# Durham 22 R1 AC

#### I affirm the resolution Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### I will begin by providing the following definition:

#### Merriam webster defines appropriation:

to take [exclusive](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/exclusive#h1) possession of

## Framing

#### Colonialism is the root cause of structural violence. For the Europeans to take land, they needed to create internal divisions based off of identity and imported their oppressive religious norms.

Kalende 14

*Val Kalende, for Think Africa Press, part of the Guardian Africa Network*Wed 30 Apr 2014 10.15 EDT

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

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

#### Western philosophical systems were built off of violence and hence maintain it – they can not include colonized people into their moral calculi because they consider them objects and not subjects- this makes a decolonial framework a pre-requisite to others. The reason why Europeans can claim they are civilizing the natives was because they didn’t see them as people in the first place. Let’s reverse that.

Quijano 07

(https://pybarra.weebly.com/uploads/6/8/7/0/687099/\_\_quijano\_coloniality\_and\_modernity\_rationality.pdf)

The radical absence of the ‘other’ not only postulates an atomistic image of social existence in general; that is, it denies the idea of the social totality. As European colonial practice was to show, the paradigm also made it possible to omit every reference to any other ‘subject’ outside the European context, i.e., to make invisible the colonial order as totality, at the same moment as the very idea of Europe was establishing itself precisely in relation to the rest of the world being colonized. The emergence of the idea of the ‘West’ or of ‘Europe’, is an admission of identity  that is, of relations with other cultural experiences, of differences with other cultures. But, to that ‘European’ or ‘Western’ perception in full formation, those differences were primarily above all as inequalities in the hierarchical sense. And such inequalities are perceived as being of nature: only European culture is rational, it can contain ‘subjects’  the rest are not rational, they cannot be or harbor ‘subjects’. As a consequence, the other cultures are different in the sense that they are unequal, in fact inferior, by nature. They only can be ‘objects’ of knowledge or/and of domination practices. From that perspective, the relation between European culture and the other cultures was established and has been maintained, as a relation between ‘subject’ and ‘object’. It blocked, therefore, every relation of communication, of interchange of knowledge and of modes of producing knowledge between the cultures, since the paradigm implies that between ‘subject’ and ‘object’ there can be but a relation of externality. Such a mental perspective, enduring as practice for five hundred years, could only have been the product of a relation of coloniality between Europe and the rest of the world. In other terms, the European paradigm of rational knowledge, was not only elaborated in the context of, but as part of, a power structure that involved the European colonial domination over the rest of the world. This paradigm expressed, in a demonstrable sense, the coloniality of that power structure

#### Thus my single standard is deconstructing colonialist thought

#### The standard has 2 distinct impacts:

#### Instead of creating outgroups for the purpose of power and control, we embrace new ways of thinking and being

1. **Colonialism and eurocentrism actualizes violence in both structural and subjective ways-it has already caused two global wars, and the continued focus on objectivity leaves no room for emotional space. This cold, calculated attitude structurally engrains a violence that threatens all life on the planet.**

**Kanth in 2k5** (Rajani Kannepalli, Against Eurocentrism:  A Transcendent Critique of Modernist Science, Society, and Morals)

Violence is to men, or rather to masculinity—which is both of "natural" and social cultivation—as uranium presumably is to nuclear devices: it is their very essence. It takes on multiple forms in their persona, not at all restricted to its more brutish expressions as in rape, assault, and murder, but also in simpler manifestation of anger, churlishness, impatience, egotism, and irascibility. It is expressed every day, at home and abroad, in a panoply of ways, in modes of speech, body language, knee-jerk reactions, and such. In all its forms, it is deeply misanthropic, misogynist, and predatory toward all forms of life and constitutes a deeply embedded threat to the very notion of nurturance and empathy upon which the future of this planet may now well depend. Its most recognizable symbol today, within the extant culture of death of modernism, is the new prototypical Hollywood "hunk"—as symbolized in its original, menacing, Rambo avatar—that is now the biggest cultural export of the United States, globally. In effect, the Great American Propaganda machine is succeeding in educating and inducting the naive, and the less developed (within this genre) of other cultures, in the stereotypes of repressive, patriarchical, desublimation: that is, modernist androcentrism. The kinder, gentler social forms globally, where they still exist, are succumbing to this violent celebration of this quintessential paradigm of male aggression. The ideological militirizastion of American life, hearkening back to the early adventurist, guns and glory history of colonial America, is the outstanding feat of cultural engineering of the late twentieth century, vested with portentous consequences for the world. Masculinity abounds also in a critical domain not always understood for its significance for the project of human violence, that is, the suppression of emotions by the intellect: indeed, this is at the very heart (or is it head?) of the internalization of a structural attitude of violence. "Pure" reason, that is, reductionist reason, is always at the expense of spirit, of feeling, of warmth; it is cold and dry—it objectifies, detaches, and desensitizes us to all but our own interests. European modernism has, thereby, taken the "natural" project of masculinity to its cultural apotheosis: the steely resolve of reason unchained from its healing matrix of feelings stands ready to sweep away all that stands in its path—and this much unites disparates such as Napoleon, Stalin, Hitler, or Reagan. This infelicitous "capacity for abstraction," when wedded to Calvinist materialism, has already produced two world conflagrations, in this past century—the "greatest" century of modernism—and nearly started an apocalyptic third one. If the truth be told, however, there is a Third World War, an Armageddon, already, and far ahead, on: it is European modernist cupidity and avarice versus the survival of this planet and all its dependent species. At any rate to feel, to be concrete, to be local, and kindred-based in our affiliations and interests remains the only solicitous alternate to the tyranny of detached, abstract, world-conquering, male-driven modernism. Until recently, women, workers and native peoples the world over unselfconsciously exhibited these consilient traits, though they too are now capitulating, but only slowly, to the avalanche of modernist behavioral grids being imposed on them. To stem this ruinous advance of amoral, hedonistic, materialist, masculinist, science and reason, might well be the first order of this grim business of ensuring planetary survival; or rather, more pointedly, the survival of humans on this planet. <103-104>

## C1: Colonizing Space

#### Space exploration and planetary science aren’t divorced from past colonial actions – they are dependent encroachment of colonial lands and merely led to an expansion of colonial values into outer space.

Tavares 10

(Frank Tavares, et al. 2010, “Ethical exploration and the role of planetary protection in disrupting colonial practices”, https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/2010/2010.08344.pdf)

Commodification and Appropriation of Land and Resource Extraction: The commodification of land through extractive practices has led to significant disruption of the ecosystems that Indigenous communities rely upon for their livelihoods. Examples of extractive exploitation and colonialism abound; while many people in the US think only of the gold rush, mining of rare minerals in Central and South America and Africa incentivize and continue to accelerate colonial expansion even today. Agricultural practices throughout the colonial world have been and continue to be damaging, transforming environments and destroying human lives and cultures. 19 From cotton fields in the American south to sugar plantationsand rubber tappers in Brazil, the combination of land and people as property was key to the generation of wealth that built up the Western world. 20 **The field of planetary science and space exploration in the present day is not divorced from these practices, and both existing and planned space infrastructure continue to encroach upon Indigenous land**. This is often justified by falsely framing opposition to such encroachments as "obstructions" to "the future." 21 For example, construction of the Thirty Meter Telescopeatop Mauna Kea has begun despite opposition from many Kanaka ʻŌiwi (Native Hawaiians), who note that previous astronomy development atop Mauna Kea has already had substantial adverse effects. 22 Current structures for in-situ resource utilization on other worlds are analogous to some of these past and current practices on Earth. Most immediately, lunar resource maps seek to enable public and private sector mining actors to plan for extraction of water iceand other resources. Similar proposals exist for asteroid mining. This is presented undera guise of “sustainability,” but in actuality replicates the practices of extractive capitalism that have contributed to the environmental degradation of Earth. In the long-term, this exploitative approach to extraterrestrial exploration will be similarly detrimental, and recommendations provided in the white paper “Asteroid Resource Utilization: Ethical Concerns and Progress” address these issues in more depth. 23

#### The appropriation of space is a move to colonize space for the use of rich, white men.

Bianco 18

Bianco, Marcie.“The Patriarchal Race to Colonize Mars Is Just Another Example of Male Entitlement.” *NBCNews.com*, NBCUniversal News Group, 2 Aug. 2019, www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/patriarchal-race-colonize-mars-just-another-example-male-entitlement-ncna849681

These men, particularly Musk, are not only heavily invested in who can get their rocket into space first, but in colonizing Mars. The desire to colonize — to have unquestioned, unchallenged and automatic access to something, to any type of body, and to use it at will — is a patriarchal one. Indeed, there is no ethical consideration among these billionaires about whether this should be done; rather, the conversation is when it will be done. Because, in the eyes of these intrepid explorers, this is the only way to save humanity. It is the same instinctual and cultural force that teaches men that everything — and everyone — in their line of vision is theirs for the taking. You know, just like walking up to a woman and grabbing her by the pussy. It’s there, so just grab it because you can. “I want to be clear, I think we should be a multi-planet species, not a single planet species on another planet,” [Musk said at the 2015 Vanity Fair New Establishment Summit](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SqEo107j-uw). “What kind of future do you want to have? Do you want to have a future where we are forever confined to one planet…or…one where we are on many planets?” This Columbusing attitude — a strident business acumen laced with an imperialist ethos — comes with an air of benevolence: Musk doesn’t just want to colonize Mars to satisfy his ego. No, he wants to colonize Mars to help his fellow humans. “I really think there are two fundamental paths [for humans]: One path is we stay on Earth forever, and some eventual extinction event wipes us out,” [he said.](https://www.wired.com/2016/09/elon-musk-colonize-mars/) In this way, colonizing Mars is a “[collective life insurance policy](http://www.businessinsider.com/why-elon-musk-doesnt-want-to-live-forever-2015-10).” Although considering the last 500 years of colonization on this planet alone, one could wonder **whose lives**, according to Musk and other rich white men like himself, are worth being insured. But again, this impulse to enter the “space race” isn’t simply the embodiment of the American spirit of invention or forward-thinking entrepreneurship. Neither is it driven by the kind of nationalist Cold War fervor that inspired the creation of America’s space program in the 1950s. Rather, the impulse to colonize — to colonize lands, to colonize peoples, and, now that we may soon be technologically capable of doing so, colonizing space — has its origins in gendered power structures. **Entitlement to power, control, domination and ownership.** The presumed right to use and abuse something and then walk away to conquer and colonize something new. The Friday before SpaceX’s launch, legendary astronaut Buzz Aldrin reiterated to me over lunch that it is imperative that we talk about space exploration in terms of “migration,” rather than using words like “colonize” or “settle” when talking about going to Mars. Through a feminist lens, Aldrin’s deliberate word choice revealed an important reality of the space race: This 21st century form of imperialism is the direct result of men **giving up on the planet they have all but destroyed.**

## C2: Private Entities

#### Private companies are given the unique permission to launch as many space object as they want without check back – affirming the resolution is the only solution.

Haskins 18

(Caroline Haskins, May, 08,2018, The Future, “Private Space Companies no longer have to follow the law”, https://theoutline.com/post/4469/outer-space-treaty-commerce-free-enterprise-bill-spacex-blue-origin-boeing-lockheed-martin)

**It just got a whole lot easier for private companies to launch satellites, rovers, and spacecrafts, and pursue future industries like asteroid mining**. The catch? The U.S. is completely ignoring what’s outlined in a 51-year-old treaty designed to keep space peaceful and war-free.The [Space Commerce Free Enterprise Bill](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/115/hr2809/text), which [passed the House of Representatives yesterday](https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/house-passes-space-commerce-free-91943/), works off the [Outer Space Treaty](https://theoutline.com/post/3739/mars-colony-settlement-spacex-elon-musk-trump?zd=1&zi=ld4wx6g3), which the United States and dozens of other countries signed in 1967 and serves as a basic framework for keeping space safe and accessible for every country. Countries can’t own property on behalf of their own nation, and they’re liable for any private activity from their country. But the U.S.’s new bill won’t apply every part of the Outer Space Treaty to **private companies**. In other words, the U.S. doesn’t believe that it’s liable for activities of private space companies like SpaceX or Blue Origin.The bill also bundles almost all space mission approvals under one roof, the Office of Space Commerce, to try and **encourage as many companies as possible to launch objects into space**. The office would be in charge of everything from a theoretical asteroid mining industry to private space stations, which have been proposed as tourist attractions by companies like [Blue Origin](http://www.businessinsider.com/jeff-bezos-blue-origin-rocket-space-most-important-work-im-doing-2018-4).

#### Private entities are a cornerstone in colonization. We can see the east Indian company which support British colonization into Asia and we can take a look today at the Dakota access pipeline, which allows for private industry colonization of indigenous lands. The question applies to private entities in the appropriation of space. Private actors by their very structure will prioritize economic considerations over moral ones.

Tavares 2

(Frank Tavares, et al. 2010, “Ethical exploration and the role of planetary protection in disrupting colonial practices”, https://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/2010/2010.08344.pdf)

Public-Private Partnerships as a Colonial Structure: Private individuals and institutions, in collaboration with governments, are a key aspect of the colonial structure. For example, the East India Company was fundamental to British expansion across the Eastern hemisphereand took a central role in colonial domination and political control as well as trade. 24 More recent examples include the influence of American fruit companies in the United States’ interventions into Latin American politics during the Cold War. 25 In the United States, treaties signed with Native American nations have repeatedly been broken, often by settler colonialist individuals working in tandem with the US government and military. The Dakota Access Pipeline,a modern reframing of the ongoing Indigenous demand to honor the Black Hills Treaty, 26 illustrates how capitalist interest intersects with colonialism today. **These examples are mirrored in the active role private industry is currently taking in space exploration**. Presently, there is little to no oversight by national governments or international structures. Private partnerships are encouraged to plan missions to the Moon and Mars, often supported by state funding. However, there is a lack of concrete and effective policy to guide their actions, and no consequences are levied when existing policies are violated. 27 For example, the privately-funded and state-operated Beresheet lunar lander crashed on the Moon and accidentally released thousands of tardigrades. 28 At present, bodies like the Moon and Mars are in practice free reign for private entities. An unfortunately accurate euphemism is that weare in a “wild west” of space policy in this regard. When faced with complex and nuanced ethical questions like the ones we will face in space exploration, private actors, by their very structure, will prioritize economic considerations above moral ones. History, through the examples above and others, shows us that they will. These four points are a vast oversimplification of the tactics used in the multiple centuries of colonial expansion and rule, and do not cover all the ways colonial structures manifest themselves in our field. Instead, we use them to highlight structures pertinent to the ethical issues that planetary protection must tackle in the coming years.

#### Thus I affirm and stand open for cross examination.