# 1AC TOC Round 2

## 1

**Interpretation: The affirmative must only garner offense off of the resolution “Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust”**

**Resolved**

**Parcher 1**. [Jeff. 2/26/01. “Re: Jeff P--Is the resolution a question?” [https://web.archive.org/web/20050122044927/http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html](https://web.archive.org/web/20050122044927/http:/www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html)] Justin

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committtee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not.

**Violation: They get methodological offense in addition to defending the resolution– err neg on the violation debate to prevent them from shifting out of their vague aff with a ton of buzzwords and I meets are defensive at best so under competing interps a risk of a violation/abuse means you would still vote negative. ”I critique private space appropriation through a rejection of colonial mimicry, the attempt to reform one’s identity by imitating colonizers’ practices.” which paired with the ROB means “whichever side’s performance better ruptures replication politics wins” AND that the res goes further than a value statement because it defends a method in addition.**

**Vote neg for limits – all pre-tournament research is predicated on the mechanisms of policy, not discourse – in-round their extra-t interpretation means 1NC speech time is wasted on DA and CP ground that becomes totally irrelevant as per the 1AR shift – plus, it decks predictable limits by moving focus from hypothetical argumentation over policy action to how speech acts can facilitate political strategies and means they can literally defend any unpredictable strategy and make the resolution a super small part of the aff, so its practically non-t. Counter-interpretations are arbitrary, unpredictable, and don’t solve the world of neg prep because there’s no grounding in the resolution**

**Fairness outweighs–**

**1–It’s an intrinsic good – debate is a game that requires rules to evaluate it--it ensures a structure to make their aff heard**

**2–To deny fairness’s value is a performative contradiction since you obviously cared about other rules such as speech times**

**3–If fairness didn’t matter, you should just hack against them and evaluate their arguments unfairly, making responses circular**

**4–Link turns their education offense – getting to the third and fourth level of tactical engagement is only possible with refined and well-researched positions connected to the resolutional mechanism. Repeated debates over core issues incentivize innovative argument production and improved advocacy based on feedback and nuanced responses from opponents**

**5–Probability – The role of individual debate rounds on broader subject formation is white noise – can you remember what happened in (TOC [x])? – individual rounds don’t affect our subjectivity, so fairness is the only impact your ballot can resolve**

**6–You should presume all their truth claims false because they have not been properly tested–means no weighing case**

**7–Flips accessibility since small schools are given another caselist which makes preparation impossible and further benefits schools with coaches–means we can’t access your method**

**Also TVA–defend implementation through tribal law rather than the state, or just don’t get offense on colonial mimicry but read it in round, OR just read the performance on neg**

**Drop the debater–T indicts the whole aff and severance kills NC strat construction**

**Competing interps–reasonability’s arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom but limited words in the res mean limited interps so no race to the top, but rather just setting the best norm through theory debates**

**No rvi or impact turns–**

**1–They’d purposefully be abusive to bait us into reading bad arguments and can drill it a lot chilling us from checking abuse**

**2–You shouldn’t win for being T - if you win T is a bad thing then its at most just a reason we should drop it to let us learn from our mistakes which also takes out any reps independent voter writ large**

**3–Only reason we read T is because we were pigeonholed and had nothing else to read**

**4–We don’t force you to do anything - we just propose a norm that can be subject to change**

**5–Reject new 1ar voting issues writ large including T turns–causes a 7:6 time skew and 2:1 speech skew and causes intervention from 2ar ethos since the judge has to decide if new 2ar arguments to new 2n arguments are sufficient**

## 2

**Interp: The affirmative must define appropriation with a delineated text in the 1AC**

**Pershing 19**, Abigail D. "Interpreting the Outer Space Treaty's Non-Appropriation Principle: Customary International Law from 1967 to Today." Yale J. Int'l L. 44 (2019): 149. (Robina Fellow at European Court of Human Rights. European Court of Human Rights Yale Law School)//Elmer

Though the Outer Space Treaty flatly prohibits national appropriation of space,150 it leaves unanswered many questions as to what actually counts as appropriation. As far back as 1969, scholars wondered about the implications of this article.151 While it is clear that a nation may not claim ownership of the moon, other questions are not so clear. Does the prohibition extend to collecting scientific samples?152 Does creating space debris count as appropriation by occupation? While the answers to these questions are most likely no, simply because of the difficulties that would be caused otherwise, there are some questions that are more difficult to answer, and more pressing. As commercial space flight becomes more and more prevalent,153 the question of whether private entities can appropriate property in space becomes very important. Whereas once it took a nation to get into space, it will soon take only a corporation, and scholars have pondered whether these entities will be able to claim property in space.154 Though this seems allowable, since the treaty only prohibits “national appropriation,”155 allowing such appropriation would lead to an absurd result. This is because the only value that lies in recognition of a claim is the ability to have that claim enforced.156 If a nation recognized and enforced such a claim, this enforcement would constitute state action.157 It would serve to exclude members of other nations and would thus serve as a form of national appropriation, even though the nation never attempted to directly appropriate the property.158 Furthermore, the Outer Space Treaty also requires that non-governmental entities must be authorized and monitored by the entities’ home countries to operate in space.159 Since a nation cannot authorize its citizens to act in contradiction to international law, a nation would not be allowed to license a private entity to appropriate property in space.160 While this nonappropriation principle is great for allowing free access to space, thereby encouraging research and development in the field, it makes it difficult to create or police a solution to the space debris problem. A viable solution will have to work without becoming an appropriation. There is, however, very little substantive law on what actually counts as appropriation in the context of space.161 So, the best way to see what is and is not allowed is to look both at the general international law regarding appropriations and to look at the past actions of space actors to see what has been allowed (or at least tolerated) and what has been prohibited or rejected.

**The net benefit is shiftiness – vague plan wording wrecks Neg Ground since it’s impossible to know which arguments link given different types of appropriation like mining, space col, satellites, and tourism – the 1AR dodges links by saying they don’t affect particular types of appropriation, or they don’t reduce private appropriation enough to trigger the link. Cx doesn’t check–it’s non verifiable and skews preround prep–they get away with abuse no risk justifying infinite abuse BUT no regress since the interp is grounded in the lit and limited words in the res mean limited interps**

This turns case–movements fail if they’re too vague and get circumvented

Dtd uniquely–no arg to drop and 1ar is too late

## 3

**CP: The appropriation of outer space except for the planet Rhyonon by private entities except Korga and Marq is unjust**

**The CP is key for them to embrace queer expression–they claim Rhyonon as their home; the home of erotic relationships**

GerShun **Avilez**, Callaloo, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Winter, **2011**), pp. 126-142 “CARTOGRAPHIES OF DESIRE: Mapping Queer Space in the Fiction of Samuel Delany and Darieck Scott” <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41242600> //SR

The vastness of outer space is the setting and the subject of science fiction writer Samuel Delany's masterpiece Stars in My Pocket Like Grains of Sand. As Madhu Dubey explains, Delany writes a novel that is about information and the dissemination and perception of information. That which connects the six thousand or so worlds referenced in the novel is a complex, intergalactic system of information sharing called the Web. Even planets that are not "online" or "plugged" into the Web become identified by their exclusion, so that this exclusion includes them within the purview of the vast matrix of knowledge that is the Web thereby demonstrating an unlimited jurisdiction.4 Ostensibly, there is no outside of this invisible framework. Accordingly, through the "web" motif, Delany offers a spatialization of information - information that is all-encompassing, inundating, and ultimately repressive.5 The control and regulation of information is the Web's most salient activity throughout the narrative, and this control extends to the realm of intimacy. The central plot of the narrative is driven by the need for protagonist Marq Dyeth to be united with his "perfect erotic object," another person with whom (reportedly) he is sexually compatible "out to about seven decimal places" in one direction and "out to about nine decimals" in the other (Delaney, Stars 166). Curiously, Marq and his erotic object Rat Korga do not meet because they had been looking for each other or for their "soul mates"; instead, the Web's officials - appropriately called "spiders" - determine that they should meet.6 Japril, a spider, tells Marq: "What's important - to you, to Rat, and to the Web - is that you will meet" (169, emphasis added). Accordingly, the Web enables and sanctions their meeting and even the possibility of their desire. In this sense Delany' s fictional Web materializes Michael Warner and Lauren Berlant's idea that "intimacy is itself publicly mediated" (193).7 The extension of the Web's attention into this amorous territory results in inexorable imbrications of circuits of desire with channels of regulatory power. Rat Korga himself provides the most palpable evidence of this imagined connection within the text. The perfect erotic object that is presented to Marq is an individual who has a radically processed and reformulated body; he only exists because of the Web's manipulative intervention. Rat Korga was living on the planet Rhyonon when it experienced a kind of planetary cataclysm called "Cultural Fugue"; although he survived, he did not survive intact: his eyes were destroyed in the explosion as was one of his legs. The spiders rescue him from the dead planet after the disaster and provide him with functioning prostheses so that ultimately the Web makes possible both his sight and mobility. Through this process, the extensive capabilities and unlimited resources available only to the Web become inscribed onto Rat Korga' s body and are mapped into his skin through the stitches that solidify his physical being. Not only does he carry around with him material evidence of the Web's power, but he is also a living document and token of that power. Rat Korga is not identified as Marq' s perfect erotic object until after the accident - after he is a functioning cyborg and a symbolic banner announcing the Web's seeming omnipotence. In effect, this "erotic object" is always a creation, a contrived construction that is only made possible through manipulation and artifice. Additionally, Rat Korga is only Marq' s perfect erotic object because Japril "assures" him that the stranger is (181). I insist on Marq's erotic object being one that is artificially constructed and then provided for him by a third party not to undermine the erotic attraction that exists between the two male characters; on the contrary, the Web's intervention does not necessarily evacuate their liaison of its erotic charge. In making this point, I aim to elucidate the argument that Delany is proffering about erotic relationships: circuits of desire - regardless of their specific nature or the individuals involved - cannot be experienced, imagined, or analyzed without recourse to discourses of power and control. There is no other way to read them, as it were.

**Creating queer utopias through the use of science fiction appropriates outer space as a praxis of hope for queer folk–that shatters heteronormative culture through a radical reconceptualization of queerness and takes out traditional notions of debate as heteronormative**

**Shafer 17** [Alexander Phillip. *Queering Bodies: Aliens, Cyborgs, and Spacemen in Mexican and Argentine Science Fiction*. Diss. UC Riverside, 2017. <https://cloudfront.escholarship.org/dist/prd/content/qt1tx0h3jx/qt1tx0h3jx.pdf> //gc

Cyborgs are not the only figures in science fiction that get us to question heteronormativity and other regulatory means; aliens, and other posthuman figures also abstract notions of the self and Other, the importance of the body, and queer relationships, particularly through the homosocial bonds these figures form with humans and non-humans alike. In this dissertation, the major questions I will address are: How does science fiction provide spaces and temporalities that allow us to relate to and understand diverse queer subjectivities? How does Latin American science fiction use colonial narratives of space travel to make evident the connection between gender, race, sexuality, and coloniality? How does the construction of non-human and quasi-human subjects in science fiction represent the intersection of categories of race, class, and sexual orientation? In order to understand these question, it is necessary to understand the study of Latin American science fiction, my use of queer theory to approach these questions, as well as the study of race, gender, and sexuality in science fiction criticism in general. I rely heavily on queer theorists’ work on space and time, and their connection to science fiction. One way to understand queer lives is in terms of “sexual orientation.” Sara Ahmed explores the spatial component to orientation, as the word orientation implies direction, the creation of space, and the relationship of people and objects in that space (1). In phenomenology, it involves “intentional consciousness,” the direction of attention 5 towards certain objects and away from others (27). Queer phenomenology, an idea I will return to in Chapter 1, offers one lens to see queer space and time; it seeks to view the way the world is oriented to privilege certain groups and exclude others. Sexual orientation affects the way we inhabit and experience a world already set before us, and thus understanding queer space can offer a glimpse of how to configure the world to be more inclusive. By analyzing queer spaces, we think outside the normative spaces created for and by gender and sexuality. Halberstam seeks to modify “postmodern geographies” to account for queer spaces and temporalities: Queer work on sexuality has to respond to canonical work on postmodern geography by Edward Soja, Frederic Jameson, and David Harvey and others that has actively excluded sexuality as a category for analysis precisely because desire has been cast by neo-Marxists as part of a ludic body politics that obstructs the ‘real’ work of activism (6).1 Halberstam makes queer lives central to questions about the creation of social space and class. Halberstam asks us to think beyond epistemologies that exclude gender and sexual orientation. By looking at these spaces, Halberstam and Ahmed construct a discourse that includes queer lives in ways that are sometimes overlooked. Doing so illuminates the presence of subjectivities often ignored in hegemonic discourse, such as rural queers or queer people of color. Opening up the category of queer to be that which goes against the norm in more general terms, Ahmed specifically allows us to think outside of the given spaces for things. In terms of queer phenomenology, this means carving a space in 6 phenomenology for queer lives as well as queering the way we think about inhabiting spaces already set before us. In other words, the world privileges certain groups by creating patterns and social and physical spaces that are more easily inhabited by some than others. Another dimension to understand queer lives is in terms of time. Queer temporality creates not only space but time for queer lives. Halberstam explains that there are “queer” subjectivities, such as HIV positive subjects or even the unemployed if we use the term queer more broadly, that go against heterosexual logics of reproductive and family time (6). These lives exist outside the “normal” capitalist schema of marriage, children, labor, and longevity, and acquire value based on other temporalities. Thus, time and space can be analyzed from a queer perspective. Queer includes that which goes against the norm, but also the sexual orientations associated with the word queer. As an inclusive not simply one but the other, looking at queer subjectivities rather than simply identities allows us to view queer lives from a multifaceted perspective within restricting what does or does not constitute the category such as a term like gay. Analysis of science fiction texts goes hand in hand with an analysis of queer space and time. Science fiction texts help us to get a better view of the structures of power that are frequently invisible; by creating new worlds, new alien races, and alternate histories, the familiar is rendered unfamiliar, and the unfamiliar becomes familiar. Darko Suvin theorizes that there is a relation between the world of the reader and the science fictional setting that is “estranged” to the reader in a process he calls “cognitive estrangement” (12). Borrowing from Bertolt Brecht’s examination of vanguard theatre, the idea is that 7 science fiction estranges the familiar world of the reader through a far-off time or place (or differing future or past). Science fiction, rather than estranging the world of the reader to the point of non-recognition, like surrealism, relies on tools of cognition to understand the unfamiliar. This frequently requires the reader to engage with scientific principles that render the story possible to the mind of the reader. 2 Science fiction then, through means of cognitive estrangement, forces us to reckon with the norms of society, such as gender, race, social hierarchies, and economic inequalities. Science fiction allows us to consider the reconstruction of gender as something one does rather than something one has; Like the ideas articulated by Ahmed and Halberstam, science fictional time and space is often queer time and space; alien bodies abstract notions of gender to the reader. The fictional space of science fiction allows writers to test the limits of the body and particularly gender.3 Judith Butler asks us in Undoing Gender to imagine a world beyond a gender binary: "fantasy is essential to an experience of one’s own body or that of another, as gendered” (15). Thus, gender itself is created in space and time, and in the imagination as much as being something one performs or does. Science fiction is a privileged site for imaginary worlds and spaces, and can be for the reconceptualization of gender and sexuality as well.

**Solves case–none of their privatization stuff links because there’s no monetary attachments to using a planet to further queer love–I envision new relationships to space decentered from the systems they critique as a survival strat for me rather than a wholesale rejection of appropriation altogether**

## 4

**CP: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust only after indigenous folks have consented to it after a prior and binding consultation over the aff**

**It’s competitive–normal means fails to consult and we pic out of a specific instance that appropriation is just, but, consultation is key to indigenous sovereignty and values**

Hilding **Neilson &** Elena **Cirkovic** Consulting Canadians on a Framework for Future Space Exploration Activities: A Response to the Canadian Space Agency (CSA) - Part I, Völkerrechtsblog, 28.07.**2021**, doi: 10.17176/20210728-135814-0. //SR

Canada’s position of support and leadership in space exploration has a positive and impressive history. From the development of the CanadaArm and the participation in work on the International Space Station (ISS) to the new scientific contributions with respect to lunar and Martian exploration, Canada has many reasons to be proud. However, it is worth noting that Canada’s role in space exploration has traditionally neglected to include Indigenous peoples, Indigenous knowledges, and Indigenous rights. In general, the history of Canadian participation in space exploration did not have a substantial and direct impact on Indigenous peoples’ rights in Canada. With accelerating technological developments in the past twenty years, space has become more accessible for humans. With these transformations, the current and proposed future of space exploration has the potential to negatively impact Indigenous peoples across Canada. One of the emerging issues for astronomers and various traditions including traditions of Indigenous peoples in Canada and elsewhere, is the launching of so-called satellite mega constellations, such as the SpaceX’s Starlink. Increasing the number of satellites in the Lower Earth’s Orbit (LEO), impacts further research. For various human cultures, Dark Skies have, among others, navigational and spiritual significance. Finally, the objective of our post is to emphasize the need for greater scientific understanding of the universe, which is achieved through research, education and outreach, and inclusion of multiple knowledges and ontologies. Without consultation with multiple knowledges of multicultural and multinational Canada, future space activities might contribute to the ongoing culture of colonization. We present arguments for the ethical and legal requirements for the CSA to consult with and to be inclusive of Indigenous rights and concerns as Canada moves to support the Artemis Accords. The Accords trigger a variety of issues in the outer space sector, which are beyond the scope of this brief post. The authors come to this work from two perspectives: the first being a Mi’kmaw astronomer who grew up in Newfoundland and is a status member of the Qalipu Nation, and co-author, a Bosnian-Canadian legal scholar. Thereby we stress that our contribution is an opinion and has no intent to speak for Indigenous peoples in general and/or any Indigenous-led organization in Canada, or any particular group or community in Canada. Please note that we will be using the terms Indigenous, and Aboriginal interchangeably as we engage with the language of domestic (Canadian) and international documents, publications, institutions, and relevant regulatory and/or administrative bodies. The terms Indigenous and Aboriginal refers to the three different categories of Indigenous peoples in Canada – First Nation, Inuit, and Métis. We reflect upon the CSA’s obligation to consult Indigenous peoples in Canada via two lenses: Firstly, where does Outer Space Law intersect with the modern and historic treaties between the First Nations and Canada (Crown)? Do these treaties include the skies and outer space? Secondly, considering its status as an international (and bilateral) agreement, where the Artemis Accords trigger the application of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Assuming that the Artemis Accords might, and in the situations where they do, trigger any responsibilities and obligations of Canada under the UNDRIP and its domestic laws to consult the First Nations, what are the CSA’s and Canada’s obligations to First Nation, Inuit, and Métis communities and Nations? We engage with these two points considering the following: That the questions of Indigenous rights and title in Canada, including the treaty rights, have significant impacts on how Canada consults with the First Nations and other communities and nations in Canada and pursues the ongoing and future space exploration accordingly; That these questions also require a revisiting of the allegedly prevailing narrative as proposed by some scholars and members of the global outer space sector, generally speaking, which treats space exploration as an analogy of the colonization of the Americas. The legal framework of our argument is that of Canadian Constitutional obligations towards indigenous peoples. The relevant cases are discussed and listed in the rest the following sections. Brief Consideration of Indigenous Rights in Canada Canada’s obligations to Indigenous peoples under the Canadian Constitution cannot be superseded or undermined by commitments under a bilateral agreement such as the Artemis Accords. These legal obligations include those recognized and affirmed by Section 35 of the Constitution Act, 1982, and those set out in self-government agreements. We recognize that, in 1985, the Supreme Court of Canada (SCC) concluded that treaties between Indigenous peoples and the Crown were not international treaties but were sui generis treaties (Simon v The Queen, [1985] 2 SCR 387 at para 33). However, it is worth considering that ‘[f]or many Indigenous peoples, treaties concluded with European powers…are, above all, treaties of peace and friendship, destined to organize coexistence in – not their exclusion from – the same territory and not to regulate restrictively their lives…under the overall jurisdiction of non-Indigenous authorities’ (para 117). While the United Nations, in documents including the UNDRIP, has recognized the potentially international character of Indigenous Crown treaties (UNDRIP Preamble, art 37(1)), we recognize that Canadian law has yet to consider this international recognition in domestic law. Nevertheless, as Henderson argues ‘any Crown authority over First Nations is limited to the actual scope of their treaty delegations. If no authority or power is delegated to the Crown, this power must be interpreted as reserved to First Nations, respectively, and is protected by prerogative rights and the common law since neither can extinguish a foreign legal system.’. There are plural and ongoing discussions on the status of Aboriginal title in Canada, as well as treaty obligations. It is beyond the scope of our comment to address the extensive international and domestic jurisprudence on the topic. However, we stress the existence of the Crown’s fiduciary duty to Aboriginal People as an aspect of various activities, including Canada’s activities in outer space (See, Annex I). Indeed, ‘The doctrine of Aboriginal rights exists… because of one simple fact: when Europeans arrived in North America, Aboriginal peoples were already here, living in communities on the land, and participating in distinctive cultures, as they had done for centuries. It is this fact, and this fact above all others, which separates Aboriginal peoples from all other minority groups in Canadian society and which mandates their special legal status.’ (Chief Justice Lamer in R. v. Van der Peet, para 30).

**Solves the aff–they say yes**

**Young**, M. J. (**1987**). “Pity the Indians of Outer Space”: Native American Views of the Space Program. Western Folklore, 46(4), 269. doi:10.2307/1499889 //SR \*brackets for problematic language]

Because Native Americans [indigenous people] have a different perspective of the world, they can offer us alternative ways of seeing ourselves in relationship to the natural world and help us answer the question of what constitutes appropriate behavior-in outer space, as well as on earth. Furthermore, some non-Native Americans realize that, as they look to the traditions of the Native Americans, they see their own heritage with increased clarity. Although this appreciation of Native Americans comes too late in America's history and could be construed as appropriating their ideas as we did their land, a significant number of Native Americans are receptive to the potential that now exists for a dialogue between traditions, both non-Native and Native American, perhaps because they are experiencing a parallel concern, a need to come to terms with their own emerging identity.2 Both groups have begun to realize that it is only through such a dialogue that the mistakes of the past can be avoided in the future. For non-Native Americans the justification for this inquiry is that through an analysis of the difference between the two understandings of space-Anglo and Native American-we can better "see" the ideological dimensions of our own, taken-for-granted mythology that legitimizes space exploration. Native American [indigenous] attitudes towards "outer space" often conflict with the attitudes of the proponents of the U.S. space program. Rather than applying the metaphor of the "new frontier" or even the term "outer" to this aspect of the cosmos, many Native Americans regard it as encompassed in "Father Sky," part of their network of symbolic associations that integrates all elements of the cosmos. A recent commercial called "Earth Pictures," produced by TRW, a firm that specializes in "aerial views" of portions of the earth's globe from outer space, aptly illustrates these differing attitudes.3 In this commercial, TRW representatives give members of the Navajo tribe a guided tour of the TRW laboratories and conclude by showing them a satellite picture (Landsat) of the Navajo reservation from outer space. With evident humor, the Navajos respond by holding up a picture of outer space from their reservation-a dry painting of Father Sky who contains within his body the sun, moon, and constellations. The commercial thus serves to illustrate Navajo beliefs about "outer space." According to Navajo worldview, which emphasizes harmonious relations with all elements of the cosmos-a sacred kinship among all aspects of experience, natural and supernatural-Father Sky is a living being, intimately related to humans who should, therefore, treat him with appreciation and respect. This example from the Navajo is representative of the cosmology of most Native American groups, a cosmology that is shaped by a belief in the unity and sacred nature of all life, the above and the below. As Joseph Epes Brown suggests, the Native American quality of seeing is based on "a polysynthetic metaphysic of nature, immediately experienced rather than dangerously abstracted."4 He describes this vision as a "message of the sacred nature of the land, of place."5 Place in this sense extends, of course, to outer space, or Father Sky, as well as to Mother Earth. This perspective contrasts sharply with that of enthusiasts of space exploration who regard space as something "out there," beyond everyday experience, through which we should travel to reach planets and other objects that we will investigate, and, if possible, use to meet our own needs.

## 5

**Starlink is key to the splinternet–stops censorship and misinformation which reverses authoritarianism and turns case by enabling mass resistance against violent dictators**

**Koetsier 20** John Koetsier 1-9-2020 "Elon Musk's 42,000 StarLink Satellites Could Just Save the World"<https://archive.is/K6Lq0#selection-3087.0-3131.123> (I've been a journalist, analyst, and corporate executive, and have chronicled the rise of the mobile economy. I built the VB Insight research team at VentureBeat)//Elmer

Elon Musk’s other company, SpaceX, is building Starlink, a global communications constellation that could approach a staggering 42,000 satellites. And it could be all that stands between us and a fragmented world living in virtually — and actually — different realities. How? World War II can tell us the answer. In the early 1940s a tyrannical power using fake news, hate speech, military might and hegemonic power controlled most of Europe: the Nazis. They controlled public life, news and local economies. Resistance groups dotted the European mainland, with one lifeline for non-official communication from free countries: radio. As such, radios were contraband and confiscated. One of the activities the allies undertook to support resistance fighters was shipping in radios for communication and outside news. Today, radios aren’t at risk of being confiscated. But the internet is. And as a cloud-delivered service, hijacking the internet happens largely out of public sight, in servers and routers that enable services like Netflix and the BBC and Facebook and Google. It’s called splinternet, and it’s the ongoing division of a worldwide interconnected internet into separate and isolatable fiefdoms, each of which can be controlled and managed so that governing powers can control what their populations see. The Great Firewall of China is the most well-known example, but Iran, Syria and Vietnam also control significant portions of the internet for their populations. Russia just completed technology to wall off its internal networks, servers and internet users from the wider internet. And India, in its attempt to control unrest following its anti-Muslim citizenship law, has employed a particularly heavy-handed approach: simply blocking the internet entirely. (One unintended result: contractors in India can’t reach their employers in the U.S.) Another country, United Arab Emirates, took a different approach: outlawing all messengers except one that it built a digital backdoor into: Totok. However it happens, it allows governments to control what people see, read and hear from outside sources — and censor what their own people say. Starlink can change all of that. Elon Musk recently revealed details about how people will access StarLink. It will be incredibly simple, and it will enable access to the relatively free global internet from anywhere on the planet. Starlink Terminal has motors to self-adjust optimal angle to view sky. Instructions are simply: plug in socket, point at sky. These instructions work in either order. No training required. Elon Musk What that means is that anyone can access the internet from anywhere. Chinese citizens will be able to access Google and information about Tiananmen Square. Russian citizens will be able to see external analysis of Putin’s financial dealings if even Russia blocks outside sources. Indian protesters can’t be cut off from the internet. Of course, governments will make the Starlink Terminal illegal. But that in itself will be a victory. Censorship works best when it is invisible: when people don’t even know that there is alternate information, other understandings of reality. (Chinese teenage exchange students at a relative’s house last year, for example, had never heard of Tiananmen Square, and refused to believe stories that, they felt, painted China in a negative light.) But when a device to connect to the outside world becomes contraband, the glass walls become opaque. People realize that walls have been erected to prevent them from seeing other opinions. And that is at least one step to maintaining a free, open and accessible internet globally, which should help combat fake news, propaganda and information deprivation aimed at controlling populations. And it’s a step towards making the splinternet harder to achieve. 1,000 satellites will be enough to enable basic service, Musk has said. SpaceX just launched a third batch of 60 satellites, and is expected to continue launching that many every two weeks through the rest of 2020. (For context, only about 9,000 satellites have been launched in all of space history, about 5,000 of which are still in orbit. And only 2,000 are actually still operational. So even at a quarter or a fifth of total capacity, Starlink is a ridiculously large satellite constellation and unprecedented in human history — and astronomers have legitimate concerns about light pollution.) While Musk has applied for launch permission for up to 42,000 satellites, he’s unlikely to launch them all. But at the current pace, a global and unblockable internet service should be available in less than a year. This doesn’t mean that all will instantly be rosy. Governments, of course, can try to jam satellite signals. That’s unlikely to work — or even be possible — in all places and all times, however. They’re also likely to continue to try to engage in false flag and other misinformation projects. And people seem to be pretty good at fooling themselves these days: locking themselves in reality bubbles that block dissenting narratives. But any gaps in the emerging splinternet are opportunities for different perspectives and, hopefully, true facts to emerge.

**Authoritarianism causes Nuclear War.**

**Brown 19**—Analyst for the Department of Defense’s Nuclear Enterprise, aiding in nuclear strategy research and conducting exercises to verify nuclear surety policy, spent six years in the United States Air Force working in nuclear security operations, Master's of Art in International Relations and intends to pursue a Ph.D., conducting research on nuclear strategy and deterrence [Gerald, 12/16/2019, “Conflict and Competition: Limited Nuclear Warfare and the New Face of Deterrence”, Global Security Review,<https://globalsecurityreview.com/conflict-competition-limited-nuclear-warfare-new-face-deterrence/>] AMarb

Proliferation to autocratic states is a cause for concern, primarily because they are considerably less stable than democratic states and may be more willing to utilize a nuclear weapon. The inherently volatile nature of these regimes poses a significant challenge. North Korea has a very poor and impoverished populace, held under authoritarian rule. Regimes such as these are not known for their longevity and stability. The threat of regime change and revolt from within is a realistic consideration with autocratic states. If this occurred, it could result in the loss of a nuclear weapon, or their domestic use to quell a rebellion.[20] It could also escalate into conflict as Chinese and U.S. forces both seek to secure their nuclear assets and end up in conflict with each other. China would certainly not accept U.S. forces along the Yalu river, and both would want to immediately seek to ensure the stability of Pyongyang’s nuclear assets. Autocratic states could also safely assume that Western powers would prefer it if they were a democratic government friendly to the West. With the international liberal orders push for global democracy, autocratic rulers are likely to fear Western interference. After Pyongyang’s recent success, a nuclear weapons capability may appear to be an effective way to prevent Western interference and ensure its sovereignty. With smaller autocratic states, the constant external and internal threats to the stability of their regimes breed paranoia and volatility. Leading government officials tend to be promoted based on loyalty rather than competence, and disagreement or discontent with the dictator may be punished harshly, stifling progress and ingenuity. These regimes also tend to have strong military leadership directing the country. Pakistan is notable in this regard, where the military maintains significant control over the government and has a history of instigating a military coup when they dislike civilian leadership. Pakistan has had four separate military coups since its creation, with military dictators constantly consolidating their power into the executive branch.[21] Military leadership is far more likely to see nuclear weapons use as a viable option, which increases the instability of nuclear autocratic regimes even further. Civilian leadership has arguably been a key factor in preventing nuclear use thus far. Military officers often possess a different mindset and attitude on the subject than civilian leadership due to their career path. During the Cold War, there were numerous instances where the Joint Chiefs of Staff were far more willing to utilize nuclear weapons in a preventive war and were reined in by U.S. civilian leadership.[22]

**Extinction**

**Starr 15** [Steven, Senior Scientist for Physicians for Social Responsibility (www.psr.org) and Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program at the University of Missouri. Starr has published in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Strategic Arms Reduction (STAR) website of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology] “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015. https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html TG

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that ends human history. There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food. Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.