I affirm the resolution resolved: the appropriation of outer-space by private entities is unjust

The value is **Justice**, defined as to give each their due.

However, in order to give each their due, we must tear down oppressive structures that prevent certain groups from getting their dues in the first place.

Thus, the value criterion is **Deconstructing Colonialism**

**Deconstructing colonialism first requires the acknowledgement and critical thinking of the power of ideologies that fuel colonial mindsets.** Opara 21

https://speakingofmedicine.plos.org/2021/07/29/its-time-to-decolonize-the-decolonization-movement/

**Power is fundamental to colonialism**, neo-colonialism, and coloniality. **Critical introspection** as **to how** individuals as part of institutions, as well as the **institutions** themselves, **produce**, re-produce, **maintain, and benefit from** intersectional **systems of oppression within a colonial framework is necessary for decolonization** to be realized. What this means is that Euro-American people and the systems they represent and uphold need to divest from power-hoarding and lean out of power and privilege to allow indigenous and Majority World people thrive. While the formerly colonized and neo-colonized lead, the former colonizers and neo-colonizers need to actively dismantle the structures of oppression they created, inherited, maintain, and from which they benefit. This not a light proposition as it will require (neo)colonizers to divest from the very definition of themselves, as their identities were constructed on the basis of dominance acquired through bloody violence, rape, genocide, enslavement all to concentrate power and resources. **To divest from** an identity that sits at the intersection of **coloniality** and [whiteness](https://www.truthdig.com/articles/james-baldwin-and-the-meaning-of-whiteness/) will **require[s] a fundamental** existential **shift in consciousness**, imagination, decision-making, **and politics** that sets the (neo)colonizer free from the bondage of their addiction to power and the [lies](https://medium.com/message/how-white-people-got-made-6eeb076ade42) constructed to preserve the un-earned position of power in the social hierarchical house of cards. The challenge would be in the novel act of crafting an identity independent of dominance and oppression.

Prefer for the following four reasons.

**First, colonialism is morally abhorrent absent utilitarian effects.** According to Renzo 19,

https://sci-hubtw.hkvisa.net/10.1093/clp/cuz011

The process of decolonization that has reshaped the face of the globe in the second half of the 20th Century is widely recognized as one of the success stories of the international legal order that has emerged in the aftermath of World War Two. And yet, philosophers have failed to pay sufficient attention to this process. Indeed, until recently, **the** very **question of** **why colonialism is morally wrong has been** surprisingly **neglected in the philosophical discussion.** Perhaps this is because the answer seems too obvious to need spelling out. Historically, colonial occupations have involved subjecting innocent populations to some of the worst imaginable atrocities, including murder, torture, exploitation, sexual violence, and enslavement. Is there really any need to add something to this list to explain why colonialism is wrong? There is if we are interested in providing an account of the distinctive way in which colonialism is morally wrong. After all, **murder, torture, exploitation,** sexual violence, **and enslavement are wrong whether or not they occur in the context of colonial occupation.** Thus, if all we can do to explain the wrong of colonialism is point at the fact that it typically involves the perpetration of these crimes, we cannot vindicate the thought that there is something distinctively wrong with it, a wrong that cannot be reduced to the systematic perpetration of these more familiar crimes. And yet, many seem to share this thought. Although colonialism does typically involve the systematic perpetration of these crimes, intuitively, the members of former colonies have suffered a distinctive wrong over and above those associated with murder, exploitation, enslavement etc. One way to see the force of this intuition is to consider whether the objection to colonial domination would be fully met if the **colonizers** didn’t commit these wrongs and realized instead the benign form of government described by the apologists of colonialism. Clearly that would not be the case. Intuitively, a colonial power **could not** plausibly **neutralize the** legitimate **objection to its rule** simply **by refraining from engaging in murder**, exploitation, enslavement etc.1 Such hypothetical colonial power would be less bad than the actual ones, which extensively engaged in these practices, but **it would be wrong nonetheless.** **Just like** **slavery is wrong, no matter how benevolent** we imagine **a** particular **master to be**, so colonial domination is wrong, no matter how benign we imagine a particular colonial regime to be. The aim of this paper is to provide an account of this wrong. I start by rejecting a view which explains the wrongfulness of colonialism by appealing to the idea that colonialism involves the subjection of the colonized to the authority of the colonial power against their will. I argue that this view cannot vindicate the intuition that colonialism is distinctively wrong because it is unable to distinguish between cases of colonialism and cases of forcible annexation, such as the one suffered by Crimea at the hands of Russia in 2014 (section 1). I then offer an alternative account, which appeals to the idea that colonial domination undermines the capacity of political communities to exercise their self-determining agency in a particular way. **When** political **communities are treated** in **this way, they suffer a distinctive wrong, independent**ly **of** whether this treatment is accompanied by any of **the other crimes** listed above.

(Warrant) Renzo 19 continues, stating that

https://sci-hubtw.hkvisa.net/10.1093/clp/cuz011

Whether it takes the form of direct or indirect rule, **the distinguishing feature of colonial domination is that the colonized** continue to exist as a distinct group agent, but they **can no longer engage in the process of collective deliberation** that is required **for them to** be able to **autonomously shape the future of their** political **community.** The colonized continue to exist as a distinct group agent, because insofar as they do take part in a process of institutionalized political cooperation, they do fulfil the agency condition. By doing things such as obeying the law, paying taxes and cooperating with public officials, they do maintain the political institutions they are subject to, though they do so willy-nilly.25 However, the colonized do not fulfil the authorship condition because they cannot be properly regarded as authors of the institutions that govern them. In cases of direct rule, the colonized are under the direct control of the colonizers, in the sense that they are subject to laws and decisions made by the colonizers. In cases of indirect rule, the colonized may retain some capacity to pass their own laws and make their own decisions through the functioning of their local political institutions, but here too they are ultimately subjected to the control of the colonizers. For although they can influence the laws they are subject to, the colonized cannot determine what these laws are, and thus cannot decide for themselves how the political community acts. While they do retain a say in how to rule themselves, an important input in the decisionmaking process comes from the colonizers, and **thus the decisions of the community are no longer a reflection of how its members have exercised their personal agency.**

**Second, deconstructing colonialism is critical to evaluating the world around us.**

Colonialist mindset has dominated literature and life around us, preventing us from seeing the world clearly. For example, white, English speaking thinkers get their papers published and distributed internationally, while those written in indigenous languages are never exposed. Decolonization is key to ensuring any idea of reality, otherwise coloniality survives eternally. Opara 21 states that

https://speakingofmedicine.plos.org/2021/07/29/its-time-to-decolonize-the-decolonization-movement/

**Decolonization is** often perceived as a means to uncover the histories of the colonized, those whom Frantz Fanon refers to as the “[Wretched of the earth](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Wretched_of_the_Earth)”, and bring their stories to the awareness of the mainstream. However, it is **often** confused with any social justice endeavor including diversity, equity, and inclusion and often **devoid of a critical analysis of power, history, and sociopolitics.** This **lack of critical** introspective **analysis of power, hegemony, and** the historical and **continuing dynamics of** internalized and **systemic oppression** in contemporary health and higher education structures, **results in the reproduction of colonial logic[,]**s of **commodifying human beings**, labor, space, **and knowledge.** **What this looks like is** **the maintenance of** a power hierarchy in global health that is still predominantly white, cis-gendered, heterosexual, male, and European/American. It looks like institutional-community or (neo)colonial-(neo)**colonized processes, practices, and policies** of funding, partnerships, and program/project development **that replicate colonial dynamics of extraction and exploitation**. **It** looks like curricula that re-marginalize, de-prioritize, and **minimize[s] the lived experiences**, expertise, and epistemologies **of indigenous communities**. **It looks like narratives that obscure** **the** interdependent causative **relationship of** the development and **wealth [in]** of **Europe and** North **America and the** under-development and **poverty of their past and present colonies.** It looks like discourse that ignores the role of (neo)colonizer economic and national security decisions and policies that suppress indigenous independence. It looks like co-opting and bending the decolonization discourse to adhere to Eurocentric constraints such as viewing situations in binary terms and, therefore, in “tension” versus in multifaceted, intersectional, and in harmony. Constraints such as framing approaches as pragmatic vs philosophical as opposed to each informing and depending on the other. **It** looks like language that **reinforces the hegemony of Europe and North America over the rest of the word [through language]** such as “Global North” and “Global South” or defining nations by economic status set to Euro-American indices of prosperity and development. It looks like the absence of a commitment to justice and engagement with [community-led justice and liberation movements.](https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/what-global-health-can-learn-black-lives-matter)

**Third, the deconstruction of colonialism and oppression is a prerequisite to understanding morality in the first place.** According to Winter and Leighton 99,

https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/u.osu.edu/dist/b/7538/files/2014/10/Section-II-Structural-Violence-Winter-Leighton-28aggie.pdf

Recognizing the operation of structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions that often have painful answers. The first chapter in this section, “Social Injustice,” by Susan Opotow, argues that **our** normal perceptual/**cognitive processes lead us to** **care about people inside our scope of justice, but rarely care about those** people **outside.** **Injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love** or know **is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers** or those who are invisible or irrelevant to us. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone; **moral exclusion is a product of our normal cognitive processes.** But Opotow argues convincingly that **we can reduce its nefarious effects by becoming aware of our distorted perceptions.** Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity..

**Fourth, colonization is the root of systematic oppression.** According to Kalend 14,

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/apr/30/africa-homophobia-legacy-colonialism>

**Most** Africans **don’t recognise homophobia as a colonial legacy** even though **before colonialism, many traditional cultures were tolerant of different sexualities and gender relations.** For instance, in my tribe, the Ganda or [Baganda](http://www.uganda-visit-and-travel-guide.com/baganda-people.html), (Uganda’s largest ethnic group) women from the royal clan are addressed with male titles and may or may not be required to perform duties expected of women. More broadly, from the [Azande](http://www.gurtong.net/Peoples/PeoplesProfiles/Azande/tabid/179/Default.aspx) of the Congo to the [Beti](http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/63490/Beti)of Cameroon, and from the Pangwe of Gabon to the Nama of Namibia, there is ethnographic evidence of same-sex relationships in pre-colonial Africa. By preying on African values of inclusive difference, **however, Africa’s colonisers rewrote its history**, the effects of which haunt Africa to this day. Tribal chiefs and village courts of law which were traditionally the hallmark of conflict resolution were traded for a **European [colonial law]** Penal Code system which **included the criminalisation of homosexuality.** It is also important to stress that so-called sodomy laws would not have impacted African sexual politics without the influence of Christianity. **Christianity was used to whitewash African culture as primitive and to demonise traditional interpretations of African intimacies.** The bible became the credo of African morality, disordering African sexuality to missionary positions of heteronormativity (ie. the idea that heterosexuality is the only 'natural' sexual orientation). But sexuality is not all that the colonisers rewrote about Africa. European colonies were established through military conquest, perpetuated through the politics of divide and rule, and religion. The colonisers understood that to conquer Africa they had to turn Africans against Africans such that Africans would blame themselves for their divisions, most of which culminated in ethnic hostility. **Amongst other things,** **colonial policies** of divide and rule **spurred ethnic tensions.** **For example, by dividing Rwanda along race and class,** German **imperialists turned the Tutsis against the Hutus.** In Sudan meanwhile, British imperialists divided the Northern Muslim region from the Southern Christian region creating divisions that perpetuate [ethnic tensions to this day](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/gallery/2014/apr/29/south-sudan-crisis-displaced-people-conflict-in-pictures).

I offer the following observations

As the affirmative debater, I only need to argue that the appropriation of outerspace by private entities is unjust. That means it is NOT by burden to argue that the public sector would be more just, or to offer an alternative.

**Contention 1) Cosmic Colonialism**

**Subpoint a) Manifest Destiny in the 21st Century**

The appropriation of outer space by private companies is rooted in ideologies of expansion that justifies colonialism. Weitzel 21

<https://dissidentvoice.org/2021/03/history-shows-privatized-space-colonization-will-be-disastrous/>

This same **outward expansion in search of** cheap raw **materials and labor is** exactly **what will** end up **driv[e]**ing the **colonization of space.** **The Moon, Mars, and even asteroids** may all **become** the peripheral, privatized, and **exploited locations that permit corporations** on Earth **to profit.** **Similar to Indigenous understandings of** certain **land rights** in precolonial New England**, space is currently viewed as a**[**global commons**](https://www.fastcompany.com/90290871/outer-space-new-space-race-competition-cooperation). This means **that all people have rights to** it and none should be able to claim exclusive rights over it. The Outer Space Treaty of 1967 prevents any nation from claiming territory in space, although the treaty is known to be vague concerning the [power of corporations](https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-34324443) in space and will certainly be [challenged legally](https://theconversation.com/private-companies-are-launching-a-new-space-race-heres-what-to-expect-80697) in the coming years. The enclosure and privatization of space may therefore lead not only to the direct and immediate exploitation of the environment and of people, but may also lay the groundwork for long-term systems of exploitation and dispossession.

Instead of adopting indigenous understandings of collective land rights, the privatization of outer space is rooted in colonialist ideologies. Billings 19 states that

https://sci-hubtw.hkvisa.net/10.1016/j.futures.2019.02.020

Examining **the** history of the U.S. space program reveals an underlying **ideology of space exploration** that **has** at its core **a rationale for conquest and exploitation.** **This** ideology **is deeply rooted in** a durable **American cultural narrative of** frontier pioneering, free enterprise, rugged individualism, and a right to life without limits. 5 It is a pastiche of many ideologies, drawing on **American exceptionalism,** neoliberalism (**and** its more extremist cousin, libertarianism), the doctrine of **manifest destiny**, the belief in the necessity of “progress,” and even Russian cosmism.6 In the early 21st century, the trend in the U.S. space community, energized during Ronald Reagan’s administration and reinvigorated during the George W. Bush administration, has been to view the solar system as an environment to exploit, as we have done with our own planetary environment. From this “dominionist” or “manifest destiny” perspective, our home planet, and our home solar system, are seen as resources here for humans to use as they like. The Obama administration embraced this way of thinking and advanced the cause of colonization and exploitation. Though at this writing the Trump administration has not issued any official guidance on the future of human exploration, except for NASA Administrator Jim Bridenstine’s repeated claim that NASA will be returning people to the Moon and landing people on Mars, it is reasonable to assume we will see no change in ideological direction. As to American exceptionalism, political scientist Seymour Martin Lipset wrote, “The United States is a country organized around an ideology which includes a set of dogmas about the nature of a good society. Americanism…is an ideology in the same way that communism or fascism or liberalism are isms…. The nation’s ideology can be described in five words: liberty, egalitarianism, individualism, populism, and laissezfaire.” With the exception of the former Soviet Union, he noted, “other countries define themselves by a common history as birthright communities, not by ideology.”7 The idea of American exceptionalism as it appears in space exploration rhetoric ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT 4 looks bright and shiny on the surface – it’s about the U.S. leading in space exploration for the benefit of humankind. Beneath that shiny surface, though, lies neoliberal/libertarian ideology, an embrace of space as a wide-open frontier, open to exploitation and colonization, ripe for so-called commercialization unfettered by government oversight. It promotes capitalism and development, whenever and wherever possible, according to the principle that those who get there first get the most. Behind today's American exceptionalism lies a specific religious vision of manifest destiny. Historian Anders Stephanson has explored the premise that the ideology of manifest destiny “is of signal importance in the way the United States came to understand itself in the world and still does…. The world as God’s ‘manifestation’ and history as predetermined ‘destiny’ had been ideological staples of the strongly providentialist period in England between 1620 and 1660,” the period when English Puritans migrated to North America, bringing their beliefs with them. The related belief in “right” – that is, that white Europeans had been “chosen by the finger of God to possess (America)” – is at least as old. These beliefs came to underlay a U.S. national narrative of “prophecy, messianism, and historical transcendence.”8 Some threads of Russian cosmist philosophy are also woven into the web of beliefs propagated by advocates of space colonies – the belief that humans are destined to conquer the planets and the stars, to populate the universe, to evolve to a higher form in space.9 While Russian Orthodox cosmist philosopher Nikolai Fedorov (1828-1903) is not often cited by space colonization advocates, his disciple Konstantin Tsiolkovsky (1857- 1935) often is, especially for his avowal that while Earth is the cradle of humanity, humans can’t stay in their cradle forever. **For more than 500 years, these ideologies have wreaked havoc on Earth, and they should not be exported to other planets.** The founding declaration of the Mars Society states: “The settling of the Martian New World is an opportunity for a noble experiment in which humanity has another chance to shed old baggage and begin the world anew; carrying forward as much of the best of our heritage as possible and leaving the worst behind.” Human societies have tried and failed to “shed old baggage” over centuries. We have not yet learned how to do it.

Weitzel 21 furthers, stating that

Elon Musk intends to colonize Mars as soon as possible. Thankfully, there is no potential for genocide of indigenous Martians as there was for Native Americans and other Indigenous peoples around the world under European colonialism. Yet **because [space exploration]** the endeavor **is privatized and operating under** centuries-old **colonialist mindsets,** [**exploitation and destruction will assuredly manifest**](https://www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/patriarchal-race-colonize-mars-just-another-example-male-entitlement-ncna849681) in other ways. Mining and resource extraction is one avenue for profit, although [Musk acknowledges](https://www.cnn.com/2020/09/08/tech/spacex-mars-profit-scn/index.html) that it is unclear if the natural resources on Mars could be extracted for the profit of companies on Earth. Even if the costs of transporting raw materials back to Earth are too great, natural resources extracted in space could be [manufactured in space](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/07/17/why-jeff-bezos-spends-billions-on-space-technology.html) and shipped to Earth. **Colonization of Mars may therefore differ slightly from** cases of **colonization on Earth**, **but the fundamental exploitative relationship remains.** Plus, there are other ways to profit besides the extraction of raw materials. [Space tourism](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2019/06/nasa-iss-private-astonauts/591421/) by wealthy thrill-seekers is poised to be a cash cow for companies, and a relatively autonomous SpaceX colony on Mars could also have a potentially great degree of freedom to profit from all sorts of business ventures, especially if they are legally [independent of the United States government](https://www.popularmechanics.com/space/moon-mars/a34525209/spacex-laws-mars-elon-musk-starlink-app/) as has been hinted. Musk has also alluded to other “[extraordinary entrepreneurial opportunity](https://www.businessinsider.com/why-elon-musk-launched-tesla-mars-falcon-heavy-2018-3)” on Mars, ranging from manufacturing to restaurants to tourism. However, it remains to be seen just how the financing, ownership, and taxation of these enterprises will be handled in what may be a semi-autonomous colony. In the case of English colonists arriving in North America, it was often the case that the company financing the colony [claimed ownership](https://fee.org/articles/who-paid-for-the-mayflower/) over all property and all economic products of the settlers for a set number of years. Any colonists on a settled Mars will certainly be exploited as well, in one form or another, for the profit of shareholders and company executives. More than a colony of Earth, Mars may become a colony of SpaceX, and this is a troubling thought. Resisting exploitation is exceedingly difficult in a privately funded, owned, and operated colony because such a colony is, by its very nature, undemocratic. Private companies like SpaceX are [not democracies](https://jacobinmag.com/2016/04/democracy-capitalism-freedom-friedman-wright-socialism). CEOs are not elected representatives of the employees and business decisions are not voted upon by all workers. Thus, with a corporation calling the shots, settlers on Mars may have disturbingly little input in decision-making processes concerning their businesses and lives. Fundamentally, the privatization of **space exploration is not the beneficial solution that many think** it is. **It will simply result in a continuation of the colonial exploitation** of nature and people as our capitalist global economy transcends [outside] our own atmosphere. Exploitation is an inherent part of such for-profit ventures in a capitalist system, and this will carry over into space. Privatized exploration of our solar system will be biased towards profitable ventures instead of those with public benefits and will certainly hav[ing]e numerous detrimental [environmental impacts](https://www.salon.com/2020/05/28/why-spacexs-historic-manned-space-flight-really-isnt-all-that-historic/)

Even if there aren’t actual people in space, this isn’t the argument. The colonialism of space is backed by the ideologies of past colonialism where private entities rush towards wealth without a consideration of the rights of the people in their way. Urata 21 states that

https://bostonreview.net/articles/lost-in-space/

**Musk and Bezos rely on the notion that colonizing space somehow differs from colonizing Earth.** Implicit in their arguments is the belief that it was not the systems of colonial-capitalism, but rather the context surrounding their implementation, that wreaked havoc in the past. On this view, although previous colonization attempts often unleashed genocidal violence, that history cannot be repeated in space. **After all, no one lives there. This perspective ignores the fact that colonial destruction was justified by a specific ideology** that made a certain view of the world, and humanity’s role in it, appear natural and inevitable. **The idea that space is open for the taking simply because “no one is there” finds root in the exact colonial logics that have justified settler genocide for centuries**: that only certain people, using resources in certain ways, have a claim to land and ownership. Imperialist conceptions of ownership thus transform space into an “empty frontier” where certain individuals can project their political dreams, whether they be extractive manufacturing industries or settler colonies. In his recent book Theft is Property! (2019), Robert Nichols interrogates the recursive logic of colonial dispossession, which relies on the simultaneous processes of transformation and theft. As he puts it: Colonization entails the large-scale transfer of land that simultaneously recodes the object of exchange in question such that it appears retrospectively to be a form of theft in the ordinary sense. . . ‘dispossession’ may be coherently reconstructed to refer to a process in which new proprietary relations are generated but under structural conditions that demand their simultaneous negation. In one move, land is both transformed into property, and taken away.

The offense under this contention are in two layers

Firstly, if I win this argument then I have won that space colonialism is unjust which means I have met my burden of proof.

Secondly, fiat is illusory. By rejecting an inherently colonialist action of private appropriation of outer space, you show that you as the judge reject colonialist mindsets. This is key to combatting colonialism in the real world, which outweighs any post-fiat offense.

Our perception that oppression must only be solved by politics ignores our personal involvement in these structures, justifying violence. Kappeler 95

Which is why **many** of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to **engage in a form of mental** deputy **politics, in the style of ‘What would I do if I were** the general, the prime minister, the **president**, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?’ Since **we seem to regard** their **mega spheres of action as the only** worthwhile and truly **effective ones**, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as ‘virtually no possibilities’: **what I could do seems petty and futile.** For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN — finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like ‘I want to stop this war’, ‘I want military intervention’, ‘I want to stop this backlash’, or ‘I want a moral revolution.’7 ‘We are this war’, however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so—called peace talks, namely as Drakuli~ says, in our non-comprehension’: **our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and** for working out our own **understanding**, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of **prefabricate**d arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we ‘are’ the war in **our ‘unconscious cruelty** towards you’, our tolerance of the ‘fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don’t’ — our readiness, in other words, to build identities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the ‘others’. **We share** in the **responsibility for this** war and its **violence** in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, **in the way we shape** ‘our feelings, our relationships, **our values’ according to the structures** and the values **of** war and **violence.**

https://u1lib.org/book/937924/d376f5

**Subpoint b) Cultural Genocide**

In order to deconstruct colonialism, we need to be aware of the practices of colonialism in the first place. Otherwise, the colonialism remains invisible and we can never deconstruct it. The aff recognizes that the appropriation of outer space by private companies blocks cultural practices of indigenous people. This materializes in two ways.

**First is light pollution.**

Private companies are launching ton of satellites into outer space. Stockwell 20 states that

<https://www.e-ir.info/pdf/86284>

A number of NewSpace actors are likely to complicate these worries even further through recent satellite proposals. Whilst **Boeing is [planning on launching]** proposing a constellation of up to **3,000 satellites[.], SpaceX has even grander goals of creating a constellation consisting** of 4,425 satellites, eventually expanding to **12,000 satellites in the near-future** (Kosiak, 2019: 7). Putting this into context, there are currently just around 1,400 active satellites in orbit around the Earth, highlighting the scale of these projects **[Overall, the plans of private corporations would increase the number of satellites in orbit by nearly ten times].**

(100k satellites: https://www.inverse.com/science/what-is-kessler-syndrome)

This is massively harmful, as Ferreira 21 states that

https://www.vice.com/en/article/k78mnz/spacexs-satellite-megaconstellations-are-astrocolonialism-indigenous-advocates-say

Across cultures and continents, our ancestors [indigenous people] have looked to the night sky for purpose, connection, and stories that they imagined were painted across a star-studded canvas. This ancient practice has now reached a critical inflection point as a new group of constellations, created by humans, is suddenly appearing in space. These “megaconstellations'' consist of satellites, deployed by companies such as SpaceX, that range in number from a few hundred to several thousand. All told, Earth orbit [may contain 100,000 operational satellites](https://www.theverge.com/2020/8/26/21401455/satellite-mega-constellations-astronomy-spacex-amazon-oneweb-bright-internet-space) by 2030, roughly 25 times the existing population. **Indigenous communities are disproportionately affected by this interference with the night sky, which falls under** a broader pattern of **astrocolonialism.** Light pollution [from satellites] is considered by some experts to be a form of cultural genocide against Indigenous peoples, whose traditions have already experienced erasure across countless other spheres.

Ferreira 21 continues, stating that

https://www.vice.com/en/article/k78mnz/spacexs-satellite-megaconstellations-are-astrocolonialism-indigenous-advocates-say

Across cultures and continents, our ancestors **[indigenous people] have looked to the night sky for purpose, connection, and stories** that they imagined were painted across a star-studded canvas. This ancient practice has now reached a critical inflection point as a new group of constellations, created by humans, is suddenly appearing in space. These “megaconstellations'' consist of **satellite**s, deployed by companies such as SpaceX, that range in number from a few hundred to several thousand. All told, Earth orbit [may contain 100,000 operational satellites](https://www.theverge.com/2020/8/26/21401455/satellite-mega-constellations-astronomy-spacex-amazon-oneweb-bright-internet-space) by 2030, roughly 25 times the existingpopulation. Indigenous communities are disproportionately affected by this interference with the night sky, which falls under a broader pattern of astrocolonialism. **Light pollution is considered** by some experts **to be a form of cultural genocide against Indigenous peoples, whose traditions have already experienced erasure across countless other spheres.**

**Second is by appropriating native land**

A chief of example of this is SpaceX appropriating indigenous land on Biak Island, a small indigenous island by Indonesia. According to Devon-Shire Ellis 21,

https://www.silkroadbriefing.com/news/2021/03/10/indonesias-biak-island-not-a-good-example-of-the-us-belt-road-alternative/

The US company **SpaceX has been in discussions** with the Indonesian Government **concerning development of Indonesia’s Biak Island, as a rocket launch site and for mining of copper and nickel, two of the most important metals for rockets** as well as the long-range batteries used in Tesla’s electric vehicles (EV). Both SpaceX and Tesla are US companies with strong ties to the US government and military. They are managed by Elon Musk. **[Further]** **Biak[‘s]** is part of Indonesia’s Papua province,  faces the Pacific Ocean, and its **location [is]**, **one degree below the equator**, is **[making it] ideal for launching low-orbit satellites for communications, with less fuel needed to reach orbit.** Its proximity to reserves of natural resources also makes it a prime candidate for a launch site. SpaceX plan to launch 12,000 satellites by 2026 to provide cheap high-speed internet through internet service Starlink.

This is absolutely devastating for native groups on the island, as Chao 21 states that

https://www.trtworld.com/opinion/elon-musk-s-spacex-project-could-put-papuan-lands-and-futures-at-risk-46702

**The SpaceX project also poses** potential **risks to the lands and livelihoods of Biak residents, who continue to rely primarily on fishing, hunting**, and horticulture **for their daily subsistence.** As among other Indigenous Papuan communities, the land and environment represent an integral part of the richness of their local cultures. Different clans shares ancestry with different plants, species, and locations with the landscape, and are responsible for their health and wellbeing. **The environment is** also **a source of traditional knowledge,** intergenerationally transmitted **stories, sacred mythologies, and animist belief systems.** **Damaging the environment**, then, **also means damaging local inhabitants’ sense of cultural identity, belonging, and pride.** For some tribal representatives, the risk of population displacement accompanying the Biak project poses a further threat. As one tribal elder explained to me, “If different tribes (suku) have to move to other territories, then that will cause problems with the tribes already inhabiting and owning these territories. This will lead to land disputes, social conflict, and more violence.” As for the argument for economic development made by the government, many Biak inhabitants believe they have the right to decide what kind of livelihoods they want to pursue. As the tribal elder explained, “Our way of life might be simple, but it has existed since time immemorial. We hunt, we gather, and we fish. We cherish and protect the land and forest. For me, this is sustainability. Not in space. Not on Mars. Right here, on Papuan land (tanah Papua).

2 clarifications for the entire case

First, you reject any link-ins and responses that say that negating leads to material benefits for native groups. This is for three reasons.

1. Stating things like “satellites provide internet” or other benefits for indigenous people is another link into colonialism. It’s the same rhetoric that justified the “developed western world” forcing their way of living onto indigenous groups which is another link into assimilation and colonialism.
2. The AC is challenging mindsets not material distribution. You aren’t linking in by saying “asteroid mining gives minerals to native groups”. No mindset and ideologies are being challenged. It’s also another link into colonialism because this is the same rhetoric that states that “colonialism is over, lets just give native groups some rare rocks now to say sorry” and “we pushed you off your land, but here’s 100 acres on a faraway reservation to make up for it”.
3. The VC outweighs on timeframe. If you only solve for material benefits, then colonialism will always happen and society will perpetually try to keep solving for that. If you shift mindsets, then the colonialism never happens in the first place, outweighing on time frame and hijacking the solvency.

Second, reject any responses that are post-fiat. They are non-interactive for two reasons.

1. The ballots is an endorsement of a message that challenges colonialists mindsets in the real world. Stating that affirming leads to a unjust society should not be evaluated and is outweighed.
2. The resolution isn’t comparative worlds, no side “bans appropriation”. Colonialism is always unjust, if I prove that then I win. As such, reject non-uniques and post-fiat responses.

Overall, affirming isn’t a claim of an imaginary post-fiat world without any colonialism. The AC is an acknowledgment that everything is rooted in colonialism. From the ideologies we blindly accept to be good, to the industries we believe to be just. Voting aff is an acknowledgement of the injustice of these ideologies which is critical to deconstructing colonialism. The AC is a protest, and your ballot is the endorsement of its message.

Thus, I urge you to affirm