inevitable extinction.

Zarkadakis 19 [George; December 26; Ph.D. in Artificial Intelligence; George Zardakis, “Abandoning the metropolis: space colonisation as the new imperative,” <https://georgezarkadakis.com/2019/12/26/abandoning-the-metropolis-space-colonisation-as-the-new-imperative/>]

Space colonization is not only the subject of fiction but of serious science too. The late physicist Stephen Hawking argued that unless colonies were established in space the human race would become extinct. There are several natural phenomena beyond our control that could spell our obliteration. Over a long enough period of time our planet is vulnerable to catastrophic meteorite strikes, or getting exposed to the deadly radiation of a nearby supernova explosion. As our Sun burns its fuel it will start to expand and, in a few million years, will scorch Earth. We can also self-destruct by waging nuclear war, or by tilting our planet’s climate towards a runaway greenhouse effect. Space colonization is therefore the ultimate insurance policy of long-term human survival[4].

#### Colonization of outer space is essential to humanity – 5 warrants

Orwig 15 [(Jessica, a senior editor at Insider. She has a Master of Science in science and technology journalism from Texas A&M University and a Bachelor of Science in astronomy and physics from The Ohio State University. Before NY she spent time as an intern at: American Physical Society in MD International Center for Theoretical Physics in Italy Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory in IL American Geophysical Union in DC), “5 undeniable reasons humans need to colonize Mars — even though it's going to cost billions,” Slate, 4/21/2015, https://www.businessinsider.com/5-undeniable-reasons-why-humans-should-go-to-mars-2015-4] MN

Establishing a permanent colony of humans on Mars is not an option. It's a necessity. At least, that's what some of the most innovative, intelligent minds of our age — Buzz Aldrin, Stephen Hawking, Elon Musk, Bill Nye, and Neil deGrasse Tyson — are saying. Of course, it's extremely difficult to foresee how manned missions to Mars that would cost hundreds of billions of dollars each, could benefit mankind. It's easier to imagine how that kind of money could immediately help in the fight against cancer or world hunger. That's because humans tend to be short-sighted. We're focused on what's happening tomorrow instead of 100 years from now. "If the human race is to continue for another million years, we will have to boldly go where no one has gone before," Hawking said in 2008 at a lecture series for NASA's 50th anniversary. That brings us to the first reason humans must colonize Mars: 1. Ensuring the survival of our species The only home humans have ever known is Earth. But history shows that surviving as a species on this tiny blue dot in the vacuum of space is tough and by no means guaranteed. The dinosaurs are a classic example: They roamed the planet for 165 million years, but the only trace of them today are their fossilized remains. A colossal asteroid wiped them out. Putting humans on more than one planet would better ensure our existence thousands if not millions of years from now. "Humans need to be a multiplanet species," Musk recently told astronomer and Slate science blogger Phil Plait. Musk founded the space transport company SpaceX to help make this happen. Mars is an ideal target because it has a day about the same length as Earth's and water ice on its surface. Moreover, it's the best available option: Venus and Mercury are too hot, and the Moon has no atmosphere to protect residents from destructive meteor impacts. 2. Discovering life on Mars Nye, the CEO of The Planetary Society, said during an episode of StarTalk Radio in March that humanity should focus on sending humans instead of robots to Mars because humans could make discoveries 10,000 times as fast as the best spacecraft explorers we have today. Though he was hesitant to say humans should live on Mars, he agreed there were many more discoveries to be made there. One monumental discovery scientists could make is determining whether life currently exists on Mars. If we're going to do that, we'll most likely have to dig much deeper than NASA's rovers can. The theory there is that life was spawned not from the swamps on adolescent Earth, but from watery chasms on Mars. The Mars life theory suggests that rocks rich with microorganisms could have been ejected off the planet's surface from a powerful impact, eventually making their way through space to Earth. It's not a stretch to imagine, because Martian rocks can be found on Earth. None of those, however, have shown signs of life. "You cannot rule out the fact that a Mars rock with life in it landing on the Earth kicked off terrestrial life, and you can only really test that by finding life on Mars," Christopher Impey, a British astronomer and author of over a dozen books in astronomy and popular science, told Business Insider. 3. Improving the quality of life on Earth "Only by pushing mankind to its limits, to the bottoms of the ocean and into space, will we make discoveries in science and technology that can be adapted to improve life on Earth." British doctor Alexander Kumar wrote that in a 2012 article for BBC News where he explored the pros and cons of sending humans to Mars. At the time, Kumar was living in the most Mars-like place on Earth, Antarctica, to test how he adapted to the extreme conditions both physiologically and psychologically. To better understand his poignant remark, let's look at an example: During its first three years in space, NASA's prized Hubble Space Telescope snapped blurry pictures because of a flaw in its engineering. The problem was fixed in 1993, but to try to make use of the blurry images during those initial years, astronomers developed a computer algorithm to better extract information from the images. It turns out the algorithm was eventually shared with a medical doctor who applied it to the X-ray images he was taking to detect breast cancer. The algorithm did a better job at detecting early stages of breast cancer than the conventional method, which at the time was the naked eye. "You can't script that. That happens all the time — this cross pollination of fields, innovation in one, stimulating revolutionary changes in another," Tyson, the StarTalk radio host, explained during an interview with Fareed Zakaria in 2012. It's impossible to predict how cutting-edge technologies used to develop manned missions to Mars and habitats on Mars will benefit other fields like medicine or agriculture. But we'll figure that out only by "pushing humankind to its limits" and boldy going where we've never been before. 4. Growing as a species Another reason we should go to Mars, according to Tyson, is to inspire the next generation of space explorers. When asked in 2013 whether we should go to Mars, he answered: "Yes, if it galvanizes an entire generation of students in the educational pipeline to want to become scientists, engineers, technologists, and mathematicians," he said. "The next generation of astronauts to land on Mars are in middle school now." Humanity's aspirations to explore space are what drive us toward more advanced technological innovations that will undoubtedly benefit mankind in one way or another. "Space is like a proxy for a lot of what else goes on in society, including your urge to innovate," Tyson said during his interview with Zakaria. He added: "There's nothing that drives ambitions the way NASA does." 5. Demonstrating political and economic leadership At a February 24 hearing, Aldrin told the US Senate's Subcommittee on Space, Science and Competitiveness that getting to Mars was a necessity not only for science, but also for policy. "In my opinion, there is no more convincing way to demonstrate American leadership for the remainder of this century than to commit to a permanent presence on Mars," he said. If Americans do not go to Mars, someone else will. And that spells political and economic benefit for whoever succeeds. "If you lose your space edge," Tyson said during his interview with Zakaria, "my deep concern is that you lose everything else about society that enables you to compete economically."

#### Independently brings immeasurable expected value

Baum 16 – Executive Director of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute [Seth D. Baum, “The Ethics of Outer Space: A Consequentialist Perspective,” 2016, Springer, pp. 115-116, EA]

Space colonization is notable because it may be able to bring utterly immense increases in intrinsic value. Early colonies might start small, given that other planets and moons have inhospitable environments. However, it may be possible to build large indoor colonies or create more hospitable outdoor environments (i.e., terraforming). Even just on other planets and moons in the Solar System, space colonies could multiply the total area available for human habitation. And there are many more planets around other stars, as ongoing research on exoplanets is now learning. One recent study estimates 22 % of Sun-like stars have Earth-like exoplanets (Petigura et al. 2013), implying billions to tens of billions of potentially habitable planets across the galaxy.

Opportunities at any given star may also be quite a bit greater than those available only on planets. Earth only receives about one two-billionth of the Sun’s radiation. To collect all the Sun’s radiation, humanity would need a Dyson swarm (named after Dyson 1960), which is a series of structures that surrounds a star, collecting its radiation to power a civilization. A Dyson swarm around the Sun could potentially enable a civilization a billion times larger than is possible on Earth. Likewise, Dyson swarms around one billion stars would bring humanity approximately 1018 (one billion–billion) times more energy per unit time.

Space colonies could also increase the amount of time available for human civilization. Earth will remain habitable for a few billion more years (O’Malley-James et al. 2014). Stars will continue shining for about 1014 more years (Adams 2008). That gives us an additional 105 times more energy, for a total of 1023 times more energy than is available on Earth. After the stars fade, other energy sources may be available. And even if our current universe eventually becomes uninhabitable, it may be possible to move to other universes (Kaku 2005). The physics here is speculative, but it cannot be ruled out, and hence there is a nonzero chance of a literally infinite opportunity for space colonization (Baum 2010a).

Whether the opportunity is infinite or merely, say, 1023 times larger than what can be done on Earth, the opportunity is clearly immense. As long as space colonization is an improvement (Sect. 8.3.1), then it would seem that the consequentialist should prioritize space colonization. The sooner space colonization begins, the more of its immense opportunity can be gained. Indeed, Ćirković (2002) estimates 5 × 1046 human lifetimes are lost for every century in which space colonization is delayed.

There can also be large value for space colonization under ecocentric intrinsic value. It is sometimes argued that Earth would be better off without humans. For example, the Voluntary Human Extinction Movement states that “Phasing out the human race by voluntarily ceasing to breed will allow Earth’s biosphere to return to good health” (http://vhemt.org, accessed 25 October 2015). However, this makes sense only if extraterrestrial locations are not intrinsically valued. Otherwise, exterminating humanity ruins the opportunity for humans to bring flourishing ecosystems into outer space. Terraforming other planets or bringing ecosystems into Dyson swarms could bring immense amounts of ecosystem flourishing.

#### Massive spillover effects, solves resources and ex risks

Green 21 [Brian Patrick Green, director of technology ethics at the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University, “Space Ethics,” 2021, Rowman, pp. 4-5, EA]

In favor of going into space are such basics as gaining scientific knowledge and developing beneficial new technologies, both of which space exploration and use have already begun to accomplish with dramatic and sometimes unexpected effects for humankind. Scientific advancements include astronomical and cosmological knowledge from various orbiting experiments and telescopes that have let us gain unprecedented understanding about our universe. But space activities have also contributed to a great deal of scientific knowledge about our Earth, including measurements of environmental status, habitat conversion and destruction, detailed knowledge of anthropogenic climate change, and much about Earth’s chemistry and geology. We have also learned a great deal about our local planets, for example, that a runaway “greenhouse effect” in the atmosphere of Venus makes the surface scorchingly hot, while too little greenhouse effect on Mars leaves the surface quite cold. There have also been significant contributions made to medical science, especially concerning the behavior of the human body when subjected to radiation, microgravity, nutritional restrictions, and so on.

On the technological side, everything with American global positioning system (GPS), Russian Glonass, or other global navigation systems—from smartphones to military vehicles—relies on a network of satellites above us, placed there by rocketry and painstakingly tracked with instruments developed for the task. So many technologies have been pioneered by space exploration and use that it is hard to list them all, but some of the more important ones include weather satellites (which are not only convenient but also allow preparation for and evacuation from severe weather), communication satellites, solar photovoltaic (PV) cells, advances in electronics and computers, advances in materials science, and so on.

Space is also an important location for the contention of national interests in a geopolitical and military sense. As the ultimate “high ground” in battle, space allows certain asset classes such as spy satellites to exist in a position unassailable by many or most opponents. While permanent weapons stations and weapons of mass destruction are banned from space by the United Nations Outer Space Treaty (OST), 6 that has not stopped the development of weapons that are impermanent (such as missiles, missile interceptors, and antisatellite weapons) or the research and development of possible space-based weapons platforms, such as were envisioned by U.S. president Ronald Reagan’s Strategic Defense Initiative, nicknamed “Star Wars.” While military and political interests may ultimately seem to be a less noble reason to explore and use space, relative power, safety, and security certainly are very human interests and are valuable to those who feel they are being protected by them.

Space activities are also a key way of promoting international cooperation and global awareness. While the international competition of the “space race” fueled one nation all the way to the Moon, shortly afterward, the Apollo-Soyuz program announced a thawing of this competition and commenced a period of cooperation between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Currently the International Space Station continues this cross-national cooperation in space, with five space agencies (representing Canada, the European Space Agency nations, Japan, Russia, and the United States) participating. In addition to cooperation in space exploration itself, the perspective given from space has itself helped to produce some feelings of unity on Earth, with the famous “Blue Marble” and “Earthrise” pictures showing Earth’s oneness and scientific discoveries supported by space science, such as those related to climate change, helping to promote international cooperation to address these problems.

Gaining access to new critical resources may be another reason to go into space. Earth is a finite planet, and certain elements on Earth are very rare in the planetary crust, particularly platinum group metals that are very dense and siderophilic (iron-loving) and so have tended to sink toward the core over the natural history of the planet. However, asteroids and other objects in space (for example, planets, comets, and moons) can sometimes have these elements in abundance and in more available locations, making them potentially excellent sources for these valuable materials. Now-defunct asteroid-mining startup Planetary Resources once estimated that one “platinum-rich 500 meter wide asteroid contains . . . 1.5 times the known world-reserves of platinum group metals (ruthenium, rhodium, palladium, osmium, iridium, and platinum).” 7 In addition to returning elements to a resource-hungry Earth, further exploration and development of space will require access to resources that are not purely sourced from Earth. In particular, it will be necessary to gain access to water, which is relatively rare in the inner solar system and which would be far too costly to transport in any significant amounts from the Earth’s surface.

Another reason that humans may want to explore space would be to create a “backup Earth” to hedge against global catastrophic and existential risks (risks that may cause widespread disaster or human extinction, respectively) on our home planet. 8 Earth has always been a dangerous place for humans, with asteroid impacts, supervolcanic eruptions, pandemic disease, and other natural hazards threatening civilization. Now, in addition to these natural threats, human-made hazards such as nuclear weapons, climate change, biotechnology, nanotechnology, and artificial intelligence may threaten not only the viability of technological civilization but perhaps the survival of human life itself. A serious global-scale catastrophe could set back civilization many decades or centuries, and the worst disasters could cause human extinction. In one scenario, in which 100 percent of humanity dies, all of human effort for all of history would be for nothing. However, were the same global catastrophe to happen to Earth, yet humans were a multiplanetary species with just one self-sustaining settlement off-Earth, it would not result in the end of human civilization or human extinction. Instead while the same unimaginable fate would befall the Earth (certainly no mere triviality, with perhaps the deaths of 99.999 percent of all humans and possibly the destruction of the ecosphere and everything in it), at least all of human and planetory history would not be for nothing. Human life and culture would go on elsewhere, as well as other Earth species. This is a dire fate, but less terrible than the first.

## 5---CP

Labor CP

#### Plan Text: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. The appropriation of outer space through private labor investigative commercial constellations is just.

\*\*\*labor investigative commercial constellations refer to DigitalGlobe, Planet and their similar counterparts\*\*\*

#### Data from commercial satellites are key to preventing modern slavery---subjects people to horrific structural violence that can’t be explained by any single theory.

Beaumont 18, [Peter Beaumont, senior reporter on the Guardian's Global Development desk. He has reported extensively from conflict zones including Africa, the Balkans and the Middle East and is the author of *The Secret Life of War: Journeys Through Modern Conflict* ("Experts reach for the stars to fight slavery as satellite pictures tell all," 3-19-2018, *The Guardian*, <https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2018/mar/19/experts-fight-slavery-satellite-pictures-south-asia-brick-belt>)] Recut Sachin

It has been used to identify suspected weapons sites, monitor troop movements, and chronicle war damage and allegations of genocide. Now, however, satellite imagery is being used to tackle one of the developing world’s most persistent problems – the scourge of modern slavery. An innovative programme involving space imaging and anti-slavery experts at the University of Nottingham has established the prevalence of sites in industries associated with slavery, including Asian brick kilns and fishing camps, in an approach they suggest may be applicable to other forms of compelled labour. In the widest application of the idea so far, the team has used commercial satellite imagery to build up the first proper estimate of the number of people working as bonded labourers in the area that runs across the clay fields of Asia through Pakistan, India and Nepal, known as the “brick belt”. The oval brick kilns – easily identifiable from space – often employ dozens of people, including whole families, lured with the promise of work and an advance on their salaries. Once at the hazardous and highly polluted camps, however, they find they are little more than unpaid slaves, prevented from leaving and subjected to rape, violence and threats. The project is the brainchild of Dr Kevin Bales, an anti-slavery researcher who has long nurtured the hope of using satellites to track modern slavery and nudge governments into action with the evidence gleaned. Bales, one of the first researchers to attempt to quantify the number of people caught up in modern slavery, already knew from examining satellite pictures that different kinds of slavery were identifiable at sites including kilns, strip mines and quarries. “The brick kilns in Pakistan I looked at, and sites like charcoal camps in Brazil, are so big – and had such unique patterns – that I realised you could see them from space,” said Bales. “I had spoken to Google but it had always been a question of money. When I moved to Nottingham two years ago, they said: ‘You now have a geospatial institute with people who have worked for the UK space agency.’ “We know the proportion of people – what we don’t know is the exact number and all of the locations.” Describing the practice of modern slavery in brick kilns, which he has researched first-hand, Bales said: “It is normally done through an offer of work. Individual migrants and migrant families are told they can live and work, and that food will be provided and they will be given a bit of an advance. “But then, once on site, they find there a couple of thugs who have complete physical control, and kids are to work in the kilns. Rape of women and girls is common.” The brick kilns project is a development of Bales’ earlier efforts to use imaging to identify fishing camps in the [Sundarbans](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2016/mar/02/thousands-to-march-protest-coal-plant-threat-bangladeshs-sundarbans-forest) of Bangladesh, where [child slavery is common](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2016/dec/07/child-labour-bangladesh-factories-rampant-overseas-development-institute-study). “With the fishing camps, suddenly we were able to say to the authorities, ‘Here are five more camps to say that you have no record of.’” Doreen Boyd, one of the imaging experts involved, said: “[The brick kilns project] was proof of concept. It was relatively easy because they are so distinct. Next we want to develop the idea to map other activities using slavery, including mining and charcoal camps. “So far, we have been dictating where – for instance – the brick belt is. The next step is to flip the thinking and ask the machine to tell us exactly where the brick belt is.” Bales is more ambitious still, asking whether technologies like spectroscopic analysis of satellite images might be able to detect where informal gold mines are in countries like Ghana, by tracking the contamination of rivers with the mercury they use. Jakub Sobik of Anti-Slavery International described the tracking of industries associated with modern slavery from space as particularly useful in identifying unknown camps in places where governments were more willing to work against issues like child slavery and forced labour.

#### Commercial Satellites are critical to provide data to anti-slavery movements---allows activists to pinpoint where it happens.

Jackson 19, [Bethany Jackson, Geography PhD Candidate, the Rights Lab at the University of Nottingham, ("Slavery from Space: A Remote Sensing Approach to Ending Modern Slavery," 3-7-2019, *Delta 8.7*, <https://delta87.org/2019/03/slavery-space-remote-sensing-approach-ending-modern-slavery/>) Accessed: 2-8-2022] Sachin

The ability to monitor patterns on the surface of the Earth will only improve due to the technological innovations taking place on satellite platforms, including improvements to the spatial, spectral and temporal resolutions. Continued investigation of vulnerabilities to modern slavery will require fast responses, and AI will enable the fast processing times that we need to monitor numerous data sources and integrate them with satellite imagery to fully reveal slavery risk and vulnerability.

In addition, the costs associated with the production and operation of spacecraft are continuing to decline with the production of “smallsats” and constellations of satellites, which are beneficial to the timescales in which data are collected. Usually these are operated by commercial providers, but these companies [regularly partner with humanitarian and human rights agencies](https://library.theengineroom.org/satellite-imagery-human-rights/) to investigate crises and abuses.

#### Commerical DigitalGlobe sats are uniquely key to high rez imagery---governments open the door to wrongful use.

Jackson 18, [Jackson, Bethany & Bales, Kevin & Owen, Sarah & Wardlaw, Jessica & Boyd, Doreen. (2018). Analysing Slavery through Satellite Technology: How Remote Sensing Could Revolutionise Data Collection to Help End Modern Slavery. Journal of Modern Slavery. 4. 169-199. 10.22150/jms/URDJ6988. <https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/research/beacons-of-excellence/rights-lab/resources/academic-publications/2019/march/boyd-analysing-slavery.pdf//> Accessed: 04-08-2022] Sachin

Whilst the use of UAVs may be beneficial in some contexts they may not be for all. UAVs fly close to the ground, thus they can capture a lot of detailed images; features such as people and vehicles are visible. Airborne sensors fly higher, but they also carry sensors which may put people at risk, these features are also becoming common in commercial satellite data. For example DigitalGlobe’s ‘WorldView’ satellites have a spatial resolution of up to 31cm (high enough to view and detect the model of a car, but not so high as to identify people) which is available commercially for the first time since changes to U.S. law. It is therefore 18 important to consider the ethics of using remote sensing for a human rights issue such as modern slavery, as high levels of detail in the future may put vulnerable people at risk of further harm. There is no guarantee that imagery will not be used nefariously, however, these high resolution data are still primarily commercial, limiting those who can access the data to those who have the financial means, or are restricted by governments. The technology is already available and there 19 appears to be very little will to restrict access again, but perhaps imagery providers need to consider who the data are released to and users must also play a role in thinking carefully about what data are required, and why, when engaging in remote sensing investigations of vulnerable populations.

#### They say constellations are appropriation---the CP competes.

## Case

### Top

#### “Space col” is exploration not colonialism.

Marko Kovic, June, 2018, (the “ć” is pronounced like “ch” in chocolate, PhD in political communication, University of Zurich) Political, moral, and security challenges of space colonization, ZIPAR Discussion Paper Series, <https://zipar.org/discussion-paper/political-moral-security-challenges-space-colonization/>

The term «space colonization» is somewhat unfortunate, because it is reminiscent of colonialism. Colonialism was the (predominantly European) practice of settling in and taking political control of foreign territories, including the local populations in those territories [5]. European Colonialism did not have one single goal, but it was usually means to both economic and cultural ends.

Space colonization, of course, does not refer to the continuation of colonialism in space. Usually, space colonization is a shorthand term for permanent and self-sufficient human habitats beyond Earth. Describing the creation of human habitats beyond Earth as space colonization is actually inaccurate, because the goals of historical colonies are not the same as the goals of space colonies. Human habitats beyond Earth might benefit humans on Earth, but the main goal of habitats beyond Earth is not subjugation, but exploration. In this article, I use the term space colonization for the sake of convenience, even though the term is imprecise.

### Framing---1NC

#### Opposition between Western and indigenous epistemologies is rooted in essentialism which undermines anti-colonial struggles --- only the CP’s pluralism can draw-upon the best of both.

Chris ANDERSEN 9. Michif (Métis) from western Canada; associate professor in the Faculty of Native Studies, Alberta. “Critical indigenous studies From Difference to Density,” *Cultural Studies Review* 15(2): 80-4. Emory Libraries.

In two recent articles,3 American Indian studies professor Duane Champagne challenges ‘Western’ academic disciplines’ epistemological ability to analyse contemporary Indigeneity.4 Specifically, their failure to consider Indigenous collectivities’ active role in colonial contexts in terms not readily discernable in Western forms of knowledge means these disciplines miss large elements of Indigeneity and, as such, fail to offer a plausible basis for its analysis. Champagne contends that despite its current failure to do so, American Indian studies—extrapolated here to include all Indigenous studies—should instead assume this mantle by presuming the distinctive agency of Indigenous peoples, including a focus on exploring our relations according to our distinctive epistemologies and according to the goals and mandates set by Indigenous communities. Not only will this distinguish Native studies from the rest of the academia, it will better position it to assist Indigenous peoples in righting their relationships with dominant, ‘whitestream’ society.5 I agree with Champagne’s assertion that Indigenous studies—whether within or outside specific departments and faculties—should exist in contemporary academia and that Indigenous communities ought to constitute a central focus to this endeavour. Despite his obvious love for the discipline (a fidelity I share), however, his peculiar positioning of Indigenous studies as different needlessly marginalises our density and, in doing so, unnecessarily gives ground to disciplinary turf long claimed by older disciplines. Thus, although he usefully positions Indigenous communities as producers of complex knowledge about indigeneity, his separation of Indigenous from white society unnecessarily marginalises two elements of our density critical to this relationship: 1) the extent of Indigenous communities’ knowledges about whiteness (a social fact which requires an expertise in ‘Western’ concepts); and 2) the extent to which the production of academic knowledge through Indigenous studies is shaped by the ‘whitestream’ academic relations of power, marking it in tension with other forms of knowledge (such as community knowledge). Both are unfortunate omissions. Regarding the first, the epistemological aprioris of whiteness are a dominant representational source through which Western societies produce and consume Indigeneity. As such, Champagne recklessly jettisons so-called Western disciplinary concepts and methodologies as immutable precisely where and when they are most necessary. Regarding the second, he dismisses the contextual importance of accounting for the academic institutional conditions under which native studies units (are allowed to) exist. My sympathetic critique of Champagne’s argument is divided into three major parts and a conclusion. Part one extrapolates his analysis of current native studies and his prescriptions for how to fix it. In this context I examine his charge that ‘Western’ disciplines (anthropology, history, sociology and so on) are too epistemologically constricted to properly explain Indigenous agency or communities and I emphasise his failure to account for the conditions of possibility under which Native American studies entered into academic history (to borrow Foucauldian phraseology).6 This latter element challenges the relationships he posits between both Indigenous studies and other academic disciplines and Indigenous knowledge within and outside the academy. Part two unpacks his tropes to reveal an epistemological and ontological essentialism which positions Indigeneity as separate from (his notion of) colonialism, such that an endogamous focus on the former obviates the need for accounting for the influence of the latter (or at least, that native studies can analyse the former in a manner which separates it from the Western academic herd). I argue that Champagne reproduces a variant strain of ‘Aboriginalism’ 7 that oversimplifies contemporary Indigeneity and overstates the immutability of concepts emanating from existing ‘Western’ disciplines. In doing so, he unnecessarily limits the contributions Indigenous studies is ideally positioned to make in deconstructing Aboriginalist discourses and in doing so produces an oddly parochial formulation of the discipline. Finally, in part three I offer my own prescriptions for an Indigenous studies anchored in Indigenous density (rather than difference). The temporal and epistemological complexity of our relationships with whitestream society means that Indigenous studies must counter hegemonic representations of Indigeneity which marginalise or altogether ignore our density. Following in the footsteps of Geonpul scholar Moreton-Robinson’s path-breaking work, I argue that Indigenous studies’ study of both Indigeneity and whiteness must use all available epistemologies, not just those which apparently distance Western disciplines from Indigenous studies analysis.8 While Champagne’s formulation can possibly be stretched to examine whiteness, the epistemological strategies he proposes for analysing Indigeneity capture only specific, isolated elements of our complexity. The essay ends with a discussion of the implications of this argument. I Locating (Champagne in) the discipline of native studies Native studies ‘state of the discipline’ pieces often begin by differentiating our scholarship from that of longer-standing disciplines.9 Though these are as often prescriptive as reflective of actual practice, such immanent analysis signals a healthy and growing discipline. American Indian scholar Clara Sue Kidwell suggests that, at least in native studies, these debates often play themselves out in a tension between two poles of analysis: essentialism/difference and adaptation/assimilation.10 She suggests that the essentialism cluster is rooted in an extreme form of post-colonialism which ‘implies that American Indian ways of thinking existed before colonialism and remain unknowable by anyone outside those cultures. Native American studies/American Indian studies can recover the long-suppressed values, epistemologies, and voices from colonial oppression’.11 Conversely, adaptation clusters typically emphasise the agency of Indigenous collectivities in the face of whitestream colonialism. Like the essentialism cluster, however, Kidwell argues that in its extreme variant: the idea of adaptation, or acculturation, or agency represents the ultimate disappearance of Indian identity into American society. If Indians dress like everyone else, speak like everyone else, attend public schools, are citizens of the state in which they live and citizens of the United States, how can they justify claims to a distinctive identity?12 Like others taking the essentialist position in the debate,13 Champagne contends that Indigeneity and Indigenous communities are fundamentally different in ways which elide the epistemological premises of Western disciplines (more on this in part two). These disciplines employ data collection concepts and practices saturated with a concern for ‘examining the issues, problems, and conceptualizations that confront American or Western civilization’.14 Indigenous issues are merely positioned as a specific instance of more general patterns of minority oppression.15 Such thinking has, he suggests, detracted intellectual energy from the more laudable Indigenous studies disciplinary goal of ‘conceptuali[s]ing, researching, and explaining patterns of American Indian individual and collective community choices and strategies when confronted with relations with the American state and society’.16 Champagne suggests that most native studies departments are multidisciplinary in character with faculty scattered in numerous disciplines teaching theories and concepts from numerous academic fields, to students as often as not from non-Aboriginal backgrounds, with a vague mandate for increasing or generating broader awareness about Indigenous history and contemporary realities.17 He admits that this multidisciplinarity is often advantageous in that ‘programs could be constructed from long-standing disciplines, and often seasoned scholars could be called upon to provide guidance and support’.18 However, to the extent that concepts central to Western disciplines remain ‘oriented toward examining the issues, problems, and conceptualizations that confront American or Western civilization’,19 these approaches effectively stifle the ability of American Indian studies to produce disciplinarily endogamous theory and methodology. The existing Indigenous studies academic landscape is thus, Champagne explains, littered with disjointed and epistemologically scattered forays into (and about) Indigenous communities. The current inability to produce distinctive theory and method has exacerbated institutional marginality (his context is American but this is readily extrapolated more broadly): fiscal conservativism limits the likelihood that even well-meaning administrators will build-in the solid, permanent funding required for stable Native studies departments (since money made available for ‘Aboriginal issues’ is just as likely to go to more wellregarded disciplines such as anthropology, history or education); broader multicultural or diversity concerns overshadow the distinctiveness of Indigenous experiences by linking them to broader forms of ‘minority’ oppression (thus the seemingly natural fit of native studies departments within ‘ethnic studies’ faculties); and mainstream theorising and methodological thinking has shown a reluctance to ‘think outside the box’ of Western modes of analysis.20 Champagne argues in a nutshell that: the university bureaucratic environment, weak resource support, the emphasis on race and ethnic paradigms over an indigenous paradigm, and the relegation of Indian Studies to serve general diversity interests for the university will continue to constrain, and often will prevent, full development of indigenous studies departments and programs at many universities.21 Champagne’s understanding of native studies’ relationship to the academy is reminiscent of the humanism Foucault critiques in his examination of nineteenth- and twentieth-century sexuality regulation.22 Foucault takes such explanations to task for their tendency to position power repressively as an entity which prevents actions and curtails freedoms. Foucauldian notions of power instead stress its repressive and constitutive character. They emphasise how discursive power shapes the formation of subjectivities which, in turn, shape the conditions under which subjects ‘enter into history’. Wedded to a repressive understanding of power, Champagne makes a homologous correlation between the current academic institutional marginality of Native studies and the forms of marginality Indigenous communities experience outside the academy. Thus correlated, he argues that a robust and holistic Indigenous paradigm can assist in rectifying this repression. For Champagne, then, academic and nonacademic Indigenous knowledge are comrades-in-arms, with Indigenous studies—anchored in an Indigenous paradigm—providing the missing link. In this guise, his Indigenous paradigm places Indigenous communities and nations at its centre, instead of colonial critique. Native studies, Champagne explains, ‘cannot center on a critique of the colonial experience but rather must focus on the individual and community choices American Indians make to realize their culture, values, and political and economic interests within the constraints and opportunities presented by changing colonial contexts’.23 While colonial critique can be useful for examining external forces relating to political, legal and market conditions, it ‘exclude[s] choice and social action on the part of Native historical and cultural experience, and in effect American Indians are not analyzed as players in their own historical contexts but rather viewed as billiard balls knocked around by powerful colonial powers and forces’.24 Champagne thus draws a clear distinction between, on the one hand, what he thinks Western disciplines, with their focus on colonialism, can explain about indigeneity and on the other, what makes Indigenous peoples truly Indigenous and, presumably, what these disciplines remain unable to explicate. Perhaps equally importantly, he assumes that such boundaries are discrete and readily discernable, such that he effectively erases the object–subject relationship within which all other academic disciplines produce knowledge.

#### Existential risks mitigation is a decolonial imperative of care---answers dalley.

Offord, 17—Faculty of Humanities, School of Humanities Research and Graduate Studies, Bentley Campus (Baden, “BEYOND OUR NUCLEAR ENTANGLEMENT,” Angelaki, 22:3, 17-25, dml) [ableist language modifications denoted by brackets]

You are steered towards overwhelming and inexplicable pain when you consider the nuclear entanglement that the species Homo sapiens finds itself in. This is because the fact of living in the nuclear age presents an existential, aesthetic, ethical and psychological challenge that defines human consciousness. Although an immanent threat and ever-present danger to the very existence of the human species, living with the possibility of nuclear war has infiltrated the matrix of modernity so profoundly as to paralyse [shut down] our mind-set to respond adequately. We have chosen to ignore the facts at the heart of the nuclear program with its dangerous algorithm; we have chosen to live with the capacity and possibility of a collective, pervasive and even planetary-scale suicide; and the techno-industrial-national powers that claim there is “no immediate danger” ad infinitum.8 This has led to one of the key logics of modernity's insanity. As Harari writes: “Nuclear weapons have turned war between superpowers into a mad act of collective suicide, and therefore forced the most powerful nations on earth to find alternative and peaceful ways to resolve conflicts.”9 This is the nuclear algorithm at work, a methodology of madness. In revisiting Jacques Derrida in “No Apocalypse, Not Now (Full Speed Ahead, Seven Missiles, Seven Missives),”10 who described nuclear war as a “non-event,” it is clear that the pathology of the “non-event” remains as active as ever even in the time of Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un with their stichomythic nuclear posturing. The question of our times is whether we have an equal or more compelling capacity and willingness to end this impoverished but ever-present logic of pain and uncertainty. How not simply to bring about disarmament, but to go beyond this politically charged, as well as mythological and psychological nuclear algorithm? How to find love amidst the nuclear entanglement; the antidote to this entanglement? Is it possible to end the pathology of power that exists with nuclear capacity? Sadly, the last lines of Nitin Sawhney's “Broken Skin” underscore this entanglement: Just 5 miles from India's nuclear test site Children play in the shade of the village water tank Here in the Rajasthan desert people say They're proud their country showed their nuclear capability.11 As an activist scholar working in the fields of human rights and cultural studies, responding to the nuclear algorithm is an imperative. Your politics, ethics and scholarship are indivisible in this cause. An acute sense of care for the world, informed by pacifist and non-violent, de-colonialist approaches to knowledge and practice, pervades your concern. You are aware that there are other ways of knowing than those you are familiar and credentialed with. You are aware that you are complicit in the prisons that you choose to live inside,12 and that there is no such thing as an innocent bystander. You use your scholarship to shake up the world from its paralysis, abjection and amnesia; to unsettle the epistemic and structural violence that is ubiquitous to neoliberalism and its machinery; to create dialogic and learning spaces for the work of critical human rights and critical justice to take place. All this, and to enable an ethics of intervention through understanding what is at the very heart of the critical human rights impulse, creating a “dialogue for being, because I am not without the other.”13 Furthermore, as a critical human rights advocate living in a nuclear armed world, your challenge is to reconceptualise the human community as Ashis Nandy has argued, to see how we can learn to co-exist with others in conviviality and also learn to co-survive with the non-human, even to flourish. A dialogue for being requires a leap into a human rights frame that includes a deep ecological dimension, where the planet itself is inherently involved as a participant in its future. This requires scholarship that “thinks like a mountain.”14 A critical human rights approach understands that it cannot be simply human-centric. It requires a nuanced and arresting clarity to present perspectives on co-existence and co-survival that are from human and non-human viewpoints.15 Ultimately, you realise that your struggle is not confined to declarations, treaties, legislation, and law, though they have their role. It must go further to produce “creative intellectual exchange that might release new ethical energies for mutually assured survival.”16 Taking an anti-nuclear stance and enabling a post-nuclear activism demands a revolution within the field of human rights work. Recognising the entanglement of nuclearism with the Anthropocene, for one thing, requires a profound shift in focus from the human-centric to a more-than-human co-survival. It also requires a fundamental shift in understanding our human culture, in which the very epistemic and rational acts of sundering from co-survival with the planet and environment takes place. In the end, you realise, as Raimon Panikkar has articulated, “it is not realistic to toil for peace if we do not proceed to a disarmament of the bellicose culture in which we live.”17 Or, as Geshe Lhakdor suggests, there must be “inner disarmament for external disarmament.”18 In this sense, it is within the cultural arena, our human society, where the entanglement of subjective meaning making, nature and politics occurs, that we need to disarm. It is 1982, and you are reading Jonathan Schell's The Fate of the Earth on a Sydney bus. Sleeping has not been easy over the past few nights as you reluctantly but compulsively read about the consequences of nuclear war. For some critics, Schell's account is high polemic, but for you it is more like Rabindranath Tagore: it expresses the suffering we make for ourselves. What you find noteworthy is that although Schell's scenario of widespread destruction of the planet through nuclear weaponry, of immeasurable harm to the bio-sphere through radiation, is powerfully laid out, the horror and scale of nuclear obliteration also seems surreal and far away as the bus makes its way through the suburban streets. A few years later, you read a statement from an interview with Paul Tibbets, the pilot of “Enola Gay,” the plane that bombed Hiroshima. He says, “The morality of dropping that bomb was not my business.”19 This abstraction from moral responsibility – the denial of the implications on human life and the consequences of engagement through the machinery of war – together with the sweeping amnesia that came afterwards from thinking about the bombing of Hiroshima, are what make you become an environmental and human rights activist. You realise that what makes the nuclear algorithm work involves a politically engineered and deeply embedded insecurity-based recipe to elide the nuclear threat from everyday life. The spectre of nuclear obliteration, like the idea of human rights, can appear abstract and distant, not our everyday business. You realise that within this recipe is the creation of a moral tyranny of distance, an abnegation of myself with the other. One of modernity's greatest and earliest achievements was the mediation of the self with the world. How this became a project assisted and shaped through the military-industrial-technological-capitalist complex is fraught and hard to untangle. But as a critical human rights scholar you have come to see through that complex, and you put energies into challenging that tyranny of distance, to activate a politics, ethics and scholarship that recognises the other as integral to yourself. Ultimately, even, to see that the other is also within.20

#### Settler colonialism’s structural account shuts down ways to imagine liberatory futures.

Rachel BUSBRIDGE 17, Alexander von Humboldt Postdoctoral Fellow in Institut für Islamwissenschaft (Institute of Islamic Studies), Freie Universität Berlin [“Israel-Palestine and the Settler Colonial ‘Turn’: From Interpretation to Decolonization,” *Theory, Culture & Society*, First Published: January 23, 2017, p. 1-25, Emory Libraries]

The prescription for decolonization – that is, a normative project committed to the liberation of the colonized and the overturning of colonial relationships of power (Kohn and McBride, 2011: 3) – is indeed one of the most counter-hegemonic implications of the settler colonial paradigm as applied to Israel-Palestine, potentially shifting it from a diagnostic frame to a prognostic one which offers a ‘proposed solution to the problem, or at least a plan of attack’ (Benford and Snow, 2000: 616). What, however, does the settler colonial paradigm offer by way of envisioning decolonization? As Veracini (2007) notes, while settler colonial studies scholars have sought to address the lack of attention paid to the experiences of indigenous peoples in conventional historiographical accounts of decolonization (which have mostly focused on settler independence and the loosening of ties to the ‘motherland’), there is nevertheless a ‘narrative deficit’ when it comes to imagining settler decolonization. While Veracini (2007) relates this deficit to a matter of conceptualization, it is apparent that the structural perspective of the paradigm in many ways closes down possibilities of imagining the type of social and political transformation to which the notion of decolonization aspires. In this regard, there is a worrying tendency (if not tautological discrepancy) in settler colonial studies, where the only solution to settler colonialism is decolonization – which a faithful adherence to the paradigm renders largely unachievable, if not impossible.

To understand why this is the case, it is necessary to return to Wolfe’s (2013a: 257) account of settler colonialism as guided by a ‘zero-sum logic whereby settler societies, for all their internal complexities, uniformly require the elimination of Native alternatives’. The structuralism of this account has immense power as a means of mapping forms of injustice and indignity as well as strategies of resistance and refusal, and Wolfe is careful to show how transmutations of the logic of elimination are complex, variable, discontinuous and uneven. Yet, in seeking to elucidate the logic of elimination as the overarching historical force guiding settler-native relations there is an operational weakness in the theory, whereby such a logic is simply there, omnipresent and manifest even when (and perhaps especially when) it appears not to be; the settler colonial studies scholar need only read it into a situation or context. It thus hurtles from the past to the present into the future, never to be fully extinguished until the native is, or until history itself ends. There is thus a powerful ontological (if not metaphysical) dimension to Wolfe’s account, where there is such thing as a ‘settler will’ that inherently desires the elimination of the native and the distinction between the settler and the native can only ever be categorical,

### Case

#### Public sector mining thumps

NASA 19 [“NASA Invests in Tech Concepts Aimed at Exploring Lunar Craters, Mining Asteroids,” NASA, June 11, 2019, <https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-invests-in-tech-concepts-aimed-at-exploring-lunar-craters-mining-asteroids>] TDI

NASA Invests in Tech Concepts Aimed at Exploring Lunar Craters, Mining Asteroids

Robotically surveying lunar craters in record time and mining resources in space could help NASA establish a sustained human presence at the Moon – part of the agency’s broader [Moon to Mars exploration](https://www.nasa.gov/specials/moon2mars/) approach. Two mission concepts to explore these capabilities have been selected as the first-ever Phase III studies within the [NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts](https://www.nasa.gov/niac) (NIAC) program.

“We are pursuing new technologies across our development portfolio that could help make deep space exploration more Earth-independent by utilizing resources on the Moon and beyond,” said Jim Reuter, associate administrator of NASA’s Space Technology Mission Directorate. “These NIAC Phase III selections are a component of that forward-looking research and we hope new insights will help us achieve more firsts in space.”

The Phase III proposals outline an aerospace architecture, including a mission concept, that is innovative and could change what’s possible in space. Each selection will receive as much as $2 million. Over the course of two years, researchers will refine the concept design and explore aspects of implementing the new technology. The inaugural Phase III selections are:

Robotic Technologies Enabling the Exploration of Lunar Pits

William Whittaker, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh

This mission concept, called Skylight, proposes technologies to rapidly survey and model lunar craters. This mission would use high-resolution images to create 3D model of craters. The data would be used to determine whether a crater can be explored by human or robotic missions. The information could also be used to characterize ice on the Moon, a crucial capability for the sustained surface operations of NASA’s Artemis program. On Earth, the technology could be used to autonomously monitor mines and quarries.

[Mini Bee Prototype to Demonstrate the Apis Mission Architecture and Optical Mining Technology](https://www.nasa.gov/directorates/spacetech/niac/2019_Phase_I_Phase_II/Mini_Bee_Prototype)

Joel Sercel, TransAstra Corporation, Lake View Terrace, California

This flight demonstration mission concept proposes a method of asteroid resource harvesting called optical mining. Optical mining is an approach for excavating an asteroid and extracting water and other volatiles into an inflatable bag. Called Mini Bee, the mission concept aims to prove optical mining, in conjunction with other innovative spacecraft systems, can be used to obtain propellant in space. The proposed architecture includes resource prospecting, extraction and delivery.

#### Thinking about space is inevitable---the 1AC doesn’t end the thinkings of appropriation of outer space.

#### Advocacy to prevent extinction is good and not colonialist – it’s a radical vision of a “we.”

Coles and Susen, 18—Research Professor at the Institute for Social Justice at Australian Catholic University AND Reader in Sociology at the School of Arts and Social Sciences of City, University of London (Romand and Simon, “The Pragmatic Vision of Visionary Pragmatism: The Challenge of Radical Democracy in a Neoliberal World Order,” Contemporary Political Theory May 2018, Volume 17, Issue 2, pp 250–262, dml)

Visionary pragmatism is driven by a political ethos that accents radical receptivity and a sense that a greater degree of wildness in our efforts is indispensable for transformative democratic movements. While some of my earlier works accented the ethical character of receptive generosity in political life, Visionary Pragmatism argues that receptivity is indispensable for generating democratic power – precisely because receptivity involves vulnerability, relationship formation, capacities to modulate, and learning in unexpected ways amidst difficult differences. Drawing on my engagements with the movement for democratic action research in Northern Arizona, I argue that receptive practices engender remarkable capacities for fostering grassroots critique and alternatives, powerful political assemblages across differences, and transformative dynamics in the face of what otherwise appear to be intractable problems. Our best and most powerful possibilities for co-creating urgent democratic change almost always advance along pathways engendered partly through relationships of careful attentiveness to what we initially took to be oblique, unintelligible – or, perhaps, even odious.

For these reasons, my political, theoretical, and pedagogical engagements move across many different configurations and a wider range of situations, ideologies, modes, and commitments than most. Eschewing a single subject position, in Visionary Pragmatism, I experiment with first-person plurals in which the ‘we’ morphs in relation to the different loci of initiative that animate my reflections. Sometimes ‘we’ refers to proponents of radical and ecological democracy very broadly, sometimes to scholars in higher education, sometimes to political theorists, sometimes to the action research movement that formed among people at Northern Arizona University and its community partners, sometimes to a specific action research team, sometimes to all people facing the possibility of planetary ecological collapse. Among the many things I find compelling about the writing of James Baldwin is how he shifts his pronouns without notice – for example, sometimes using ‘we’ to represent black people, sometimes as an uncanny member of the white-majority United States. This rhetorical shiftiness encroaches upon and pulls his readers – especially white readers – beyond the ‘innocence that constitutes the crime’ of their assumed individual and collective white subjectivities in ways that work in visceral, relational, and conceptual registers (Baldwin, 1992, p. 6). Such uncertainty has significant capacity to erode habits and defences, as one finds oneself unexpectedly drawn into perspectives, locations, energies, and tendencies that unsettle and reorient one’s own subjectivity. Much of my work has theorized ‘moving democracy’, and my rhetorical shifting of the first-person plural is a textual practice that aims to enhance this in ways that facilitate reflection.

Throughout Visionary Pragmatism, I argue that there are powerful reasons for active hope. At the same time, we do not live far from tipping points beyond which planetary ecological collapse, globalizing neoliberal fascism, and violent chaos may overwhelm our efforts. I do not think so much in terms of pessimism or optimism as I do about seizing and co-creating opportunities for catalysing dynamic changes in theory and practice that foster a powerful movement of receptive democracy, for complex democratic commonwealth and ecological flourishing. In one sense, as Walter Benjamin’s discussion of Paul Klee’s ‘Angelus Novus’ makes poignantly clear, it is always ‘too late’ for so much and so many, as catastrophic history keeps piling wreckage at our feet. At the same time, there are what Benjamin (1968) calls ‘weak messianic powers’ that emerge as the retroactive force of salvaged aspects of past struggles ignite sparks with emerging struggles to explode the continuum of progress. In this sense, up to our day, it is never altogether too late. With the language of ‘game-transformative practice’, I argue that a visionary-pragmatic movement of radical democracy must do something analogous in response to the fierce urgency of now, to avoid a sixth extinction in which this possibility could well become a casualty.