# 1NC TOC R1 vs. Peninsula RM

## Offs

### T

#### 1] Interp – Unjust refers to a negative action – it means contrary.

Black Laws No Date "What is Unjust?" <https://thelawdictionary.org/unjust/> //Elmer

Contrary to right and justice, or to the enjoyment of his rights by another, or to the standards of conduct furnished by the laws.

#### 2] Violation – The Aff is a positive action – it creates a new concept for Space i.e. the treating of Space as a “Global Commons”.

#### 3] Standards –

#### a] Precision – they eliminate a topical stasis point, justifying the aff talking about anything which explodes neg prep burden and nullifies any engagement. Nowhere does the resolution prescribe active action, so there’s no basis for reasonable negative ground – hold the line.

#### b] Limits – making the topic bi-directional explodes predictability – it means that Aff’s can both increase non-exist property regimes in space AND decrease appropriation by private actors – makes the topic untenable.

#### c] Ground – wrecks Neg Generics – we can’t say appropriation good since the 1AC can create new views on Outer Space Property Rights that circumvent our Links since they can say “Global Commons” approach solves.

#### 4] TVA – just defend that space appropriation is bad.

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability and we can’t get new 2nr da’s so the debate’s permanently skewed.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive, which is a litmus test for argumentation

### K

#### The 1AC’s model of debate and discourse is structured on the erasure of indigenous bodies and epistemologies. Settler colonialism is a structure not an event that infiltrates the status quo on every level. Every move we, as settlers, take on indigenous land for “well-being” is really just to hide the project of ongoing colonialism in attempt to forget the past, justifying settler moves to innocence that require slightly “recognizing” indigenous communities to mask our guilt. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best methodology that actively resists the project of settler colonialism. Only through the resistance of settler colonialism can we achieve the goodness they will talk about – its form over content – Shaw 20:

Shaw, Devin Z., [Devin Zane Shaw teaches philosophy at Douglas College, British Columbia. He is author of several books, including Philosophy of Antifascism: Punching Nazis and Fighting White Supremacy (Rowman and Littlefield International, 2020).] “The Politics of the Blockade” (February, 2020). // LHP PS

**We settlers face a choice: decolonization or white suprem-acy.** **The status quo is settler colonialism: a project of white supremacy, capital accumulation, resource extraction, and Indigenous dispossession. We, settlers, have made excuses for too long.** **For too long we have repeated our homilies as settler moves to innocence: "strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or respon-sibility without giving up land or power or privilege, with-out having to change much at all.**"4 **In Canada, we celebrate Reconciliation because Reconciliation ensconces colonial-ism in the distant past.** When **Indigenous peoples reoccupy Parliament Hill during Canada's sesquicentennial, we say that we gave them the former U.S. embassy for a cultural centre.** **When Indigenous peoples demand the recognition of Indigenous title, we deliver land acknowledgements**. **When Gerald Stanley is acquitted for the death of Coulton Boushie, we say that there are concrete flaws in the judicial system, but due process is fundamentally sound.** When **the RCMP invades unceded Wet'suwet'en territory** now, **we say** that **all peoples must recognize** **the** rule of **law**. **But Wet'suwet'en claims to title were legally recognized in Delgamuukw v. British Columbia in 1997 (the precedent, in fact, of the Tsilhqot'in decision of 2014) though without the adjudication of their specific land or territorial claim**. **Every time Indigenous peoples are given to wait, for justice will come, only the RCMP shows up.** **We settlers cannot place the burden of decolonization on Indigenous peoples alone, though we must also recognize that decolonization demands that we uproot long-standing structures of our world,** **that we must struggle against our own self-interests and our identities, for we have come to recognize ourselves in the institutions of settler-colonialism and in the prospects of settler futurity.** Such a struggle will be fraught with numerous failures. But g**iven the status quo, our choices are either decolonization or white supremacy.** Perhaps I have cast the choice as too stark a dilemma. I would suggest, however, that **we begin** from this dilemma **to measure our responsibility for the status quo.** **Black and Indigenous voices demand this of us.** But **our own intellectual traditions do, too**. I **think** here **of Jean-Paul Sartre's existen**-**talism**, which emphasized the freedom, agency, and respon-sibility of every human being. In Being and Nothingness, **Sartre** also **asserts** that **our individual freedom and the choices we make only make sense in our given historical and social situation.** Given that he was writing in the early 1940s, **Sartre characterizes human freedom and responsibility in the con-text of the Second World War and the Occupation of France.** He writes: the situation is mine because it is the image of my free choice of myself, and everything which it presents to me is mine in that this represents me and symbolizes me.…Thus there are no accidents in a life; a community event which suddenly bursts forth and involves me in it does not come from the outside. If I am mobilized in a war, this is my war; it is in my image and I deserve it.5 Philosophers often discuss this account of freedom and responsibility as if they were making choices in Sartre's cir-cumstances, as if we could readily transplant those circum- stances to our present situation. We consider the responsi-bilities attendant on joining the military to fight Germany, becoming an accomplice of Occupation, or ignoring the war because it would not affect us. We consider how each choice impinges on us due to circumstances that are not of our choos-ing. But the choices are easy, for we will never be forced to choose in those precise historical circumstances. **However, if we take Sartre's concept of responsibility seriously, we ought to consider our own situation before its possibilities have been decided. We ought to consider moral choices that implicate our actions and our responsibility.** **North America as we know it is premised on centuries of set-tler colonialism, but the future of settler colonialism has yet to be decided. We settlers have for too long made excuses. We have buried colonization in our past**, but as Patrick **Wolfe argues, settler colonialism is a structure (with legal, cultural, and social ramifications) and not an event (a moment in the past, now over).** That is, **settler colonialism is an ongoing project, and thus it is a situation that demands that we make a choice. For too long, we've evoked the politics of civility and tone-policing to silence the legitimate anger and indignation of Indigenous peoples. For too long, we've evoked the rule of law, as if it weren't already the law of the settler-colonizer. For too long, we've pointed toward historical progress and social justice, as if it will arrive inevitably, regardless of our actions and choices, but not now.** **For too long, we've chosen the status quo because we have refused to imagine an alter-native -or imagine, pitifully, all the alternatives to be worse. And for our pusillanimity, we bear responsibility for the ongo-ing project of settler colonialism, white supremacy, capital accumulation, and Indigenous dispossession. These choices have led us to our present, which prioritizes yet another pipe-line over the rights of the Wet'suwet'en, or, writ large, white settler futurity over Indigenous futurity. It does not have to be that way. Now we settlers must choose our future.** The ques-tion is: where do you stand?

#### Don’t be fooled by the aff’s claims to anti-capitalism—all they do is trade globalist capitalist exploitation for mercantilist capitalist exploitation. Private entities don’t need to appropriate themselves if they can rely on the colonial state to do it for them; the aff only dooms us to replicate the logic of the railroad, where the colonial state did the appropriating of indigenous lands to hand them over for financialization as a way to reinforce whiteness – they link they subsume unregulated private for “effective commercialization” via “public-private partnerships”. Gal 21

The Interstellar Railroad, or Speculation and Shareholder Whiteness in the Space Economy Réka Patrícia Gál April 14, 2021

Indeed, **Musk has** carefully **positioned his company as a space transportation company, and has explicitly compared the SpaceX project to building the Union-Pacific Railroad — for space** (Robertson 2016). The colonial comparison is not surprising (Cowen 2020). **Proponents of space colonization have long drawn parallels to the colonization of the Americas, enthusiastically representing frontier pioneering and imperialist expansionism as imperative to US American national identity** (Billings 2007). The explicit comparison to North American railroad construction hints at a specific trend of space colonization advocacy that is focused on stimulating commercial space operations. **The industrialist argument is that just as the construction of the transcontinental railroad was best undertaken by private entrepreneurs who were incentivized by the government with land grants and subsidies, the US American government should similarly aid private entrepreneurs** **in the establishment of the New Space industry** (Mazlish 1965, Launius 2014, McCurdy 2019a). In fact, from the founding of SpaceX up to 2012, the additional government funding provided to SpaceX raised returns on investment by more than two percent--this is approximately the same return that a nineteenth century investor might have expected to gain if the railroad company they invested in received federal land grant subsidies (McCurdy 2019b, 48). **Looking at the transcontinental railroad and current space colonial initiatives in parallel can therefore provide a helpful analytic for understanding, and struggling against, such a colonial expansion.** What questions and conceptual understandings can thinking of commercial space travel alongside the transcontinental railroad generate? I am particularly interested in thinking this analogy through some of the concepts advanced by Manu Karuka in his recent monograph Empire’s Tracks (2019). Karuka argues that **the construction of the transcontinental railroad was foundational to the development of the modern US colonial state, which grew in tandem with finance capitalism and the modern corporation.** Karuka’s systematic analysis unveils two central concepts that are useful for understanding the outer spatial analogies. First, that the financial speculation accompanying the gold rush was foundational to the establishment of the settler society’s extractive social order. And second, that the logic of corporate shareholding has served, and continues to serve, as the core vehicle upholding the white supremacist social order. While SpaceX stocks are not publicly available yet, numerous venture capital firms have invested in the aerospace company, with some key investors being Peter Thiel’s Founders Fund, Google, and the Bank of America (McCurdy 2019a). **A landscape of speculation enfolds over the lonesome weightlessness of outer space as these powerful companies are investing towards capitalizing on future shareholding profits.** A future, which has been called into question by numerous people, because, as Shannon Stirone has put it simply: “Mars is a hellhole. [...] Mars will kill you.” Stirone explains that Mars has a very thin atmosphere and no magnetic field, which means that it has extremely high radiation, and no breathable air. All the while, the surface of the planet is −63 °C, and dust storms are extremely common. These concerns, however, continue to be ignored in favor of high-risk investment. The corporate expansion into outer space is coated in a language of equality – of providing equal access to the wonders of outer space for all. An example of this is the recent private mission into space entitled Inspiration4, which developed in cooperation with the online payments startup Shift4Payments, and is currently raffling a seat to a random winner. The lottery acts as aspirational evidence of equal opportunity: Musk claims that these private missions are necessary to eventually make it possible for “everyone” to go to space (Chang, 2021). But **Musk’s vision of making space travel affordable through economies of scale can only be made possible by creating initial demand through aspirational marketing. Just as railroad companies, aided by government grants and loosened regulations, facilitated the westward expansion of European colonists over Indigenous lands, so ought the colonization of Mars create a pastoral utopia in which inspiration and creativity for all abound.** Exactly how a trip to a Martian colony could be paid by anyone was revealed in recent Tweets by Musk in which he has reinvented indentured servitude for extraplanetary colonization (McKay 2020). **Territorial expansion, based on financial speculation, facilitated by corporations and using unfree imported laborers is exactly what Karuka unveils about the logics of railroad colonialism**. He explains, As investors became increasingly disconnected from the sources of their revenue, financial profits seemed to arise through agreements between individuals, seemingly separated from, even independent of, the sweat of specific bodies in specific places. With the maturation of the modern corporation in the wake of emancipation, investors imagined financial accumulation as autonomous from labor, whiteness as autonomous from blackness and indigeneity. (2019, 150) Here I want to hone in on Karuka’s key concept of shareholder whiteness. Karuka explains that slaveholders maintained their economic advantages after the emancipation of slaves by excluding Black people, the Chinese workers who constructed the railroad, and the Indigeous peoples whose lands they occupied, from corporate ownership. According to Karuka, “**Racism is an effect, not a cause, of imperialism**. [...] Whiteness is fiction, not a biological reality, [...] Finance capital and whiteness ripened through a historical elaboration of relationships between imperial corporations and colonial states, forging and sustaining continental imperialism” (Karuka 2019, 150). The extension into the cosmos has already been theorized by scholars as a way to allow for the unfettered continuation of capitalist accumulation, and the New Space companies of the last decade have repeatedly claimed humanity’s extension into the cosmos as an inevitable consequence of “progress” (Dickens 2007; Valentine 2012; Klinger 2017). **With little left on Earth to be financialized, companies are turning outer space itself into an asset. I could hardly think of a better example of fictitious capital that would produce such profound alien-ation from the act of production**. Whether we are thinking of asteroid mining, space settlements, or simply private space voyages, the shareholders are, and will continue to be, removed from production on our planet, but will in the event of space colonization also be separated from it by several atmospheric layers, hatches, pressurized rooms, and spacesuits. Karuka writes, **“the future of the corporation presupposes the future of the colonial state, and the law of the corporation colonizes the future”** (2019, 153), and his analysis of the role of the modern corporation in the establishment of the US colonial state proves to be an entirely-too fitting prediction of a future neoliberal space dystopia**. The particular colonial expansion perpetrated through the railroad was achieved through “blending the economic and military functions of the state”** (Karuka 2019, xiv). The policing of racial and territorial borders was at the heart of imperial expansion as the colonizing states guarded reservation borders as sites of containment. **It also allowed the states to enforce the rules of colonial market relations on occupied Indigenous lands. To this day, the militaries of the US naval empire serve the vital functions of presenting their interests at sea. This produces another apt analogy when we consider the same mercantilist logic is being extended into space with the recent development of the United States Space Force, a new branch of the Armed Forces that is meant to facilitate, and ultimately guard, the supremacy of the United States in outer space.** **Rather than produce a new world or a vastly different future, interstellar-railroad-colonialism seems to aim, at best, to re-entrench and, at worst, to** exacerbate **the ongoing inequalities that exist on Earth**. This is especially true for conditions produced in and through colonial relations. Space exploration is explicitly settler-colonial**.** It projects the same logic of terra nullius into outer space that was used as a justification for the appropriation and colonization of the North American lands that were inhabited by various Indigenous nations, while also reproducing existing colonial relations on Earth through the expansion of space colonization infrastructure. For example, the observatories, telescopes, and other space exploration related buildings continue to be erected on Indigenous lands all over Earth, from Hawaiʻi, through French Guiana all the way to Aolepān Aorōkin Ṃajeḷ (Marshall Islands) (Smiles 2020; Prescod-Weinstein et al. 2020; Durrani 2019). As his Tweet about indentured servitude in space shows, Musk is already counting on the extension of the (likely racialized) material exploitative practices from Earth to outer space. But this is also the one major difference between railroad colonialism and space colonization: while the colonial expansion in North America was articulated as the colonizing European’s ongoing fight against the sovereignty of the Indigenous peoples of Turtle Island**, the fight over territory in outer space might not be fought against extraterrestrial natives. Instead, it will likely continue to be fought against the sovereignty of Indigenous peoples on Earth, and in space, against other spacefaring nations, such as China and India.** As such, what remains open for me is to what extent shareholder whiteness remains the same, or transforms with this move of the corporation into outer space. Will whiteness remain the currency of the future, or will the shareholder privilege of the future turn towards something else, something new yet equally insidious? How does shareholder whiteness function under a global economy? And more importantly, what tools for resistance can we learn from those who struggled against colonial expansion and specifically, the transcontinental railroad? Can we break with the logics of finance capital, empire, and whiteness in interstellar space, and speculate towards a better future?

#### 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 fminor 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 alternative is to make space for indigenous futurist reimagining of the relationship between the NDN and the state. It’s a prerequisite to any reconceptualization of land ownership and requires the capability to appropriate space making it mutually exclusive to the aff. The aff reinforces the settler view of relation to land with their flattened understanding of appropriation. Cornum 15.

Cornum, Lou. “The Space NDN’s Star Map” January 26, 2015, https://thenewinquiry.com/the-space-ndns-star-map/

**For indigenous futurism**, technology is inextricable from the social. **Human societies are part of a network of wider relationships with objects**, animals, geological formations and so on. **To grasp our relationship with the non-human world here on Earth, we must also extend our understanding of how Earth relates to the entirety of the cosmos.** We live on just one among millions of planets, each an intricate and delicate system within a larger, increasing complex structure. For the indigenous futurist endeavor, striving to understand the ever-multiplying connections linking us to the beginning of the universe and its constant expansion also entails unraveling the intricate relations that make up our Earthly existence. Zainab Amadahy, who identifies as a person of mixed black, Cherokee and European ancestry, grounds her writing practice in illuminating and understanding networks of relationships: “I aspire to write in a way that views possible alternatives through the lens of a relationship framework, where I can demonstrate our connectivity to and interdependence with each other and the rest of our Relations.” **Her** 1992 novel ***The Moons of Palmares*** examines the relationships, both harmful and collaborative, between indigenous peoples and descendants of slaves in an outer space setting that merges histories of the Black Atlantic with the colonial frontier. In a provocative bit of plotting, she casts an indigenous character, Major Eaglefeather, as an oppressive foreign force in the lives of an outer space labor population that has shaped its society in remembrance of black slave resistance in North/South America and the Caribbean. The story **follows Major Eaglefeather’s decision to reject his ties to the corporate state and support a rebel group of laborers**. The name Palmares is taken from a real-world settlement founded by escaped slaves in 17th-century Brazil, which is also known to have incorporated indigenous peoples and some poor, disenfranchised whites. In a chronicle written in the late 17th century, these *quilombos* are described as networks of settlements that lived off the land and were supplemented by raids on the slave plantations where the inhabitants were formerly held**. It is said that in Palmares the king was called Gangasuma, a hybrid term meaning “great lord” composed of the Angolan or Bandu word *ganga* and the Tupi word *assu*. The word succinctly captures the mixture of cultures that banded together in Palmares to live together on the margins of a colonialist, slave-holding society. While Palmares was eventually destroyed in a military campaign, it lives on as a legend of slave rebellion and utopian possibility that Amadahy finds well suited for her outer space story about collaborative resistance to state power and harmful resource extraction processes. Outer space, perhaps because of its appeal to our sense of endless possibility, has become the imaginative site for re-envisioning how black, indigenous and other oppressed people can relate to each other outside of and despite the colonial gaze.** Amadahy’s work is crucial for a critical understanding of the space NDN. **The space NDN cannot allow him or herself to fall into the patterns of domination and kyriarchy that have for too long prevailed here on Earth as well as speculative narratives of outer space. Afrofuturists have looked to space as the site for black separatism and liberation. If the space NDN is truly committed to being responsible to all our relations, it is imperative for our futurist vision to be in solidarity with and service to our fellow Afrofuturist space travelers. Our collective refusal of colonial progress (namely, our destruction) means we must chart other ways to the future that lead us and other oppressed peoples to the worlds we deserve.** *The Moons of Palmares* works toward this end by revealing the strong connections between indigenous and black histories, narratives and ways of living. **Indigenous futurism is indebted to Afrofuturism: Both forms of futurism explore spaces and times outside the control of colonial powers and white supremacy.** These alternative conceptions of time reject the notion that all tradition is regressive by narrating futures intimately connected to the past. SF and specifically the site of outer space give writers and thinkers the imaginative room to envision political and cultural relationships and the future decolonizing movements they might nourish. This focus on relationship, especially as posited by Amadahy, also accounts for those forms of indigeneity that persist among peoples either stolen from their lands or whose lands have been stolen from them. As the writer Sydette Harry recently posted on Twitter, “Black people are displaced indigenous people.” However, because of the processes of forced relocation and slavery and continuing anti-black racism, black people are often denied claims to indigeneity. There is also a pernicious erasure of black NDNs in America and Canada. **In exploring outer space, black authors are also able to assert their own relationship to land both on Earth and in the cosmos.** The Black Land Project (BLP), while not an explicitly futurist organization, fosters the kind of relationships to land on Earth that futurist authors and thinkers envision in outer space. In a recent podcast, *Blacktracking through Afrofuturism*, BLP founder and director Mistinguette Smith discusses how walking over the routes of the Underground Railroad brought forth alternate dimensions and understandings of time outside the settler paradigm of ownership. These are aspects of relating to land that the Afrofuturist and the space NDN (identities which can exist in the same person) bring with them on their travels. This focus on relationship rather than a strict idea of location speaks to the way in which the space NDN can remain secure in their indigenous identity even while rocketing through dark skies far from their origins**.** This is not to demean the work of land protectors and defenders who risk serious repercussions for resisting corporate and state encroachment on indigenous territories. **The space NDN supports those who are able and choose to remain on the land, while also hoping to broaden understandings of indigeneity outside simple location**. **Locations of course are never simple. It is the settler who wishes to flatten the relation between place and people by claiming land through ownership. Projecting themselves forward into faraway lands and times, the space NDN reveals the myriad ways of relating to land beyond property.**

## Case

### Overview

#### Settler colonialism uses “progressive” ideals of science, technology, and environment salvation to reconstruct the white settler hero and paper over apocalypses Indigenous people face every day.

Koch 21 [Natalie Koch – Department of Geography and the Environment; Whose apocalypse? Biosphere 2 and the spectacle of settler science in the desert; Geoforum; 5-21-2021; Accessible Online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2021.05.015] DL 7-12-2021

At the time, I did not understand much about the relationship between science and spectacle, but almost 30 years after my first visit to Biosphere 2, I have learned that it is impossible to disentangle the two. In my subsequent academic research, I came to see spectacle as a technology of government, which actors use strategically to advance certain agendas and visions of the world (Koch, 2018). Developed in the 1980s by the company Space Biospheres Ventures in cooperation with the University of Arizona, Biosphere 2 was a consummate spectacle. And like many spectacles, it was designed to be a one-off. That is, it was always acknowledged to be an experiment only. As a kind of utopian spectacle to sell a techno-optimistic future, it was engineered to draw attention to possible solutions for the coming environmental apocalypse – itself a dystopian spectacle. Of course, the project never succeeded in engineering the world out of its environmental troubles, but did this speculative exercise actually do something more? Whose interests did it actually serve? As this article shows, Biosphere 2′s promoters were adept propagandists. Naturally, nobody had thought to seal a bunch of humans in a glass bubble before, but such experimental projects in the desert are not particularly new. Nor are they particularly progressive: the logic, I will argue, is quintessentially colonial. Imperial projects also have a long history of employing “experiments” or “models” to introduce their new mode of social ordering, and Euro-American imperialism was always interwoven with modern scientific technologies and concepts. Harnessing the discursive power of science, Biosphere 2’s planners nimbly adapted the story of environmental apocalypse to sell their clichéd visions as visionary. In doing so, they also sold themselves as visionary. The colonial logic of modernist science has always discounted other ways of knowing, strategically constructing a particular kind of hero – the white male scientist – who has arrived to save the day. This supposedly enlightened or superior knowhow in turn works to justify settler control of Indigenous lands. In considering the case of Biosphere 2, then, we must ask who its promoters are and whose “apocalypse” are we being sold? This last question has been powerfully posed by many Indigenous scholars, who point to the colonial undercurrent of apocalyptic environmental narratives, or what April Anson (2020: 63) refers to as “settler apocalypse” – “stories that tell of the end of the whole world but are, in reality, specific to white settlers.” Potawatomi scholar Kyle Whyte (2018: 225), extends this argument and stresses how “dystopian or postapocalyptic narratives of climate crises […] can erase Indigenous peoples’ perspectives on the connections between climate change and colonial violence.” Speaking from the North American context, he notes how many Indigenous communities understand “their societies as already having endured one or many more apocalypses” (Whyte 2018, 236). Diné geographers Andrew Curley and Majerle Lister (2020) likewise describe these past and present apocalypses as a layering of “already existing dystopias,” which are also erased by narratives of settler apocalypse. That is, With colonization, Indigenous peoples saw their lands taken and lives permanently altered. This constituted its own dystopia. Tribes later suffered through forced assimilation, continued land theft, and the creation of tribal institutions with legal and political rights strongly associated with the expansion of capitalism and extractive industries within and around Indigenous communities. Oil and gas fracking around Indigenous lands have witnessed the abduction and murder of Indigenous women who are ensnared into man camps. Coal created hundreds of jobs, a sense of economic dependency, and eventual collapse. These multiple, overlapping, and current dystopias are lost on most commentaries on climate change (Curley and Lister, 2020: 260). This article thus seeks to understand whose “apocalypse” was advanced in the project to build Biosphere 2 in the Arizona desert. It is built on a recognition that settler colonialism, as a system of structural violence, includes elements that are overtly destructive (e.g. displacement, genocide), as well as elements that are productive (e.g. scientific endeavors, economic “opportunities” for both settlers and Indigenous/nonwhite people who are enticed to participate in the same structures that oppress them). These negative and positive elements of systems of oppression are never separate (Foucault 1975), but analyzing an ostensibly productive project in the American Southwest like Biosphere 2 requires a different analytical focus than analyzing the overtly destructive acts of colonial genocide and violence in the same place. While this article does not directly examine the violent history of Arizona’s colonization (see Blackhawk, 2006, Crandall, 2019, Dunbar-Ortiz, 2014, Lahti, 2012), Biosphere 2 offers important insights about how the state’s settler colonial power structure was developed with support from the discursive resources of science and environmentalism. I thus examine how certain environmental imaginaries are interwoven with scientific networks of power to sell apocalyptic visions of living in a changing planet, and by whom. Techno-fetishistic projects in the desert have a long history of using apocalyptic narratives to justify material interventions in environmental policy and exploration, and to deflect attention from their role in perpetuating (settler) colonial projects of violence and exclusion. Uniting insights from geography, environmental studies, STS (science and technology studies), and Indigenous studies, this article takes apocalyptic imaginaries seriously and asks how they “touch down” across history and diverse places around the world – whether deserts or not – and what role they play in re/configuring cross-scalar power relations. To do so, I draw from a larger study on the politics and environmental history of empire in Arizona, which has included archival research, interviews, and fieldwork from 2018 to 2020 (Koch, forthcoming-a). My interviews for this broader project routinely touched on Biosphere 2, but none were on the record (per request or per legal constraints), so that data is not presented here. Instead I use textual analysis, paired with site visits in December 2019, to contextualize the history of Biosphere 2 within the longer genealogy of experimental projects in deserts. A great deal of secrecy still surrounds the project today and no archival records are accessible to the public.1 As such, the textual analysis included a review of all published articles, books, podcasts, and other materials covering the history or commentaries about Biosphere 2 from 1991 to the present, collected via the author’s institutional library databases and a systematic search of relevant materials online. Texts analyzed also included the accounts displayed in the Biosphere 2 visitor spaces, such as the museum-like entry foyer and inside the diverse facilities open to visitors. Although I have been to the site numerous times over 30 years, the site visits in 2019 allowed me to record how different tour guides presented the facilities and the history of the Biosphere 2 project and to gain access to additional materials not available online (e.g. promotional videos shown to visitors, activities designed for children, etc.). The discursive approach sheds light on how ostensibly “positive” or “progressive” ideals of science, technology, and environmental salvation are harnessed to build the settler colonial structures of exclusionand Indigenous dispossession. This story is not isolated to the U.S. Southwest, so by centering the question of whose apocalypse we are being sold, this article conceptually contributes to efforts to map contemporary forms of environmental injustice and settler colonial violence – which are not limited to the violent theft of land and life, but might also look like a gleaming white laboratory in the desert. That is, the seductive spectacle of settler science is a form of violence too.