# 1AC – Emory

## 1AC – vs policy debaters

### Advantage

#### In 1969: After the Moon landing, Gil Scott-Heron “released a scathingly critical song called “Whitey on the Moon.”[1]

[1] [A.D. Carson (Assistant Professor of Hip-Hop, University of Virginia). “Why Gil Scott-Heron’s ‘Whitey on the Moon’ still feels relevant today”. The Conversation. July 21, 2021. Accessed 1/3/22. <https://theconversation.com/why-gil-scott-herons-whitey-on-the-moon-still-feels-relevant-today-164681> //Xu]

Not long after the July 20, 1969, Moon landing, Gil Scott-Heron – a poet hailed as the “Godfather of Ra p” – released a scathingly critical song called “Whitey on the Moon.” While others lauded the lunar landing as a “giant leap for mankind,” Scott-Heron lamented the Moon trip in his lyrical litany. He felt the trip consumed resources that could have been better put to use helping people confront the everyday costs of living on Earth. I don’t recall precisely when I first heard “Whitey on the Moon.” But I distinctly remember the cadence and flow sounding so much like the kinds of rap I appreciate today as a hip-hop scholar and lyricist. I was especially enamored with the refrain of “whitey’s on the moon” and how the song was bookended by the immediate issue at home: “a rat done bit my sister, Nell.” “I can’t pay no doctor bills, but whitey’s on the moon,” Scott-Heron says. “Ten years from now I’ll be paying still, while whitey’s on the moon.”

#### History doesn’t repeat itself, but rhymes as the story of private space exploration has always been of racism and colonialism.

#### In 2020: SpaceX “flew two astronauts to the International Space Station”[6] yet

[6] [Bracketed from “latino” to “latin” and capitalized [B]lack. Marina Koren (staff writer at The Atlantic). “The False Hope of an American Rocket Launch”. The Atlantic. June 3, 2020. Accessed 1/2/22. https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2020/06/spacex-nasa-launch-protests/612616/ //Xu]

Over the weekend, SpaceX flew two astronauts to the International Space Station on NASA’s behalf, a first in spaceflight history. NASA officials have spent months hyping the mission as a bright spot in dark times, and pointed to other milestones still to come: Under President Donald Trump, the United States is working to send Americans to the moon again in less than four years. And while history might not necessarily repeat, it does rhyme. On the day of the SpaceX launch, Vice President Mike Pence touched on these parallels. The Apollo missions, he said, were “a symbol of national strength and unity” that “rose above the tumult and the clamor of their times.” But the image of a nation united in the common purpose of delivering its people to the heavens is a false memory. Even before the recent demonstrations began, the SpaceX launch wasn’t going to be the center of national attention. That message of unity felt discordant when the biggest story in the country was a pandemic killing thousands of Americans every week, many of them [B]black and [Latin] Latino Americans, under the watch of a government unequipped to handle the virus. The dissonance has grown even more apparent as protests have sprung up in all 50 states. Space travel has inspired Americans, but it has never united them—not in the late ’60s, and certainly not in the present moment. The feats of America’s space program, then and now, are a momentary diversion, not a national salve. Morancy is too young to have lived it, but the confluence of a historic rocket launch and civil-rights protests feels to her like a terrible rerun of another painful year in American history, with a few plot changes. In 1968, as the U.S. was rocked by the worst of the Vietnam War, political assassinations, and police brutality against black people, NASA was trying to go to the moon. In 2020, as the country grapples with a deadly pandemic, the worst unemployment crisis since the Great Depression, and police brutality against black Americans, NASA is, once again, trying to go to the moon. In 1968, the year before Apollo 11 went to the moon—the year my colleague James Fallows recently described as “the most traumatic year in modern American history”—the public was consumed by turmoil unfolding on the ground. In April, Martin Luther King Jr. was shot dead in Memphis, and protests flared in more than 100 U.S. cities. Two months later, Robert F. Kennedy, the senator who championed civil rights, met the same end in Los Angeles as he campaigned for the presidency. Meanwhile, reports out of Vietnam grew more horrifying, with dozens of Americans killed every day, and many more Vietnamese, in combat and covered-up massacres. From the perspective of American spaceflight, 1968 ended on a high note. In late December of that year, the crew of Apollo 8 circled the moon, becoming the first humans to travel to another world. When the astronauts came home, Frank Borman, the mission’s commander, received a telegram from a fan thanking the crew: “You saved 1968.” The anecdote stuck, and over the years, it has bolstered the myth that Americans wholeheartedly supported the space effort and the nation’s zeal for beating the Soviets to the moon. But for most of the 1960s, the majority of Americans consistently believed that the Apollo program wasn’t worth the cost, according to the space historian Roger Launius. On the eve of the Apollo 11 launch, the Reverend Ralph Abernathy, King’s closest friend and second in command, led a group of demonstrators to Cape Canaveral to tell the NASA administrator that the country should focus on taking care of its poor instead of sending people to the moon. The moon landing in July 1969 certainly captured Americans’ attention, and even, for a brief moment, felt worth the trouble; according to Launius, one poll taken at the time of the landing showed, for the first time, that a majority of Americans supported the effort. The broadcast from the lunar surface drew the largest TV audience in history to date. But the accomplishment didn’t leave the same mark on the American imagination. Where the moon landing took humankind’s exploration of the cosmos to new heights and sparked a generation of engineers, it inspired the poet and soul musician Gil Scott-Heron to write “Whitey on the Moon,” a song that captured the disparate experiences of white and black Americans. It’s Neil Armstrong’s famous “one small step” line, however, that has impressed itself in the national conscience—and so too the image of a man in a spacesuit next to the American flag. Only many decades later did the public learn of the stories of Ed Dwight, the black man who almost became a NASA astronaut in 1962, or of Katherine Johnson and other black female mathematicians who contributed to the Apollo project, calculating the trajectories of the country’s most important flights beyond Earth. Polls show that support for the moon landing has actually risen over the years; 77 percent of people in 1989 thought the Apollo program was worth it, compared with just 47 percent a decade earlier. It is easy, now, to look back and pull from that moment the glossiest view of America, a pretty lie that sounds better in the history books than the real story. It is easy to say that humanity’s desire to explore the cosmos managed to bring together a divided nation. Why not now? On the day of the recent launch, Trump was at Cape Canaveral, vamping from behind a lectern about the state of the space program under his leadership. “When Americans are united, there is nothing we cannot do,” he said. The threat of white police officers and vigilantes to black communities long predates Trump, to be sure, and platitudes such as this would have felt hollow under the previous administration too. But Trump’s divisive rhetoric has been stoking the unrest. The morning of the launch, before he flew to Florida, Trump had alluded to deploying “the most vicious dogs, and most ominous weapons, I have ever seen” against protesters outside the White House. By then, he had already called demonstrators in Minneapolis, where police had killed George Floyd by kneeling on his neck for nearly nine minutes, “thugs.” Trump had also tweeted that “when the looting starts, the shooting starts”—a phrase that dates back to the 1960s, when it was used by a segregationist politician and a white police chief. He was still a few days from threatening the use of military force to “dominate” protesters and staging a bizarre photo op on a sidewalk that law enforcement cleared by teargassing demonstrators. Charles Bolden Jr., the former NASA administrator under Barack Obama, drove from Virginia to Cape Canaveral to witness the launch. Bolden, the first African American to lead the space agency, didn’t stick around for Trump’s speech, but he caught some of it later, including the president’s call for unity. “I found it ironic that that was the president’s theme when half the problem is him,” Bolden told me on a call during his drive back home. “You can’t unify the country when the country doesn’t have a unifying leader.” In 1968, Bolden was a young graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and bound for Vietnam. He was mesmerized by the moon landing, but he didn’t think about becoming an astronaut until later; he had grown up in the segregated South, and “becoming an astronaut was not something in the list of things that a young black kid from South Carolina did.” For him, the resemblances between America in the 1960s and America today are stark. Half a century later, the American space program looks quite different. The pace of change has been slow; it took NASA two decades after Alan Shepard’s historic flight in 1961 to send the first African American astronaut, Guion Bluford, to space. But today, the astronaut corps is at least no longer made up of a bunch of white guys with military buzz cuts. Unlike the Apollo program, the Trump administration’s moon effort—named Artemis, for Apollo’s sister in Greek mythology—is struggling to get the budget it needs, and remains a long shot. NASA officials have promised a diverse crew, including the first woman to set foot on the moon. “This time when we go, we’re going with all of America,” Jim Bridenstine, the current administrator, said last year, at a ceremony to rename the street outside of NASA’s headquarters in Washington, D.C., “Hidden Figures Way,” in honor of the black women who helped send men to the moon. Naia Butler-Craig, a Ph.D. student in aerospace engineering who lives in Atlanta, wants to be part of the Artemis generation. She told me she was in tears when she watched the SpaceX rocket lift off this weekend, overcome with pride. Yet she couldn’t truly relish the moment. How could she? “Sorry, I can’t just focus on the science,” she wrote in a blog post on the day of the launch, which was widely shared among black science communicators. “If we haven’t figured out our issue of racism and colonialism and all this madness here on Earth, we’re just going to continue to corrupt the places that we go,” Butler-Craig said. “I don’t want to repeat what we’ve done here.”

#### Now is more urgent then ever – the construction of test and future launch sites require forceful displacement and are emblematic of environmental racism. Feigning ignorance is complicit with erasure of minoritarian violence

Olivia Solon from NBC reported in December that

, Dec. 8, 2021,, "Disgruntled neighbors and dwindling shorebirds jeopardize SpaceX expansion," NBC News, <https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/tech-news/disgruntled-neighbors-dwindling-shorebirds-jeopardize-spacex-expansion-rcna7792> CHO

Celia Johnson, a retired social worker in her mid-70s, can still vividly describe childhood trips to the slender, sandy beach in Boca Chica Village, Texas. There she and her family spent their days running into crashing waves and collecting shells while feasting on sandwiches and watermelon. “My dad couldn’t afford to take us to the movies,” Johnson said. “That was our entertainment.” Thirty years ago, Johnson made sure to pass that dream on to her children by buying a three-bedroom brick ranch for her to retire there. Then she bought a second ranch house nearby to rent out to support her in retirement. For years, she spent her winters in Boca Chica, mainly driving from Michigan to escape the cold and welcome the ocean air that brought relief to her asthma. “It was so peaceful, and at night it was so dark you could see a billion stars,” she said. “You are surrounded by nothing but nature. The beach was pristine and there were tons of different species of birds.” But the idyll was disrupted when SpaceX, the aerospace company, came to town in 2014 to build a commercial spaceport. The company’s presence, while welcomed by local politicians lured by the promise of taxable income and employment opportunities, has become a nightmare for many residents and wildlife conservationists attempting to protect the sensitive habitat surrounding the development. Since SpaceX started construction in late 2015 and testing rockets in 2019, explosions have showered debris across previously unspoiled tidal flats and blown out residents’ windows, including Johnson’s. Rare species of birds like the piping plover and mammals have dwindled, and intense periods of construction and testing have closed off public access to the beach for more days than were authorized by the Federal Aviation Administration, which has federal oversight of the development. The company has also installed bright floodlights to illuminate the road and construction site. “You can’t see the stars anymore,” Johnson said. Now, the FAA is reviewing SpaceX’s plans to significantly expand the spaceport to allow for launches of the largest rocket known to man, an expansion that has alarmed many residents, environmentalists and wildlife conservationists. SpaceX declined to respond to a detailed list of questions and allegations that it is lowballing homeowners and harming the environment, stating that the company did not have anyone available. “As you can imagine, it’s an incredibly demanding time for the team,” according to an unsigned email from SpaceX’s communications team. Neither Elon Musk, who founded the company and is its chief executive, nor his chief of staff responded to a request for comment. Mushroomed scope When SpaceX pitched its spaceport, dubbed Starbase, to residents and environmentalists in 2012, the company described a modest facility with a “small, eco-friendly footprint” that would launch a maximum of one rocket per month, according to a SpaceX presentation delivered at the time, seen by NBC News. Over time, however, the project has mushroomed to accommodate the development of a new type of launch vehicle, Starship, which at 21 stories tall and with 29 rocket engines will be the largest space vehicle and rocket system known to man. Early this year, Musk announced his desire to turn Starbase and Boca Chica Village into a city with a private spaceport to the moon, Mars and beyond. The accompanying expansion plan, whose environmental impact, outlined in a 150-page draft assessment, is currently being reviewed by the Federal Aviation Authority. It includes the construction of a 250-megawatt power plant -- capable of generating enough power for 100,000 homes -- desalination plant, and liquid natural gas plant. If approved, the expanded Starbase would pave the way for humans to travel to and potentially live on Mars, but would make Boca Chica Village uninhabitable for humans and many animals due to the tenfold increase in the testing of rocket components and launches, and the associated risk of “anomalies” -- a space industry euphemism for explosions. “We are interested in space exploration like many other people and are not trying to be obstructionist,” said Mike Parr, president of the American Bird Conservancy, which has been monitoring the decline of bird species around the spaceport. “But the scope of the project has changed and it feels like a bait and switch.” SpaceX has bought out many of the villagers, offering them money for their homes that the company said in letters to the owners were three times an independently appraised valuation. But some villagers have said these offers are too low to buy an equivalent property away from the blast zone. Some residents felt pressure to accept SpaceX’s offer, which came with the looming threat of eminent domain. Residents like Celia Johnson and Maria Pointer, whose home now forms part of the SpaceX property, said that threat was communicated verbally by a real estate intermediary representing SpaceX. Eminent domain allows the government -- in this case the county through the Cameron County Spaceport Development Corp. -- to seize their property. Cameron County did not respond to a request for comment. Johnson, whose silvery-gray schnauzer Flash accompanies her everywhere, held out. The offer for her home was $150,000. She said that was insultingly low, based on valuations of inferior properties without ocean views. She would need about three times that much to buy a similar oceanfront property nearby. She had dreamed of leaving the two Boca Chica homes to her sons. “That dream was destroyed by Elon Musk,” she said, noting that since SpaceX arrived, Cameron County changed its rules around how it handled residents’ utilities. Before, they could stop water deliveries and shut off electricity if they were away during the summer months. Now, however, residents must either pay to maintain utilities even if they are not there -- which Johnson said costs about $150 per month -- or risk being permanently disconnected, as happened with her rental home. Without access to water, owners lose their occupation license, which allows the county to condemn the property. “I worked double jobs and whatever was required so that one day I would have a good retirement,” she said. “Then here comes SpaceX and they take my income away.” Blame game Some of SpaceX’s displaced neighbors are more sanguine. Pointer, a retired navigation officer in the Alaska Marine Highway System, said that she and her husband, Ray, decided to make “lemonade out of lemons” after the SpaceX development subsumed their Boca Chica home. “When they first came to town I kind of welcomed it. I like technology. We loved the Apollo program, the moonwalks and felt like it was going to help Brownsville. We didn’t feel like they were going to impede on us except maybe a bit of noise,” she said. “They never mentioned they’d work 24/7 around the clock and have lights so bright you couldn’t sleep without plywood boards on your windows.” The disturbance took a toll on the Pointers, who were both suffering from serious health issues. Ray had cancer and Maria was dealing with paralysis on one side of her body due to a latent spinal deformity. Neither could sleep because of the noise and the lights. “We were walking zombies half the time,” she said. Maria started documenting the construction of the spaceport and launch vehicles outside her bedroom window, in the early days with her Samsung smartphone camera and in the last few years with a Blackmagic Pocket Cinema Camera, posting photos and videos to social media. “If I’m going to be an independent lens, I’m going to show you what I see,” she said. “If there are birds dying and they are dropping down to the side of me from overpressures, I get to film it. I don’t get to fix it.” Economic incentives When SpaceX was first shopping around for locations for its private commercial spaceport in 2011, it negotiated tax breaks and other sweeteners with local and state officials in Florida, Georgia, Puerto Rico and Texas. By 2014, Texas won the company’s business and associated promise of jobs and economic development. State and local officials offered Musk’s company about $20 million in financial incentives, including a 10-year county property tax abatement, legal protection from noise complaints and laws altered to close the public beach at Boca Chica during launches, as reported by The Dallas Morning News in 2014. While the project has brought construction jobs to the Brownsville area, one of the poorest urban areas in the United States, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, many community activists question whether it’s bringing sustainable economic development. “How many of these jobs are long term? Most of the folks are doing contracting work,” said Michelle Serrano, a Brownsville resident and activist. “Is this going to have a sustainable economic impact for our community, or is it more trickle-down economics?” In a document outlining SpaceX’s environmental and community impacts on the region, submitted to the FAA this year as part of the licensing process, the company states that the proposed development would employ up to 450 full-time workers, many of whom would move to the area from elsewhere, depending on when the expansion is approved. More than a quarter of those in Cameron County, where the spaceport is, live below the poverty threshold, which is more than twice the national average, according to Census Bureau data. The document suggests that the main benefit to the community will come from trickle-down effects from SpaceX workers spending part of their earnings on housing, goods and services in the area. Transient SpaceX workers would also spend money on hotels, food and rental vehicles. “While the population under the poverty threshold may not directly benefit through employment and income, it may indirectly benefit as regional economic health is improved through the proposed increase in employment for commercial space exploration activity,” it states. “Even if it does result in some local hires, it doesn’t undo the destruction in the community,” said Bekah Hinojosa, another community activist, pointing to the regular closures of the “poor people’s beach” and the displacement of those living in Boca Chica Village. Hinojosa pointed to comments made by Musk in 2018, during a news conference after the launch of SpaceX’s reusable Falcon Heavy vehicle. The billionaire was asked by a reporter how soon flights would be going to the moon or Mars. Musk said that test flights would need to take place first, most likely in Boca Chica, “because we’ve got a load of land with nobody around and so if it blows up, it’s cool,” he said. The comments grated on some of Boca Chica’s residents, who have dealt with shattered windows and debris strewn across the beach and wildlife refuges after these explosions. Hinojosa went further, characterizing Musk’s position as “environmental racism.” Musk has an estimated personal wealth of about $310 billion and is the world’s richest man, according to Bloomberg. “We’re a poor community and a people of color community,” she said, “But he’s trying to erase us and claim that we’re not there.” Environmental impact Musk’s comments also irked conservationists tasked with protecting the wildlife in the surrounding area, one of America’s most biologically diverse coastal wetlands. “Musk is a very smart man. But he either was ignorant of the ecology out there or he felt his project was so much more important that it really didn’t matter what he did to the area,” said local environmentalist Jim Chapman. Chapman said he is alarmed to see rocket tests and launches taking place in such a “fragile and biologically important area,” adding that while tidal flats “are not very exciting to look at to the casual observer,” there’s a “whole web of life out there,” from algae to tiny crustaceans, that a food chain of birds and animals rely upon. “This is a very important area for migratory birds as it’s a huge stopover area,” said Jared Margolis, a senior attorney at the Center for Biological Diversity, who submitted comments to the FAA questioning the legality of the SpaceX expansion. “Even a power plant would be concerning. But here you have giant rockets powered by methane that tend to explode, causing debris and noise impact, and we want to make sure the impacts are mitigated.” While the SpaceX launch site is relatively small, covering about 75 acres, it’s sandwiched between delicate, protected tidal flats, wetlands and a much-loved public beach. Not only does the area provide a habitat for migratory birds, including endangered species such as piping plovers and red knots, it’s also one of the only places where the Kemp’s ridley sea turtle, the most critically endangered sea turtle in the world, comes ashore to nest. Amid the constant construction noise, truck traffic, enormous floodlights over the site and debris from explosions, some species have already dwindled at an alarming rate, said David Newstead, director of the Coastal Bird Program for the Coastal Bend Bays & Estuaries Program, a nonprofit group that works to protect the area's bays and estuaries. Newstead conducted a study of the local population of piping plovers, sparrow-sized shorebirds that nest and feed in coastal sand and are protected under the Endangered Species Act. He found that the population halved from 2018 to 2021, correlating closely with the intensity of SpaceX operations in the area. In addition to the piping plover, the FAA has identified at least nine other endangered species that would be adversely affected by the SpaceX expansion, including the red knot shorebird, northern aplomado falcon, Gulf Coast jaguarundi (a rare wildcat), ocelot and five types of sea turtle. There are also plenty of unknown impacts to small mammals, reptiles and the marine worms the shorebirds forage from the sediment because of the reverberations through the land from launches and construction activity, Newstead added. When one of the Starship prototypes exploded above the launchpad in March, it threw rocket debris five miles away, to the jetties at the southern tip of South Padre Island, as documented by local news media at the time. That prototype had just three Raptor engines. The Starship that SpaceX hopes to get approval to launch from Boca Chica will have at least 29 of them. Starship prototypes near Boca Chica Village , Texas, on Sunday. Verónica G. Cárdenas for NBC News “Nobody has ever put a wildlife preserve in this type of habitat through this type of experiment,” he said. Mitigation efforts Reagan Faught, the regional director of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, whose land is adjacent to the SpaceX development, said that his agency has worked closely with SpaceX to improve scheduling and communication around the closing of the state highway and access to the public beach. In September, the agency signed a memorandum of agreement with SpaceX committing to develop protocols to respond to events such as rocket “anomalies," including outlining efforts to retrieve debris and restore the sensitive public lands. “We want a good neighborly relation with them, and they want to do the same with us so we can work together with sensible and reasonable approaches to solving these issues,” Faught said, although he noted that the respective missions of the organizations “may not always align.” Several environmental groups who submitted public comments to the FAA in response to SpaceX’s expansion plans argue that the agency would be violating several laws if it fails to require a more thorough analysis of the company’s environmental impacts in Boca Chica, through a rigorous environmental impact statement, and a clearer plan for mitigating those impacts. Those laws include the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), which requires that federal agencies prepare an environmental impact statement for all “major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment,” and the Endangered Species Act. The FAA has until the end of December to review the public comments and determine whether to approve SpaceX to issue a “Finding of No Significant Impact” (FONSI) or a Notice of Intent to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. A FONSI would allow the launch licensing process to proceed, meaning SpaceX could start testing its giant rockets in early 2022, as long as a review by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, also due by the end of December, shows that the project won’t put any endangered species in jeopardy of extinction. But if a full environmental impact statement is needed, launches from Boca Chica could be delayed for years. If the FAA does issue a FONSI, environmental groups could sue the agency. But SpaceX would still be able to proceed with the expansion unless an injunction were obtained. In a public comment written to the FAA on behalf of the Center for Biological Diversity, Jared Margolis described the FAA’s decision not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the SpaceX expansion as “arbitrary, capricious and in clear violation of NEPA.” He added that it “calls into question whether the agency truly understands the scope of what SpaceX plans to do at the Boca Chica site, and the incredible environmental harm that is likely to occur, and indeed has already occurred.” A beach in Boca Chica Village, Texas. Verónica G. Cárdenas / Bloomberg via Getty Images file Another public comment, submitted by a group of 11 environmental nonprofits including the Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife and the Surfrider Foundation, and obtained by NBC News includes a letter sent from the Fish and Wildlife Service, obtained through an earlier public records request by Margolis, that calls on the FAA to carry out another environmental impact statement. “Due to operations by SpaceX, the Fish and Wildlife Service’s ability to maintain the biological integrity, diversity and environmental health of refuge resources ... has been significantly diminished at the Boca Chica tract,” the letter states. FAA spokesperson Steven Kulm said the agency was “committed to complying with the requirements” of NEPA and that the environmental review is “one aspect of this process.” He noted that the FAA had previously warned SpaceX that launch towers and structures that it is building cannot skirt the FAA’s environmental review. Laury Marshall, a spokeswoman for U.S. Fish and Wildlife, said that the agency continues to work with the FAA and SpaceX to “identify ways to further minimize possible effects to listed species from spaceport operations” by “restricting or changing lighting, noise and activity timing.” Residents like Celia Johnson are resigned to their fate that sooner or later they will have to move to make way for Elon Musk’s interplanetary ambitions. They can refuse to take SpaceX’s buyouts and drag out the eminent domain process, something legal experts like Clay Beard, an attorney at the Texas law firm Dawson & Sodd, who is familiar with the project but not representing any residents, said might yield them more compensation but won’t prevent the condemnation of their properties. Eventually, however, they’ll have no choice but to leave. “The only thing I hope for is that Elon will come around and make us a decent offer for the house,” Johnson said. “I don’t need anything bigger, I don’t expect to be a millionaire. I just want to buy another house like the one I have now near the beach.”

#### First, the appropriation of space by private entities is an insidious expansion in which corporatism and militarization are hidden under the thin guise of manifest destiny

Samuel Stockwell, a Research Manager at Brown University, writes in 2020 that [Samuel Stockwell (Research Project Manager, the Annenberg Institute at Brown University). “Legal ‘Black Holes’ in Outer Space: The Regulation of Private Space Companies”. E-International Relations. Jul 20 2020. Accessed 12/7/21. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/07/20/legal-black-holes-in-outer-space-the-regulation-of-private-space-companies/> //Xu]

The US government’s support for private space companies is also likely to lead to the reinforcement of Earth-bound wealth inequalities in space. Many NewSpace actors frame their long-term ambitions in space with strong anthropogenic undertones, by offering the salvation of the human race from impending extinction through off-world colonial developments (Kearnes & Dooren: 2017: 182). Yet, this type of discourse disguises the highly exclusive nature of these missions. Whilst they seem to suggest that there is a stake for ordinary citizens in the vast space frontier, the reality is that these self-described space pioneers are a member of a narrow ‘cosmic elite’ – “founders of Amazon.com, Microsoft, Pay Pal… and a smattering of games designers and hotel magnates” (Parker, 2009: 91). Indeed, private space enterprises have themselves suggested that they have no obligation to share mineral resources extracted in space with the global community (Klinger, 2017: 208). This is reflected in the speeches of individuals such as Nathan Ingraham, a senior editor at the tech site EngadAsteroid mining, who claimed that asteroid mining was “how [America is] going to move into space and develop the next Vegas Strip” (Shaer, 2016: 50). Such comments highlight a form of what Beery (2016) defines as ‘scalar politics’. In similar ways to the ‘scaling’ of unequal international relations that has constituted our relationship with outer space under the guise of the ‘global commons’ (Beery, 2016: 99), private companies – through their anthropogenic discourse – are scaling existing Earth-bound wealth inequalities and social relations into space by siphoning off extra-terrestrial resources. By constructing their endeavours in ways that appeal to the common good, NewSpace actors are therefore concealing the reality of how commercial resource extraction serves the exclusive interests of their private shareholders at the expense of the vast majority of the global population.

#### Second, the frontier “pioneers” and “private entities” are offered only to a select elite that ignores everyday people by positing an unapologetic “finders keepers” system.

Matthew Kearnes, the Director of the Sydney Environment Institute, reporst in 2017 that [Matthew Kearnes (Associate Professor, School of Humanities & Languages, University of New South Wales) and Thom van Dooren (Deputy Director at the Sydney Environment Institute and an Associate Professor in the Department of Gender and Cultural Studies at the University of Sydney). “Rethinking the Final Frontier: Cosmo-Logics and an Ethic of Interstellar Flourishing”. Geohumanities. Vol 3. Pages 178-197. 18 Apr 2017. Accessed 1/2/22. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/2373566X.2017.1300448> //Xu]

We discuss the frontier in greater detail in the final section of this article. For now, however, we note that this framing raises a broad range of problems, some of which have been explored by others (Billings 1997; Newell 2014). Centrally important here are the ways in which frontier rhetoric naturalizes expansion, downplaying the significance of what existed prior to the arrival of the brave explorers and settlers, where every movement is conceived as a movement into “unoccupied” space. In addition, the frontier also refigures the homeland in important ways: The promise of new resources and territories beyond the frontier—especially in the context of an opening rendered necessary by the virtual exhaustion of previous lands—can function to undermine the perceived value of home (Plumwood 1993). There is a strange kind of empty-fullness to the frontier, a site simultaneously devoid and full of possibilities. The lands beyond the frontier could well have immense value—from the Californian gold fields to the potential mineral value of asteroids—but in this frontier logic the only values that register are those of the (dominant) colonizing force. Other modes of valuation are quickly swept aside, from those of local sentient beings, to minority opinions among the colonizing culture itself (which might, for example, advocate the value of leaving these places to their own devices). At the same time, although the frontier is often presented as the definitive site of colonial power and expansionist impulse, it is worth recalling that in practice European empires and colonial enterprises were often characterized by heterogeneous forms of political rule and chaotic engagements with indigenous peoples and environments. For example, countering its image as “vast and apparently despotic,” MacKenzie (1997) argued that the British Empire was “in reality a ramshackle conglomerate, very far from the allseeing, allpowerful monolith” (222). In this sense, frontier logics tended to paper over the heterogeneous and contingent attempts to impose colonial rule. Alongside the projection of amorphous space, again and again in these off-Earth discussions, the human figure takes a homogenous form: what Cosgrove (2001) termed “the rhetoric of universal brotherhood in a shrinking world” (272). Continuing the tradition cemented by the popular reception of the first photos of Earth from outer space, this tendency evokes the notions of a shared fate of a global humanity, that seemed to arise—almost naturally—from the “above ground” perspective beamed back to Earth by interstellar travelers (Jasanoff 2001). This amorphous humanity is positioned in very different ways in these discussions: in some cases the destroyer of extraterrestrial life, in other cases liberated from the constraints of a finite planet, free to expand the human project out into the stars. In the vision of Deep Space Industries (DSI Media 2016)—as conveyed in a short promotional video—the future is one in which we are able to “create a better future for all of us through space resources.” This talk of “humanity” or “all of us” must raise questions about who will actually benefit from extraterrestrial expansion. Recent science fiction explorations of this theme—like Kim Stanley Robinson’s (2012) 2312 and Neill Blomkamp’s (2013) Elysium—offer dystopic, yet strangely familiar, visions of a future in which the Earth-bound live on as poor neighbors to those with new forms of, very literal, upward mobility. Some recent scholarly discussions have taken these distributional issues seriously, benefiting from the introduction of perspectives from environmental justice, feminist philosophy, and political ecology (Billings 2006; French 2013; Schwartz and Milligan 2017; Mitchell 2017). In contrast to the dominant threads of ethical scholarship on space from the 1980s and 1990s—which focused on the relationship between, on the one hand, an amorphous “humanity,” and on the other, off-Earth organisms or landscapes (Baird Callicott 1986; Rolston 1986; K. Lee 1994; Lupisella and Logsdon 1997; Marshall 1997; Sparrow 1999)—these more recent discussions have served to open up questions of justice and the oppression of certain human groups in relation to, for example, the potential terraforming of Mars (French 2013). This attention to questions of justice within the scholarly literature picks up on a longer history within legal and political scholarship, as well as international discussions and agreements at the United Nations and elsewhere that have explored who is being left out of the “space race” (Billings 2006), including equity and benefit sharing among nations, the ownership of off-Earth territory and resources (United Nations 1996; Cooper 2003; Tronchetti 2014) and geostationary orbit allocations for satellites (Rathman 1999). Much of this work has pointed to the fact that it is probable that the future outcomes of the space age—from resource extraction to new scientific discoveries and burgeoning markets in space tourism—will be unequally distributed.5 For the most part, however, discussions of off-Earth mining and space colonization gloss over or completely ignore these issues in their celebration of human expansion and its projected benefits. More than simply ignoring human diversity and inequity, these discussions are grounded on, and in fact leverage, a very particular figure of the universal human, that of an inherently rapacious species engaged in unavoidable expansion.6 From this perspective, space exploration is able to be presented as “a natural extension of [hu]mankind’s desire to explore our own planet” (Williamson 2003, 47, italics added), while “the exploitation of mineral resources from celestial bodies” is “the logical progression of human development” (R. J. Lee 2012, 1, italics added). At the same time, the commercial “development of the space environment—for industry, commerce and tourism” is presented as “a natural extension of our current business and domestic agenda” (Williamson 2003, 47, italics added). A prominent Web site on off-Earth mining confidently announces that “as history has repeatedly shown, where there are valuable minerals to be unearthed, adventurous humans will arrive in droves—even if it means battling extreme conditions and risking life and limb” (Australian Centre for Space Engineering Research 2016). On its Space Settlements Web site, NASA develops the trope that humans are naturally expansive even further: “Why build space settlements? Why do weeds grow through cracks in sidewalks? Why did life crawl out of the oceans and colonize land? Because living things want to grow and expand. We have the ability to live in space … therefore we will” (cited in Mitchell 2017). So it is the notion of the frontier—fecund with images of space as devoid both of humans and recognizable signs of cultivation (both material and cultural), but rich in potential resources— that operates as the screen on which the figure of collective humanity is projected. This framing is found even within much of the literature focused on the ethics of space mining and colonization. Here, however, it is the crossing of this frontier—the threshold between a familiar earthly home and a foreign and exotic other—that precipitates the need for ethics. For scholars writing in the long shadow of the colonial experience—both historic and continuing—the echoes between the notion of a stellar frontier and the projection of a space ripe for ethical and material cultivation should be enough to give us significant pause for thought. We need only recall the consequences for both indigenous communities and colonial landscapes that projections of empty space (literally terra nullius) have had—but also the role of particular modes of ethical and moral philosophy in perpetuating and even enabling this violence (Arneil 1996) 7 —to want to insist on a different starting point.

#### Third, private companies utilize outer space as the foundation for a new era of logistical surveillance that manipulate control systems to police minorities and demonize outsiders

Stockwell continues that [Brackets Original. Samuel Stockwell (Research Project Manager, the Annenberg Institute at Brown University). “Legal ‘Black Holes’ in Outer Space: The Regulation of Private Space Companies”. E-International Relations. Jul 20 2020. Accessed 12/7/21. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/07/20/legal-black-holes-in-outer-space-the-regulation-of-private-space-companies/> //Xu]

Private Space Corporations and Orbital Surveillance: Dual-Use Satellite Technology Starting in 2013, the leaking of classified information by former US National Security Agency employee Edward Snowden revealed the extent to which American intelligence agencies were collaborating with the private sector in mass surveillance operations (Bauman et al., 2014). In what has been described as the ‘securitisation’ of society, contemporary states have shifted from “politics to policing and from governing to managing” the public, which has often occurred without the consent or knowledge of their citizens (Petit, 2020: 31). While such practices have conventionally been Earth-bound in nature, the space domain provides an entirely radical and strategically beneficial perspective for conducting surveillance through satellites. Although many commercial US satellites provide an array of environmental and internet capabilities on Earth, they are also absolutely essential from a national security perspective of maintaining US space superiority (Chatters IV & Crothers, 2009: 257). This is known as the “dual-use” nature of satellites, where civilian and military purposes are blurred into a single observational system and can be adapted for different functions when necessary (Lubojemski, 2019: 128-129). Dual-use satellite technology has been vital for the US military in offering a tactical edge on the battlefield, with 80% of its satellite communications needs being derived from commercial satellites (Hampson, 2017: 7). The reliance on these networks forms a component of the broader US military doctrine of ‘space control’, part of which aims to secure the transmission of commercial satellite data that will prevent the exposure of sensitive military tactics (Peña & Hudgins, 2002). Whilst the OST does not contain any clauses specifying the rules or regulations of data monitoring in space, any form of malicious or illegal surveillance can be seen to violate Article XI, which requires states to: “Inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations as well as to the public and international scientific community, to the greatest extent feasible and practical, of the nature, conduct, locations and results of [space] activities” (UN, 1967). Yet, legal scholars have claimed that this clause is significantly weak, since states can withhold vital information about their space activities on the basis that the dissemination of such information is neither ‘feasible’ nor ‘practical’ (Chatterjee, 2014: 31-32). The absence of any clear UN guidelines has also meant that American satellite corporations are increasingly capable of refusing to state their intentions, or who their customers are – with the US government being one of these elusive clients. The 1994 Presidential Decision Decree-23 authorised the US government to require firms to either limit or stop sales of certain satellite images through a process known as ‘shutter control’. It is controversial because it designates the US executive branch the ability to limit publicly accessible information in certain circumstances, possibly violating First Amendment rights (Livingston & Robinson, 2003: 12). During the 2001 War in Afghanistan, the US government bought the rights to all orbital images taken over the theatre of operations by GeoEye’s Ikonos satellite on the grounds of ‘national security’ (The Guardian, 2001). However, media groups accused the government deal of preventing them from informing the public about matters of critical importance that in no way implicated national security, including the independent verification of government claims concerning damage to civilian structures and possible casualties (Livingston & Robinson, 2003: 12). These measures therefore undermined the OST’s Article XI clause by concealing important information to the public when it was feasibly possible, through the guise of national security discourse. At the same time, it allowed the US government to manipulate media coverage of areas it deems to be essential for conditioning public war support in Afghanistan, whilst simultaneously strengthening its space control doctrine. In many ways this strategy can also be seen as facilitating a ‘global panoptical’ intelligence network (Backer, 2008). By extending the private-public hybrid structure of surveillance into outer space, businesses and governments have the opportunity to observe millions of global citizens unknowingly at any one point – and with it – immense amounts of data. Given that GeoEye received nearly two million dollars in contract-related fees from the US government for its Ikonos pictures (The New York Times, 2001), this could incentivise the commercial satellite industry to continue to restrict data that might serve the interests of citizens globally. As such, satellite imaging may turn into a form of orbital data-siphoning where companies conducting observations in space could sell off their data to the highest bidder, with a concerning disregard for privacy rights. Indeed, the revelations surrounding Cambridge Analytica and Facebook have underscored the extent to which private entities are monetising off the sensitive information of their consumers unknowingly (Balkin, 2018: 2050-2051).

### FW

**My value is justice as the word unjust in the resolution denotes a referendum on whether appropriation is just or unjust. Unjust means** unjust adjective US /ʌnˈdʒʌst/ not morally right; not fair: New laws will protect employees against unjust dismissals. (Definition of unjust from the Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary © Cambridge University Press)

**That’s from Cambridge Dictionary** [“Meaning of unjust in English” Cambridge Dictionary, [https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust]](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust%5d)

#### The criterion is minimizing structural violence, defined as alleviating the material conditions that cause oppression for marginalized groups.

#### First, racism is inexcusable and inextricable to any theory of justice.

Albert Memmi, Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ U of Paris, Naiteire, Racism, Translated by Steve Martinot, p. 163-165 2000

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved. Yet, for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism; one must not even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people, which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. it is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which man is not himself an outsider relative to someone else?. Racism illustrates, in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated that is, it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animosity to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one’s moral conduit only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order, for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism, because racism signifies the exclusion of the other, and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view, if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is ‘the truly capital sin. It is not an accident that almost all of humanity’s spiritual traditions counsels respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. Bur no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. “Recall.” says the Bible, “that you were once a stranger in Egypt,” which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming one again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal—indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice, a just society must be a society accepted by all. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

#### Second, systems of structural inequality excludes marginalized groups from having their voice heard and thus, should be starting point for evaluating the resolution. As Deborah Winter, a professor in Psychology at Whitman University, writes,

Winter, D. D., and Dana C. Leighton." Structural violence." Peace, conflict and violence: Peace psychology for the 21st century.” Ohio State University. 2001. Accessed 8/29/19. <http://sites.saumag.edu/danaleighton/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2015/09/SVintro-2.pdf//> KOHS-AG]

Finally, **to recognize** the operation of **structural violence forces us to ask** questions about how and **why we tolerate it**, questions **which often have painful answers for the privileged elite** who unconsciously support it. A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opotow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her article Social Injustice. She argues that our normal **perceptual** cognitive **processes divide people into in-**groups **and out-groups. Those outside** our group **lie outside our scope of justice. 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. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so we draw conceptual lines between those who are in and out of our moral circle. **Those who fall outside are morally excluded, and become either invisible, or demeaned** in some way so that **we do not** have to **acknowledge the injustice they suffer**. Moral exclusion is a human failing, but Opotow argues convincingly that it is an outcome of everyday social cognition. To reduce its nefarious effects, we must be vigilant in noticing and listening to oppressed, invisible, outsiders. Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity. Like Opotow, all the authors in this section point out **that structural violence is not inevitable if we become aware of its operation, and build systematic ways to mitigate its effects.** Learning about structural violence may be discouraging, overwhelming, or maddening, but these papers encourage us to step beyond guilt and anger, and begin to think about how to reduce structural violence. All the authors in this section note that **the same structures** (such as global communication and normal social cognition) **which feed** structural **violence, can also** be used to **empower citizens** to reduce it. In the long run, reducing structural violence by reclaiming neighborhoods, demanding social justice and living wages, providing prenatal care, alleviating sexism, and celebrating local cultures, will be our most surefooted path to building lasting peace.

#### Third, Debate is a valuable site of portable skills and education. Henry Giroux, a professor in education at Boston University, argues that we need to center social change since how we learn here affects how we act out-there.

Giroux, Henry A. America on the edge: Henry Giroux on politics, culture, and education. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

The National Association of Urban Debate Leagues (UDLs) represents a promising, innovative effort to reinforce[s] substantive democratic education and tradition by fostering rigorous and passionate discussions about social change and how it is to be achieved. The Urban Debate League [They] approaches matters of school equity, reform, and agency through the use of academic debate as a way to help urban public school students learn the skills, disciplines, knowledge, and values that enable them to become critically literate and effectively engaged[.] citizens. It organizes debate teams in urban public schools, holds competitions among schools all over the country, and supports the ongoing education of urban school teachers helping them to recognize the political, pedagogical, and civic value of debate leagues while actively learning how to organize and engage students in such debates. What is so important about the UDL program is that it is not merely interested in teaching debating skills to students— though learning how to do library research, electronic retrieval, critical analysis, and policy evaluation is not inconsequential, it is simply not enough. Instead, **debating is** viewed as **a form of critical literacy that empowers students**, especially underrepresented races, ethnicities, and females, not only with high-powered academic skills but also with the essential critical knowledge and beliefs necessary to convince them that they can become both **effective advocates** for democracy *and* leaders in a world that they must learn how to influence and govern. Operating with the assumption that to be voiceless is to be powerless, the UDL organizes high school debates around the understanding that to have a voice students must learn from and construct pedagogical practices that make knowledge meaningful in order to be **critical and** critical in order to be **transformative.** And the space of the debate provides exactly the public sphere where students learn how to invest in ideas, engage in dialogue with others, respect the positions of those different from their own, and do so in the spirit of contributing to both a wider public discourse and a more vibrant public life. The UDL believes that excellence cannot be abstracted from equity, and that historically academic debate was largely the province of white, privileged youth from affluent suburban and private schools. The interscholastic debate experience provided these students with important communicative skills, modes of literacy, research opportunities, and the ability to travel and meet students from similar privileged backgrounds. Needless to say, such students enjoyed all the privileges debate leagues afforded them, but the benefits were exclusively class-based, and the very notion of the debate as a performative event was viewed as limited to the ranks of the elite. The UDL has attempted to change[s] the class dynamics of the sphere of high school debating by purposely enlisting working-class youth, minorities of color, and young women into debating leagues in order not only to raise their possibilities for going on to higher education, but also to connect them to those discourses that are crucial to engaged forms of citizenship, public policy, democratic values, and what it might mean to imagine a future that does not merely imitate the present. The UDL believes that matters of literacy, critical understanding, and intervention in the world are linked to matters of advocacy, which presupposes that notions of critical consciousness and learning are inextricably connected to social change. I believe in Urban Debate Leagues because their organizers and participants believe it is not only possible to think against the grain, but crucial to act in ways that demonstrate political conviction, civic courage, and collective responsibility.

#### Fourth, Existential risk scenarios are used to allow structural violence to continue—they are an abstraction

Omalade ‘84

Barbara. "Hearts of darkness." *Words of fire: An anthology of African-American feminist thought* (1995): 362-378. [Barbera, works with the City College Center **for Worker Education in New YorK** City, has been a historian of black women for the past twenty years and an organizer in both the women's and civil rights/black power movements] PESH AK

As women of color, who are warriors in continual struggle to reclaim our lands and liberate our peoples, resistance to war has been our heritage. Women of color are the survivors of the holocausts visited upon our people through the centuries. Five hundred years ago a group of light-skinned men left their European homelands as they had for centuries before. This time, however, they left to conquer the land, the resources, and the other people of the world. They described the people of the world as "colored," and defined themselves as "white." They defined "whiteness" of as pure, superior, right. They defined the "blackness" those they conquered as evil, dirty, and inferior. Their journeys changed the world from a diverse, autonomous group of tribes, villages, nation states, feudal empires- with varying world views and practices. we Even if we agree that all of these societies were patriarchal, must also admit that the forms of patriarchy varied widely, from the almost non-existent variety among the Arawaks to the highly structured Japanese culture. Overall, the world was not at war with itself, though territorial disputes and religious crusades continued to take place. People in areas outside of those involved in disputes could live largely unaffected by and in ignorance of these events. My Indian and African ancestors were generally at peace 500 years ago. The white men who came to conquer them were not. These white men were able to conquer not because they were superior or more intelligent or more civilized, but because they were armed and prepared for war. Indeed, the movement of these white men changed world history because the primary lines that divided the world henceforth became racism and the biological distinctions terrorism became the method of world domi of skin color. Military nation; capitalism, the method of social organization; and racism became the ideology and world view that held together a cohesive system of exploitation and oppression for the world's people and their lands. Terrorism can be drawn from the A direct¶ Historical line of military guns used during the slave trade against Africans and American Indians to the building of nuclear arsenals by the world's current superpowers. During the nineteenth century, the repeating Winchester rifle precipitated a holocaust against the Sioux and the Comanches, which massacred their people, destroyed the buffalo which had sustained them, and destroyed the land as they knew, protected, and cared for it. It was, in that sense, neither an accident of history, nor a surprise, when similar white men dropped atomic bombs on the Japanese citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Terror has also been used to destroy resistance to racism, Military for capitalism, and militarism, the fear of violent reprisals has taught people to feel powerless to attempt to change the world. Too often the statistics and other information on nuclear arsenals have merely reinforced the military's power to terrorize people into submission or into "doomsday" protests against death. The question of nuclear disarmament is not a psychological question or a technological question, but rather a political question. Nuclear arsenals and nuclear power are part of a rational and holistic system in which those in power hold power over all aspects of world society. It is irrelevant whether they are called "mad" or "sane" by protestor sand critics of the system. The fact remains that they are men, initiating and carrying out the dictates of a rational system of military terror. Calling them "mad," or considering them military "male chauvinists," assures only that the rational system they are part of will remain obscure, and that the responsibility of each man in the Pentagon will never be understood clearly enough to wage an effective political struggle against it. Nuclear disarmament and peace are political questions requiring political solutions of accountability and struggle around who has the power to determine the destiny of the earth. The demand for unconditional U.S. disarmament holds that the U.S. government is responsible for its actions and should be held accountable for them. To raise these issues effectively, the movement for nuclear disarmament must overcome its reluctance to speak in terms of power, of institutional racism, and imperialist military terror. The issues of nuclear disarmament and peace have been mystified because they have been placed within a doomsday frame which separates these issues from other ones, saying, "How can we talk about struggles against racism, poverty, and exploitation when there will be no world after they drop the bombs?" The struggle for peace cannot be separated from, nor considered more sacrosanct than, other struggles concerned with human life and change. In April, 1979, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency released a report on the effects of nuclear war that concludes that, in a general nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union, 25 to 100 million people would be killed. This is approximately the same number of African people who died between 1492 and 1890 as a result of the African slave trade to the New World. The same federal report also comments on the destruction of urban housing that would cause massive shortages after a nuclear war, as well as on the crops that would be lost, causing massive food shortages. Of course, for people of color the world over, starvation is already a common problem, when, for example, a nation's crops are grown for export rather than to feed its own people. And the housing of people of color throughout the world's urban areas is already blighted and inhumane: families live in shacks, shanty towns, or on the streets; even in the urban are as of North America, the poor may live without heat or running water. For people of color, the world as we knew it ended centuries ago. Our world, with its own languages, customs and ways, ended. And we are only now beginning to see with increasing clarity that our task is to reclaim that world, struggle for it, and rebuld it in our, own image. The "death culture" we live in has convinced many to be more concerned with death than with life, more willing to demonstrate for "survival any cost" than to struggle for liberty and peace with dignity. Nuclear disarmament becomes a safe issue when it is not linked to the daily and historic issues of racism, to the ways in which people of color continue to be murdered. Acts of war, nuclear holocausts, and genocide have already been declared on our jobs, our housing, our schools, our families, and our lands. As women of color, we are warriors, not pacifists. We must fight as a people on all fronts, or we will continue to die as a people. We have fought in people's wars in China, in Cuba, in Guinea Bissau, and in such struggles as the civil rights movement, the women's movement, and in countless daily encounters with landlords, welfare departments, and schools. These struggles are not but abstractions, the only means by which we have gained the ability to eat and to provide for the future of our people. We wonder who will lead the battle for nuclear disarmament with the vigor and clarity that women of color have learned from participating in other struggles. Who will make the political links among racism, sexism, imperialism, cultural integrity, and housing? Who will stand up

### The closer

#### In lieu of my opponents inevitable corporate apologism, I will just say this: in this debate, you should refuse to listen to corporate lies. PR campaigns only work if you believe them but if history is any indication then private entities will never keep their promise if it threatens their financial dominance.

#### when the Thirty Meter Telescope at Maunakea was proposed, private companies promised…[5]

[5] [Kailee Yoshimura (undergraduate student at the University of Hawaiʻi at Hilo, where she studies Cell, Molecular, and Biomedical Sciences with a Chemistry minor. She works as a research assistant in Dr. Abhijit A. Date’s lab at the College of Pharmacy at the University of Hawaiʻi at Hilo, where she maintains a cancer cell lab. Kailee is also a remote research intern in Dr. Antentor Hinton’s lab at Vanderbilt University and a summer AMGEN fellow at Stanford University School of Medicine). “Astronomers want the Thirty Meter Telescope on a sacred Hawaiian summit. But who is it for?”. Massive Science. June 20, 2021. Accessed 1/3/22. <https://massivesci.com/articles/opinion-hawaii-telescope-tmt-imperialism-astronomy/> //Xu]

The location and conditions of Maunakea are significant to astronomers thanks to its high elevation, dry weather, and the greatest number of cloud-free nights of any mountain in the world. Being in the middle of the Pacific Ocean, its location gives astronomers the ability to see both the northern and southern sky. A proposed telescope, the Thirty Meter Telescope (TMT), will be 34,000 square feet and sit 18 stories tall and produce images 12 times sharper than the Hubble Space Telescope. An international non-profit partnership, called TMT International Observatory, or TIO, is in charge of the telescopes design, construction, and operations. The TIO partnership consists of universities from Canada, China, Japan, India, and the US planning to explore the beginning of our universe, the physics of the early universe, and dark matter with this telescope. TMT will create additional jobs and revenue for the University of Hawaiʻi, but is this enough to overlook the religious, cultural, and environmental importance of Maunakea? American presence within the Hawaiian Islands, for the past century to the present day, suppresses the Native Hawaiian culture and population through imperialistic expansion, creating anger and distrust of some Western practices, including science. Hawaiʻi, as a whole, can provide a plethora of answers to the growing curiosity about the world, but only if the people and culture are understood and respected. The violence of the colonists who viewed Hawaiʻi as an opportunity to exploit, profit, and conquer echoes within the islands today. The Kingdom of Hawaiʻi was a sovereign nation recognized by European powers and the United States. In 1893, the Kingdom had over 90 embassies and consulates throughout the world. The Kānaka Maoli, the Hawaiian people, were educated through the oldest public school system west of the Mississippi, founded by the sovereign monarch, King Kamehameha III. As the population and profits from the sugar industry grew in the Hawaiian Kingdom, greed and imperviousness quickly transformed into treason. In 1893, a coup d’etat, supported by the United States, was organized by 13 foreign businessmen calling themselves the “Committee of Safety.” The Committee of Safety forced Queen Liliuʻokalani, the last reigning monarch of Hawaiʻi, to abdicate. To avoid bloodshed and with the promise of releasing imprisoned citizens, Liliuʻokalani signed the abdication papers, abolishing the Kingdom. Following that, the people of the Hawaiian Kingdom were forced to abandon their native tongue and culture and learn the English language and American ideologies. It wasn’t until the 1960s that a resurgence of the Hawaiian language and culture revived what had been suppressed for nearly 70 years; the language, traditions, and the stolen Kingdom of the Kānaka Maoli will never be forgotten. Astronomy is an integral part of wayfinding throughout the Pacific and is used in various everyday Hawaiian practices, such as the Hawaiian calendar, plant cultivation, and fish spawning. It is important to know that Kānaka Maoli worked in harmony with the environment without the notion of ownership or superiority. This concept is expressed in the Hawaiian proverb, “He aliʻi ka ʻāina; he kauwā ke kanaka” (“The land is chief; man is its servant”). Owning land is a Western idea, one that has no equivalent in the Hawaiian culture. From the first arrival of Westerners to the Hawaiian Kingdom until today, this balance between the land and the Kānanka Maoli has been destabilized. With well over half of the total land area in the state of Hawaiʻi owned by non-natives, the Hawaiian population is forced to watch sacred lands fall into the ownership of foreigners who disregard their culture and beliefs. Maunakea is where the earth and sky meet. It is a dormant volcano, a physical place where religious and cultural practices transpire. It’s seen as an ancestor of the Hawaiian people. A kuahu lele (alter) sits at the summit, symbolizing the connection between Akua (the creator) and ancestral ties to creation. It is also the home of nā Akua (deities) and nā ʻAumakua (ancestors) and a burial ground for high-ranking Hawaiian chiefs and Kahuna (priests). This place is the pinnacle of the Hawaiians’ connection to their past, a place that is now threatened and could be harmed in the future.