# 1NC Palm Classic Octas vs. Westwood PM

## 1 – T-ISS Replacement

#### Interpretation the affirmative may not read a plan banning private entities from appropriating outer space via commercial space stations that replace the International Space Station.

#### Violation: They did.

#### Vote neg for ground – no neg ground against ban on commercial space stations replacing the ISS – all I have is ISS bad which they’ll have frontlined – generic K’s they’ll use specificity to take out and perm the alt since they only ban – no access to policy IR disads, mining das, megaconstellations, etc. Hold the line – this is the tiniest aff in history. And, pics/clash don’t apply since this shell gives reasons why this aff specifically is unfair. Also links to topic ed since we’ll just have stale debates about the iss being good which they’ll have prepped out.

#### Vote on fairness since anything else arbitrarily skews the round to the unfair debater and it frames my ability to respond to their arguments in the first place. Competing interps since reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention, and I win under reasonability if I win strong standards.

#### Drop the debater

#### A] to deter future abuse

#### B] dropping the advocacy is functionally the same

#### No RVIs A] logic – im fair vote for me makes no sense – logic comes first on all args because they need to make sense to be evaluable

#### B] rvis make affs abusive to bait theory and win on a long counterinterp

#### C] chilling effect – people won’t read theory against good theory debaters which makes infinite uncheckable abuse that outweighs

## 2 – Set Col K

#### There should be no investment in the continued settlement of America and its hegemonic project. The continual desire to expand, develop, and claim ownership of the earth is the logic of a homemaking that forces a violent demolition of previously existing social categories in the name of settler superiority.

Seawright 14 (Gardner Seawright is a graduate teaching assistant at the University of Utah, “Settler Traditions of Place: Making Explicit the Epistemological Legacy of White Supremacy and Settler Colonialism for Place-Based Education”, Educational Studies, Volume 50 ,Issue 6, 554-572)\*\*Gendered Language edited

In the early 1900s, W. E. B. Du Bois began an analysis of white supremacy that sought to unveil the linkages between racial caste, capitalism, and colonization. In a question emerging from what appears as sardonic frustration with the racial order, Du Bois (1920/2003) pondered, “But what on earth is whiteness that one should so desire it? Then always, somehow, some way, silently but clearly, I am given to understand that whiteness is the ownership of the earth forever and ever, Amen!” (56). This racially coded drive toward “ownership” is central to clarifying the conception of place within the white settler epistemology; it simultaneously speaks to the politics of capitalistic places (the drive to accumulate wealth and property), the dominant extractive ethic of place (accumulating wealth and property by extracting it, via labor, from nature and inferior beings), in addition to personal whiteness as a signifier of ownership/power. The impetus to own and exploit all natural resources—labor power and the multitude of beings flattened into the environment—is the capitalistic impulse that advanced settler colonization and has overseen the growth of white supremacy. Settler colonialism entails a violent remaking of a place—a tearing down of previously established social norms and imposing a new socially constructed reality with its own rules and regulations. Albert Memmi (1965) provides a portrait of colonial social conditioning that becomes permanently imposed within settler nation-states: A foreigner, having come to a land by the accidents of history, has succeeded not merely in creating a place for ~~himself~~[themselves] but also in taking away that of the inhabitant, granting ~~himself~~[themselves] astounding privileges to the detriment of those rightfully entitled to them. And this is not by virtue of local laws, which in a certain way legitimize this inequality by tradition, but by upsetting the established rules and substituting his own. ~~He~~ thus appears doubly unjust. ~~He~~ is a privileged being and an illegitimately privileged one; that is, a usurper. (9) Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang (2012) offer a similar sentiment. They write, “Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain” (5). Tuck and Yang’s, as well as Memmi’s, understanding of the colonial project, emphasizes homemaking as the violent imposition of new social constructs defining the ecological world—defining place—at the expense of previously dominant Indigenous worldviews

#### Every facet of IR and foreign policy is indebted to settler colonialism. Indigenous peoples are erased in IR through being cast as domestic, primitive, and landless. The aff’s foundational assumptions are complicit in the destructive of Native life and governance.

King 17

(Hayden King, Gchi'mnissing Anishinaabe writer and educator based in the Faculty of Arts at Ryerson University in Toronto., 7-31-17, The erasure of Indigenous thought in foreign policy, <https://www.opencanada.org/features/erasure-indigenous-thought-foreign-policy/>, JKS)

This type of arrangement between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadians might be conceptualized as politics, indeed effective diplomatic practice in an imperfect world. But for the scholars and practitioners in the field of foreign policy it is invisible. Likewise with the more provocative type of Indigenous diplomacy: the countless blockades to protect the land and water, land and treaty claims, the Idle No More movement, and so on. In the discipline of International Relations (IR), too, Indigenous philosophy and politics has been excused, marginalized and categorized as domestic, at best. Indeed, the centuries of colonization that have subjugated Indigenous political communities are the foundation on which contemporary thinking about ‘the global’ has revolved. In this sense, foreign policy and IR are implicated in both spawning and sustaining settler colonialism in Canada. As a result, there is a need to chart the links between these processes and consider the shape and content of long-neglected Indigenous philosophies of the international. For as long as settler colonialism defines the limits of what is possible for foreign policy, the relationship (or, the politics) between Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous will continue to be characterized by conflict. Foreign policy, but in whose national interest? For those studying and working in foreign policy, there are certainly debates over what constitutes the definition of the field. In Canada, there are debates about what counts as foreign policy (defence, security, trade, peacekeeping) and also how to approach those subjects (from liberal frameworks, realist, even some critical lenses). In his textbook on foreign policy Kim Nossal notes that the field is inherently divisive, emerging from “the interplay of conflicting interests, divergent objectives, contending perceptions, and different prescriptions about the most appropriate course of action.” Yet despite these divisive debates, there is near universal acceptance of two core assumptions: the legitimacy of the Canadian state itself as the primary actor in foreign policy and the concept of the national interest, which the field of foreign policy strives to serve. This is no surprise, really, considering these assumptions are underwritten and supported by every domestic institution — from Canada’s constitutional sources, to the cultural organizations that currently promulgate the fantasy of Canada as 150 years of glowing hearts, or decisions of the Supreme Court that reflect on the “assertion of Crown sovereignty” without ever explaining how that sovereignty was obtained. But for critical Indigenous scholars, these assumptions are myths that form not a legitimate state in the community of nations, but rather a violent settler colony. Flower break Indigenous Between 1921 and 1923, after many years of resistance to the young countries, Canada and the United States were steadily encroaching into Haudenosaunee territory and governance. Cayuga Chief Deskaheh, also known as Levi General, travelled to London, England, to appeal to King George on the matter. (He wasn’t the first or last to appeal to a King or Queen; Anishinaabe leader Shingwaukonse actively attempted to, post-War of 1812, and Chief Theresa Spence did so in 2013, among many others). But when King George refused him, Deskaheh turned to the Geneva-based League of Nations, seeking a seat for the Haudenosaunee. With his efforts undermined by English officials there too, he returned home but was stopped at the U.S.-Canada border and turned away by Canadian border guards. He spent his final days in Rochester, New York. Before his death he made one last plea to ordinary Canadians and Americans for justice: “Do you believe — really believe — that all peoples are entitled to equal protection of international law now that you are so strong? Do you believe — really believe — that treaty pledges should be kept? Think these questions over and answer them to yourselves…We have little territory left — just enough to live and die on [because] the governments of Washington and Ottawa have a silent partnership of policy. It is aimed to break up every tribe of red men so as to dominate every acre of their territory.” (His plea is documented in Rick Monture’s We Share Our Matters.) The last two sentences of this quote are an apt description of modern settler colonialism, nearly 100 years before scholars identified the process. For anthropologist Patrick Wolfe, there is a distinction between colonialism, which eventually ends when the invaders leave, and settler colonialism, where they don’t. While in the former formulation the Indigenous population is often transformed to labour for colonial extraction, in the latter, the settler colony attempts to liquidate all remnants of the previous (Indigenous) societies to legitimize its permanent presence. Deskaheh was speaking in the North American context, Wolfe in the Australian, but the phenomenon can be seen elsewhere, from Aotearoa/New Zealand to Palestine/Israel. Common strategies in this liquidation are as follows: physical extermination; oppressive Indian legislation designed to contain; the creation of reserves/reservations/settlements, residential or boarding schools; discrimination aimed specifically at women; and eventually legal absorption into state apparatuses and assimilation. While the genocidal nature of settler colonialism may not appear as physical violence today (though we do still have plenty of that), the underlying motivation to expunge threats to settler sovereignty endures. But where the specific harms of the field of foreign policy come into greater focus are in crafting a common sense around what counts as a legitimate politics of the international. Consider the core concepts of the field, or at least the discipline of IR that foregrounds foreign policy. I think its fair to say most traditional perspectives view the international system as an anarchic environment where self-interested and (mostly) rational states compete against each other for power. Or, in contrast, they may cooperate. For foundational IR scholar Hedley Bull, this simple formulation is “the supreme normative principal of the political organization of mankind.” I don’t need to elaborate on these concepts for this audience. But, what about political communities that do not resemble a state, that eschew coercive notions of exclusive sovereignty, that are bound by obligations and responsibilities to the land and thus do not recognize an anarchic world, political communities that do not start and end with men? The discipline of IR, as well as practice of foreign policy, effectively casts Indigenous peoples as primitive (or at least inferior), sanctions the theft of their lands, and then forecloses the possibility of resurgent political communities. At a fundamental level the perpetuation of this conceptual galaxy denies opportunities for Indigenous expressions of liberation — whether the case is the Six Nations of the Grand River, whose demands for a seat at the League of Nations in 1922 were rejected, or the current Canadian government demands that the articulation of international Indigenous rights not challenge territorial integrity or state sovereignty (this is true generally but seen clearly with the United Nation’s Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples). Such a denial is also expressed in the the unequivocal support of the state of Israel at the expense of Palestinian existence, or the collaboration with a Honduran government that suppresses Indigenous communities and murders activists like Berta Cáceres. I am talking about more than denying liberation. By continuing to enforce the view of humanity as a set of political states, with Europe at the centre of the planet – as Chickasaw lawyer James Youngblood Henderson once pointed out in his deconstruction of the familiar Mercator world map – foreign policy actively contributes to the erasure of Indigenous political difference conceptually as well as Indigenous bodies physically. (Not to mention non-Indigenous but racialized political communities and bodies, too.) Thus, Canadian foreign policy is a foreign policy that normalizes and affirms settler colonialism. This is the primary national interest. And so, foreign policy is itself a manifestation of settler colonialism.

#### The evocation of common heritage of “mankind” always excludes those who are the constitutive excluded—mechanisms like the Moon treaty purport to be for the good of common humanity, but they in fact just reinforce the nation-state’s ability to make sovereign decisions over space. Cornum 18,

Cornum, Lou. “Event Horizon.” Real Life Mag, 12 Mar. 2018, https://reallifemag.com/event-horizon/.

The word *pioneer*, usually attached to innovation, is never too far from people like Jeff Bezos or Elon Musk or Peter Thiel. These men’s careers in tech startups, their origins in the digital commerce boom, and their pioneer identities were forged on the electronic frontier. Like pioneers of industry in the colonial expansion of the Americas, these men operate on the knife’s edge of sovereignty as it cuts a path for both state and capital to consolidate power. In space, these men see a chance to loosen further the bonds that still restrain the endless capital they’ve been chasing in their imagined rocket ships. Investors, architects of the financial and material future, have taken to using the term “NewSpace” to refer to the almost accessible ventures of asteroid mining, space shipping, spaceship travel, and other forms of space commerce. Still, there are minor contractual obstacles. **Even at the void’s edge, there is a treaty.** A couple of treaties actually. **Out there the governments still rely on these dusty remnants of the dying beast of nation-state sovereignty and the apparatuses of international relations first created to aid and abet the global distribution of white men’s control. The Outer Space Treaty of 1967, which has a more precise formal name** — Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies — **may seem surprisingly benevolent. It is sometimes summarized as saying that *nobody can own space*. But while it outlaws national appropriation, it allows incorporation without the state.** In a demotion from the sensual feel of its phrasing, “celestial bodies” become the body politic, managed sites of bans and requirements. While the U.S. did sign the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, it did not sign the 1979 Moon Treaty**,**more formally known as the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. The Moon Treaty, among other directives, bans any state from claiming sovereignty over any territory of celestial bodies; bans any ownership of any extraterrestrial property by any organization or person, unless that organization is international and governmental; and requires an international regime be set up to ensure safe and orderly development and management of the resources and sharing of the benefits from them. It also bans military activity such as weapons testing or the founding of extraterrestrial military bases (though it’s hard to see U.S. presence anywhere in the stars or on Earth as anything other than militaristic). **Evoking the common heritage of “mankind,” the Moon Treaty could appear a pie-in-the-sky attempt at more equitable relations to land than have been established on Earth since the advent of private property and national borders. But it is of course expressed only in the stop-gap measure of treaties that assign power to states, governments, and resource-management regimes. The power of the treaty is in its possible revoking. In making the decision to sign the treaty or not sign the treaty, the collectives state their unquestioned right to make decisions in space at all. Space is a place where old and new sovereignties, like asteroids desired for mining, are colliding or sometimes colluding. There is a line connecting the Dutch East India Company, the Hudson Bay Company, and SpaceX. These companies begin as corporate endeavors, but then as now the nation-state is sticky: It finds a way to adhere.** Take the case of Luxembourg, a polity that lives on tax loopholes (allowing large corporations to move money in and out of the nation with utmost secrecy and minimal charges) where, as Atossa Araxia Abrahamian [reports for the *Guardian*](https://www.theguardian.com/news/2017/sep/15/luxembourg-tax-haven-privatise-space), private space companies are finding their funding allies for financed trips to the moon, Mars, and the interstellar spots for satellites. The mixing of business and research mixes the money and power hungering of technocrats who don’t just want to own businesses but want people to see their businesses as the shareholders of humanity’s future.In middle school we didn’t have model U.N., but we did have model Earth. For field trips we’d be taken away to Biosphere 2, a site for space-colonization experiments built by Space Biosphere Ventures but owned by Columbia University by the time I visited. In these field trips to the desert outside a town auspiciously named Oracle, we walked around the display vivarium, always being reminded to call it biosphere *two*— biosphere *one* was the earth outside, the one we had momentarily left behind and one day might leave behind for good. That old planet was a past prototype. But the new prototype was itself already a defunct research facility. The closed-system experiment with human subjects had failed twice in the ’90s, and it now rests as one of the many dreams littering the desert of a new world.When a world is new, it creates alongside a space held for the older worlds. This is the drama between what can be brought from before and what will be made anew. It is why Aeneas carried his dying father Anchises on his shoulders out of Troy on his way to found Rome. The traveler always brings baggage. Jeff Bezos would like to be the one who carries that baggage to space or controls the robots and poorly paid temporary laborers who accomplish the carrying. In this supposedly new space, the regimes of inequality will be quite familiar. The space-goers insist it is something called humanity, with the ingrained hierarchical legacies of this category, that will be going.Leaders in industry who have always wanted to be world leaders are now positioning themselves as leaders of outer worlds. Elon Musk makes union busting seem like a cosmic necessity for the continuation of human life. The material and subsequent cultural valorization of certain kinds of work in the tech industry, wherein the “great minds” make all the money and those who maintain the machinery of day-to-day existence are treated like the shit they’re supposed to take, does not end at the stratosphere.Even the more lofty moral considerations of outer-space ethics (e.g., is terraforming ever morally acceptable?) often ignore their fundamental basis in deathly processes still very much situated on Earth. Any outer-space endeavor today or in the near future will be an extension of the life-destroying capacities of capitalists and their colonial countries. On the [Deep Space Industries page](https://deepspaceindustries.com/mining/) for asteroid mining, the exploitation and extraction of minerals is heralded as “an unlimited future for all mankind**.” The endless extension of capitalist accumulation comes with an extension of this delusion of “all mankind.” As if all such projects, the project of humanity itself, has not always been an exclusionary one.** SETI may appear to inhabit a different realm of speculation than that of the grandstanding services-and-commodities pioneers. But its project also follows a willful ignorance about human history and the exclusions that make humanity as a class possible. SETI proponents, much like Musk and his ilk, view themselves at the forefront of a new breakthrough not necessarily of capital but of knowledge. Their sites of expansion are not centered so much on the territories capital requires in order to enclose, privatize, and extract until depletion (though they can be intimately connected, as in the development of the university and research centers as global actors of dispossession), but on sites of encounter. Outer-space commerce and funded extraterrestrial contact-seekers operate on and reinforce damaging notions of land, life, and the future that actually hinder the survival of most Earth dwellers rather than provide anything like meaningful hope. Stories of contact are only ever understood as colonial stories. Every inquiry of future contact with extraterrestrial life, from academic and government-funded to amateur and whimsical, relies on the same stale comparisons of colonial conquest. Columbus, of course; Captain James Cook, often. Every episode of the podcast *Making New Worlds: Why Are We Going?*features historical authorities commenting on colonial situations of the past and comparing them to hypothetical situations with extraterrestrials. The topics convened by those who are granted the authority to speak on them are conducted under the tyranny of certain givens, the most persistent and damning of them being contact as conquest.

#### The alt is for judges to refuse the fantasy of the 1AC. Refusal is not just a “no,” but a generative process that challenges sanctioned modes of protocol and decorum in the university,

**King 17** (Tiffany, Assistant Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies at the Georgia State University “Humans Involved: Lurking in the Lines of Posthumanist Flight” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3, No. 1, pp. 163-170) NIJ

**Native feminist politics of decolonial refusal and Black feminist abolitionist politics of skepticism informed by a misandry and misanthropic distrust of and animus toward the (over)representation of man/men as the human diverge from the polite, communicative acts of the public sphere**, much like the politics of the “feminist killjoy.”4 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: I use “misandry” (hatred of men) and “misanthropic” (distrust or deep skepticism about humankind or humanity) to illustrate how Sylvia Wynter and other Black scholars attend to the ways that the human— and investments in the human—and its revised forms or genres of the human as woman/feminist still reproduce violent exclusions that make the death of Black and Native people viable and in-evitable. In other words, neither men nor women (as humans) can absorb Black females/males/children/LGBT and trans people into their collective folds. Both the hatred of “misandry” and the distrust and pessimism of “misanthropy” are appropriate methods to describe the inflection of the critique levied by Wynter and the other Black scholars examined in this article. END FOOTNOTE] Throughout this article, I deploy the term “feminist” both ambivalently and strategically to mark and distinguish the scholarly tradition created by Black and Native women, queer, trans, and other people marginalized within these respective communities and their anticolonial and abolitionist movements.5 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See Sylvia Wynter’s afterword, “Beyond Miranda’s Meanings: Un/silencing the ‘Demonic Ground’ of Caliban’s ‘Woman,’” in Out of the Kumbla: Caribbean Women and Literature, ed. Carole Boyce Davies (Chicago, Ill.: Africa World Press, 1990) 355– 72. Wynter warns Black women in the United States and the Caribbean that they need not uncritically embrace womanism as a political position, which can effectively oppose the elisions, racism, and false universalism of white feminism. “Feminism” as well as “womanism” are bounded and exclusive terms that do not effectively throw the category of the human into continual flux. END FOOTENOTE], Until a more useful and legible term emerges, I will use “feminist” to mark the practices of refusal and skepticism (misandry/misanthropy) as ones that largely exist outside more masculinist traditions within Indigenous/Native studies and Black studies. “Decolonial refusal” and “abolitionist skepticism” depart from the kinds of masculinist anticolonial traditions that attempt to reason Native/ Black man to White Man within humanist logic in at least two significant ways. First, **neither participate in the communicative acts of the humanist public sphere from within the terms of the debate. Further, they do not play by the rules**.6 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See the critiques of the anticolonial tradition within Caribbean philosophy articulated by Shona Jackson in her book Creole Indigeneity (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012). Jackson argues that anticolonial Caribbean masculinist philosophy tends to argue from inside the logic of Western philosophy in order to counter it. For instance, in a valorization of the laborer as human and inheritor of the nation-state, Caribbean philosophy tends to reproduce the Hegelian telos of labor as a humanizing agent for the slave, which inadvertently makes the slave a subordinate human and effectively erases the ostensibly “nonlaboring” humanity of Indigenous peoples in the Anglophone Caribbean. END FOOTENOTE] Specifically, the Native and Black “feminist” politics discussed throughout launch a critique of both the logic of the discussion about the human and identity as well as the mode of communication. In fact, **practices of refusal and skepticism interrupt and flout codes of civil** and collegial **discursive protocol**  to focus on and illumine the violence that structures the posthumanist discourse. Attending to the comportment, tone, and intensity of an engagement is just as important as focusing on its content. The particular manner in which Black and Native feminists push back against violence is important. The force, break with decorum, and style in which Black and Native feminists confront discursive violence can change the nature of future encounters. Given that Black women who confront the logics of “nonrepresentational theory” are really confronting genocide and the white, whimsical disavowal of Black and Native negation on the way to subjectlessness, it is understandable that there is an equally discordant response. **Refusal and skepticism are modes of engagement that are uncooperative and force an impasse in a discursive exchange.** This article tracks how traditions of “decolonial refusal” and “abolitionist skepticism” that emerge from Native/Indigenous and Black studies expose the limits and violence of contemporary nonidentitarian and nonrepresentational impulses within white “critical” theory. Further, this article asks whether Western forms of nonrepresentational (subjectless and nonidentitarian) theory can truly transcend the human through self- critique, self-abnegation, and masochism alone. **External pressure, specifically the kind of pressure that “decolonial refusal” and “abolitionist skepticism” as forms of resistance** that **enact** outright rejection of or view “posthumanist” attempts with a “hermeneutics of suspicion,”7 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See the work of Black feminists such as Susana M. Morris, author of Close Kin and Distant Relatives: The Paradox of Respectability in Black Women’s Literature (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014), as well as womanist theologians who appropriate the phrase “hermeneutics of suspicion” as coined by Paul Ricoeur to describe the reading and interpretive practices of Black woman who are distrustful of traditional tropes about heteronormativity or conventional ways of thinking about what is natural and normal. Further, in Morris’s case, as well as within the tradition of Black women of faith and theologians, canonical and biblical texts are interpreted through a lens that acknowledges white supremacy and misogyny, and critically challenges racism and sexism (or kyriarchy in Morris’s case). Within Black feminist and womanist traditions, it is a position that can recognize the limitations of text and that refuses to accept the doctrine, theories, or message of an ideology wholesale. END FOOTENOTE] **is needed in order to truly address the recurrent problem of the violence of the human** in continental theory. While this article does not directly stake a claim in embracing or rejecting identity per se, it does take up the category of the human. Because the category of the human is modified by identity in ways that position certain people (white, male, able- bodied) within greater or lesser proximity to humanness, identity is already taken up in this discussion. Conversations about the human are very much tethered to conversations about identity. In the final section, the article will explore how Black and Native/Indigenous absorption into the category of the human would disfigure the category of the human beyond recognition. Engaging how forms of Native decolonization and Black abolition scrutinize the violently exclusive means in which the human has been written and conceived is generative because it sets some workable terms of engagement for interrogating Western and mainstream claims to and disavowals of identity. Rather than answer how Native decolonization and Black abolition construe the human or identity, the article examines how Native and Black feminists use refusal and misandry to question the very systems, institutions, and order of knowledge that secure humanity as an exclusive experience and bound identity in violent ways. I consider the practices and postures of refusal assumed by Native/Indigenous scholars such as Audra Simpson, Eve Tuck, Jodi Byrd, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith to be particularly instructive for exposing the violence of ostensibly nonrepresentational Deleuzoguattarian rhizomes and lines of flight. While reparative readings and “working with what is productive” about Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s work is certainly a part of the Native feminist scholarly tradition, this article focuses on the underexamined ways that Native feminists refuse to entertain certain logics and foundations that actually structure Deleuzoguattarian thought.8 [I thank one of the reviewers, who reminded me that Native feminist thought’s engagement with continental theory, specifically the work of Deleuze and Guattari, can be likened more to “constellations” as it takes up Deleuzoguattarian thought rather than a single point that always departs from a place of refusal. END FOOTENOTE] Further, I discuss “decolonial refusal” in relation to how Black scholars like Sylvia Wynter, Zakiyyah Iman Jackson, and Amber Jamilla Musser work within a Black feminist tradition animated by a kind of skepticism or suspicion capable of ferreting out the trace of the white liberal human within (self-)professed subjectless, futureless, and nonrepresentational white theoretical traditions. In other words, in the work of Sylvia Wynter, one senses a general suspicion and deep distrust of the ability of Western theory— specifically its attempt at self- critique and self- correction in the name of justice for humanity— to revise its cognitive orders to work itself out of its current “closed system,” which reproduces exclusion and structural oppositions based on the negation of the other.9 [INSERT FOOTENOTE: See Katherine McKittrick, “Diachronic Loops/Deadweight Tonnage/Bad Made Measure,” Cultural Geographies 23, no. 1 (2016): 3– 18, doi:10.1177/14744740156 12716, for an exemplary explication of how Sylvia Wynter uses the decolonial scholarship of an “autopoiesis.” END FOOTENOTE] Wynter’s study of decolonial theory and its elaboration of autopoiesis informs her understanding of how the human and its overrepresentation as man emerges. Recognizing that humans (of various genres) write themselves through a “self- perpetuating and self- referencing closed belief system” that often prevents them from seeing or noticing “the process of recursion,” Wynter works to expose these blind spots.10 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See McKittrick, “Diachronic Loops,” in which the author cites the importance of the work of H. Maturana and F. Varela, Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living (London: D. Reidel, 1972), for the study of the human’s process of self- writing. END FOOTNOTE] Wynter understands that one of the limitations of Western liberal thought is that it cannot see itself in the process of writing itself. I observe a similar kind of cynicism about the way the academic left invokes “post humanism” in the work of Jackson and Musser. Musser in particular questions the capacity of queer theories to turn to sensations like masochism within the field of affect studies to overcome the subject. Further, Jackson’s and Musser’s work is skeptical that white transcendence can happen on its own terms or rely solely on its own processes of self-critique and self- correction. I read Jackson’s and Musser’s work as distrustful of the ability for “posthumanism” to be accountable to Black and Indigenous peoples or for affect theory on its own to not replicate and reinforce the subjugation of the other as it moves toward self- annihilation. Both the human and the post human are causes for suspicion within Black studies. Like Wynter, the field of Black studies has consistently made the liberal human an object of study and scrutiny, particularly the nefarious manner in which it violently produces Black existence as other than and at times nonhuman. Wynter’s empirical method of tracking the internal epistemic crises and revolutions of Europe from the outside has functioned as a model for one way that Black studies can unfurl a critique of the human as well as Western modes of thought. I use the terms “misanthropy” and “misandry” in this article to evoke how Black studies has remained attentive to, wary about, and deeply distrustful of the human condition, humankind, and the humanas-man/men in the case of Black “feminists.” Both Black studies’ distrust of the “human” and Black feminism’s distrust of humanism in its version as man/men (which at times seeks to incorporate Black men) relentlessly scrutinize how the category of the human and in this case the “posthuman” reproduce Black death. I link misandry (skepticism of humankind-as-man) to the kind of skepticism and “hermeneutics of suspicion” that Black feminist scholars like Wynter, Jackson, and Musser at times apply to their reading and engagement with revisions to or expansions of the category of the human, posthuman discourses, and nonrepresentational theory In this article, **I connect discursive performance of skepticism to embodied and affective responses I have witnessed in the academy that challenge the sanctioned modes of protocol, politesse, and decorum in the university.** For example, Wynter assumes a critically disinterested posture as she gazes empirically on and examines intra-European epistemic shifts over time. Paget Henry has described Wynter as an anthropologist of the Occident, as Europe becomes an object of study rather than the center of thought and humanity.11 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Paget Henry, Caliban’s Reason: Introducing Afro-Caribbean Philosophy (New York: Routledge, 2002), 19. END FOOTENOTE] Throughout the body of Wynter’s work, she seems to be more interested in drawing our attention to the capacity of European orders of knowledge to shift over time— or their fragility— than in celebrating the progress that European systems of knowledge have claimed to make. Wynter’s tracking is just a tracking and not a celebration of the progress narrative that Western civilization tells about itself and its capacity to define, refine, and recognize new kinds of humanity over time. This comportment of critical disinterest is often read as an affront to the codes and customs of scholarly discourse and dialogue in the academic community, particularly when it is in response to the white thinkers of the Western cannon. **Decolonial refusal and abolitionist skepticism respond to how perverse and reprehensible it is to ask Indigenous and Black people who cannot seem to escape death to** move beyond the human or the **desire to be human.** In fact, Black and Indigenous people have never been fully folded into the category of the human.

#### ROB is to vote for the debater with the best grammar for resisting conquest. Colonialism functions in education through rhetorical imperialism, decolonial framing and discourse is key.

**Grande**, Sandy 20**15**: *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought, Tenth Anniversary Edition* . United States of America. Rowman & Littlefield Publisher Inc. (pp 55-56). Sandy Grande is associate professor and Chair of the Education Department at Connecticut College. Her research interfaces critical Indigenous theories with the concerns of education. In addition to Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought. (HTE)

**However the question of sovereignty is resolved politically, there will be significant implications on the intellectual lives of indigenous peoples, particularly in terms of education.** Lyons (2000, 452) **views the history of colonization, in part as the manifestation of “rhetorical imperialism,” that is “the ability of dominant powers to assert control of others by setting the terms of the debate.”** He cites, for example, Marhsall’s use of “rhetorical imperialism” in the Worcester v. Georgia opinion: “(T)reaty’ and ‘nation’ are words of our own language, selected in our diplomatic and legislative proceedings…having each a definite and well-understood meaning. We have applied them to Indians, as we have applied them to other nations of the earth. They are applied to all in the same sense” (Lyons 2000, 425). Indeed, through history of federal Indian law terms and definitions have continually changed over time. Indians have gone from ‘sovereign’ to ‘wards’ and from ‘nations’ to ‘tribes,’ while the practice of treaty making has given way to one of agreements (Lyons 2000, 453). **As each change served the needs of the nation-state, Lyons argues that “the erosion of Indian national sovereignty can be credited in part to a rhetorically imperialist use of language by white powers”** (2000, 453). Thus, just language was central to the colonialist project, it must be central to the project of decolonization. Indigenous scholar Haunaini-Kay Trask writes, “Thinking in one’s own cultural referents leads to conceptualizing in one’s own world view which, in turn, leads to disagreement with the eventual opposition to the dominant ideology” (1993, 54). **Thus, where a revolutionary critical pedagogy compels students and educations to question how “knowledge is related historically, culturally and institutionally to the processes of production and consumption,” a Red pedagogy compels students to question how (whitestream) knowledge is related to the process of colonization.** Furthermore, **it asks how traditional indigenous knowledge can inform the project of decolonization**. In short, this implies a threefold process of education. Specifically, a **Red pedagogy necessitates: (1) the subjection of the process of whitestream schooling to critical pedagogical analyses; (2) the decoupling and dethinking of education from its Western, colonialist contexts; and (3) the institution of indigenous efforts to reground students and educations in traditional knowledge and teaching.** In short, a Red Pedagogy aims to create awareness of what Trask terms “disagreements,” helping to foster discontent about the “inconsistencies between the world as it is and as it should be” (Alfred 1999, 132).

## Case

#### Overview to the aff scenario – their plan only fiats banning of things meant to replace the ISS, meaning they don’t get access to any offense because obviously there are commercial space stations – hold the line – they were shifty in cx

#### Public private partnerships are happening in the squo and all their evidence is in the context of them -

#### Solvency deficit –

#### Smith 79 – it’s about public control of private entities – if they’re different space stations it wouldn’t replace the ISS

#### Their Heilwell card is badly miscut – it’s likely funding is expanded only until 2028 either way, and NASA supports blue-origin which means it’s a private public partnership the aff can’t solve for.

#### ISS sunset gets extended to 2028 absent commercial replacement – be suspect of “replacement good” offense

Heilwell 12/03 [Rebecca, reporter for Open Sourced, covering emerging technologies, artificial intelligence, and logistics, “NASA gave Jeff Bezos money to build his office park in space”, Updated 12-03-2021 (I couldn’t find the original publishing date – this is the only one that showed up on the website – if you can please lmk), Vox Recode, https://www.vox.com/recode/2021/10/27/22747509/blue-origin-orbital-reef-office-park-bezos]//pranav

After more than two decades in orbit, NASA is preparing to retire the International Space Station. The habitable satellite only has permission to operate until 2024, and while it’s likely that the space station’s funding could be extended until 2028, NASA plans to decommission the ISS and find a replacement by the end of the decade. Cue Jeff Bezos. The billionaire’s spaceflight company, Blue Origin, has proposed a new commercial space station called Orbital Reef, which would provide a “mixed use business park” in space. **This concept now has the support of NASA. The agency announced on Thursday that it would award Blue Origin and its partner companies $130 million to develop the space station, which NASA hopes will launch before 2030**. With the help of several other companies, including Sierra Space and Boeing, Blue Origin plans to build a satellite that’s slightly smaller than the ISS and houses up to 10 people. The design includes desk space, computers, laboratories, a garden, and 3D printers. The goal, the company says, is to lease out office space to interested parties, including government agencies, researchers, tourism companies, and even movie production crews. Blue Origin’s plan is predicated on the idea that the end is coming for the ISS, which NASA is still figuring out how exactly to remove from orbit. While space stations have been helpful for space exploration, Blue Origin senior vice president Brent Sherwood argued in an October op-ed that private companies now have the capabilities to take over much of the burgeoning economy in low-Earth orbit, or LEO. Blue Origin is even building a space tug, a transport vehicle that moves cargo between different orbits, that could reportedly be used to salvage parts from the ISS and incorporate them into Orbital Reef’s systems. NASA doesn’t mind the corporate takeover of low-Earth orbit. The agency’s first space station, SkyLab, was only in orbit for a few months before NASA let the vehicle descend and decompose into the atmosphere. The space agency has been weighing defunding the ISS, which is full of aging hardware, for several years, and NASA’s investment in Orbital Reef is part of more than $400 million in funding that the agency has set aside to develop new, privately built and operated space stations through its Commercial LEO Destinations program. Eventually, NASA hopes that it can send its astronauts to these stations instead of paying to maintain the ISS. Overall, the plan could save the government more than $1 billion every year. “This is technology that is over 20 years old at this point. When you expose that infrastructure to radiation, solar weather ... things are going to break down,” Wendy Whitman Cobb, a professor at the US Air Force’s School of Air and Space Studies, told Recode. “Having these commercial space stations will be a way of America keeping their foot in low-Earth orbit while focusing more of their resources on moon and Mars exploration.” In the meantime, NASA is currently focusing on the Artemis program, an ambitious plan to establish a long-term human presence on the moon. The agency intends to send people to the moon for the first time in decades as soon as 2025, and hopes the project will eventually serve as a stepping stone to future exploration of Mars. Private companies, including Blue Origin, have desperately fought for a role in this prestigious mission, and especially a lucrative contract to develop pivotal moon landing technology. SpaceX won that contract earlier this year, prompting Bezos’s company to sue NASA and lobby the Senate to reverse the decision. Those efforts have yet to bear fruit, so Bezos now seems to be turning his attention back to the low-Earth orbit economy, where there are more customers and less competition from Elon Musk. “Most, if not all, of the problems or the challenges that need to be worked to have a commercial LEO destination have already been solved by the International Space Station program,” Sherwood, of Blue Origin, said in a Thursday press conference. “That’s the explanation for why we can develop a commercial space station for so much less than it cost NASA the first time.” But there’s reason to believe that the Orbital Reef project may not succeed in the near future — or at all. Blue Origin still hasn’t launched humans into orbit, a feat SpaceX achieved last month during the Inspiration4 mission. Blue Origin also lists its New Glenn reusable launch system and Boeing’s Starliner crew vehicle as pivotal parts of the Orbital Reef plan, but both vehicles have yet to conduct a problem-free spaceflight.

#### Cobb 20 – proves uq overwhelms the link – NASA is partnering with the European space agency in the squo

Additionally, NASA is partnering with the European Space Agency and others on its plans for the Gateway, a mini-space station in lunar orbit. The ISS experience has been fundamental to all of these developments as it continues to launch the next generation of space endeavors.

#### Zarkadis is a link – types of justifications people used to colonize the US & african countries – we need your resources and land or we’re going to die – settler colonialism card.. – this proves alt solves…

#### Davenport 20 a] contradicts with heilwell because it says private space stations are far away yet heilwell says orbital reef is coming and b] proves uniqueness overwhelms the link since it says ISS has good time left

#### Mason 21 – the aff is basically the squo since there are public space stations – but they havent solved conflict as the card shows – they cant fiat a framework on space or cooperation

#### Mason disproves Ortega weaponization is happening even with the ISS, means only the K can solve since we destroy the concept of the state

#### Tisdall – nueks in space don’t kill earth

### Framework

### Impact Turn

#### Space colonization ensures extinction – 6 warrants – malefic geopolitics, natural threat amplification, restraint reversal, hierarchy enablement, alien generation, and monster multiplication – they have to respond to each scenario – Deudney 20:

Deudney, Daniel. [Daniel Horace Deudney is an American political scientist and Associate Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. His published work is mainly in the fields of international relations and political theory, with an emphasis on geopolitics and republicanism.] Dark Skies: Space Expansionism, Planetary Geopolitics, and the ends of humanity. Oxford University Press. (2020). pg 356-362 // LHP BT + LHP PS

This dark scenario of solar space expansion produced by the application of geo- political theory has profound implications for the argument that colonization of other bodies in the solar system is necessary to alleviate or escape the formidable catastrophic and existential risks facing Earth-bound humanity. **Both riskologists and space expansionists strongly believe, with Hawking, that “once we establish independent colonies, our entire future will be safe.”**25 If all humanity’s eggs are in one fraying and vulnerable basket, then it stands to reason that spreading vi- able colonies of humans to other celestial bodies will help ensure the survival of the human species. While the role of existing space capabilities in amplifying the dangers of the great technogenic threat of nuclear war belies the astro-optimism of space advocates, what of their cherished larger vision of making humanity a multiworld species? While space advocates propose a variety of ways space ex- pansion might *alleviate* or *escape* existing risks, they give almost no attention to whether expansion might generatenew risks or help *re-activate* already regulated ones. The list of major threats facing humanity is dauntingly long, and the expansionist agenda for solar space has many parts, making assessment a complex undertaking. But there are six major ways in which the realization of the space expansionist agenda for solar orbital space is likely to generate or activate cata- strophic and existential risks. Taken in combination these arguments provide a strong basis for putting ambitious space expansion on the list of megathreats potentially confronting humanity, and for making every effort to relinquish it. **Large-scale space expansion must be viewed as something akin to a full-scale nuclear war and assiduously avoided. Unlike many of the other threats humanity faces, addressing those created by ambitious space expansion is now extremely simple: just say no. The realization of the space expansionist program for solar orbital space enlarges the probability and scope of catastrophic and existential risks confronting humanity in six ways: *malefic geopolitics, natural threat amplification, restraint reversal, hierarchy enablement, alien generation*, and *monster multiplication***(see Table 10.3). **First, large-scale solar space expansion will produce a radically novel political and material landscape that is extremely inauspicious for security, freedom, and human survival, a perfect storm of unfavorable possibilities and tendencies.** With a new word for a new phenomenon, borrowed from astrology for a con- junction of negatives, solar space patterns can be characterized as geopolitically malefic. Just as the space environment creates terrestrially inconceivable extremes of frigid and torrid temperatures on opposite sides of the same ob- ject, so too the prospective solar landscape combines geopolitical extremes in ways unknown to terrestrial experience. Most ominously, **solar space geopolitics combines the extreme diversities and high effective distances** experienced on Archipelago Earth **with system-wide levels of intense violence interdependence** found on Planetary Earth. **Polities will be extremely different and spatiotempo- rally remote but will be capable of readily inflicting massive levels of destruction on one another**. **Add shifting distribution, wide accessibility, and low distinc- tiveness, and the contours of the violence-material landscape becomes even more prone to large-scale destruction**. **With system-wide common government and mutual restraints very difficult to create and sustain, solar space comes close to being maximally suboptimal for positive outcomes, a nightmarish worst of all possible worlds in geopolitical conjunction. Extensive mutual restraints will be vitally necessary, but they will be nearly impossibleto realize. While humanity’s** **eggs might be scattered among many baskets, egg-smashing with large rocks will be easy—and likely**. Facing this extensive list of major factors disposing the system toward large- scale violent conflict in solar space will require humanity’s transmutation into Tsiolkovskian angels to avoid catastrophic and existentially threatening warfare. Perhaps the only saving grace of this key conclusion of geopolitical analysis is that the demons loosened by opening the Pandora’s box of space colonization might start to wreak their damage early enough to throttle the colonial enter- prise before it gets too fatally under way. **A second way in which colonizing solar space poses catastrophic and existential threats is through natural threat amplification. Because asteroids and comets collide with the Earth, and the total energy contained within the population of near-Earth objects vastly exceeds that contained in all nuclear arsenals, they pose the inevitable prospect of terrestrial calamities. The rate at which these objects strike the Earth is now solely a function of natural forces.** Space expansionists advance human movement into space to avert this threat and promote their solution to this problem as a principal space contribution to reducing cata- strophic and existential threats. **But because the technologies to divert away from the Earth are essentially identical to those needed to direct objects toward the Earth, the rate at which these objects strike the Earth could increaseif they become instruments of interstate rivalry and become weaponized as planetoid bombs.** This prospect leads Sagan to recommend delaying the full mapping of asteroid orbits and development of diversion techniques until after some form of effective world government has been established on Earth. But with the spread of colonies across the solar system, the writ of any government on Earth will be severely limited. The same anarchical political configurations that Sagan views as incompatible with security from intentional asteroid bombardment on Earth will almost certainly be reproduced on a vastly larger, and more severe, scale in the Solar Archipelago. **If, as seems extremely likely, systemic anarchy returns with the diaspora of humans across the solar system, then militarized rivalries are very likely to ensue, producing asteroidal weaponization. If this happens, a natural threat will have been amplified, enlarging the potential for the occur- rence of a catastrophic event. The third way in which ambitious space expansion could increase the cata- strophic and existential risks confronting humanity is through restraint reversal. Barring civilizational collapse, the cornucopia of technological innovation will continue to pour forth its prodigies.** If the monstrosities and menaces of the ever-widening technological cone of possibility can be thwarted only by staying within a narrow path of human preservation and enhancement, then space expansion must be assessed for its effects on the reversals, regulations, and relinquishments constituting the barriers of restraint. **The record with nuclear weapons demonstrates that institutional architectures of restraint are not easy to erect and sustain on Earth.** If space expansion makes the creation and pres- ervation of restraints even more difficult, the probability of otherwise unrelated catastrophic and existential outcomes will rise, making it a potent catalyst for multisided disaster. Instead of mitigating the effects of multiple catastrophic and existential risks, large-scale space expansion promises to multiply them. **There are many reasons to anticipate that restraints established on Earth will be reversed if space colonization occurs. Restraints are unlikely to survive trans- plantation into diverse and demanding off-world environments.** **If humans are living on multiple worlds subject to different governments, regulation and relin- quishment will be more difficult to establish, there will be more places for potential breakdowns, and verification of compliance will be vastly more difficult.** If, as seems extremely likely, the many different worlds in the Solar Archipelago in systemic anarchy have violently hostile relations, establishing and sustaining restraints will become nearly impossible. Surveillance in the vast reaches of solar space will be vastly difficult. **And if the human species radiates into multiple species, the barriers to regulation and relinquishment will become even more formidable**. **A particularly dangerous case of restraint reversal may be technologies leading to artificial superintelligence, a particularly potent technogenic threat.** Space activities are already heavily dependent on advanced computing and ro- botic technologies, and peoples living in space are likely to be far more cyber- dependent than those on Earth. **Living in harshly inhospitable environments, spacekind will have strong incentives to push the development of cybernetic capabilities. If a robust regime for the restraint and relinquishment of ASI is not established, human extinction might occur before significant space colonization occurs. If an effective ASI-restraint regime is developed on Earth before extensive space colonization takes place, it seems unlikely that such restraints would survive the expansion of humanity across the solar system**. It might be objected that the breakout of an ASI in some remote world in solar space would not pose a general existential threat to humanity once all of humanity’s eggs are no longer in one basket. **If, however, we take seriously the standard scenarios of what an ASI would do once it emerges, the dispersion of humanity across multiple worlds would afford no protection whatsoever because an uncontrolled ASI, it is widely anticipated, will in short order expand not just on the planet of its origins but across the solar system, indeed the galaxy.26 To the extent uncontrolled ASI is deemed something to avoid at all costs, large-scale space expansion must be viewed similarly. Terrestrial arrangements to restrain nuclear, genetic, and nanotechnologies are also likely to be reversed as humanity expands to other worlds.** **The prospects of interworld and interspecies wars will provide large incentives for maintaining weaponized nuclear capabilities and for pursuing research into mil- itary genetic and nanotechnology applications. Any restraint regime for genetic technologies is unlikely to survive extensive human expansion into space, given the attractiveness of directed and accelerated species alteration in off-worlds.** Solar space contains a vast number of islands for potential Doctors Moreau to work their alchemy, as memorably envisioned in Robinson’s *2312*. If self- replicating nanomachines are possible and built on Earth, human existence will be threatened**. But if a relinquishment regime is established on Earth, it is unlikely to survive in a solar diaspora. While interplanetary distances will afford a buffer from runaway replicators on other celestial bodies, this is unlikely to be permanently effective, thus delaying rather than foreclosing the gray-gooization of the Earth. Fourth, solar expansion poses catastrophic and existential risks to humanity through hierarchy enablement. The emergence of totalitarian world govern- ment, nearly universally viewed as deeply undesirable, is reasonably judged a catastrophic threat to humanity. As we have seen, space expansion is likely to produce hierarchies in several significant ways.** Many space advocates view large- scale space expansion as freedom insurance and anticipate that various forms of freedom and plurality deemed in jeopardy on Earth can be recovered and pre- served in space. But anticipations of a freedom dividend from space expansion are largely illusory because large-scale space expansion into Earth orbital space is very likely to enable the erection of a highly hierarchical world government, either from one-state military dominance of the entire planet or from the control of a major infrastructure for resources or energy. The further large-scale expan- sion of human activity into solar space is likely to facilitate the emergence of a highly hierarchical world government on Island Earth that could then be prone to become totalitarian. **The fifth way in which ambitious space expansion poses catastrophic and existential risks is through alien generation. The human species radiation anticipated by expansionists will generate significantly different forms of intel- ligent life suited to other worlds. If these anticipations are realized, there will be multiple intelligent species, all descendants from terrestrial Homosapiens*,* in this solar system and eventually across the galaxy. While space expansionists celebrate this as an expansion of life, they rarely dwell on its implications for the future of human life**. If ascentionist assumptions about moral improvement resulting from vertical expansion are true, humanity and its descendant species will live in harmony. But if ascentionist assumptions are unfounded, then the generation of alien intelligent species in this solar system should be viewed as a catastrophic and existential threat to humanity. As the cyber visionary Hans Moravec observes, “**biological species almost never survive encounters with superior competitors.”27** While habitat space expansionists embrace the Darwinian proposition that life inevitably expands, they do not seem to have thought through the implications of the corollary proposition that life forms often lethally compete. **The mechanisms for the annihilation of humans by advanced forms of extra- terrestrial life, long a staple of dystopian SF, are easy enough to imagine. While it might be possible for humanity, mobilized and directed by a centralized world government devoted to planetary and species defense, to survive for a while, eventually the sheer number and variety of alien species with advanced technology is sure to prevail.** **Fictional accounts of alien threats to humanity are typ- ically about life forms originating on other planets, and their eventual defeat commonly results from improbable expedients and heroics. The more realistic threat is probably from humanity’s descendants, and this threat can simply be prevented from arising by relinquishing space colonization.** **The sixth way in which ambitious space expansion is related to catastrophic and existential risk is through monster multiplication. The number of “monsters,” threats that are unknown, has, we are told by riskologists, been steadily growing with the development of powerful new technologies**. **Some monsters are in prin- ciple knowable, but others may be unknowable to humans**. **Ambitious space ex- pansion will clearly entail the development of powerful new technologies, and the actors developing these technologies will be spread in multiple worlds across the solar system.** **Therefore it stands to reason that the number of monsters posing potential terminal threats will inevitably increase as ambitious space ex- pansionist projects are realized. Taken together, these six ways in which the realization of the space expan- sionist program for solar space pose catastrophic and existential threats demolish the core proposition of space advocates that large-scale expansion is desirable**. **Space expansionists start with the persuasive proposition that technological capabilities for destruction are rapidly enlarging, while the Earth remains spatially finite. They then reason that expanding the spatial range of human activi- ties through expansion into outer space will dilute dangers and bring the ratios between the powers of destruction and the spatial domain of human activity into safer proportions. But they fail to recognize or acknowledge that the potency of the destructive potentials inherent in space expansion also increases, and these capabilities can potentially be brought to bear on the finite and fragile Earth and its human populations, thus making the survival problem, at least for the Earth and humanity, much greater. If humans, or their alien progeny, occupying this vaster spatial realm behave in the same manner as they have on Earth, all that will have changed is that the magnitude of the threats will have been enlarged. For large-scale space expansion, there is no plausible human path of preservation bypassing its many very likely menaces and monstrosities. For humanity in space, there is only darkness at the end of the tunnel.**

#### We can’t escape our planetary imagination by escaping the planet – Scharmen 21:

Scharmen, Fred. Space Forces: A Critical History of Life in Outer Space. Verso Books, 2021. // LHP BT + LHP PS

Whether humans eventually go and live permanently in space or not, we will continue to see an ever more complicated and visible relationship between the creation and control of worlds and the collective subjectivity within them. Regarding the climate crisis, the historian and postcolonial scholar Dipesh Chakrabarty told interviewer James Graham in a 2016 book, *Climates: Architecture and the Planetary Imaginary*, “**The moment we ask ‘what should we do?’ we discover that the ‘we’ needs to be constructed.”**[6](about:blank) If the catastrophic changes in Earth’s climate, produced without conscious intention by human intervention, are to be addressed, then deliberate effort will have to be brought to bear on conditions that were previously considered unintended consequences. One way or another, a new world must be constructed, along with Chakrabarty’s new “we.” A reduction in global carbon production, and a hold on, or reversal of, temperature rise, would be a demonstration of what sociologist and theorist Saskia Sassen calls a “capability”: a new technical skill that hadn’t been available before, whose implications and capacity might not be obvious right away.[7](about:blank) Sassen points out that a capability derived to accomplish one purpose might eventually be used to achieve other, yet unknown goals. After all, the first rockets that went to space were developed from missiles that carried deadly warheads. **The capability to design and prescribe every aspect of a total environment in space brings in the possibility for more and more unknowns—future uses to which those powers might be applied**. These unknowns arise, ironically, even as a side effect of the attempt to broaden the ability to control and optimize for predictability. The specification of environmental parameters as part of the construction and control of a world is the general case that describes a central issue in both long-term space settlement and climate crisis mitigation. Specificity creates its own kind of crisis. And the specificity of that future world’s conditions is deeply entangled with the construction of a “we.” Sociologist Lisa Messeri has a term for the kind of thinking that deals with the constitution and experience of worlds: “the planetary imagination.”[8](about:blank) Messeri studies the way astronomers, researchers, and planetary scientists start to conceive of the objects of their study in space as *places* instead of databased abstractions. **That conception, and the practice of the planetary imagination, is mediated by technology, analogy, representation, and even fiction. The planetary imagination has to do with all the ways in which humans organize their perceptions of, and relationships with, worlds. In this sense, the capability to mitigate climate crisis would be an exercise in applied planetary imagination**. So too would be the practice of conceiving a plan for living in space. If **each** of the seven **space narratives** in this book reveals assumptions about the nature of the subjects within its world, then each also **depends on some specific worldview**. **Each of the stories is sustained by unique imaginations, planetary and otherwise**. **Living off of Earth is a kind of world-making, and any variation on that practice will need some basic idea of what a world is, and what a world is *for*. After all, and again, the current climate crisis is the result of the application of a specific kind of unexamined planetary imagination—that this world is for some groups of humans to use and instrumentalize toward certain ends. Colonization is** **another very particular kind of planetary-scale imagination**. The phrase “space colony” is often used uncritically, without any thought for the larger implications of the second term in it. **If the fraught history of colonization on Earth is considered at all, it’s usually dismissed in the next breath. Proponents of the term “space colony” point out that in uninhabited outer space, there are no preexisting people to be “colonized.” However, this is a narrow view of the historical process of colonization; besides the displacement and subjugation of indigenous people, colonization is a matter of forcible redirection of whole systems of social life, biology, politics, and material infrastructure. Even when it comes to supposedly “empty” spaces, colonization depends on massive amounts of forced immigration combined with coerced labor.** Colonization doesn’t begin or end with the arrival of armed men in boats, taking away someone else’s territory. **Colonization is the ongoing production and maintenance of social hierarchies. It is the economic arrangement of places into center and edge, with one feeding off of the other.** **It is an approach to resource management that sees ecosystems and geography solely in terms of their use value. More than anything, colonization is another attitude about what worlds are for, and the result of that attitude is ongoing global trauma. Moreover, as we’ve seen and will see, the total production of an environment—necessary in space—is also the total production of the human subject within it. If the paradigm for space habitation is a colonial one, then the inhabitants will literally be colonial subjects.** And those who are outside of these habitats will be there by design, as effectively displaced as any other people on Earth. But models for living in space don’t have to be colonial. In the scenarios in this book, unless it appears in quotes, the phrase “space colony” and its variants won’t be used without consideration. If the model is an explicitly colonial one—and sometimes the protagonist insists that it is—it will be called out as such.As geophysicist and researcher Mika McKinnon says, for human life, “Earth is easy mode.”[9](about:blank) There are a lot of conditions here that are taken for granted, and a lot of unknown challenges to living in space. Space scientists and writers often repeat an old homily when things go wrong: “Space is hard.” But often, as astronomer and writer Lucianne Walkowicz observes, “what happens in space happens on Earth.”[10](about:blank) The challenges of going to, and living in, space demand an accelerated pace of technological innovation, many products of which have been brought back to Earth. The Dustbuster, freeze-dried food, and improvements in water purification and solar cell technology, among other inventions, owe their origins to various space programs. But space is also a laboratory for the ways that new technologies will impact social and political life on the home planet. **As human presence, public and private, expands in space, the capacity for technical and social change will expand too. But as more techno-social experimentation takes place in space, the consequences of failure also grow. Fragile artificial worlds are not the best place for large-scale, large-stakes experiments. And their successes, where reimported to Earth, could carry huge costs—especially if their new applications include means of social or political control.**

#### Feasibility-necessity paradox thumps escape, Deudney 20:

Deudney, Daniel. [Daniel Horace Deudney is an American political scientist and Associate Professor of Political Science at Johns Hopkins University. His published work is mainly in the fields of international relations and political theory, with an emphasis on geopolitics and republicanism.] *Dark Skies: Space Expansionism, Planetary Geopolitics, and the ends of humanity.* Oxford University Press. (2020).

However, technological advance may not unambiguously favor space expansion. **Technological progress poses a feasibility-necessity paradox: as new technologies make space expansion more feasible, they may also make it less necessary**. Most **space-enabling technologies are moving rapidly forward to meet terrestrial needs**, not to enable space expansion. To the extent **space expansion is necessary to solve terrestrial problems, and to the extent technological innovations provide new terrestrial solutions, advances may undercut the need for space expansion as rapidly as they improve its feasibilit**y.59 For example**, nanotech**nological advances dramatically lowering the cost of accessing Earth orbit may also **undercut the need to obtain resources** from asteroids. **Robotics** could enable cheap fabrication of orbital infrastructures but could also reduce the need for space megastructures by **facilitating terrestrial wealth generation.**

### Case Proper