# \*\*\*\*Notes\*\*\*\*

This affirmative is a combination of the feminism kirtik on the negative, and the space troopers science fiction affirmative. Some of the tags will need to be redone to make the story flow in the direction you want.

The case neg consists of the Answers To each part that was run.

There are many different routes you can take with this affirmative. You can put in a narrative, or not. There are many approaches. The plan text in addition has no specific one.

Cards can be taken out, or rearranged in each contention- some may be too long.

# Status Quo

**The discourse of the current US Space Policy relies on a masculine and securitized paradigm of military dominance. The gendered assumption built into exploration and development policies ensure insecurity and patriarchy.**

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.)

The US is, of course, heavily reliant on its satellite-based systems, and to this end works (to a certain extent) within a regime framework of international space ‘law’ (Brearly, 2005: 14). This is not to suggest that US discourse is not constructed around the embedded belief that the US itself represents the global hegemon, and the only viable, indeed legitimate, keeper of global ‘order’. Although, as US Space Command states, the US may be challenged ‘regionally’, it remains ‘unlikely to be challenged by a global peer competitor (US Space Command, ‘Joint Vision 2020’). From a position of discursive hegemony, US Space Command and the Pentagon have formulated a politics of Outer Space that is in all but name a justification for unabashedly imperial conquest. According to the ‘Joint Vision 2020’ control of space assures ‘access to space, freedom of operations within the space medium, and an ability to deny others the use of space, if required’. The discursive deployment of space as a ‘medium’ suggests that, in US discourse, space exists essentially as a void, an extractable and expendable resource to be used at will (much like the oceans of ‘historical sea commerce’), with the US cast in ‘a classic warfighter role’. The gendered assumptions that underlie this rhetoric are tacit but striking, and depend on two distinct, heteronormative, tropes of masculinization and femi­ nization. Firstly, the US’s ability to control ‘space capabilities’ depends upon assumptions of dominance inherent superiority that revolve around the (gendered) signifier of the US’s role as ‘classic’ or ‘active warfighter’: assumptions including the need for speed and watchfulness (‘real time space surveillance’), agility and technical superiority (‘timely and responsive spacelift’), ‘enhanced protection’ (of ‘military and commercial systems’), robustness and efficient repelling capabilities (‘robust negation systems’), ‘precision force’, and ‘enhanced “sensor-to-shooter”’ capabilities. Secondly, in establishing its (heterosexually masculine) credentials, the US’s technostrategic reconfigures all other space-able nations as subordinate, constructing a binary, heterosexual relationship of masculine hegemony/feminine subordination. Tellingly, US Space Command cites the forging of ‘global partnerships’ as essential to protecting US national interests and investments, where such partnerships are at the behest of the US, with those that partner the US ‘warfighter’ little more than passive conduits for US ‘opportunity’ and ‘commerce’ (‘Joint Vision 2020’). This 'warfighting' discourse is not, of course, the only construction of outer space to possess discursive currency in the US, 'Space exploration', as Crawford argues, 'is inherently exciting, and as such is an obvious vehicle for inspiring the public in general, and young people in particular' (2005: 258). Viewed predominantly as a natural extension [Q the so-called evolution of military and commercial 'arts' in the Western hemisphere, human, technological expansion into outer space is justified in terms of scientific, commercial and militaty global entrepreneurship. Conquering the final frontier of outer space is increasingly seen as crucial to a state's pre-eminence in the global economy (cf. 'Joint Vision 2020'). International alliances in the post-Fordist economy 'have already consolidated the decision for future space exploration and colonization' (Casper and Moore 1995: 315). In a particularly dramatic turn of phrase, Seguin argues that '(mJankind (sic] now stands at the threshold of long-duration space habi­ tation and interplanetary travel' (2005: 980). Similarly, Manzey describes human missions to Mars less as contingent future events, but as the inevitable consequences of technological progress (Manzey 2004: 781-790). Space, once defined as a power-laden site of Cold War military conflict, has also become a site of international political and economic cooperation. Often conceptualized in expansionist terms, as that which will make our world bigger, with space 'discovery' expanding human knowledge, space is also conceived of as that which will make the world smaller, in neo-liberal globalization terms, 'by reconfiguring capitalism and nationalism' (Casper and Moore 1995: 315). The US' 'warfighting' discourse is also at odds with much so-called 'space law', in particular the Outer Space Treary (967), which defines space as the 'province ofall mankind' and asks that states act 'with due regard to the corre­ sponding interests of States Parties to the Treaty' (Bready 2005: 16-17). Within the US itself, congressionally-led efforts to discuss and minimize the threats posed by human-made debris caught in Low Earth Orbit (LEO), of which there is somewhere in the region of 2,300 metric tons (ibid.: 9), appear ill-matched with clear efforts by US government to increase the weaponization of space. The US cooperates, to a limited extent, in perpetuating a sustainable space environment for its satellite-based systems, to which space debris undoubtedly poses a threat, because this is of direct individual benefit to US commercial interests. The US refuses, however, to ratifY the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), prohibiting all use of nuclear explosions in space, since this constitutes a restriction of its ability to develop and test 'new' weapons. US critics of the CTBT contend that ratifYing the treaty would 'undercut confidence in the US deterrent', and thus increase 'the incentive for rogue states to obtain nuclear weapons' (Medalia 2006: 13). All this is not to argue that dominant 'scientific' and 'commercial' justifications for space exploration, which are perhaps less overtly related to the militarization of space (for example, concerning advances in medicine, mole­ cular and cellular biology, geology, weather forecasting, robotics, electronics and so on), do not in their basic assumptions also embody a gendered sense of 'man's' natural right to colonize so-called unknown territory (see, e.g. Morabito 2005). The 'quest for knowledge' remains deeply embedded in Western accounts of the need for space colonization (as Bush's 2004 speech makes clear), rationalized from humanity's so-called 'natural' desire to explore and conquer (cf, Bush 2004; Crawford 2005; Mendell 2005). Craw­ ford, in proposing a case for the 'scientific and social' importance of human space exploration, suggests that, there are reasons for believing that as a species Homo sapiens is geneti­ cally predisposed towards exploration and the colonisation of an open frontier. Access to such a frontier, at least vicariously, may be in some sense psychologically necessary for the long-term wellbeing of human societies. (Crawford 2005: 260) Similarly, NASA's website claims that 'from the time of our birth, humans have felt a primordial urge to explore', to 'blaze new trails, map new lands, and answer profound questions about ourselves and O l l [ universe' ([www.nasa.gov](http://www.nasa.gov)). Much commercial gain already depends on the exploitation of outer space, but there is undoubtedly more to be made of space's 'resources': 'asteroidal' mining, for example; the extraction of 'lunar soil oxygen'; the mining of very rare 'Helium-3' from lunar soil as fuel for nuclear fusion reactors; or space, and particularly the Moon, as a 'tourist venue', offering all kinds of new 'sporting opportunities' (Morabito 2005: 5-7), But the lines distinguishing the various components of the outer space 'whole' are vague, and are particularly obscured by the tacit but pervasive heteronormativity that makes of space (to borrow the language of the then USSPACECOM) a 'medium' to be exploited; the passive receptacle of US terrestrial 'force', As Goh states, outer space 'is an arena of growing economic and technological importance, It is also a developing theatre of military defence and warfare' (2004: 259), US outer space discourse is driven by the belief that outer space exists to be conquered (and that it rarely fights back), that those at the cutting edge of its exploitation are the 'visionaries' and 'entrepreneurs' that will pave the way to tourists, explorers, TV crews and to, as Morabito claims, 'dubious characters' such as, perhaps, 'bounty hunters' (2004: 10).

**NASA and its quest for space colonization reinforce heteronormativity.**

Casper and Moore 95 (Monica J., Ph.D in sociology from the University of California, San Francisco, feminist scholar and researcher on reproductive justice. Lisa Jean, Ph.D in sociology from the University of California, San Francisco, professor of sociology and gender studies at Purchase College. “INSCRIBING BODIES, INSCRIBING THE FUTURE: Gender, Sex, and Reproduction in Outer Space”, pg. 312, jstor [NT])

In a twist on the "truth is stranger than fiction" maxim, this paper examines gender, sex, and reproduction in outer space. Unlike on Star Trek, where these issues are more or less taken for granted, in "real time" they are highly contested. In 1992, a married couple flew together on a U.S, space shuttle mission, generating a flurry of public curiosity and controversy over what the paparazzi termed "celestial intimacy." The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) was bombarded with questions about heterosexual sex and reproduction in space, topics which the agency seemed ill-equipped and unwilling to address. Not only are sex and reproduction perceived as topics which should not be discussed in polite society, they are also seen as contributing to a loss of legitimacy for NASA in an age of uncertain and ever-diminishing resources. We argue that the emergent controversy over "sex in space" is shaped by intersecting and mutually reinforcing discourses about gender, sex, and reproduction in the contemporary United States. Our argument rests on three core findings. First, gender differences are constructed at multiple "spaces" within this domain; males bodies are equated with masculinity and are accepted as the norm, while female bodies are equated with femininity and are configured as problematic. Women astronauts are defined simultaneously as potential sexual partners for male astronauts and as potential reproducers in the interest of colonization. Second, sexual practices are framed exclusively within the heterosexual paradigm, which leaves few "spaces" for other sexualities. Third, sexuality is explicitly and invariably linked to reproduction, reflecting and reinforcing heterosexist assumptions about sexual behavior. Yet, reproduction in a space environment is potentially damaging to missions because human bodies are physiologically transformed by microgravity and radiation. Thus, as far as NASA is concerned, astronauts should neither copulate nor reproduce; within the heterosexual paradigm, preventing sex in space becomes a strategy for preventing reproduction in space. In short, contemporary accounts of sex and reproduction in space, like Star Trek and its progeny, inscribe human bodies and futures, and in so doing tell us a great deal about who "we" are at present. A key theoretical concept informing our analysis is inscription. What exactly do we mean by "inscribing bodies, inscribing the future"? Within cultural studies, for example, inscription is defined as the act of "writing" culture onto bodies and/ or subjectivities through a variety of social, cultural, and technical practices. ln this process, bodies and subiectivities are seen, read, and produced as texts (Treichler and Cartwright 1992). For example, speculative and science fiction have been important cultural "spaces" where new possibilities and freedoms are imagined. Space is constructed in these accounts as a site at which liberatory practices may (or may not) occur. Often, fictional humans depart a troubled Earth to begin again on another planet, although not without a fair amount of hardship and hard work in their new, intergalactic American Dream. It is precisely this vision of possibility and freedom that draws people to science fiction (Lefanu 198% Kuhn 1990 Barr 1993) and also to the seemingly infinite possibilities offered by the space program. Yet, we argue that inscribing the future has a negative and pernicious side, as well. Contemporary discourses and practices negate many types of future freedoms, both on Earth and in space. These inscriptions shape our lives profoundly, while they simultaneously shape what could, might, and should occur in space in an uncertain future. To cite one example, heterosexist framings preclude other sexualities by highlighting sex in space as a social and scientific problem for NASA, which must screen out homosexuality and other "deviant" practices in order to proceed with its agenda of exploration. Thus, we suggest that within these cultural "spaces," some inscriptions are disallowed while others are relentlessly pursued. Inscription, then, is a multifaceted practice imbued with both pleasures and dangers. If people are not earthbound, as aviation history and the space program have illustrated with often stellar successes, then neither is sociology. Adding a sociological spin to inscription, we focus on the social relations within which different types of inscriptions occur. We suggest that "space" is both an actual spatial site for certain practices and a symbolic and material screen onto which earthbound activities are projected and refracted. Yet, there is considerable traffic between Earth and space, not only in terms of shuttle and satellite missions but also symbolically via flights of the imagination. Much of the space program actually takes place on Earth, for example in the scientific, economic, and institutional planning required for each mission. Yet, as on Earth, humans in space interact with each other in myriad ways, solve a range of problems, cope with technical difficulties, and deal with orders from Mission Control. All of this collective activity takes place within the institutional context of NASA and the U.S. space program as well as the broader social, political, and economic context of international space travel. ln short, a number of dimensions of space travel are open to sociological investigation. Sociology, in our view, should not end at the Van Allen Belt, that astrophysical "boundary" of intense ionizing radiation surrounding Earth."

**The drive to colonize space precludes queer identities and concretizes sexual difference. This reinforces heterosexism and turns women into commodities.**

**Casper and Moore 95** (Monica J., Ph.D in sociology from the University of California, San Francisco, feminist scholar and researcher on reproductive justice. Lisa Jean, Ph.D in sociology from the University of California, San Francisco, professor of sociology and gender studies at Purchase College. “INSCRIBING BODIES, INSCRIBING THE FUTURE: Gender, Sex, and Reproduction in Outer Space”, pg. 312, jstor [NT])

In addition, animal studies have indicated that while ovulation, copulation, and fertilization may occur in space, there are potentially serious implications for resulting offspring (Santy, Jennings, and Craigie 1989).According to one informant, a reproductive scientist, embryos and fetuses may be impaired during space flight. The physical movement necessary for fetal development on Earth may be impossible in a weightless environment. If fetuses experience the same physiological deconditioning that adults do, this could severely impact fetal growth and development. This raises a possibility that fetuses which develop in a space environment may be unable physiologically to return to Earth once they are born. Would fiscal, material and moral responsibility for "space babies" then fall on the astronauts who birth them, or on the country, corporation, or movie star who sponsored the mission? Scientific accounts of sexual reproduction thus stress the problematic nature of female bodies and raise a number of intriguing questions about the construction of sex differences in outer space. In short, NASA has chosen to define reproduction and sexuality as synonymous and interchangeable. A simplified relationship would look like this: sexuality = men fucking women = reproduction. There are two contradictory readings here. First, NASA's long-term political goals include colonization of space as discussed earlier, which requires propagating the human species in a space environment. Given current reproductive conditions, female bodies are a necessary "space" for the creation and maintenance of fetuses. In such a reading, heterosexual sex becomes a necessary means through which reproduction is accomplished, especially given the limited use of assisted reproductive technologies in space. In this framing, NASA's reluctance to talk about sex seems somewhat puzzling. If the agency wants to colonize, it needs women and it needs heterosexual sex. Yet a second reading, drawing on the above data on reproduction, tells us that there is a fundamental problem with NASA's colonization goals. At this particular historical moment, reproduction in space is highly uncertain and NASA fears its physiological and social consequences. But if reproduction in space becomes a viable practice, then women will become commodities, valued for their role in potential colonization. Historically, colonizing activities on Earth have generally required women's participation in masculine voyages of discovery and conquer. It is possible that in future colonization efforts, heterosexual intercourse would be encouraged while other expressions of desire might be actively discouraged. Thus, NASA's activities may create a "brave new world" shaped by the sexual and reproductive trafficking women (Rubin 1975). We have argued that gender, sexuality, and reproduction are imbricating and mutually constitutive discourses within the US. space program Within the masculine framework of space flight, gender differences are constructed and deployed across multiple sites. Female bodies are essentialized in opposition to a male norm, leading to notions of masculinity and femininity as "natural" categories. These differences are construed as fundamental and constrain the ways sexuality and reproduction are understood and explored. Sexuality is discursively located in complementary male and female bodies, reflecting and reinforcing the heterosexual paradigm. Reproduction is then articulated as a natural and inevitable outcome of sexual activity defined in terms of male-female intercourse. On their surface, these constructions are consistent with NASA's long-term goals of colonizing space. Yet, because reproduction is physiologically problematic and because sexuality means many different things despite NASA's narrow ideological framing, sex and reproduction are contested and will likely remain so in the future. We have also suggested that these discourses are situated within a broader set of practices in which human bodies and futures are inscribed. These include scientific research, mission planning public relations activities, crew management, and other key sites. Inscription is a powerful tool for analyzing the dynamic, porous relationship between Earth and space, including the activities and meanings which mediate the symbolic and vehicular traffic. Space is alive with possibilities, yet it is also an embattled domain and no future is certain. What we have attempted to show in this paper is that conservative theories and praxis on Earth propel us towards some futures while eclipsing the possibility of others.

**This gendered security discourse causes inevitable violence and war inevitable.**

Shepherd 2007 [Laura J., Department of Political Science and International Studies, University of Birmingham, “Victims, Perpetrators and Actors’ Revisited:1 Exploring the Potential for a Feminist Reconceptualisation of (International) Security and (Gender) Violence,” *BJPIR*: 2007 VOL 9, 239–256]

As Spike Peterson and Jacqui True comment, ‘our sense of self-identity and security may seem disproportionately threatened by societal challenge to gender ordering’ (Peterson and True 1998, 17). That is, the performance of gender is immanent in the performance of security and vice versa, both concern issues of ontological cohesion (as illustrated in Table 2). Taking this on board leads me to the conclusion that perhaps security is best conceived of as referring to ontological rather than existential identity effects. Security, if seen as performative of particular configura- tions of social/political order, is inherently gendered and inherently related to violence. Violence, on this view, performs an ordering function—not only in the theory/practice of security and the reproduction of the international, but also in the reproduction of gendered subjects. Butler acknowledges that ‘violence is done in the name of preserving western values’ (Butler 2004, 231); that is, the ordering function that is performed through the violences investigated here, as discussed above, organises political authority and subjectivity in an image that is in keeping with the values of the powerful, often at the expense of the marginalised. ‘Clearly, the west does not author all violence, but it does, upon suffering or anticipating injury, marshal violence to preserve its borders, real or imaginary’ (ibid.). While Butler refers to the violences undertaken in the protection of the sovereign state—violence in the name of security—the preservation of borders is also recognisable in the conceptual domain of the inter- national and in the adherence to a binary materiality of gender. This adherence is evidenced in the desire to fix the meaning of concepts in ways that are not challenging to the current configuration of social/political order and subjectivity, and is product/productive of ‘the exclusionary presuppositions and foundations that shore up discursive practices insofar as those foreclose the heterogeneity, gender, class or race of the subject’ (Hanssen 2000, 215). However, the terms used to describe political action and plan future policy could be otherwise imagined. They could ‘remain that which is, in the present, never fully owned, but always and only redeployed, twisted, queered from prior usage and in the direction of urgent and expanding political purposes’ (Butler 1993, 228). The concepts both produced by and productive of policy could reflect an aversion to essentialism, while recognising that strategic gains can be made through the temporary binding of identities to bodies and constraining of authority within the confines of the territorial state. This is, in short, an appeal to a politics of both/and rather than either/or. Both the state (produced through representations of security and vio- lence) and the subject (produced through representations of gender and violence) rely on a logic of sovereignty and ontological cohesion that must be problematised if alternative visions of authority and subjectivity are to become imaginable. International Relations as a discipline could seek to embrace the investigation of the multiple modalities of power, from the economic to the bureaucratic, from neo- liberal capitalism to the juridical. Rather than defending the sovereign boundaries of the discipline from the unruly outside constituted by critical studies of develop- ment, political structures, economy and law, not to mention the analysis of social/ political phenomena like those undertaken by always-already interdisciplinary feminist scholarship, IR could refuse to fix its own boundaries, and refuse to exercise sovereign power, in terms of authority, over the meanings of its objects of analysis. Future research on global politics could look very different if it were not for the inscription of ultimately arbitrary disciplinary borderlines that function to constrain rather than facilitate understanding. It may seem that there is a tension between espousing a feminist poststructural politics and undertaking research that seeks to detail, through deconstruction, the ways in which particular discourses have failed to manifest the reforms needed to address security and violence in the context of gendered subjectivity and the constitution of political community. In keeping with the ontological position I hold, I argue that there is nothing inherent in the concepts of (international) security and (gender) violence that necessitated their being made meaningful in the way they have been. Those working on policy and advocacy in the area of security and violence can use the reconceptualisation I offer ‘to enable people to imagine how their being-in-the-world is not only changeable, but perhaps, ought to be changed’ (Milliken 1999, 244). As a researcher, the question I have grown most used to hearing is not ‘What?’ or ‘How?’ but ‘Why?’. At every level of the research process, from securing funding to relating to the academic community, it is necessary to be able to construct a convincing and coherent argument as to why this research is valuable, indeed vital, to the field in which I situate myself. A discursive approach acknowledges that my legitimacy as a knowing subject is constructed through discursive practices that privilege some forms of being over others. In the study of security, because of the discursive power of the concept, and of violence, which can quite literally be an issue of life and death, these considerations are particularly important. Further- more, as a result of the invigorating and investigative research conducted by exemplary feminist scholars in the field of IR,17 I felt encouraged to reclaim the space to conduct research at the margins of a discipline that itself functions under a misnomer, being concerned as it is with relations inter-state rather than inter- national. As Cynthia Enloe has expressed it, To study the powerful is not autocratic, it is simply reasonable. Really? ... It presumes a priori that margins, silences and bottom rungs are so natu- rally marginal, silent and far from power that exactly how they are kept there could not possibly be of interest to the reasoning, reasonable explainer (Enloe 1996, 188, emphasis in original). If this is the case, I am more than happy to be unreasonable, and I am in excellent company

**Heteronormativity results in omnicide. The combination of the universal suspicion of Queerness and the genocidal impulse to eradicate it motivates a larger apocalyptic movement to rescue hetero-culture with extinction.**

Sedgwick 8 (Eve, Professor of English at Duke University, *Epistemology of the Closet*, second revised edition, California at Berkeley Press, p. 127-130)

From at least the biblical story of Sodom and Gomorrah, scenarios of same-sex desire would seem to have had a privileged, though by no means an exclusive, relation in Western culture to scenarios of both genocide and omnicide. That sodomy, the name by which homosexual acts are known even today to the law of half of the United States and to the Supreme Court of all of them, should already be inscribed with the name of a site of mass extermination is the appropriate trace of a double history. In the first place there is a history of the mortal suppression, legal or subjudicial, of gay acts and gay people, through burning, hounding, physical and chemical castration, concentration camps, bashing—the array of sanctioned fatalities that Louis Crompton records under the name of gay genocide, and whose supposed eugenic motive becomes only the more colorable with the emergence of a distinct, naturalized minority identity in the nineteenth century. In the second place, though, there is the inveterate topos of associating gay acts or persons with fatalities vastly broader than their own extent: if it is ambiguous whether every denizen of the obliterated Sodom was a sodomite, clearly not every Roman of the late Empire can have been so, despite Gibbon's connecting the eclipse of the whole people to the habits of a few. Following both Gibbon and the Bible, moreover, with an impetus borrowed from Darwin, one of the few areas of agreement among modern Marxist, Nazi, and liberal capitalist ideologies is that there is a peculiarly close, though never precisely defined, affinity between same-sex desire and some historical condition of moribundity, called "decadence," to which not individuals or minorities but whole civilizations are subject. Bloodletting on a scale more massive by orders of magnitude than any gay minority presence in the culture is the "cure," if cure there be, to the mortal illness of decadence. If a fantasy trajectory, utopian in its own terms, toward gay genocide has been endemic in Western culture from its origins, then, it may also have been true that the trajectory toward gay genocide was never clearly distinguishable from a broader, apocalyptic trajectory toward something approaching omnicide. The deadlock of the past century between minoritizing and universalizing understandings of homo/heterosexual definition can only have deepened this fatal bond in the heterosexist imaginaire. In our culture as in Billy Budd, the phobic narrative trajectory toward imagining a time after the homosexual is finally inseparable from that toward imagining a time after the human; in the wake of the homosexual, the wake incessantly produced since first there were homosexuals, every human relation is pulled into its shining representational furrow. Fragments of visions of a time after the homosexual are, of course, currently in dizzying circulation in our culture. One of the many dangerous ways that AIDS discourse seems to ratify and amplify preinscribed homophobic mythologies is in its pseudo-evolutionary presentation of male homosexuality as a stage doomed to extinction (read, a phase the species is going through) on the enormous scale of whole populations. 26 The lineaments of openly genocidal malice behind this fantasy appear only occasionally in the respectable media, though they can be glimpsed even there behind the poker-face mask of our national experiment in laissez-faire medicine. A better, if still deodorized, whiff of that malice comes from the famous pronouncement of Pat Robertson: "AIDS is God's way of weeding his garden." The saccharine luster this dictum gives to its vision of devastation, and the ruthless prurience with which it misattributes its own agency, cover a more fundamental contradiction: that, to rationalize complacent glee at a spectacle of what is imagined as genocide, a proto-Darwinian process of natural selection is being invoked—in the context of a Christian fundamentalism that is not only antievolutionist but recklessly oriented toward universal apocalypse. A similar phenomenon, also too terrible to be noted as a mere irony, is how evenly our culture's phobia about HIV-positive blood is kept pace with by its rage for keeping that dangerous blood in broad, continuous circulation. This is evidenced in projects for universal testing, and in the needle-sharing implicit in William Buckley's now ineradicable fantasy of tattooing HIV-positive persons. But most immediately and pervasively it is evidenced in the literal bloodbaths that seem to make the point of the AIDS-related resurgence in violent bashings of gays--which, unlike the gun violence otherwise ubiquitous in this culture, are characteristically done with two-by-fours, baseball bats, and fists, in the most literal-minded conceivable form of body-fluid contact. It might be worth making explicit that the use of evolutionary thinking in the current wave of utopian/genocidal fantasy is, whatever else it may be, crazy. Unless one believes, first of all, that same-sex object-choice across history and across cultures is one thing with one cause, and, second, that its one cause is direct transmission through a nonrecessive genetic path--which would be, to put it gently, counter-intuitive--there is no warrant for imagining that gay populations, even of men, in post-AIDS generations will be in the slightest degree diminished. Exactly to the degree that AIDS is a gay disease, it's a tragedy confined to our generation; the long-term demographic depredations of the disease will fall, to the contrary, on groups, many themselves direly endangered, that are reproduced by direct heterosexual transmission. Unlike genocide directed against Jews, Native Americans, Africans, or other groups, then, gay genocide, the once-and-for-all eradication of gay populations, however potent and sustained as a project or fantasy of modern Western culture, is not possible short of the eradication of the whole human species. The impulse of the species toward its own eradication must not either, however, be underestimated. Neither must the profundity with which that omnicidal impulse is entangled with the modern problematic of the homosexual: the double bind of definition between the homosexual, say, as a distinct risk group, and the homosexual as a potential of representation within the universal. 27 As gay community and the solidarity and visibility of gays as a minority population are being consolidated and tempered in the forge of this specularized terror and suffering, how can it fail to be all the more necessary that the avenues of recognition, desire, and thought between minority potentials and universalizing ones be opened and opened and opened?

Patriarchy lead to war, prolif, environmental destruction, and eventually extinction

Warren and Cady 94—Warren is the Chair of the Philosophy Department at Macalester College and Cady is Professor of Philosophy at Hamline University (Karen and Duane, “Feminism and Peace: Seeing Connections”, p. 16, JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3810167.pdf, JB)

Operationalized, the evidence of patriarchy as a dysfunctional system is found in the behaviors to which it gives rise, (c), and the unmanageability, (d), which results. For example, in the United States, current estimates are that one out of every three or four women will be raped by someone she knows; globally, rape, sexual harassment, spouse-beating, and sado-masochistic pornography are examples of behaviors practiced, sanctioned, or tolerated within patriarchy. In the realm of environmentally destructive behaviors, strip-mining, factory farming, and pollution of the air, water, and soil are instances of behaviors maintained and sanctioned within patriarchy. They, too, rest on the faulty beliefs that it is okay to "rape the earth," that it is "man's God-given right" to have dominion (that is, domination) over the earth, that nature has only instrumental value, that environmental destruction is the acceptable price we pay for "progress."And the presumption of warism, that war is a natural, righteous, and ordinary way to impose dominion on a people or nation, goes hand in hand with patriarchy and leads to dysfunctional behaviors of nations and ultimately to international unmanageability. Much of the current" unmanageability" of contemporary life in patriarchal societies, (d), is then viewed as a consequence of a patriarchal preoccupation with activities, events, and experiences that reflect historically male-gender identified beliefs, values, attitudes, and assumptions. Included among these real-life consequences are precisely those concerns with **nuclear proliferation, war, environmental destruction, and violence toward women**, which many feminists see as the logical outgrowth of patriarchal thinking. In fact, it is often only through observing these dysfunctional behaviors-the symptoms of dysfunctionality that one can truly see that and how patriarchy serves to maintain and perpetuate them. When patriarchy is understood as a dysfunctional system, this "unmanageability" can be seen for what it is-as a predictable and thus logical consequence of patriarchy.'1 The theme that global environmental crises, war, and violence generally are predictable and logical consequences of sexism and patriarchal culture is pervasive in ecofeminist literature (see Russell 1989, 2). Ecofeminist Charlene Spretnak, for instance, argues that "militarism and warfare are continual features of a patriarchal society because they reflect and instill patriarchal values and fulfill needs of such a system. Acknowledging the context of patriarchal conceptualizations that feed militarism is a first step toward reducing their impact and preserving life on Earth" (Spretnak 1989, 54). Stated in terms of the foregoing model of patriarchy as a dysfunctional social system, the claims by Spretnak and other feminists take on a clearer meaning: Patriarchal conceptual frameworks legitimate impaired thinking (about women, national and regional conflict, the environment) which is manifested in behaviors which, if continued, **will make life on earth difficult, if not impossible**. It is a stark message, but it is plausible. Its plausibility lies in understanding the conceptual roots of various woman-nature-peace connections in regional, national, and global contexts.

# Science

**Western Technology and science are tools of patriarchy and a source of male power**

**Wajcman** **09** (Judy is a [sociologist](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sociology) working in the field of the social shaping of technology and [gender](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gender) in organisations. She is currently Head of Sociology at the London School of Economics and Political Science. She was formerly a Professor of Sociology in the Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, a Visiting Professor at the Lehman Brothers Centre for Women in Business at London Business School, and a Visiting Professor at the Oxford Internet Institute. She was also formerly a Centennial Professor in the Department of Sociology's Gender Institute at London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), and has previously held posts in Cambridge, Edinburgh, Manchester, Sydney, Tokyo, Vienna, Warwick and Zurich. She was also a Visiting Fellow at All Souls College, Oxford. “Feminist theories of technology” Cambridge Journal of Economics January 8th <http://wiki.medialab-prado.es/images/4/4b/Wajcman_Feminist_theories_of_technology.pdf>) AK

What role does technology play in embedding gender power relations? Let us begin with the traditional conception of what technology is taken to be. On this view technology tends to be thought of in terms of industrial machinery and military weapons, the tools of work and war, overlooking other technologies that affect most aspects of everyday life. The very definition of technology, in other words, is cast in terms of male activities. An initial challenge for feminists was to demonstrate that the enduring identification between technology and manliness is not inherent in biological sex difference. Feminist scholars have demonstrated how the binary oppositions in Western culture, between culture and nature, reason and emotion, hard and soft, have privileged masculinity over femininity (Harding, 1986). The taken-for-granted association of men and machines is the result of the historical and cultural construction of gender. Similarly, the standard conceptions of innovation, production and work have been the subject of scrutiny. Just as feminist economists have redefined the discipline of economics to take account of unpaid domestic and caring work (Folbre, 2001; Himmelweit, 2003), so too feminist scholars of STS have argued for the significance of everyday life technologies (Cowan, 1976; Stanley, 1995). A revaluing of cooking, childcare and communication technologies immediately disrupts the cultural stereotype of women as technically incompetent or invisible in technical spheres. It is salutary to be reminded that it was only with the formation of engineering as a white, male middle-class profession that ‘male machines rather than female fabrics’ became the markers of technology (Oldenziel, 1999). During the late nineteenth century, mechanical and civil engineering increasingly came to define what technology is, diminishing the significance of both artefacts and forms of knowledge associated with women. This was the result of the rise of engineers as an elite with exclusive rights to technical expertise. Crucially, it involved the creation of a male professional identity, based on educational qualifications and the promise of managerial positions, sharply distinguished from shopfloor engineering and blue-collar workers. It also involved an ideal of manliness, characterised by the cultivation of bodily prowess and individual achievement. At the same time, femininity was being reinterpreted as incompatible with technological pursuits. It was during and through this process that the term ‘technology’ took on its modern meaning. The legacy is our taken-for-granted association of technology with men. In common with mainstream STS, feminist writing has long identified the ways in which socio-technical relations are manifest not only in physical objects and institutions but also in symbols, language and identities (McNeil, 2007). Scientific facts and technological artefacts are treated as simultaneously semiotic and material. Such a broad notion of science and technology (technoscience) as a culture or ‘material-semiotic practice’ enables us to understand how our relationship to technology is integral to the constitution of subjectivity for both sexes (Haraway, 1997). To continue with the example of engineering for a moment, here we see a classic case of an archetypal masculine culture, where mastery over technology is a source of both pleasure and power for the predominantly male profession (Faulkner and Lohan, 2004; Hacker, 1989). Such images resonate with the world of computer hackers at MIT described by Sherry Turkle (1984, p. 216): ‘though hackers would deny that theirs is a macho culture, the preoccupation with winning and of subjecting oneself to increasingly violent tests make their world peculiarly male in spirit, peculiarly unfriendly to women’. This is not to say that all women reject ‘geek culture’, nor that computer science is universally coded as masculine. In Malaysia, for example, women are well represented among computer science students (Lagesen, 2008). Sexual ideologies are remarkably diverse and fluid, and for some men technical expertise may be as much about their lack of power as the realisation of it. However, in contemporary Western society, the hegemonic form of masculinity is still strongly associated with technical prowess and power (Wajcman, 1991). Different childhood exposure to technology, the prevalence of different role models, different forms of schooling, and the extreme gender segregation of the job market all lead to what Cockburn (1983, p. 203) describes as ‘the construction of men as strong, manually able and technologically endowed, and women as physically and technically incompetent’. Entering technical domains therefore requires women to sacrifice major aspects of their feminine identity. Notwithstanding the recurring rhetoric about women’s opportunities in the new knowledge economy, men continue to dominate technical work. Women’s employment in the information technology, electronics and communications (ITEC) sector is much lower than their participation in the workforce generally, and it is declining in most industrialised countries. In the UK, for example, fewer than one in five ITEC professionals and managers are female and this figure is even lower in IT strategy and software development roles (Evans et al., 2007). This is consistent with the findings of the 2006 Skills Survey which found that men are more likely than women to be found in jobs that involve complex and advanced computer or computerised equipment use and ‘this gender imbalance has changed little between 1997 and 2006 (Felstead et al., 2007, p. xii).1 These sexual divisions in the labour market are proving intransigent and mean that women are largely excluded from the processes of technical design that shape the world we live in—a point to which I return below.

**Defenses of earth science and attempting to know our ecological situation through space research replicates gender dichotomies**

**Litfin 97** (Karen T., has a Ph.D from UCLA and is an associate professor in the Department of Politics at the University of Washington, Jstor “The Gendered Eye in the Sky: A Feminist Perspective on Earth Observation Satellites” pg.30-31)

Taking these assumptions in order, consider the purported neutrality of science and scientists. Since the publication ofThomas Kuhn's work in the 1960s, a great deal of research in the history of science and the sociology of knowledge has undercut this assumption, demonstrating that science, like all social institutions, is suffused with power dynamics and irrationalities.19 Feminist theorists have highlighted the dimension of gender, elucidating how scientific practice has evolved under the formative influence of a particular ideal of masculinity based upon objectification and control. Feminists relate the fixation on scientific objectivity, which depends upon a rigid dichotomy between subject and object, to other parallel hierarchical dichotomies of modernity: human/animal, mind/body, mas-culine/feminine, reason/emotion, and elite/mass. Feminists also find in these hi-erarchical dichotomies of modernity the link between the oppression of women and the degradation of nature, pointing to the Baconian legacy that summons the scientist "to bind Nature to your service and make her your slave."20 Women, who have been traditionally defined as objects of control, have good reason to question the subject/object dichotomy. Evelyn Fox Keller, one of the pioneers of feminist philosophy of science, argues that the static objectivity of science that renders Nature into alien Other is rooted in the distinctive subjectivity of masculine psychological development with its preoccupation with autonomy.21 Keller's conception of dynamic objec-tivity offers an alternative stance, one that draws upon the ebb and flow (rather than a rigid dichotomy) between subject and object. While dynamic objectivity, which "actively draws on the commonality between mind and nature as a re-source for understanding," is rooted in a feminist psychoanalytic perspective, it is similar to Sylvester's postmodern feminist notion of "empathic cooperation."22 I return to these ideas toward the end of this article in order to draw out the possi-bilities of Earth remote sensing informed by feminist insights. With respect to issues of objectivity, one striking aspect of remote sensing of the environment is indeed its very remoteness. In a sense, satellite-generated pho-tographs of the earth represent the ultimate subject/object dichotomy. Space tech-nology offers the tantalizing prospect of being able to leave the earth in order to get a better view-the ultimate Archimedean vantage point. Rather than being embedded participants in the reality depicted, Earth system scientists become disengaged observers of that reality.23T hus, according to the celebratory dis-course, remote sensing is "building a valid picture of the earth" for the first time.24 Presumably this picture is "valid" because it is drawn from huge quantities of objective, remotely acquired information. It is a picture that privileges knowl-edge derived from abstract science over knowledge derived from lived experi-ence. The main elements of a spaceborne remote sensing system are "spacecraft, instruments, modeling/systems engineering, and data processing,"25e lements that give primacy to an expert structure comprised primarily of white men in affluent societies. To the question, "Who shall be designated as reliable environmental narrators?"E arth system science answers, "Scientists with professional creden-tials in physics, chemistry, and computer sciences-particularly those whose work is most distant from the everyday lived experience of poor people and most women." Whenever quantifiability monopolizes the mantle of legitimacy, qualititative val-ues are given short shrift, so that even if satellite data are supplemented with "ground truth," the privileging of abstract decontextualized data is likely to de-value other approaches to knowledge.26 In particular, as a male-dominated activ-ity, it may reinforce the division of labor that Joni Seager suggests permeates environmental politics: Women care about the environment and men think about it. 27A strong feminist position need not valorize caring as the only viable activity, but can rather insist that environmental preservation requires both men and women to become caring and thinking

Claims of rationality are inherently masculine

Nagl-Docekal 99 (Herta, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Vienna, “The Feminist Critique of Reason Revisited”, Hypatia, Volume 14, Issue 1, Project Muse, HC)

In contemporary feminist theory, many authors share the view that the concept of rationality in modern science and technology is, nevertheless, inseparably bound with masculine gender identity. Additional support for this thesis is sought in psychoanalytical theory, and this way of arguing is characteristic of the second type of critique of reason I'll investigate. Primarily object-relations theory is used as the conceptual framework in this context—in particular the investigations focusing on the differences between the development of male and female children. 4 I will briefly outline the relevant findings concerning the way the ability to perceive reality is generated: At first, the child does not distinguish between the inner and the outer world; the external environment, which for most children in this early stage consists of the mother, is experienced by the child as the extension of itself. Only gradually does the child learn to distinguish the self from the not-self. What is crucial for this process is the separation from the mother: when the mother comes to appear as an independent being, the child experiences the painful recognition of its own autonomous existence. At first, ambivalent feelings arise from this experience: there is, on the one hand, a drive to reinstate the original unity and, on the other, a desire for autonomy. The complex process of development that is thereby set into motion ultimately leads to the child's acknowledgement of a world external to, and independent from, itself. The child then sees itself confronted with objects, and a self-consciousness begins to take shape—one established in opposition to the mother. Yet the child still does not reach the mature stage. Maturity is rather a matter of learning that the separation can be overcome without a return to an earlier stage: "Out of this recognition and acceptance of one's aloneness in the world, it becomes possible to transcend one's isolation, to truly love another" (Keller 1985, 82). Generally speaking, this pattern of development is valid for all children: [End Page 53] boys and girls both must learn to distinguish between the self and the other. Nonetheless, differences begin to take shape, partly because boys must undergo double disidentification from the mother: 5 first for the construction of a self-identity and then for the consolidation of a masculine gender identity. Boys therefore tend toward an excessive detachment, resulting in distant behavior, autonomy, and objectivism—all characteristics generally taken to be masculine. On the other hand, a girl's ongoing identification with the mother hinders to a certain extent the development of a sense of separation. Accordingly, closeness, dependancy, and subjectivity are taken to be typically feminine characteristics. In feminist theory, this differentiation between male and female characteristics is brought to bear in the interpretation of science. For Evelyn Fox Keller, a continuity exists between a boy's aggressive separation and a science defined by confrontation between subject and object: "A science that advertises itself by the promise of a cool and objective remove from the object of study selects for those individuals for whom such a promise provides emotional comfort" (1985, 124). 6 According to her, the same applies to the power aspect of science; consequently, "the dream of domination over Nature, shared by so many scientists, echoes the dream that the stereotypic son hopes to realize by identifying with the authority of his father" (1985, 124-25). This is the very point of Keller's understanding of science. She characterizes the deficiency of science in the following way: "But such dreams are by their very nature self-limiting. They prevent the son from ever getting to know the real mother. And so, it could be argued, they similarly obstruct the scientist's efforts to know the 'real' Nature" (1985, 125).

**Space exploration and technology rest on a flawed faith in science and objectivity and depend on masculine ways of knowing and ensure ecological domination.**

**Litfin 97** (Karen T., has a Ph.D from UCLA and is an associate professor in the Department of Politics at the University of Washington, Jstor “The Gendered Eye in the Sky: A Feminist Perspective on Earth Observation Satellites” pg.26-27)

A major shift in the way knowledge about our planet is produced is now under way, a shift that is likely to have profound consequences for environmental politics in the coming decades. The lion's share of information that will guide international environmental policy making will soon be obtained through the global gaze of space-based satellites. While this sort of knowledge production will no doubt offer many advantages, it has gained ascendancy amid a remarkable absence of critical thinking about its implications. Among participants and observers alike, the expectations are lofty, verging on the grandiose. The view from space is said to offer "unlimited perspectives on ourselves, the world, and the cosmos around us"' and benefits from satellite observation that "cannot be overestimated."2 In the absence of the Soviet threat, satellite technology will be deployed against the "environmental threat" in order "to prevent new ecological and economic `falling dominoes' and enhance global security."3 Yet the celebratory discourse surrounding Earth remote sensing (ERS), as is usually the case with celebratory discourses, serves to mask deeper questions regarding the uses of science and technology in an unequal world. This paper raises some of those questions in the hope of uncovering some unconscious assumptions and resurrecting some unheard voices in conversations about the global environment. In particular, this essay explores satellite monitoring of the earth from the perspectives of feminist theory, asking: What are the cultural and philosophical underpinnings of the planetary gaze, and how might these be played out if the science and technology that generate it are embraced uncritically? The article draws especially on insights from ecofeminism, psychoanalytic feminism, and postmodern feminism. What do we expect to gain from space-based observation that justifies placing the earth's climate systems at risk of unprecedented change as we await greater scientific certainty? The aim of "Earth system science," built upon satellite data, is "to build a comprehensive predictive model of the earth's physical, chemical, and biological processes."16 No doubt, remote sensing and computerized data processing techniques will generate hitherto unknown quantities of information and "hitherto unknown power for the scientist," as David Rhind has pointed out.'7 In the absence of the Cold War threat, satellite monitoring accompanied by computer-based analytic techniques, will, according to Peter Thatcher, "prevent new, ecological and economic `falling dominoes' and enhance global security"'8 The "global view" afforded from the vantage point of space is certainly conducive to notions of "global security," but what might that mean in an unequal world? Not only will remote sensing benefit poor countries, we are told, but it will simultaneously serve both U.S. interests and global welfare. But there is good reason to be wary of a celebratory discourse that stifles critical thinking about the nature of these technologies. Must we not be skeptical of a technology that promises so much? If celebratory discourses serve a masking function, then what might be said of the shadow side of remote sensing? Feminist Perspectives on Science and Technology Critical approaches to science and technology, including feminist critiques, begin with the premise that these bastions of neutrality are not neutral, but rather originate from, express, and reinforce certain sets of power relations. A critical approach to remote sensing reveals some of the unquestioned assumptions that undergird the celebratory discourse surrounding earth remote sensing, giving preference to those voices that are least likely to be heard. Because programs like EOS and EOSDIS, relying as they do upon aerospace and electronics technologies, are primarily the domain of white men in the wealthiest countries, that means looking at the matter from the perspectives of women and the disempowered. From those perspectives, six assumptions embedded in most discussions of satellite monitoring may be uncovered. First, the scientists are assumed to be the neutral architects of this global view, despite the fact that they are drawn from a rather narrow segment of the global population. Second, science, taken as a source of neutral information, is taken as a basis for rational policy making. Third, science is believed to generate the kind of certainty needed to guide action. Fourth, the same scientific and technological paradigms that have caused environmental problems on a global scale are thought to be capable of solving them. Fifth, a "global view" is assumed to be necessary, both scientifically and politically. Sixth, once scientists have an understanding of the "earth system," policymakers will have the capacity to "manage" the planet. All of these assumptions are rooted in a paradigm of rationality and control that has characterized patriarchal modernity. Taking these assumptions in order, consider the purported neutrality of science and scientists. Since the publication ofThomas Kuhn's work in the 1960s, a great deal of research in the history of science and the sociology of knowledge has undercut this assumption, demonstrating that science, like all social institutions, is suffused with power dynamics and irrationalities.19 Feminist theorists have highlighted the dimension of gender, elucidating how scientific practice has evolved under the formative influence of a particular ideal of masculinity based upon objectification and control. Feminists relate the fixation on scientific objectivity, which depends upon a rigid dichotomy between subject and object, to other parallel hierarchical dichotomies of modernity: human/animal, mind/body, mas-culine/feminine, reason/emotion, and elite/mass. Feminists also find in these hi-erarchical dichotomies of modernity the link between the oppression of women and the degradation of nature, pointing to the Baconian legacy that summons the scientist "to bind Nature to your service and make her your slave."20 Women, who have been traditionally defined as objects of control, have good reason to question the subject/object dichotomy. Evelyn Fox Keller, one of the pioneers of feminist philosophy of science, argues that the static objectivity of science that renders Nature into alien Other is rooted in the distinctive subjectivity of masculine psychological development with its preoccupation with autonomy.21 Keller's conception of dynamic objec-tivity offers an alternative stance, one that draws upon the ebb and flow (rather than a rigid dichotomy) between subject and object. While dynamic objectivity, which "actively draws on the commonality between mind and nature as a re-source for understanding," is rooted in a feminist psychoanalytic perspective, it is similar to Sylvester's postmodern feminist notion of "empathic cooperation."22 I return to these ideas toward the end of this article in order to draw out the possi-bilities of Earth remote sensing informed by feminist insights. With respect to issues of objectivity, one striking aspect of remote sensing of the environment is indeed its very remoteness. In a sense, satellite-generated pho-tographs of the earth represent the ultimate subject/object dichotomy. Space technology offers the tantalizing prospect of being able to leave the earth in order to get a better view-the ultimate Archimedean vantage point. Rather than being embedded participants in the reality depicted, Earth system scientists become disengaged observers of that reality.23 T hus, according to the celebratory dis-course, remote sensing is "building a valid picture of the earth" for the first time.24 Presumably this picture is "valid" because it is drawn from huge quantities of objective, remotely acquired information. It is a picture that privileges knowl-edge derived from abstract science over knowledge derived from lived experi-ence. The main elements of a spaceborne remote sensing system are "spacecraft, instruments, modeling/systems engineering, and data processing,"25e lements that give primacy to an expert structure comprised primarily of white men in affluent societies. To the question, "Who shall be designated as reliable environmental narrators?"E arth system science answers, "Scientists with professional creden-tials in physics, chemistry, and computer sciences-particularly those whose work is most distant from the everyday lived experience of poor people and most women." Whenever quantifiability monopolizes the mantle of legitimacy, qualititative val-ues are given short shrift, so that even if satellite data are supplemented with "ground truth," the privileging of abstract decontextualized data is likely to de-value other approaches to knowledge.26 In particular, as a male-dominated activ-ity, it may reinforce the division of labor that Joni Seager suggests permeates environmental politics: Women care about the environment and men think about it. 27A strong feminist position need not valorize caring as the only viable activity, but can rather insist that environmental preservation requires both men and women to become caring and thinking

**Masculine science causes extinction and is the root cause of all impacts.**

Nhanenge 7(Jytte, Masters @ U South Africa, Accepted Thesis Paper for Development Studies, “ECOFEMINSM: TOWARDS INTEGRATING THE CONCERNS OF WOMEN, POOR PEOPLE AND NATURE INTO DEVELOPMENT, uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/10500/570/1/dissertation.pdf)

The androcentric premises also have political consequences. They protect the ideological basis of exploitative relationships. Militarism, colonialism, racism, sexism, capitalism and other pathological 'isms' of modernity get legitimacy from the assumption that power relations and hierarchy are inevitably a part of human society, due to man's inherent nature. Because when mankind by nature is autonomous, competitive and violent (i.e. masculine) then coercion and hierarchical structures are necessary to manage conflicts and maintain social order. In this way, the cooperative relationships such as those found among some women and tribal cultures, are by a dualised definition unrealistic and utopian. (Birkeland 1995: 59). This means that power relations are generated by universal scientific truths about human nature, rather than by political and social debate. The consequence is that people cannot challenge the basis of the power structure because they believe it is the scientific truth, so it cannot be otherwise. In this way, militarism is justified as being unavoidable, regardless of its patent irrationality. Likewise, if the scientific "truth" were that humans would always compete for a greater share of resources, then the rational response to the environmental crisis would seem to be "dog-eat-dog" survivalism. This creates a self-fulfilling prophecy in which nature and community simply cannot survive. (Birkeland 1995: 59). This type of social and political power structure is kept in place by social policies. It is based on the assumption that if the scientific method is applied to public policy then social planning can be done free from normative values. However, according to Habermas (Reitzes 1993: 40) the scientific method only conceal pre-existing, unreflected social interests and pre-scientific decisions. Consequently, also social scientists apply the scientific characteristics of objectivity, value-freedom, rationality and quantifiability to social life. In this way, they assume they can unveil universal laws about social relations, which will lead to true knowledge. Based on this, correct social policies can be formulated. Thus, social processes are excluded, while scientific objective facts are included. Society is assumed a static entity, where no changes are possible. By promoting a permanent character, social science legitimizes the existing social order, while obscuring the relations of domination and subordination, which is keeping the existing power relations inaccessible to analysis. The frozen order also makes it impossible to develop alternative explanations about social reality. It prevents a historical and political understanding of reality and denies the possibility for social transformation by human agency. The prevailing condition is seen as an unavoidable fact. This implies that human beings are passive and that domination is a natural force, for which no one is responsible. This permits the state freely to implement laws and policies, which are controlling and coercive. These are seen as being correct, because they are based on scientific facts made by scientific experts. One result is that the state, without consulting the public, engages in a pathological pursuit of economic growth. Technology can be used to dominate societies or to enhance them. Thus both science and technology could have developed in a different direction. But due to patriarchal values infiltrated in science the type of technology developed is meant to dominate, oppress, exploit and kill. One reason is that patriarchal societies identify masculinity with conquest. Thus any technical innovation will continue to be a tool for more effective oppression and exploitation. The highest priority seems to be given to technology that destroys life. Modern societies are dominated by masculine institutions and patriarchal ideologies. Their technologies prevailed in Auschwitz, Dresden, Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Vietnam, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan and in many other parts of the world. Patriarchal power has brought us acid rain, global warming, military states, poverty and countless cases of suffering. We have seen men whose power has caused them to lose all sense of reality, decency and imagination, and we must fear such power. The ultimate result of unchecked patriarchy will be ecological catastrophe and nuclear holocaust.

The lie of an “objective reality” manifests itself in international law and relations through gendered concepts like “rule of law,” systematically excluding and suppressing women. Only by accepting objectivity as fiction can we challenge the abstract underpinnings of masculinized IR.

Joyner and Little, 96 (Chrisopher Joyner - Professor of Government and Foreign Service at Georgetown University and George Little - Adjunct Professor of Government at Georgetown University, “It's Not Nice to Fool Mother Nature- The Mystique of Feminist Approaches to International Environmental Law,” Boston University International Law Journal vol. 14, http://www.heinonline.org.proxy.lib.umich.edu/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/builj14&id=241&type=text&collection=journals, CM)

It may well be that feminist legal analysis is launched by the premise that objective reality is fiction.s5 Objectivity - the condition of being real and actually existing within the realm of sensual experience, as opposed to existing only in the mind of the subject - is seen to function as a silent suppressor of the feminine voice. Women traditionally have been seen, but not heard, or at least not listened to. Such objectivity, be it in law, economics, politics, or social institutions, essentially acts to legitimize the normative edifices that males have traditionally erected to maintain legal control over society.56 The ironic consequence is that objectivity becomes a means for instilling bias and prejudice in the construction of law for social regulation. Feminist legal theorists therefore, are loath to consider the so-called "objective perspective" as being legitimate, principally because it represents and ingrains expressions of masculinity.57 To enforce particulars of international law as currently defined, feminists contend, is to enhance and further entrench the male perspective, notwithstanding the law's espoused intent to do precisely the opposite. To accept objectivity as a fiction, or at least a myth, permits feminist thinkers to question the abstract rationality that focuses the world's legal vision along male trajectories.5" It allows feminist critics to reject the normative roots of notions that reinforce the gendered bias of international law, such as the "rule of law" and "neutrality."59 Precepts like these might purport objectivity, but in reality they act as legal constraints on more than one-half of society. Such legal notions promote the dominance of men as a social group by giving privilege to certain perceptions of power in social life. Feminist consciousness has traditionally inferred that general perceptions of power are predominantly male.6"
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**The use of feminist science fiction narratives allows for the re-imagining of gender and identity, to open up for a new avenue of resistance against hegemonic discourse**

**Wolmark 94** (Jenny, has a MA at Leeds University and is an Editor of the Journal of Gender Studies, “Aliens and Others: Science Fiction, Feminism, and Postmodernism” Pg. 21-25 \*\*Note: SF = Science Fiction [CR])

The intersection of feminism and science fiction has produced a similar emphasis on provisionality, in that it has resulted in the production of texts who recognizable generic boundaries and continuities are consistently undermined by their subject matter, as Anne Cranny-Francis has indicated in her study of what she calls ‘feminist genre fiction’: Feminist theory and the experiential knowledge of women went into the making of feminist SF and the result was the remaking of a literary genre, a fundamental investigation of the conventions of that genre, both for their literary or narrative implications and for their embedded ideological significances(s). The ‘investigation of the genre has been informed by more than feminist theory and experiential knowledge, however, as has already been suggested: the intersections between science fiction and postmodernism, as well as those between feminism and postmodernism, and feminism and science fiction, have contributed to the complex accounts of gender and identity offered in feminist SF. The fragmented and decentered narrative of Joanna Russ’s *The Female Man* (1975; 1985) is a notable example of a text that explores the pleasures of dissonance and incongruity that occur when gender and genre are in conflict. Russ dispenses the necessity for either a single plot or a specific time sequence by means of a narrative that shifts continuously between parallel universes, and between the four different female characters who inhabit them. Joanna, Janet, Jael, and Jeannine are all aspects of ‘Everywoman’ but they are also stubbornly themselves: ‘I said goodbye and went off with Laur, I, Janet; I also watched them go, I, Joanna; moreover I went off to show Jael the city, I, Jeannine, I Jael, I myself. Goodbye, goodbye, goodbye. Thus, they, and the narrative, remain fragmented, disrupting the familiar discursive practices of science fiction in a playful and witty way, and enabling Russ to explore the possibility suggested by Mary Gentile that women ‘must begin to see themselves as in a network of multiple possibilities, multiple perspectives, multiple identities, where there is no clear split between “I” and “not-I”, but rather a range or continuum of existence.’ The instability of the genre is emphasized by the way in which feminist science fiction, foregrounds female desire, and makes reference to other genres, particularly that of romance, in order to do so. Feminist SF challenges the way in which female desire is subordinated to the privileged position accorded to male desire within the genre, as Russ herself points out in a discussion of the work of one male SF writer, whose novel is ‘one long proof that, for women, heterosexuality is so much physically pleasanter than lesbianism that it binds a woman not only to sexual pleasure but to one man in particular and to a whole ideology of male dominance.’ In opposition to this subordination of female desire, the narrative strategies of feminist SF have developed to ‘provide women with possible scenarios for their own future development’, as Pamela Sargent put it in the introduction to her pioneering collection of science fiction stories by women, *Women of Wonder*. These strategies recognize what Joanna Russ calls ‘the whole difficulty of science fiction, of genuine speculation: how to get away from traditional assumptions which are nothing more than traditional strait-jackets.’ Feminist SF is concerned with the complexities and ambiguities of contemporary definitions and representations of gender, and this concern places it within the terrain marked out by the contradictory relations between science fiction, feminism, and postmodernism. Although it is rare for feminist science fiction narratives to engage in narrative experimentation of the kind that is familiar in postmodern texts, they are nevertheless fully implicated in the complicitous and contradictory processes of postmodernism described by Hutcheon. Feminist science fiction is situated within a popular cultural genre which itself has an uneasy relationship with postmodernism, but it uses the mechanisms of the genre against it, in order to question the way in which science fiction narratives represent the gendered self. It utilises the genre’s preoccupation with the future in order to suggest that the construction of subjectivity and identity is a process, and as such is always incomplete. As Stuart Hall says of cultural identity, it is ‘a matter of “becoming” as well as being. It belongs to the future as well as to the past.’ The notion of a unified, integrated self is made as problematic in feminist science fiction as it is in more explicitly postmodern texts. The territory of unresolved contradictions inhabited the postmodernism has been described in other terms by Samuel Delany, who uses the term ‘paraspace’, as distinct from ‘subspace’, to define the relations that exist between the narrative space of science fiction and that of ‘naturalistic’ fiction. A paraspace does not exist in a hierarchical relation – at least not in a simple and easy hierarchical relation – to the narrative’s ‘real’, or ordinary, space. What goes on in one subverts the other; what goes on in the other subverts the one. They change the weights all the time, throughout their stories. So calling it a subspace – with the prefix’s strong suggestion of subordination – is wrong. A paraaspace, or even an alternative space, with its much weaker – and more problematic – question of position and troubling supplementarity, is more to the point. The notion of paraspace also provides a useful way of thinking about the way in which feminist science fiction exists within a gendered space of ‘troubling supplementarity’. It is a space in which subjectivity and experience, gender and identity, can be re-imagined in opposition to, and in recognition of, the dominant gendered discourses. The ‘paraspace’ within which feminist SF exists corresponds to that ‘elsewhere’ described by Teresa de Lauretis, which consists in ‘spaces in the margins of hegemonic discourses, social spaces carved in the interstices of institutions and in the chinks and cracks of the power-knowledge apparati’. De Lauretis uses the notion of an ‘elsewhere’ in a specific context, that of the need to ‘theorize gender beyond the limits of “sexual difference”, and the constraints that such a notion has to come to impose on feminist critical thought.’ The emphasis on sexual difference, and its limitations, are present in Alice Jardine’s discussion of the construction of the feminine in *Gynesi*s*,* in which she suggests that the rethinking provoked by the crisis of legitimacy in the grand narratives of western culture has opened up an ‘elsewhere’ or a space that is specifically coded as feminine, because it has involved, above all, a reincorporation and a reconceptualization of that which has been the master narrative’s own ‘nonknowledge’, what has eluded them, what has engulfed them. This other-than-themselves is almost always a ‘space’ of some kind (over which the narrative has lost control), and this space has been coded as *feminine*, as *woman.* Jardine argues that the feminine is both defined by and defines the marginal spaces which emerge as the binary divisions of western culture begin to collapse, and this marginalization enables it to subvert the dominant masculinist cultural order. However, the radical potential of the marginal is undermined here by the way in which the feminine is equated with ‘woman’, and because the differences between women cannot be recognized in this equation, the female subject becomes a unified rather than a contradictory, and therefore multiple, subject. The female subject is thus defined solely by its marginality, rather than by, and in, the contradictory discourses of the dominant culture. In contrast, de Lauretis argues that it is gender rather than the feminine, that is constructed in the social space that is ‘elsewhere’, and that the subject is therefore constituted in gender, to be sure, though not by sexual difference alone, but rather across languages and cultural representations; a subject en-gendered in the experiencing of race and class, as well as sexual, relations; a subject, therefore, not unified but rather multiple, and not so much divided as contradicted. The distinction discussed above, between the subject as gendered or as female, finds a parallel in the distinction that is made between ‘feminine’ writing and feminist writing, and all of these different positions become relevant when considering the nature of the cultural intervention that feminist SF is making. Although attempts to define feminine writing are problematic, its primary intention is to challenge and disrupt the dominant discourse by means of its experimental, fluid and non-linear qualities. In the work of Luce Irigaray and Helen Cixous in particular, the practice of feminine writing is defined by the female body: feminine writing becomes the embodiment of woman and of female sexuality. Feminine texts are defined as oppositional because of the way in which they rupture the semantic and syntactical structures of the dominant culture; similarly for Julia Kristeva, this means that women’s writing is identified with the ‘explosion of social codes: with revolutionary movements’, in other words, with the avant-garde. However, these arguments are forced to ignore the existence of texts that are resolutely realist and conformist, but which are equally oppositional because they contain an explicit critique of the unequal power relations experienced by women within the dominant culture. Feminist science fiction can clearly be situated here: like feminism itself, It exists in a contradictory relationship to the hegemonic discourses to which it is opposed but on which it draws, and this is the reason for its oppositional capacity to open up new spaces for alternative representations of gender that these spaces, conceived of in terms of an ‘elsewhere’ or a ‘paraspace’, cannot be coded as ‘feminine’ or as ‘woman’. The texts that operate within these spaces can, however, be considered as feminist, because they destabilize and rupture the dominant ideology of gender by confronting the contradictions of gender representation, rather than assuming the existence of a unitary subject that is ‘feminine’ or ‘masculine’.

**Feminist science fiction can unlock patriarchy’s hidden agenda through a lens of feminist fabulation**

**Barr 93** (Marleen S., Professor of communication at Fordham University, notable for her analysis in science fiction studies in which she won a Pilgrim Aaward. Her primary contributions have been in critical analysis of feminist science fiction. “Lost in Space: Probing Feminist Science Fiction and Beyond” [NT])

Feminist science ﬁction, then, acts as a microscope in relation to patriarchal myths. In this volume, I read feminist science ﬁction as ﬁction that enlarges patriarchal myths in order to facilitate scrutinizing these myths. I also include examples of the criticism that results from linking feminist science ﬁction to the larger literary category I call feminist fabulation. Vonnegut’s fellow fabulator John Barth seems to speak to these efforts when he presents himself as a genie who announces, “The key to the treasure is the treasure” (Barth, 64). Feminist science ﬁction is a key for unlocking patriarchy’s often hidden agendas; the treasure is a woman’s ability to use feminist reading positions as a means to live as freely as possible. In other words, I value nullifying patriarchal myths about—for example-—women, propriety, and orgasms. In still other words, I was lucky to become an adult at a time when many women rejected the patriarchal story about how their bedrooms should serve as garages for boring cars. To guard against still virulent patriarchal stories, I positioned feminist science ﬁction as a repair manual that can be used by women who wish to ﬁx patriarchy. The manual instructed me about how not to live parked in sexist stereotypes. The danger of unknowingly obeying patriarchal traffic signals—the stop signs, red lights, and yield and slow merge instructions that impede women—was more onerous to me than the risk of being denied tenure for choosing the “wrong” ﬁeld of study. I gave myself the right of way before I had obtained a permanent license to teach in a university. Despite the chance of colliding with the patriarchal academy, I engaged in my own needs reading practices when needed. This instruction of the proper use of the as: “proper” way to approach this role in that “woman-to-woman writing is an oppositional mode an unacceptable” [Cranny-Francis, 23].) My crash, I, obviously, survived. Although I saw the crash looming the feminist space ﬁction the literary marginal zone. I did not want my own voice and concerns to become lost in patriarchal space. It is, after all, logical to think about women’s disempowerment while reading feminist power fantasies. This statement leads me to recall writing the swordsman chapter (“Heroic Fantastic Femininity: Women Warriors”) in Alien to Femininity: Speculative Fiction and Feminist Theory. At the time when I encountered my extremely conservative colleagues in the mail room (they made no secret of their belief that the department had room for only males), I grasped my pen, waved it back and forth, and smiled.

# \*Plan Text\*

*Insert Plan Text Here*

# \*\*\*Possible Narratives\*\*\*

# Option 1:

President Obama rose from a deep sleep, slightly dazed from the buzzing alarm that sounded and rudely woke him up. **The** blaring alarm that echoed through the White House went off at 4:37 A.M only meaning that something was going to need an immediate resolution. That alarm never went off, never a sound heard before, by anyone. It was used solely to warn of space emergencies, in the instance an asteroid was heading to destroy Earth. He pulled his Black Berry from the dresser, and proceeded to send an emergency text to the Chief of Staff, and the president of the Science Foundation. The text reads: “Emergency meeting! We need a plan! THE OVAL OFFICE. NOW.” He leans over to his wife, and says “I need your help.”

Within a half hour, the Chief of Staff rolls in the room. He is a medium height man, fit, stands with pride, almost arrogance, radiating an intimidating feat. You can tell he demands nothing but 100% attention. His face looks old and withered, as though he has seen the world, and every amount of wisdom he holds, lies in his face. However, he has a handsome feature, something you are drawn to. You wonder his capabilities and what his twisted mine is capable of doing.

Shortly following the Chief is a tiny man who rushes in wearing a white lab coat and small bifocals with duck tape meeting at the middle. He stands in an awkward manner, cradling his body, with his face slightly scrunched looking as though he is in constant thought.

President Obama rushes in, tie undone, a tooth paste stain on his shirt, and says boldly, “The end….. may be near. We need to get out of here.”

Puzzled, **James**, the Chief of Staff, says, “Get off of…….. where?”

With almost full guarantee, **Herald**, the science foundation president chimes in “The Earth.”

Just as the questions begin to fly though their heads, the First Lady Walks with a small but bright smile, looking like every lady should when she is representing the world’s best…. Flawless. The President nods, almost as though it was a queue, she waves slowly, and says with pure grace, “Good morning gentlemen.”

James, still confused, the President uneasy, and Herald writing rigorously on a legal pad. A moment of silence is shared, hesitation to find a solution.

Obama, clearing his voice, speaks with unease, “We need to get out of here. We don’t have much time. The alarm went off.” His voice paused, perhaps for dramatic effect, or to try and gather his thoughts. “An asteroid… Is heading for earth, those billion dollar do-hickies we threw into space to track that crap actually works. The alarm sounded, and well…. An asteroid is heading our way. We will all suffer consequences of instant death upon impact our only option is move humanity to another place. Herald, what are you thinking?”

Obama waits for an answer but he stares blankly at Herald drawing, and scribbling on that sheet of paper.

Obama looks to James, who is simply tapping his hand on the table, scratching his face and checking himself out on the reflection of the table.

Without showing it, Obama rolls his eyes, takes a small deep breath, and yells at Harold.

Harold’s head shoots up; he adjusts his glasses, and apologizes. “Our only option,” Harold says with hesitation, “Is to try to go into space. Colonize and procreate on another planet if you will.”

Obama, appalled at the idea, simply asks “How much will that cost and how long do we have?”

Harold with great precision says “A lot, but we can work with others to speed this up, and to lower the cost. Space colonies could be the answer to our short, almost microscopic timeframe. The colonists would mine the minor planets and build beamed power satellites that would supplement or even replace power plants on the Earth. The colonists could also take advantage of the plentiful raw materials, unlimited solar power, vacuum, and microgravity in other ways, to create products that we cannot while inside the cocoon of Earth's atmosphere and gravity. I think……”

As his voice trails off, James chimes in and says “It’s not about what YOU think; it’s about how we survive. Skip the math, make some phone calls, get people in space. Oh and hey, nerd, enough with the entire space lingo. Not all of us care about the technicality.”

Michelle, with almost hesitation and fear of hearing that answer asks, “Who?” Her eyes look to James who simply huffs his breath, and releases a small chuckle, and says “The Hell I know, talk to mister brains over there, better yet, your husband, he knows everything. You throw some mutt into office, and expect good results. I bet the military could have better run this place, we are the best of the best after all.”

Michelle with great desperation in her eyes looks at Barack who shakes his head in shame. She finally looks to Harold who looks at her and says, “***Anyone*** we can.”

The thought that simply anyone could go into space eats at James. He, once again, beings to chime in. “The hell I will let any human just go into space, this is MY future we are talking. We need the best of the best. We need the strongest men, the most attractive men. We need the quietest, most loyal, obedient, beautiful women. We can’t just throw anyone into space. Sure, we can blend in the average folks we have living on Earth now, if we survive and all, but we need the best of the best. Perfect, uh, yeah, genes. Oh, I got just the people! Our military, navy, air force, marines. The best of the best. They are trained for this kind of garbage” He smiles at the idea of a perfect race, invincible people.

Harold appalled at that thought, that stereotypical, narrow minded idea, he scuffs, “Who said they need to be that? It’s not feasible to send in a super race, that’s simply not possible. We need to recreate society as it is. Why not send everyone, some heterosexuals, homosexuals, everyone?”

Obama tries to hide a little laugh, but fails. And Michelle lets out a small smile, but covers her mouth. James lets out an arrogant, flamboyant chuckle, “No, what a joke. We can’t have a bunch of fags colonizing space. All that glitter and rainbows just won’t work. We need real men to do the job.”

Michelle, stepping out of line says, “I agree. Only straight people. We need to be able to reproduce, therefore, only heterosexual people. They also need to be married. Man and wife. We can’t go preaching having sex out of wedlock. They need to be married, beautiful, and strong.”

Obama, for once, at a loss of words, nods his head, keeping his eyes glued to the floor.

“Alright Herald a few things. 1) We need a resume, that will filter the best of the best. 2) We need space technology. 3) We need to just need to get this crap done. How long until we can do this? 4) Oh, and, how much is it going to cost?”

Harold scratching the paper, pen moving fast, he says “1) If that is what you want. 2) Surprise, surprise the technology already exists, it is just a matter of launching oh, and we need the homsapiens.” There is a brief pause, and without any hesitation, James adds his two sense, “WOAH! I thought we agreed no gays.”

Harold, ignoring all of the ignorance that brink of a Chief possess, continues,

“4) The financial situation is the last thing you need to worry about, humanity is at risk by a flying artifact rushing towards Earth at speeds faster than anything that is able to be comprehended. 5) Six years, if that.”

James, once again speaks, “So about those gays, homo-whats?”

Harold with slight pride in his knowledge, “Maybe if you would pick up a book instead of checking yourself out in the glass, you would know that homosapien is the scientific name for………..”

“Alright ladies,” Obama says with dominance, “Let’s stop arguing like a bunch of helpless females. We have work to do.”

Michelle simply hangs her head in shame, helpless.

Within a matter of three days, resumes were went through, the top 20 people were picked, and heading out into space. Traveling light years away, they landed upon a rocky planet. Harold stayed up for the whole three days, created a pop-up house, compact air mattresses, and everything needed to make colonization possible. It was just a matter of time for the people, the best of the best, to get the deed done, and to colonize.

Things were going well for the first two years. People were being created. Occasional they faced people blowing up, and getting hit by asteroids, but nothing unmanageable. Year three would mark the first time people from Earth would be able to go up to this new Hetertopia place. All was well, no surprise to anyone though. The day before people from Earth was coming, end came for Hetertopia, man verses man for the dominate position, the military, the best of the best competition kicked in, and everyone on Hetertopia was annihilated.

Obama was worried, and called for a final plan- he made a broad cast:

# Option 2:

Date: November 6, 2017.

Obama has been elected for the third term~

Speaking: The President of the United States.

“I regret to inform you, America, we need to get off the rock, the end may be near. If you haven’t

noticed the Earth splitting in half, and the trees combusting, it may be the end of our time. Our

existence may also be in jeopardy of other super houses with huge nuclear weapons. However,

we lack technology, funding, and resources to live in space. We lack the ability to procreate

to colonize. We need space missionaries; People we don’t need on Earth, who have no life, no

value, no fundamental being here, someone we can dispose of, with no shame.”

“Wait, CALL IN THE…………. The He-He’s . The United States Federal Government, should establish a queer theory beyond Earth’s mesosphere.”

He-He one, once referred to as Jacob, had a tall lean stature. A defined jaw line, long sandy

brown hair, and dull golden eyes.

He-He two, once called Garrett, had a large, muscular body. Much shorter than He-He one, had

jet black hair, eyebrows thick as sharpie markers, and silver striking eyes.

The He-He’s, brought in by chain, pulled out by forced and demanded 100 % attention. The

lowest being no chance to speak or reply but simply to open their crusted eyes to take a final

glimpse at their fate. Used once again for nothing more experiments and mockery..

After hearing the mission, they are forced into a cramped shell, a rocket ship, and shot out

to “explore” the unknown, trying to preserve the rest of humanity, as though they have a

moral obligation to do anything but.

The last thing they heard while the clock ticked was: “IF YOU DON’T CONTACT US, WE WILL FIND YOU.” Words they commonly heard, and still the thought shook them. Three, two, one. Blast off.

They emerge from the surface of the Mesosphere, breaking the harsh, raw ozone layer.

Joined together, they traveled light-years away to a place beyond what humanity knows, where

safety is no longer an option, a given precaution is abiding by the rules of the given unknown.

They venture with wonderment to a place far beyond the rusted metal structure, the masculine

playground and hated area. They pass beams of absurd colors, not the typical black and white,

not allowing any gray area, but the colors of a rainbow. They stop, landing among the pillow-

y surface to a realm that would be matched with the thoughtful comparison of another earth,

unoccupied by any life-no constraints by society. He-He one and He-He two float airlessly

to the soft surface looking confused at the mysterious goop that is sloshing in front of them.

Pure curiously strikes the young souls, taking a deep breath and joining hands, they take a

step forward, another step forward. They look down, and see that both of their feet are stuck

in a mushy substance no movement once again. Their minds revert to the place once known

as home- their eyes wonder to the scars on their arm, the brief glimpse of reality at what was.

Chain. Not being able to move. Panic arises, and then they look to one another, and feel their

The substance that once posed an overbearing problem evaporated. Their hug dissipates

and they release a sigh, a sigh of relief. They hear a small whimper, and look behind them. Only

to find, with great surprise, a baby. He-He one picks up the small life, and cradles it with great

pleasure and amazement. Simply as instinct they begin to build a house. Days pass, and they

watch the baby grow, he grows up to look exactly like He-He one and He-He two, a perfect

combination.

Using the pillow lint and dust on the surface, the He-He family sent two messages to Earth. One

written to the government, saying that life is meek and unsustainable, the ground is rock hard,

the days are filled with nothing but ash flying around, filling lungs with a painful shards, and

that the rest of humanity would be better off to die on Earth with honor than suffer in unknown

land. The other message, sent to every couple that felt oppressed, that was silenced, that were

shunned advising them to join them on… on this newly discovered place, promising change.

Warning them that the escape and the risk was worth the struggle.

The He-He’s felt they needed a name for this new place, they decided on Homotopia.

Unlike societies once refers to as Hetertopia~ where Earth was referred to- only a man’s world,

being for or against the cause. More days pass, and He-He one and He-He two began to wonder

if others would ever come, if they ever got the message, if the message was sent in time, if they

were able to escape in time, and if the government would ever find out what Homotopia really

was. They came across even more squishy mushy goop along their journey of exploring the

unknown land. They joined hands again, with a little less hesitation this time and went through

the movements with more passion and eagerness. Bodies joining, hearts racing, and before long,

the substance evaporating. With no surprise, a baby was crying behind them.

Later that day, people arrived on Homotopia, and with no surprise, they immediately faced

that same goop. The He-He family welcomed them and told them what happens. With great

eagerness, the She-She’s joined hands, the He/She-He/She’s joined hands, and the rest of the

He-He’s joined hands while standing in the pink goop. Babies, small lifes, new generations were

born. Born in a place, in a world where they are free from constraints, where life and exploration

is a social norm. Where freedom is a given right.

Hours passed, the He-He family watched the newly formed families tend to their babies,

they saw a community being built, a future being made, and smiled at the idea that they made

something good happen out of a bad situation. Change was possible and [when it finally

happened, because it was bound to happen, we all knew it was only a matter of time, we felt,

in the midst of our curiosity and terror, a certain calm, the calm of familiarity, we knew what

was expected of us, at such a moment.]

# Option 3:

Speaking: The President of the United States.

“My fellow Americans:

I come to you with the deepest regret to inform you that the end may be near. The Earth will soon become uninhabitable – it is only a matter of time before the effects of the nuclear warheads launched this morning destroy us. However, I come to you with hope – though we lack the funding, resources, and the ability to procreate in space necessary for a colony, there is a plan – to ensure the survival of those needed on Earth, we must send missionaries: people who don’t need to live, who have no value, and only consume much-needed resources, to space. It is with grave hearts that we have selected the perfect candidates to make this ultimate sacrifice for humanity – bring in the He-He’s.

He-He One, was tall and lean with a defined jaw line and long, sandy brown hair.   
  
He-He Two, was large and well-built. Much shorter than He-He One, He-He Two had jet black hair, thick eyebrows, and striking silver eyes.

Chained, the He-He’s were dragged out of their cells and informed of their fate. “You should be proud,” they were told, “to do the world this great service.” Proud to be the sacrifice, proud to be thrown away.

Forced into a cramped shell of a shuttle, He-He’s One and Two were shot out, ejected like trash from a chute for the “greater good.”

As they entered the atmosphere, a voice spoke: “If you don’t contact us, we will find you.” They were just words from a speaker, but words familiar enough to both to send a shudder of fear through them.

Blasting through the mesosphere and into the black abyss, they travelled light-years away to a place beyond science’s reach, where the only thing that existed save for themselves was the other He-He, cramped in the same shell. They ventured with wonderment beyond the rusted metal structure, the masculine playground of the non-existence they left behind, through beams of absurd colors, not black and white, not gray, but the kaleidoscope colors of the rainbow.

They stopped, gently bouncing on a pillow-y surface to a realm like another Earth, but unoccupied by any life and not constrained by society. Emerging from the shuttle, the He-He’s floated near-weightlessly into a pool of an unknown substance. In a moment of shared wonder, the two joined hands, slowly stepping forward into the goop. As they explored, their minds reverted to the only place they had known before – home – and the scars they had from years of being immobilized by chains. Nostalgic, they felt their bodies join.

The substance touching the He-He’s evaporated as the moment of connection slowly recedes. The two hear a whimper, and turning around, find a child. He-He One picked up the small life, cradling it with amazement. Instinctively, the He-He’s begin to build a house. As the days pass, they watch the baby grow to look exactly like He-He One and Two – a perfect combination.

With the radio given to them back on Earth, the He-He family sent two messages: the first was for the government, saying that life was bleak and unsustainable, that the days were searing, and the nights frigid – a fate worse than nuclear fallout. The second, sent to every other creature oppressed, silenced, and shunned, called for a gathering on this different place – that life was better, that it was worth the struggle.

The He-He’s, waiting, decided that there needed to be a name – Cosmotopia – the antithesis to Heterotopia, or the man’s world, where one could only be for or against the masculine cause. Days passed, and the He-He’s began to wonder if the others would come, if they got the message, if they were able to escape, if the government had discovered the truth of Cosmotopia. As they waited, they came across more goop, and, like the first time, but with more confidence, He-He One and He-He Two joined hands, waited for the substance to evaporate, and discovered a baby.

Shortly afterwards, more began to arrive. The He-He family welcomed them, explaining the goop. With great eagerness, the She-She’s joined hands, the He/She-He/She’s joined hands, and everybody else joined hands with one another, and in this, small lives, new generations, were born. Born in a place free of societal constraint, where freedom is not a privilege, but a right.

As time passed, a community began to form, and a future emerged. Change was possible – when it finally happened, because it was bound to happen – we felt, in the midst of curiosity and terror, a certain calm, knowing that things would be different.

# Option 4:

The date is November 6, 2017. Obama has been re-elected for his third term.

Speaking: The President of the United States.

“My fellow Americans, I regret to inform you that the end is near. Our atmosphere has been utterly decimated fromnuclear radiation as a result of our triumphant victory over China. To this end, we must now look outward – our skills and traits of aggression, dominance and

control must now be put to the final test – the final frontier. Outer space. The inherent risks and danger are merely a test of **man’s** ability to succeed against all odds. We, the Americans, must organize a space expedition to begin colonizing outer space – we currently have the best scientists world-wide working on ways to make heterosexual reproduction in space possible. Now is our time to shine.”

He-He 429 watched the stars float by as the rocket flew through space, wondering how he ended up here, one of many of his kind rounded and up and forced into space on the off-chance that this miracle element, Felicium, made homosexual reproduction possible. He thought back to his life on Earth, the cold, barren planet that ostracized and alienated his kind and wondered if any life, even life on an unknown planet, could be worse than that. His musings were interrupted by the sharp barking of the expedition commander, Sergeant Angustus – “He-Hes and She-Shes – prepare for descent. Upon arrival, you have 24 hours to complete your purpose on this planet. Should you fail, know your fate ends here.”

He-He 429 stepped off the vehicle, flanked by He-He 636, his life-long companion. They immediately recognized the miracle element, Felicium. Appearing as a shimmering mist, the gaseous element seeped into their lungs and changed their lives forever. As He-Hes 636 and 429 embraced, without any of the restrictions and worries of their former home.

The dense mist lightened up a bit, and He-Hes 429 and 636 looked in amazement at the happy couples stretched out over the grassy plains. Each held a small infant and shone with the satisfaction that a different kind of life was possible and that the chains of their life on Earth were gone, forever. One person stood out from the cloud, with an amazed look of incredulity on his face. Sergeant Angustus made eye contact with He-He 429 and motioned for him to come over. Leaving He-He 636 with the baby, He-He 429 walked over to the previously tyrannical sergeant and said “This might be outer space – but this is a space for freedom and self-expression. This space will never know the hegemonic oppression of Earth.” Bowing his head, the Sergeant said his goodbyes with a few simple words – “From everything I was taught, rationality and science, this is impossible. This is biologically impossible. This peace is not rational and can’t last… but I believe in different ways now.” and he went back to Earth to spread his stories and his new-found knowledge.