## Contention 1: Harms

#### [Valentine 17] Space exploration assumes and utilizes the assumption of a cisgender, heterosexual, able-bodied white man

**Valentine 2017** [David Valentine, Professor at the University of Minnesota, “Gravity fixes: Habituating to the human on Mars and Island Three,” HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory, Volume 7, Number 3, Winter 2017, journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.14318/hau7.3.012) //neth

My informants cite pressing, human-scaled terrestrial problems as justification for this weighty endeavor: a “back up” of terrestrial species against cosmic or Anthropocene-era disasters; a need to restore Earth’s biosphere by moving mining, polluting industries, and energy production to space; a growing population’s demand for new resources under globalized capitalism; and a human-species psychic need to explore and be free on a new frontier. But they also hold out a libertarian hope that conscious effort and free enterprise in places where—as I have frequently heard said—“there are no natives” will fix things so that humans can do a more equitable job of colonialism this time around in settlements characterized by diversity and equal opportunity. The problems of terrestrial history, human difference, and equality, that is, could be finally settled and fixed elsewhere in the cosmos. As habitual analysts of contemporary and historical matters of concern, readers will immediately recognize problems in these imagined futures of human equality and planetary salvation: the enduring gravity of universalizing Euro-American Enlightenment, free market, and imperial chronotopes that promise fixes through claims of general human equivalence and a future human diversity in as-yet uninhabited places. The unmarked “human” underpinning these visions has been an ever-widening focus of critical concern across a range of scholarly fields for decades now, for precisely its capacity to fix modernity’s universalizing progressive projects through an epistemological colonialism that simultaneously retains the white, male, able-bodied, cisgendered, and heteronormative Man as its implicit representative. More recently, scholars in anthropology and other disciplines have insisted that “human” be revised by attention to Euro-American world-making, including a critical scholarship that retains humanness at its core. Ontological and multinaturalist anthropologies critique the discipline’s solution to the problem of human difference, commonality, and exceptionalism through fuller representation as rooted in a Western ontology that frames humanness as commensurable in the context of a common nature and therefore ultimately subject to comparison (e.g., Viveiros de Castro 1998). Ethnographies that take nonhumans as ethnographic subjects insist on the human’s deep imbrication with other species, undercutting human claims to radical difference and separateness from those species (e.g., Kohn 2013). But as Black and Indigenous feminist scholars such as Sylvia Wynter (2003) and Audra Simpson (2014) further argue, any attempt to fix or problematize the “human” by way of a solution to any general problem of the nature of difference (between different kinds of humanness or between the human and nonhuman) is still barren unless it acknowledges the historical centrality of Black death and attempts at Indigenous extinction to the constitution of the problem of general humanness and of difference itself (see also McKittrick 2013; Weheliye 2014). The problem of the unmarked “human” is thus, like Earth’s crust, a ground that consistently shifts (Clark 2010). For critical scholars who engage outer space—from Hannah Arendt (1968) to Paul Virilio (1997), Peter Redfield (2000), Dennis Cosgrove (2003), and Daniel Sage (2014)—we see a similar problem with the shifting grounds of the human. These scholars have focused on state-led space programs’ self-proclaimed goals of human-species-level projects of discovery as universal solutions to terrestrial problems. If Arendt was concerned about the view from space as broadly dehumanizing and depoliticizing, these latter scholars have concluded that outer space is not a site of radical difference, but rather a renewed spatial fix for the problems faced by capital and (especially US) state power on Earth, underwritten by the alibi of an unmarked “humanity.” Jean Baudrillard expresses this stance precisely through gravity: “What, ultimately, is the function of the space program … if not the institution of a model of universal gravitation, of satellization of which the lunar module is the perfect embryo?” (1995: 34). Critical concern with outer space has more recently been met by a materialist and ontological analysis around the urgency of the Anthropocene and concomitant emergent problems that require “planet” and “cosmos” as frames of analysis to upend certainties about the human or that require new collective ways to think about humanness (Chakrabarty 2009; Stengers 2010; Latour 2013; Olson and Messeri 2015). But, as Zoe Todd notes, metropolitan scholarly concerns with the Anthropocene and Earth-as-planet still implicitly mobilize both human commonality and Euro-American discovery—this time that “the climate is a common organizing force” for humanness (2016: 8)—without citing Indigenous intellectuals who speak from those traditions and who frame the human in other terms. This critique demands a rethinking of the problems of commonality and equivalency proposed by metropolitan arguments, even if they recognize the incommensurabilities of climate change experience. The evolving critiques of “the human” that I sketch out above are vital first readings of modernist projects, whether historical, epistemological, or ontological. But as the scale of social theory moves toward that of Earth and its material conditions, and toward human engagements in places beyond Earth, I argue that it is necessary to think about those places, their multiple conditions, and what new challenges they pose to “the human.” In the multiple places of outer space, where Earth’s conditions of spatiality or temporality—including those of one-g—do not hold, the problem of what it is to be and become human would need to be ongoingly debated, revised, and contingently solved in ways that do not easily enable a spatial fix via the extension of terrestrial relations or forms of difference—discursive, historical, or ontological.

#### [Griffin 09] The politics of space are profoundly gendered – the discourse of exploration, development, appropriation, and colonization reproduce heteronormative hierarchies and ensure the continuation of heteronormativity in space.

**Griffin 9** (Penny, Senior Lecturer - Convenor, MA International Relations, ‘The Spaces Between Us: The Gendered Politics of Outer Space’, in Bormann, N. and Sheehan, M. (eds), Securing Outer Space. London and New York: Routledge, pp.59-75.) SJ

This chapter is about sex, but not the sex that people already have clarity about. 'Outer space' as a human, political domain is organized around sex, but a 'sex' that is tacitly located, and rarely spoken, in official discourse. The politics of outer **space exploration**, militarization and commercialization as they are conceived of and practiced in the US, embody a distinction between public and private (and appropriate behaviours, meanings and identities therein) highly dependent upon heteronormative hierarchies of property and propriety.1 The central aim of this chapter is to show how US outer space discourse, an imperial discourse of technological, military and commercial superiority, configutes and prescribes success and successful behaviour in the politics of outer space in particularly gendered forms. US space discourse is, I argue, predicated on a **heteronormative discourse of conquest** that reproduces the dominance of heterosexual masculinity(ies), and which hierarchically orders the construction of other (subordinate) gender identities. Reading the politics of outer space as heteronormative suggests that the discourses through which space exists consist of institutions, structures of understanding, practical orientations and regulatory practices organized and privileged around heterosexuality. As a particularly dominant discursive arrangement of outer space politics, **US space discourse (re)produces meaning through gendered assumptions of exploration, colonization, economic endeavour and military conquest** that are deeply gendered whilst presented as universal and neutral. US space discourse, which dominates the contemporary global politics of outer space, is thus formed from and upon institutions, structures of understanding, and practical orientations that privilege and normalize heterosexualiry as universal. As such, the hegemonic discursive rationalizations of space exploration and conquest ,re)produce both heterosexuality as 'unmarked' (that is, thoroughly normal­ ized) and the heterosexual imperatives that constitute suitable space-able people, practices and behaviours. As the introduction to this volume highlights, the exploration and utilization of outer space can thus far be held up as a mirror of, rather than a challenge to, existent, terrestrially-bound, political patterns, behaviours and impulses. The new possibilities for human progress that the application and development of space technologies dares us to make are grounded only in the strategy­ obsessed (be it commercially, militarily or otherwise) realities of contemporary global politics. Outer space is a conceptual, political and material space, a place for collisions and collusions (literally and metaphorically) between objects, ideas, identities and discourses. Outer space, like international relations, is a global space always socially and locally embedded. There is nothing 'out there' about outer space. It exists because of us, not in spite of us, and it is this that means that it only makes sense in social terms, that is, in relation to our own constructions of identity and social location. In this chapter, outer space is the problematic to which I apply a gender analysis; an arena wherein past, current and **future policy-making** is embedded in relation to certain performances of power and reconfigurations of identity that are always, and not incidentally, gendered. Effective and appropriate behaviour in the politics of ourer space is configured and prescribed in particularly gendered forms, with heteronormative gender regulations endowing outer space's hierarchies of technologically superior, conquesting performance with theif everyday power. It is through gender that US techno-strategic and astro-political discourse has been able to (re)produce outer space as a heterosexualized, masculinized realm.

#### **[Starr 20] Those with the most ‘desirable genetics’ will be chosen to go to space which results in marginalized groups being excluded**

**Starr 20** (Michelle Starr, April 10, 2020, Homo Galacticus: How Space Will Shape The Humans of The Future, Science Alert, an award-winning journalist with over 15 years of experience in the science and technology sectors, <https://www.sciencealert.com/homo-galacticus-how-space-will-shape-the-humans-of-the-future>) SJ

Even with all those unknowns, decisions made before those pioneers set off into the infinite final frontier - decisions we might see made in our lifetimes, in fact - will have more of an impact than we might know. As Solomon explains, it's yet another effect we've already watched unfold on Earth - the [founder effect](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Founder_effect). "The people that are the founders will have a very significant influence on the long-term makeup of the human population in space," he said. "It plays out on Earth all the time. Every time a new island pops up out of the sea there are going to be some plants and some insects and other species that will eventually make their way there. And whatever characteristics and traits they happen to have are going to be the characteristics that are going to be present in that population." We can already see hints of how it might play out for spacefaring humans. Earlier this year, NASA put out a call for astronaut applications - and [one of the requirements is a Masters degree](https://www.sciencealert.com/apply-now-nasa-is-looking-for-the-next-generation-of-astronauts). That means people who are [wealthy enough to be highly educated](https://www.education.gov.au/wealth). That means, in America at least, [probably white people](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/pdf/coe_svc.pdf). Not every country has the resources for a human space program, or can train astronauts. Sometimes the decisions on who gets to go to space may be politically motivated. People can also get selected based on physical traits, which is starting to sound a bit too much like [eugenics](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eugenics), if the plan is to travel space for multiple generations. "A lot of how we develop and what we develop is affected, not so much by 'is there gravity' or 'isn't there gravity', but by who they decide make acceptable astronauts," Bacal said. A mid-point as a test case, she points out, is the notion of the commercialisation of space. Miners, for instance - spending stretches in low gravity, returning to Earth in between jobs. It takes much longer to regain bone density than it does to lose it, so it could be possible that space miners never gain enough time to fully recover, resulting in early-onset osteoporosis. "That could - as it already is in terms of the astronaut corps - impact who gets to work there or who gets chosen for your 10-generation generation ship. You might say, 'look, we're going to choose people who are less likely to be susceptible to bone density loss'," she said. "That has ethnographic implications. It has gender implications." And these will need to be considered very carefully if we want to avoid a situation where specific groups of people are barred from space because of their race or gender. We may never become a true space-faring species. It's possible [we'll never leave the Solar System](https://www.sciencealert.com/nobel-winning-astrophysicist-says-we-ll-never-colonise-exoplanets). But we're also not likely to stay here on Earth forever.

## Contention 2- Solvency

#### [Gorove 69] All signatories of the Outer Space Treaty (OST) of 1967 should end private appropriation of outer space by ruling that it violates the non-appropriations clause of the OST

**Gorove 1969** [Stephen Gorove, jurist & Professor Emeritus at University of Missisipi, “Interpreting Article II of the Outer Space Treaty”, 37 Fordham L. Rev. 349, 1969, <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1966&context=flr>] //neth

I. SUBJECT MATTER OF APPROPRIATION With respect to the problem of subject matter, the prohibition of national appropriation relates clearly to "outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies."2 The Treaty is silent on the question of what is outer space, what it encompasses or what its boundaries are in relation to airspace. The only statement contained in the Treaty is that the moon and other celestial bodies are included in outer space. For this reason, the prohibition regarding national appropriation would unquestionably extend to the moon and other celestial bodies. Whether or not the prohibition would extend to outer space in its totality or only to part of it, or would relate to the moon or a celestial body as a whole or only to a part of it, are further significant questions. By common sense interpretation the prohibition could not very well relate to outer space as a whole since no one could at present appropriate outer space as a whole but only a part of it. Insofar as the moon and other celestial bodies are concerned, the prohibition could extend to the whole entity if national appropriation of the whole is indeed possible. But even in relation to the moon and other celestial bodies, it would appear by reasonable interpretation that the prohibition would also cover acquisition of a part of the moon or other celestial body. Any contrary interpretation would seem to make the prohibition of national appropriation largely illusory. In relation to national acquisition of a part of outer space, further questions may be raised. For example, does the prohibition extend to the collection of dust particles or other special elements during flight in outer space? Does the prohibition extend to the appropriation of cosmic rays, gases or the sun's energy, or to the collecting of mineral samples or precious metals on the moon or other celestial bodies? Should the answer depend on the type of resource involved, or on its availability in unlimited (cosmic rays, meteorites, gases) or limited (minerals, metals) quantities or perhaps on its location? In attempting to give answers to these questions, it may be pointed out, first of all, that, in the absence of some special circumstance, little would be gained by insisting on the nonappropriation of resources such as cosmic rays or gases, which are available in inexhaustible quantities. At the same time, the Treaty as it stands seems to make little allowance for national acquisition of exhaustible spatial resources. With respect to location, it could be argued that if any parts of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, were found on the earth, they would not be subject to the prohibition of national appropriation since they would become part and parcel of the earth. Under a strict interpretation it may also be argued that the prohibition extends to the resource irrespective of its location. However, it might be preferable to distinguish between elements of outer space which have reached the earth as a result of natural causes and those which have done so through human intervention. In the first instance national appropriation would not be prohibited, whereas in the second example the prohibition would apply. Thus, a meteorite falling on the earth could be appropriated whereas a precious stone or metal brought to the earth from outer space could not be a subject of national appropriation. Regarding the jurisdictional boundaries of outer space, particularly the dividing line between airspace and outer space, we seem to know a little more now than we knew at the time of the first Colloquium on the Law of Outer Space back in 1958. At that time it did not appear with certainty that nation states would not object to the orbiting of foreign space instrumentalities over and above their territories. Today after more than a decade of spatial experiments, it can be said that an international custom seems to have sprung up which regards the area where space instrumentalities move in durable orbit as outer space. From this we also take for granted that anything above and beyond this area is also regarded as outer space. However, the more precise boundary line between airspace and outer space is still left undetermined. II. NATIONAL APPROPRIATION Turning to the second question which involves the meaning of "national" appropriation, it has been suggested that only the United Nations acting on behalf of the world community as a whole, should be entitled to appropriate.3 While further developments in space law, by international custom or treaty, may eventually prohibit spatial appropriations by an individual or a chartered company or the European communities, the Treaty in its present form appears to contain no prohibition regarding individual appropriation or acquisition by a private association or an international organization, even if other than the United Nations. Thus, at present, an individual acting on his own behalf or on behalf of another individual or a private association or an international organization could lawfully appropriate any part of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies. Whether or not an ad hoc international organization could be created for the exclusive purpose of enabling it to appropriate outer space is a delicate question. The answer may have to depend on the good faith of the parties. A further question in relation to "national" appropriation is whether or not political subdivisions of a state, such as the states of a federal state, cities or municipalities may appropriate? Under a strict interpretation, the answers to these questions would likely be in the negative even though an occasional court decision in other areas of the law may support an affirmative position.4 IlL. THE CONCEPT OF APPROPRIATION With respect to the concept of appropriation the basic question is what constitutes "appropriation," as used in the Treaty, especially in contradistinction to casual or temporary use. The term "appropriation" is used most frequently to denote the taking of property for one's own or exclusive use with a sense of permanence. Under such interpretation the establishment of a permanent settlement or the carrying out of commercial activities by nationals of a country on a celestial body may constitute national appropriation if the activities take place under the supreme authority (sovereignty) of the state. Short of this, if the state wields no exclusive authority or jurisdiction in relation to the area in question, the answer would seem to be in the negative, unless, the nationals also use their individual appropriations as cover-ups for their state's activities.5 In this connection, it should be emphasized that the word "appropriation" indicates a taking which involves something more than just a casual use. Thus a temporary occupation of a landing site or other area, just like the temporary or nonexclusive use of property, would not constitute appropriation. By the same token, any use involving consumption or taking with intention of keeping for one's own exclusive use would amount to appropriation. The question may also be asked whether or not the purpose of appropriation, that is whether it takes place in the name of science, for enrichment, or for any other purpose would have a bearing on the question of its lawfulness. Normally, the purpose of appropriation should have little bearing on the prohibition except that to constitute appropriation, the acquisition must be carried out for the purpose of one's own or exclusive use. However, since the Treaty proclaims freedom of scientific investigation in outer space, 6 there seems to be some support for the argument that if the appropriation takes place in the name of science or in the course of a scientific investigation in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, such use would not be prohibited under the Treaty. Nonetheless, if the proclaimed principle is taken literally, the same argument could not be used with equal force in a case where the scientific investigation was carried out on the earth. It is doubtful whether the Treaty intended such effect, but if it did not, it is unfortunate that it fails to make it clear.7 IV. SOVEREIGN AUTHORITY In relation to the question whether or not there is any room for the exercise of some form or degree of superior authority, jurisdiction, use or occupation in outer space, the answer would seem to be in the affirmative, since the Treaty prohibits the exercise of such authority, use or occupation only if it amounts to national appropriation. Under such interpretation, the temporary use of a spatial resource without the latter's transformation or deterioration may be permissible, whereas the consumption or destruction of a resource may not. Furthermore, insofar as the exercise of authority is concerned, the state on whose registry an object launched into space is carried must retain jurisdiction and control over such object, and over its personnel, while in outer space or on a celestial body.' The Treaty also makes it clear that the states will be internationally responsible for national activities in outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, irrespective of whether such activities are carried on by governmental or nongovernmental entities. In fact, the activities of nongovernmental entities require authorization and continuing supervision by the state concerned.9 The fact that some measure of at least temporary exclusive jurisdiction may be exercised over a particular area on the moon or other celestial bodies, such as a space station and its adjacent grounds, is also apparent from Article XII which makes access by representatives of a foreign state contingent on reciprocity. It is not the purpose of the foregoing brief analysis to attempt to resolve the complex problems which may arise in connection with the interpretation of Article II of the Outer Space Treaty. The purpose is rather to draw attention to the existence of these problems which will have to be resolved if man's exploration of the cosmos is to be guarded by law and order.

#### [Marx 20] The aff is key to global cooperation and scientific exploration

**Marx 20** (Paris Marx is a freelance writer, host of left-wing tech podcast Tech Won't Save Us, and editor of Radical Urbanist, June 8, 2020, Yes to Space Exploration. No to Space Capitalism, <https://jacobinmag.com/2020/06/spacex-elon-musk-jeff-bezos-capitalism>) SJ

Musk and Bezos are the leading drivers of the modern push to privatize and colonize space through their respective companies, SpaceX and Blue Origin. Their visions differ slightly, with Musk preferring to colonize Mars, while Bezos has more interest in building space colonies in orbit. In 2016, Musk claimed he would [begin sending rockets to Mars in 2018](https://observer.com/2016/06/elon-musk-charts-path-to-colonizing-mars-within-a-decade/). That never happened, but it hasn’t ended his obsession. Musk is determined to make humans a multi-planetary species, framing our choice as either space colonization or the risk of extinction. Bezos says that Earth is the best planet in our solar system, but if we don’t colonize space we doom ourselves to “[stasis and rationing](https://jacobinmag.com/2019/07/space-colonies-jeff-bezos-blue-origin).” These framings serve the interests of these billionaires, and make it seem like colonizing space is an obvious and necessary choice when it isn’t. It ignores their personal culpability and the role of the capitalist system they seek to reproduce in causing the problems they say we need to flee in the first place. Billionaires have a [much greater carbon footprint](https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2017/12/1/16718844/green-consumers-climate-change) than ordinary people, with Musk [flying his private jet](https://arstechnica.com/cars/2019/01/elon-musk-private-jet-flew-150000-miles-in-2018-washington-post-reports/) all around the world as he claims to be an environmental champion. Amazon, meanwhile, is [courting oil and gas companies](https://gizmodo.com/amazon-is-aggressively-pursuing-big-oil-as-it-stalls-ou-1833875828) with cloud services to make their business more efficient, and Tesla is selling [a false vision of sustainability](https://jacobinmag.com/2020/01/elon-musk-climate-apocalypse-tesla-spacex) that purposely serves people like Musk, all while capitalism continues to drive the climate system toward the cliff edge. Colonizing space will not save us from billionaire-fueled climate dystopia. But these billionaires do not hide who would be served by their futures. Musk has given many figures for the cost of a ticket to Mars, but they’re never cheap. He told Vance the tickets would cost $500,000 to $1 million, a price at which he thinks “it’s highly likely that there will be a self-sustaining Martian colony.” However, the workers for such a colony clearly won’t be able to buy their own way. Rather, Musk tweeted a plan for [Martian indentured servitude](https://gizmodo.com/elon-musk-a-new-life-awaits-you-on-the-off-world-colon-1841071257) where workers would take on loans to pay for their tickets and pay them off later because “There will be a lot of jobs on Mars!” Bezos is even more open about how the workforce will have to expand to serve his vision, but has little to say about what they’ll be doing. His plan to maintain economic “growth and dynamism” requires the human population to [grow to a trillion people](https://jacobinmag.com/2019/07/space-colonies-jeff-bezos-blue-origin). He claims this would create “a thousand Mozarts and a thousand Einsteins” who would live in space colonies that are supposed to house a million people each, with the surface of Earth being mainly for tourism. Meanwhile, industrial and mining work would move into orbit so as not to pollute the planet, and while he doesn’t explicitly acknowledge it, it’s likely [that’s where you’ll find many of those trillion workers](https://jacobinmag.com/2019/12/jeff-bezos-the-expanse-space-fantasy-sci-fi-syfy/) toiling for their space overlord and his descendants. Space Shouldn’t Serve Capitalists In 1978, Murray Bookchin [skewered a certain brand of futurism](http://unevenearth.org/2019/10/bookchin_doing_the_impossible/) that sought to “extend the present into the future” and desired “multinational corporations to become multi-cosmic corporations.” Much of this future thinking obsesses about possible changes to technology, but seeks to preserve the existing social and economic relations — “the present as it exists today, projected, one hundred years from now,” as Bookchin put it. That’s at the core of the space billionaires’ vision for the future. Space has been used by past US presidents to bolster American power and influence, but it was largely accepted that capitalism ended at the edge of the atmosphere. That’s no longer the case, and just as past capitalist expansions have come at the expense of poor and working people to enrich a small elite, so too will this one. Bezos and Trump may have a public feud, but that doesn’t mean that their mutual interest isn’t served by a renewed US push into space that funnels massive public funds into private pockets and seeks to open celestial bodies to capitalist resource extraction. This is not to say that we need to halt space exploration. The collective interest of humanity is served by learning more about the solar system and the universe beyond, but the goal of such missions must be driven by gaining scientific knowledge and enhancing global cooperation, not nationalism and profit-making.Yet that’s exactly what the space billionaires and American authoritarians have found common cause in, with Trump declaring that “[a new age of American ambition has now begun](https://twitter.com/TeamTrump/status/1266846741787074560?s=20)” at a NASA press briefing just hours before cities across the country were placed under curfew last week. Before space can be explored in a way that benefits all of humankind, existing social relations must be transformed, not extended into the stars as part of a new colonial project.

## Contention 3- Framing

#### [Farrell and Gupta 04] Heteronormativity actively constrains education and expression in debate - challenging it is key to accessing education.

**Farrell and Gupta 2004** (Farrell, Kathleen, Honors B.A. in sociology from Trinity College; M.A. and Ph.D. in sociology from Syracuse University. Professor Farrell's primary research and teaching interests include gender and sexualities, with an emphasis on inequality studies. In her courses, Professor Farrell focuses on the interdisciplinary and practical implications of sociology and Nisha Gupta, Assistant Proffessor of Psychology at University of West Georgia, "Interrupting heteronormativity: Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender pedagogy and responsible teaching at Syracuse University." (2004)) SJ

Should discussions of sexuality be included in the classroom?1 The easy answer might be no: it is not ‘relevant’ to the subject matter of most courses except perhaps to those that explicitly engage with human sexuality, such as Child and Family Studies, Sociology, or Women’s Studies. Moreover, this reasoning might go, given estimates that within the general population less than ten percent identify as non-heterosexual, there’s a good chance that in a class of sixty students everyone is straight. It is this kind of perspective, however, that not only contributes to the invisibility of LGBT students, but it also constructs and reinforces heteronormativity in our classrooms and across campus.2 LGBT students (and teachers) ARE present in our classrooms—whether we choose to see them or not—and it is their very invisible presence that demonstrates the power of heteronormativity to mask that which does not conform, and to naturalize that which does. This is a problem for both LGBT and heterosexual students and teachers alike. Heteronormative assumptions and practices regulate the beliefs, behaviors, and desires of ALL of us, restricting the range of possibilities of identification and expression for ALL of us, to such an extent that even momentary and joyful expressions (e.g. the heterosexual man singing “I feel like a woman” in the Chevy commercial discussed by Susan Adams) become sources of discomfort and fear. Practices of regulation and restriction are integral to creating and maintaining hierarchies of power, which in turn limit the kinds of learning and teaching that can happen in our classrooms. As responsible teachers, we know that our pedagogical theories and practices need to expand the kinds of learning opportunities we provide students, not restrict them. In fact, the administration of this university recognizes the importance of this by emphasizing the link between a rich intellectual climate and a diversity of perspectives and people: “[. . .] diversity in our student body, faculty, and staff has far-ranging and significant educational benefits for all nonminorities and minorities alike” (Syracuse University Academic Plan, 2001). Particular strategies to create more inclusive curricula have been developed and implemented in programs and departments university-wide because “[s]tudents in diverse learning environments learn more, and have higher levels of satisfaction and greater degrees of civic engagements. They are better able to appreciate the ideas of others and they are better prepared to enter the world they will lead” (SU Academic Plan, 2001). This diversity of students, faculty, and ideas includes: “race, ethnicity, gender, age, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, and physical and mental ability” (Syracuse University Human Resources, emphasis added). In principle, then, SU values diversity. Taking a closer look at what diversity means and how it is “practiced,” however, exposes some gaps between these principles and actual, everyday classroom procedures, particularly when that “diversity” topic is sexual orientation. It’s important to note that sexual orientation is a term that does not reference a particular set of people; it’s not only about LGBT people, but also non-LGBT, or heterosexual, people. Why is this broader definition of sexual orientation important? Because the sexual orientation of heterosexuality is simultaneously institutionalized and naturalized to the extent that it becomes the invisible norm against which all other sexual orientations, identifications, or expressions are named “abnormal.” The issue of “invisibility,” then, isn’t just about LGBT students and teachers; it’s about the ways in which our assumptions about (hetero)sexuality are invisible to us. And we carry these assumptions into our classrooms. As a result, heteronormativity is reproduced, most often unconsciously, through our own everyday classroom practices. Rather than expanding the kinds of learning opportunities we create space for, we inadvertently reinforce a regulated and restrictive framework for understanding the complexity of human sexuality.

#### [Damante 16] The role of the judge is to promote queer inclusion in educational spaces

**Damante 2016** (Rebecca Damante, June 16, 2016, “Can Education Reduce Prejudice against LGBT People?”, The Century Foundation, graduated from Smith College with a B.A. in the Study of Women and Gender. She worked as an LGBTQ Opposition Researcher at Media Matters for America in Washington D.C.., <https://tcf.org/content/commentary/can-education-reduce-prejudice-lgbt-people/?agreed=1>) SJ

Incorporating LGBT people, history, and issues in schools’ curricula could combat the widespread homophobia prevalent throughout the United States. In an ideal world, laws like those in [North Carolina](https://www.cnn.com/2016/03/29/health/north-carolina-bathroom-law-cards/) and [Tennessee](http://www.advocate.com/health/2016/4/27/tenn-gov-signs-bill-allowing-psychologists-turn-away-lgbt-patients) would be deemed unconstitutional, and people would not violently target those in the LGBT community. However, even the strictest gun control policies and largest campaigns to ban these laws doesn’t erase the problem at hand: intense homophobia exists in our country. Ensuring that information on the LGBT community is provided to the public during the developing years of their lives can begin to address this issue.There are many notable LGBT people that can be included in school curricula across a variety of fields such as Harvey Milk, Sylvia Rivera, Michel Foucault, Audre Lord, and Bayard Rustin; as well as notable media and sports icons like Anderson Cooper, Ellen DeGeneres, Jason Collins, Lady GaGa, and Laverne Cox. Talking about these individuals’ contributions to society, as well as the battles faced by the LGBT community as a whole, could open people’s minds to LGBT issues. While including LGBT content in schools is beneficial for students, the way in which this content is presented is just as important, if not more. Going forward, teachers can adopt an [anti-bias lens](http://www.tolerance.org/sites/default/files/general/PDA%20Critical%20Practices_0.pdf), a form of social-emotional learning that respects diversity and challenges sexism, racism, ableism, classism, and other societal prejudices. This means educating students about the history of heterosexism, and encouraging these students to speak out in support of the LGBT community.Some states have already begun to include LGBT history in their curricula. In 2011, for example, California passed the [Fair Education Act](http://www.faireducationact.com/about-fair/), which requires schools to teach some aspect of LGBT history, and [the results were astounding](http://www.casafeschools.org/FactSheet-curriculum.pdf). Both LGBT and non-LGBT students reported feeling safer in their classrooms when LGBT issues were included in the curriculum.

#### [Damante 16] Therefore discussing queer issues in the debate space is important for spillover into material change and makes the debate space more inclusive. The role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who performatively creates the best impacts for queer people.

**Damante 2016** (Rebecca Damante, June 16, 2016, “Can Education Reduce Prejudice against LGBT People?”, The Century Foundation, graduated from Smith College with a B.A. in the Study of Women and Gender. She worked as an LGBTQ Opposition Researcher at Media Matters for America in Washington D.C.., <https://tcf.org/content/commentary/can-education-reduce-prejudice-lgbt-people/?agreed=1>) SJ

Ensuring that these instances of anti-LGBT violence and discrimination do not continue to repeat themselves may require society to turn to one of its oldest tools: education. [Reports from GLAAD have found](https://www.glaad.org/blog/new-glaad-report-maps-long-road-full-lgbt-acceptance-despite-historic-legal-advances) that increased knowledge about LGBT people leads to lower levels of discomfort toward this community, and thus can reduce anti-LGBT discrimination. Yet, there is a lack of education across the nation on this sector of the population, with [only one state](http://www.faireducationact.com/about-fair/)—California—mandating the implementation of LGBT figures and history into school curricula. Taking that into consideration, one can’t help but wonder: what would have happened if state lawmakers or the Orlando shooter had received more education about LGBT people? As the American public learns more about the LGBT community, [this can foster LGBT acceptance.](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2015/02/14/glaad-accelerating-acceptance-report-_n_6681620.html) LGBT education can be fulfilled in a variety of ways, including getting to know a family member who is gay or a friend that is transgender; it can also include consuming media that features LGBT people or characters. Seeing Caitlyn Jenner on TV, for example, can help make the change from misunderstanding to acceptance, which is extremely important given that only [16 percent of people know someone who is transgender.](https://www.glaad.org/releases/number-americans-who-report-knowing-transgender-person-doubles-seven-years-according-new) With that in mind, teaching students about LGBT issues and individuals within the classroom could help them better understand LGBT people. Similar to the benefits of racial and socioeconomic integration explored in The Century Foundation’s report [How Racially Diverse Schools and Classrooms Can Benefit All Students](https://tcf.org/content/report/how-racially-diverse-schools-and-classrooms-can-benefit-all-students/), the inclusion of LGBT issues in a school’s curriculum could reduce stereotypes and biases against the LGBT population. Interacting with people from different backgrounds and varying preferences is an [integral skill](https://tcf.org/content/report/promoting-inclusion-identity-safety-support-college-success/), as [employers today](https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/2013_EmployerSurvey.pdf) are seeking professionals who can collaborate with our world’s [increasingly diverse population.](https://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/02-241.ZO.html) Furthermore, as the TCF contributors Amy Stuart Wells, Lauren Fox, and Diana Cordora-Cobo explain, learning in diverse environments has been shown to improve one’s educational experience, as it “promote[s] creativity, motivation, deeper learning, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills.”Including LGBT content in curricula could also offer LGBT students—who disproportionately feel the effects of bullying in schools—a safer, improved educational experience. More than [one-third of gay youth](http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/bullying-and-gay-youth) have missed a day of school because they felt unsafe, and [nine out of ten of LGBT teens](http://www.bullyingstatistics.org/content/gay-bullying-statistics.html) have been bullied in school, which [can cause students to suffer academically.](http://newsroom.ucla.edu/releases/victims-of-bullying-suffer-academically-168220) Educating students about LGBT issues could foster an environment where LGBT students [feel safer in the classroom](https://www.glsen.org/download/file/MzIzMw==), improving their overall educational experience for years to come.

#### [Mitchell] The drive to prevent extinction is a form of heteronormative survivalism where gendered bodies become the unwilling tools to sustain humanity.

**Mitchell 15** (Audra Mitchell, Audra Mitchell is a settler scholar who lives and works on the Ancestral and treaty lands of the Neutral (Attawandaron), Haudenosaunee and Mississaugas of the New Credit (please see Honouring the Land). She currently holds the the Canada Research Chair in Global Political Ecology at Wilfrid Laurier University. From 2015-18 she held the CIGI Chair in Global Governance and Ethics at the Balsillie School of International Affairs Audra is an Associate Professor at Wilfrid Laurier University, Canada, 8-3-2015, "Gendering extinction," Worldly, <https://worldlyir.wordpress.com/2015/08/03/gendering-extinction/>, JKS)

**The reproduction of survival/ the survival of reproduction**

Extinction is almost always understood against the horizon of survival and the imperative to sustain it – at least for life forms deemed to be of value to humans. In many cases, this imperative takes the form of deliberate strategies for enforcing existence. Donna Haraway’s influential book When Species Meet devotes considerable attention to the logics, practices and politics of Species Survival Plans. These plans monitor and enforce reproduction amongst ‘endangered’ species, not least by collecting data on populations, genetic profiles and genetic materials to enable selective breeding. This strategy assumes that all organisms can, should, and can be made to exercise their reproductive capacities in order to resist extinction, and it actively mobilizes members of ‘endangered species’ into this project. In so doing, it helps to entrench norms regarding gender, sexuality and reproductive labour that are deeply entrenched in modern, Western human cultures. Attention to these programmes highlights an important way in which extinction is gendered in dominant scientific and policy frameworks. Specifically, strategic breeding programmes share in the belief that reproduction is an imperative for those capable of reproducing if ‘the species’ is at risk’. This belief is directly related to Western norms of the reproductive imperative for women. Indeed, Haraway points out that it is precisely “‘woman’s’ putative self-defining responsibility to ‘the species’ as this singular and typological female is reduced to her reproductive function”. In a similar sense, within SSPs and other strategies of enforced survival, entire life forms are reduced to their reproductive capacities. Moreover, programmes of enforced survival can, in the context of sexual reproduction, disproportionately burden female organisms with the task of avoiding extinction. This logic is particularly fraught in discussions of the possibility of human extinction, in which female fertility (captured in the standard policy language of ‘births per woman’) is framed simultaneously as a threat to survival, and the only hope for escaping extinction (see, for instance, Alan Weisman’s comments on this). In these ways, the securitization of survival entrenches the intersectional categories of gender, species and race discussed above. Dominant discourses of extinction and conservation also entrench and privilege sexual reproduction, in ways that entrench heteronormative assumptions and norms. This is reflected in the way that the subjects of extinction and conservation are framed. The standard object of conservation is the biological ‘species’, a term which is defined by the ability of organisms to reproduce sexually. As Myra Hird has pointed out, this conception of ‘species’ makes it appear as if sexual reproduction is the ‘best’ means of sustaining the existence of a life form. However, Hird’s work demonstrates that Earthly life forms actually engage in myriad forms of reproduction, from the free exchange of DNA between bacteria to the hermaphroditic practices of some fish. The upshot of these arguments is that Earthly life is sustained through a huge variety of reproductive activities that do not conform to biological understandings of life processes or species. Crucially, Hird argues that there is no necessary hierarchy between forms of reproduction. In Darwinian terms, all species that manage to survive are equally successful. However, by conflating survival with sexual reproduction, existing discourses of extinction embed hetero-normative frameworks that devalue other forms of reproduction. They also reduce reproduction to the imperative to survive, ignoring the myriad cultural, political, aesthetic, sensual and other dimensions of reproduction.

#### [Fahs 13] Academic spaces are used to communicate values systems and are important for promoting critical thinking and enacting social change.

**Fahs and Bertagni 13**(Breanne Fahs, Department of Women and Gender Studies, Arizona State University, Jennifer Bertagni, Arizona State University, “Up from SCUM: Radical Feminist Pedagogies and Consciousness-Raising in the Classroom”, Radical Pedagogy, 2013, <http://www.breannefahs.com/uploads/1/0/6/7/10679051/2013_radical_pedagogy_fahs_bertagni.pdf> ) SJ

Many scholars that utilize critical and feminist pedagogies have critiqued the traditional model of education as one that creates a learning environment centered on a grading system, memorization, and an authoritarian teacher and submissive student relationship. Embedded within this model, power imbalances are perpetrated without much consideration for how such imbalanced power dynamics affect student learning. Critics of traditional pedagogy argue that it overrelies upon what Paolo Freire describes as “banking,” where students become passive receptacles that teachers supposedly “fill” with information (Beckman, 1990; Freire, 1970; hooks, 1994; Larson, 2006). Both critical and feminist theorists argue that knowledge is socially constructed and that schools perpetuate certain value systems via beliefs, attitudes, and priorities set forth in the classroom. Pedagogical practices are therefore not “neutral,” but rather, modes of communicating dominance, social norms, and ideologies about social identities like race, class, and gender (Leistyna, Woodrum, & Sherblom, 1999; McLaren, 1998). Though feminist pedagogy and critical theory share similar criteria and goals for educating students, feminist pedagogy focuses specifically on women’s lives and experiences as a starting point for creating and learning about epistemology in the women’s studies classroom (Beckman, 1990; Larson, 2006). Feminist pedagogies insist upon a continual examination of the way gender affects lived experience, policy, and cultural norms, particularly by exploring and unpacking the unexamined dynamics of gender and power (Crabtree & Sapp, 2003; Stake, 2006). Crabtree and Sapp (2003) describe feminist pedagogy as “a set of classroom practices, teaching strategies, approaches to content, and relationships grounded in critical pedagogical and feminist theory” (p. 131). Feminist pedagogy challenges the teacher-student relationship and the student’s relationship to knowledge (Stake, 2001). Jayne Stake and Francis Hoffman (2000; 2006) qualitatively measured women’s studies professors’ pedagogical practices and found the following four categories most commonly used: 1)participatory learning: student participation by expressing their personal experiences in the classroom; 2)development of critical thinking/ open-mindedness: strengthening of critical thinking skills, where students engaged in critical thinking about the topics in lecture, rather than accepting information or “debanking”; 3)validation of personal experience/ development of confidence: encouraging students to see the connection between assigned readings and their own life experiences and 4) development of political/social understanding: helping students to conceptualize connections between readings, their societal context, and their role in engaging actively in social change. Therefore, feminist pedagogy enables students to critically examine the microcosmic implications of macrocosmic and hegemonic cultural policies and to decipher how those belief systems affect them on the personal level (Stake, 2006). In addition to the aforementioned tenets of feminist pedagogy, women’s studies professors often strive to practice egalitarian power dynamics in the classroom, as well as to encourage egalitarian attitudes in general (Crabtree & Sapp, 2003; hooks, 1994; Stake, 2006). This creates a supportive atmosphere where students respect everyone’s right to comment and critically evaluate their world. Opinions inconsistent with feminism expressed in the classroom can serve as platform for critical analysis and debate, with students deconstructing comments construed as sexist, racist, heterosexist, etc. while maintaining the democratic structure of the classroom (Kimmel & Worrell, 1997). Women’s studies classes have demonstrated the capacity to heighten students’ awareness of gender inequality; increase confidence and sense of empowerment; develop less conventional beliefs about gender and create greater practices of egalitarianism. Enhanced confidence, empowerment, and critical thinking skills students developed in women’s studies classes predicted feminist and political activism later on (Stake & Hoffman, 2001; 2007). No current studies have interrogated the intersections between radical politics and feminist pedagogy.

#### [Brady 17] Appeals to meritocratic fairness serves to perpetuate violence

**Brady, 17** - Janelle Brady, University of Toronto, Canadian Journal for New Scholars in Education, May 29th, 2017 “Education for whom? Exploring systems of oppression and domination” [<https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/cjnse/article/view/30801>] Accessed 8/28/19 SAO

On the matter of objectivity, Code (as cited in Alcoff, 2007) stated, “objectivity requires taking subjectivity into account” (p. 41), and within a guise of objectivity, ignorance prevails and is produced and reproduced. An implication of objectivity within education is that it is presented as the ideal-truth and something one ought to strive for, thus subjectively located realities are assumed to be weak in nature and not scientific in assumptions and arguments. For example, the reproduction of objectivity is presented in educational curricula as students strive to follow a scientific model in order to seek a supposed truth, but this misses the significant situatedness of knowers, group identities, and an analysis of systemic foundations of oppression (Alcoff, 2007, p. 40). As such, students who are the knowers of their own realities become silenced and disenfranchised from the dominant perspectives presented in Canadian curricula. Students’ experiences and knowledge should be centered in the classroom to create multicentric ways of knowing (Dei, 1996), which involves multiple epistemologies and debunks universality, as opposed to unicentric ways of knowing. The epistemological ignorance of objectivity is rarely raised in education, thus reproducing systems of oppression which become ontological reality. Dei (2016) posited that “objectivity is the dominant’s subjectivity” (G. J. S. Dei, personal communication). Without this epistemological bias being called into question, objectivity is presented as the ultimate truth. King (2015) highlighted the need for liberation from “ideological myths, masquerading as objective scientific or academic knowledge, that rationalize and obscure dominating power relations” (p. 180). In Kindergarten to grade 12, students are rarely encouraged to question the philosophical canons and all-knowing mathematicians and scientists (Abawi, 2016-2017)—the keepers of knowledge—who are white men. Thus, non-white students are unlikely to find people who represent their lived experiences or look like them as part of their normal encounters with subject material (Smith, 2010). Furthermore, according to Smith, educators have a difficult time in providing multiple sites of teaching and learning within the classroom, because identities, which do not fall under a white, patriarchal supremacist ordering, are deemed as Others and are only provided in juxtaposition to or as additives on the normative base. In an effort to achieve objectivity in education, the focus on essentializing difference through liberal democratic discursive practices oftolerance, respect, and fairness depicts racialized minorities and Indigenous peoples through a deficit perspective (Abawi & Brady, 2017; Dei, 1996). Therefore, Alcoff’s (2007) epistemology of ignorance of objectivity demonstrated how the subjugated are questioned: their values, experiences, and lived realities are labelled as subjective and henceforth weak, non-encompassing ways of knowing. This leads to Alcoff’s discussion of the third epistemology of ignorance, which highlights the epistemic advantages and disadvantages to knowledge and ways of knowing. Knowledge systems and ways of knowing are rooted in people’s social locatedness and help them to understand certain phenomena. Alcoff (2007), again drawing on Code’s work, asserted that there are epistemic advantages and disadvantages to ways of knowing and knowledge systems. In relation to the epistemology of ignorance of objectivity, those whose knowledges are validated and legitimized are part of the dominant group, whereas those whose knowledges are disenfranchised are part of the oppressed group. According to Dei (2014), knowledge is based on its historical, as well as ancestral and spiritual underpinnings, and cannot be pinpointed to one contextual moment. Epistemological advantages or disadvantages may play out in education when educators or students become ascribed knowers in particular contexts. One might be the “South Asian Food expert” or the “Indigenous history expert,” and they may experience some level of epistemological advantage in knowing; however, their knowledge is still Othered and compartmentalized into particular moments in time and removed from history. In an educational context, Othering people’s knowledges, histories, and identities to become stagnant points in history or single stories takes the onus away from school administrators and curriculum developers whose responsibility is to delve into South Asian history beyond samosas and Indigenous history beyond Pow wows. This is because the epistemologically advantaged become responsible for sharing their knowledge in educational contexts. However, their knowledge is not solely contextualized to that particular moment in time, but deeply entrenched in history and implicated by the history of others. Questions in the educational context can be asked about why South Asians were denied entry into Canada through racist immigration policies (Ralston, 1999; Thobani, 2007) or why and how Indigenous residential schooling, forced assimilation, the building of pipelines and the like continue to affect Indigenous communities to this very day (Coulthard, 2014). The contextual experts carry the burden for the ignorant who dominate, thus reinforcing the idea of “sharing their subjective experiences.” As Lorde (1984) stated, People [of colour] are expected to educate white people as to our humanity. Women are expected to educate men. Lesbians and gay men are expected to educate the heterosexual world. The oppressors maintain their position and evade responsibility for their own actions. (p. 115) Thus, it becomes the work of the oppressed to become educators to share their stories and their subjective histories and realities for the dominant group, when the dominant group deems it appropriate to do so. The oppressed become the bearers of the oppressor’s ignorance while also living through their own oppression. It is important to be critical of such dynamics so that people of colour do not bear all of the responsibility for the privileged to learn and unlearn about their privilege. The idea of knowing and the relentless pursuit of knowledge is another issue that comes into play when addressing the ignorance of objective epistemologies and ontologies. Objectivity, falling under a moderncolonial logic, is presented as all-knowing and truth-seeking. However, this is counter to Indigenous knowledges—which anticolonial scholars (e.g., Dei, 2008; Simpson, 2004) believe should be centered in curricula—with one of the major tenets of Indigenous knowledges being the humility of knowing (Shields, 2005). The humility of knowing—where the learner does not seek mastery of knowledge, but instead knowledge is gained through sharing, learning, and unlearning—is in contrast to what becomes sought after in colonial education, which is rooted in individualism and the ultimate quest for knowledge, meritocracy, and excellence. Students who are from non-dominant groups are forced to attempt scholarly excellence in institutions based on individualism while their very ancestral, family, and community settings are contradictorily based in holistic and community-based ways of knowing and organizing. Therefore, the consumption of knowledge does not become a sharing process, but a process based on individual ownership of knowledge, and those with access to such value systems succeed while those who come with humility are pushed out of schools (Dei et al., 1997). This focus on individualism is further exacerbated through neo-liberalist education. In this context, while education promotes group work, academic success advantages individuals (Giroux, 2003). The danger here is that students begin to believe their academic success is based on their own merit rather than the systems which afford them privilege. This results in mantras of equality falling under the veil of liberalism, sameness, and meritocracy. This individualism also creates chants like “All lives matter,” which is critical of the Black Lives Matter movement and supports the belief, built on an epistemology of ignorance, that all lives are subjected to the same trials. This perpetuates ignorance and objective knowledge systems, while negating and furthering the expendable nature of Blackness, Indigenousness, and Black and Brown bodies. Hence, scholars have explored the dangerous nature of claiming that “All lives matter” (Adjei, 2016; Carney, 2016; Orbe, 2015; Yancy & Butler, 2015), believing it upholds white supremacy and denies the police brutality of Black people, the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, and Islamophobic attacks. Such a claim to innocence becomes key to upholding systems of oppression, which are often silenced and denied by the dominant group. Therefore, educators, students, community members, and parents/families need to trouble the ideal of equality and claims to fairness for all in reimagining new possibilities for hope and change.