### Setcol

#### Western philosophy is colonialist -- its presuppositions of objectivity and rationality which devalues indigenous knowledge while justifying imperialism.

**Gutierrez et. al 19** [Daniel Orr de Gutierrez - Tsi Tsalagi, Born and raised in Oklahoma (Ponca City and Norman), B.A. in Native Education from Swarthmore College, M.A. in Teaching from the University of San Francisco, Edwin Mayorga - an Assistant Professor in the Department of Educational Studies and the Program in Latin American and Latino Studies at Swarthmore College, Lekey Leidecker - A youth educator in New York City, activist, and writer, Daniel Orr de Gutierrez, “Burn it Down: The Incommensurability of the University and Decolonization” , Iowa state university digital press & School of education, Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis, 2019, Vol. 8, No. 1, 87-106]

Birthed through and for the colonial state, modern philosophy does not coincidentally bear colonialist ideology, although we would not attempt a full accounting of that here. Rather, because knowledge production and regulation are the defining functions of the university, we analyze the epistemology of modern philosophy. In doing so, we find that modern epistemology not only justifies and authorizes colonial violence, but, in itself, demands epistemic violence. Operating upon these principles, the essential function of the modern university has become a colonization of knowledge: knowledge is processed to conform to colonial ideology and agendas, and, in turn, disseminated in order to assimilate the populace. To conceal the inherent violence of that mission today, the university employs a strategic negligence that reaffirms its own indispensability. Two epistemological assumptions narrate modern philosophy: (1) there are certain aspects of reality which are ubiquitously and invariably true, (2) observation and logical reasoning are the only means of accessing that absolute truth. From these two basic assumptions however, issue a number of derivative beliefs linking knowledge production to power. The first of these corollaries is the privileging of objectivity, assessing knowledge against the perceived contamination of subjective experience, by which modern scholars limit the scope of legitimate knowledges to those consistent with their own principles and tradition. In so doing, Western thinkers not only affirm the superiority of their knowledge systems but also claim for themselves the exclusive authority to define knowledge (Smith, 2012). Moreover, the assumption that absolute truth is ascertainable practically and ethically implies a responsibility to do so, creating an obligation for humanity to thoroughly investigate their reality. Given the exclusive authority of modern Western scholars to lead that investigation, instrumental reasoning insinuates, and hubris abets, that all reality need come under Western dominion. On the one hand, this epistemology leaves no room for enchantment, sacrificing the private and sacred for the pursuit of knowledge3 (Grande, 2015). On the other hand, it justifies imperialist ideation and, in fact, makes scientific investigation dependent upon the subjugation of non-Western peoples and lands. In order to understand reality, modern philosophy thus engenders material and symbolic violences against reality. But, more immediately, modern scientific investigation and knowledge production, in themselves, constitute epistemic violence. Modern philosophy is confronted by the same conflict as is any intellectual paradigm: incorporating and rectifying new knowledges with the old. In its pursuit of absolute truth, however, modern philosophy cannot engage in dialogic relations, but is confined to the dialectic, and, operating upon the presumed objective superiority of its own knowledge traditions, must contort new knowledge so that it takes on a form comprehensible within its own ideological framework.

#### Two links:

#### Pragmatism is relativistic which prevents us from condemning oppression across the board – atrocities like colonialism were the outcome of societal deliberation and experimentation and their framework gives us no way to condemn that

#### Deliberative procedures privilege those who are already listened and seen as human – their framework can’t consider people like indigenous people who have no access to those procedures

#### Forces indigenous people to continue to waste energy and time in a system created to destroy them

**Large-scale threats of future suffering stake a hegemonic claim to political and moral urgency that makes the bodily violence of imperialism illegible, endlessly deferring its priority to an awaited future that will never come. The only response is to interrupt this temporal blackmail, insisting that the urgent bodies suffering structural violence across the globe cannot wait any longer.**

**Olson ‘15** (Elizabeth, prof of geography @ UNC Chapel Hill ‘Geography and Ethics I: Waiting and Urgency,’ *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 39 no. 4, pp. 517-526)

Though toileting might be thought of as a special case of bodily urgency, geographic research suggests that the body is increasingly set at odds with larger scale ethical concerns, especially **large-scale future events of forecasted suffering**. Emergency planning is a particularly good example in which the large-scale threats of future suffering can **distort moral reasoning**. Žižek (2006) lightly develops this point in the context of the war on terror, where in the presence of fictitious and real ticking clocks and warning systems, the urgent body must be **bypassed** because there are **bigger scales to worry about**:¶ What does this all-pervasive sense of urgency mean ethically? The pressure of events is so overbearing, the stakes are so high, that they nec essitate a suspension of ordinary ethical concerns. After all, displaying moral qualms when the lives of millions are at stake plays into the hands of the enemy. (Žižek, 2006)¶ In the presence of large-scale future emergency, the urgency to secure the state, the citizenry, the economy, or the climate creates new scales and new temporal orders of response (see Anderson, 2010; Baldwin, 2012; Dalby, 2013; Morrissey, 2012), many of which treat the urgent body as impulsive and thus requiring management. McDonald’s (2013) analysis of three interconnected discourses of ‘climate security’ illustrates how bodily urgency in climate change is also recast as a menacing impulse that might require exclusion from moral reckoning. The logics of climate security, especially those related to national security, ‘can encourage perverse political responses that not only fail to respond effectively to climate change but may present victims of it as a threat’ (McDonald, 2013: 49). **Bodies that are currently suffering cannot be urgent**, because they are **excluded from the potential collectivity** that could be **suffering everywhere in some future time**. Similar bypassing of existing bodily urgency is echoed in writing about violent securitization, such as drone warfare (Shaw and Akhter, 2012), and also in **intimate scales** like the street and the school, especially in relation to race (Mitchell, 2009; Young et al., 2014).¶ As **large-scale urgent concerns are institutionalized**, the urgent body is increasingly **obscured through technical planning and coordination** (Anderson and Adey, 2012). The predominant characteristic of this institutionalization of large-scale emergency is a ‘**built-in bias for action’** (Wuthnow, 2010: 212) **that circumvents contingencies**. The urgent body is at best an assumed eventuality, one that will likely require another state of waiting, such as **triage** (e.g. Greatbach et al., 2005). Amin (2013) cautions that in much of the West, governmental need to provide evidence of laissez-faire governing on the one hand, and assurance of strength in facing a threatening future on the other, produces ‘just-in-case preparedness’ (Amin, 2013: 151) of neoliberal risk management policies. In the US, ‘personal ingenuity’ is built into emergency response at the expense of the poor and vulnerable for whom ‘[t]he difference between abjection and bearable survival’ (Amin, 2013: 153) will not be determined by emergency planning, but in the material infrastructure of the city.¶ In short, the urgencies of the body provide justifications for social exclusion of the most marginalized based on impulse and perceived threat, while **large-scale future emergencies effectively absorb the deliberative power of urgency into the institutions of preparedness and risk avoidance**. Žižek references Arendt’s (2006) analysis of the banality of evil to explain the current state of ethical reasoning under the war on terror, noting that people who perform morally reprehensible actions under the conditions of urgency assume a ‘tragic-ethic grandeur’ (Žižek, 2006) by sacrificing their own morality for the good of the state. But his analysis fails to note that bodies are today so rarely legitimate sites for claiming urgency. In the context of the **assumed priority of the large-scale future emergency**, the urgent body becomes **literally nonsense, a non sequitur** within societies, states and worlds that will **always be more urgent**.¶ If the important ethical work of urgency has been to identify that which must not wait, then the capture of the power and persuasiveness of urgency by large-scale future emergencies has consequences for the kinds of normative arguments we can raise on behalf of urgent bodies. How, then, might waiting compare as a normative description and critique in our own urgent time? Waiting can be categorized according to its purpose or outcome (see Corbridge, 2004; Gray, 2011), but it also modifies the place of the individual in society and her importance. As Ramdas (2012: 834) writes, ‘waiting … produces hierarchies which segregate people and places into those which matter and those which do not’. The segregation of waiting might produce effects that counteract suffering, however, and Jeffery (2008: 957) explains that though the ‘politics of waiting’ can be repressive, it can also engender creative political engagement. In his research with educated unemployed Jat youth who spend days and years waiting for desired employment, Jeffery finds that ‘the temporal suffering and sense of ambivalence experienced by young men can generate cultural and political experiments that, in turn, have marked social and spatial effects’ (Jeffery, 2010: 186). Though this is not the same as claiming normative neutrality for waiting, it does suggest that waiting is more ethically ambivalent and open than urgency.¶ In other contexts, however, our descriptions of waiting indicate a strong condemnation of its effects upon the subjects of study. Waiting can demobilize radical reform, **depoliticizing ‘the insurrectionary possibilities of the present by delaying the revolutionary imperative to a future moment that is forever drifting towards infinity’** (Springer, 2014: 407). Yonucu’s (2011) analysis of the self-destructive activities of disrespected working-class youth in Istanbul suggests that this sense of infinite waiting can lead not only to depoliticization, but also to a disbelief in the possibility of a future self of any value. Waiting, like urgency, can **undermine the possibility of self-care** two-fold, first by making people wait for essential needs, and again by reinforcing that waiting is ‘[s]omething to be ashamed of because it may be noted or taken as evidence of indolence or low status, seen as a symptom of rejection or a signal to exclude’ (Bauman, 2004: 109). This is why Auyero (2012) suggests that waiting creates an ideal state subject, providing ‘temporal processes in and through which political subordination is produced’ (Auyero, 2012: loc. 90; see also Secor, 2007). Furthermore, Auyero notes, it is not only political subordination, but the subjective effect of waiting that secures domination, as citizens and non-citizens find themselves ‘waiting hopefully and then frustratedly for others to make decisions, and in effect surrendering to the authority of others’ (Auyero, 2012: loc. 123).¶ Waiting can therefore function as a potentially important spatial technology of the elite and powerful, mobilized not only for the purpose of **governing individuals**, but also to **retain claims over moral urgency**. But there is **growing resistance** to the capture of claims of urgency by the elite, and it is important to note that even in cases where the material conditions of containment are currently impenetrable, arguments based on human value are at the forefront of **reclaiming urgency for the body**. In **detention centers, clandestine prisons, state borders and refugee camps**, geographers point to ongoing struggles against the ethical impossibility of bodily urgency and a rejection of states of waiting (see Conlon, 2011; Darling, 2009, 2011; Garmany, 2012; Mountz et al., 2013; Schuster, 2011). Ramakrishnan’s (2014) analysis of a Delhi resettlement colony and Shewly’s (2013) discussion of the enclave between India and Bangladesh describe people who refuse to give up their own status as legitimately urgent, even in the context of larger scale politics. Similarly, Tyler’s (2013) account of desperate female detainees stripping off their clothes to expose their humanness and suffering in the Yarl’s Wood Immigration Removal Centre in the UK suggests that demands for recognition are not just about politics, but also about the acknowledgement of humanness and the irrevocable possibility of being that which cannot wait. The continued existence of places like Yarl’s Wood and similar institutions in the USA nonetheless points to the challenge of exposing the urgent body as a moral priority when it is so easily hidden from view

, and also reminds us that our research can help to explain the relationships between normative dimensions and the political and social conditions of struggle.¶ In closing, geographic depictions of waiting do seem to evocatively describe otherwise obscured suffering (e.g. Bennett, 2011), but it is striking how rarely these descriptions also use the language of urgency. Given the discussion above, what might be accomplished – and risked – by incorporating urgency more overtly and deliberately into our discussions of waiting, surplus and abandoned bodies? Urgency can clarify the implicit but understated ethical consequences and normativity associated with waiting, and encourage explicit discussion about harmful suffering. Waiting can be productive or unproductive for radical praxis, but urgency compels and requires response. Geographers could be instrumental in reclaiming the ethical work of urgency in ways that leave it open for critique, clarifying common spatial misunderstandings and representations. There is good reason to be thoughtful in this process, since moral outrage towards inhumanity can itself obscure differentiated experiences of being human, dividing up ‘those for whom we feel urgent unreasoned concern and those whose lives and deaths simply do not touch us, or do not appear as lives at all’ (Butler, 2009: 50). But when the urgent body is rendered as only waiting, both materially and discursively, it is just as easily cast as impulsive, disgusting, animalistic (see also McKittrick, 2006). Feminist theory insists that the urgent body, whose encounters of violence are ‘usually framed as **private, apolitical and mundane’** (Pain, 2014: 8), are as deeply **political, public, and exceptional** as other forms of violence (Phillips, 2008; Pratt, 2005). Insisting that **a suffering body, now, is that which cannot wait**, has the **ethical effect of drawing it into consideration alongside the political, public and exceptional scope of large-scale futures**. It may help us insist on the body, both as a single unit and a plurality, as a legitimate scale of normative priority and social care.¶ In this report, I have explored old and new reflections on the ethical work of urgency and waiting. Geographic research suggests a contemporary popular bias towards the urgency of large-scale futures, institutionalized in ways that further **obscure and discredit the urgencies of the body**. This bias also justifies the production of new **waiting places** in our material landscape, **places like the detention center** and the waiting room. In some cases, waiting is normatively neutral, even providing opportunities for alternative politics. In others, the technologies of waiting serve to manage potentially problematic bodies, leading to suspended suffering and even to extermination (e.g. Wright, 2013). One of my aims has been to suggest that **moral reasoning is important** both because it **exposes normative biases against subjugated people**, and because it potentially **provides routes toward struggle where claims to urgency seem to foreclose** the **possibilities** of alleviation of suffering. **Saving the world still should require a debate about whose world is being saved, when, and at what cost – and this requires a debate about what really cannot wait**. My next report will extend some of these concerns by reviewing how feelings of urgency, as well as hope, fear, and other emotions, have played a role in geography and ethical reasoning.¶ I conclude, however, by pulling together past and present. In 1972, Gilbert White asked why geographers were not engaging ‘the truly urgent questions’ (1972: 101) such as racial repression, decaying cities, economic inequality, and global environmental destruction. His question highlights just how much the discipline has changed, but it is also unnerving in its echoes of our contemporary problems. Since White’s writing, our moral reasoning has been stretched to consider the future body and the more-than-human, alongside the presently urgent body – topics and concerns that I have not taken up in this review but which will provide their own new possibilities for urgent concerns. My own hope presently is drawn from an acknowledgement that the **temporal characteristics of contemporary capitalism** can be interrupted in creative ways (Sharma, 2014), with the possibility of squaring the urgent body with our large-scale future concerns. **Temporal alternatives already exist in ongoing and emerging revolutions** and the disruption of claims of cycles and circular political processes (e.g. Lombard, 2013; Reyes, 2012). Though **calls for urgency will certainly be used to obscure evasion of responsibility** (e.g. Gilmore, 2008: 56, fn 6), they may **also serve as fertile ground for radical critique**, a truly fierce **urgency for now.**

#### That cannot be delinked from settler institutions – the settler state is driven by the logic of elimination – the primal drive to expansion that materializes native land dispossession, displacement, and genocide.

Rifkin 14 – Associate Professor of English & WGS @ UNC-Greensboro [Mark, ‘Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance,’ pp. 7-10] mp

If nineteenth-century American literary studies tends to focus on the ways Indians enter the narrative frame and the kinds of meanings and associa- tions they bear, recent attempts to theorize settler colonialism have sought to shift attention from its effects on Indigenous subjects to its implications for nonnative political attachments, forms of inhabitance, and modes of being, illuminating and tracking the pervasive operation of settlement as a system. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is a structure not an event” (2).6 He suggests that a “logic of elimination” drives settler governance and sociality, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence” (388). Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/ period of conquest, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settler- colonial society” (390). In Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work, whiteness functions as the central way of understanding the domination and displacement of Indigenous peoples by nonnatives.7 In “Writing Off Indigenous Sover- eignty,” she argues, “As a regime of power, patriarchal white sovereignty operates ideologically, materially and discursively to reproduce and main- tain its investment in the nation as a white possession” (88), and in “Writ- ing Off Treaties,” she suggests, “At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will, thus it is open to being possessed,” such that “possession . . . forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity” (83–84). For Jodi Byrd, the deployment of Indianness as a mobile figure works as the principal mode of U.S. settler colonialism. She observes that “colonization and racialization . . . have often been conflated,” in ways that “tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion” and that “misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism” (xxiii, xvii). She argues that

settlement works through the translation of indigeneity as Indianness, casting place-based political collectivities as (racialized) populations subject to U.S. jurisdiction and manage- ment: “the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself ”; “ideas of Indians and Indianness have served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself ” (xix).

**The alternative is unyielding decolonization—reject any and all attempts at reformism and assimilation**

**Walia ‘12** (Harsha, South Asian organizer and writer based in Vancouver Coast Salish Territories, “Moving Beyond a Politics of Solidarity Towards a Practice of Decolonization,” Jan 5, www.peopleofcolororganize.com/analysis/theory/moving-beyond-politics-solidarity-practice-decolonization/) \*\*\*We don’t endorse ableist language.

Decolonization is as much a process as a goal. It requires a profound re-centring of Indigenous worldviews in our movements for political liberation, social transformation, renewed cultural kinships, **and the development of an economic system that serves rather than threatens our collective life on this planet.** As stated by Toronto-based activist Syed Hussan “Decolonization is a dramatic re-imagining of relationships with land, people and the state. Much of this requires study, it requires conversation, it is a practice, **it is an unlearning**.” It is a positive sign that a growing number of social movements are recognizing that Indigenous self- determination must become the foundation for all our broader social-justice mobilizing. Indigenous peoples are the most impacted by the pillage of lands, experience disproportionate poverty and homelessness, are over-represented in statistics of missing and murdered women, and are the primary targets of repressive policing and prosecutions in the criminal injustice system. Rather than being treated as a single issue within a laundry list of demands, Indigenous self-determination is increasingly understood as intertwined with struggles against racism, poverty, police violence, war and occupation, violence against women, and environmental justice. Intersectional approaches can, however, subordinate and compartmentalize Indigenous struggle within the machinery of existing Leftist narratives: anarchists point to the anti-authoritarian tendencies within Indigenous communities, environmentalists highlight the connection to land that Indigenous communities have, anti-racists subsume Indigenous people into the broader discourse about systemic oppression, and women’s organizations point to relentless violence borne by Indigenous women in discussions about patriarchy. We have to be cautious to avoid replicating the state’s assimilationist model of liberal pluralism, whereby Indigenous identities are forced to fit within our existing groups and narratives. The inherent right to traditional lands and to self-determination is expressed collectively and should not be subsumed within the discourse of individual or human rights. Furthermore, it is imperative to understand being Indigenous as not just an identity but a way of life, which is intricately connected to Indigenous people’s relationship to the land and all its inhabitants. Indigenous struggle cannot simply be accommodated within other struggles; it demands solidarity on its own terms.

### FWRK

#### The role of the ballot should be the team who best deconstructs and combats settler colonialism.

#### You should view the 1ac as a research project, in which we test the represenatations of the aff and the epistemology of the aff.

#### Its better for debate – the aff will never actually happen in the real world, and testing the actual education and representations of the 1ac changes our views of the real world and allows us to get more education.

#### Education comes first – it’s the only reason we do debate and the subjectivities we form is the only out of round impact – fairness doesn’t outweigh – its not an out of round impact and it

#### Fairness not a gateway issue: a. It's a sliding scale, at best 1% abuse only means 1% uncertainty b. False, judges decide that abusive arguments are true all the time c. Terminally nonunique because lack of fairness is inevitable, resource disparities, judge biases, etc. d. An argument is true if the judge agrees it's true, no reason fairness is key e. Even if there's some abuse that doesn't preclude them from answering the links, if they don't it will be a choice so don't grant them this

#### D. it doesn’t control the internal link because any risk that you engage in settler colonialism is necessary as the first step – it’s the best way to solve for the impacts the k articulates – any link outweighs the possible discussions – our argument is specific to rejecting settler colonial practices

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for who best centers indigenous scholarship and resistance-- Any ethical commitment requires that the aff place themselves in the center of Native scholarship and demands.

Carlson 16 (Elizabeth Carlson, PhD, is an Aamitigoozhi, Wemistigosi, and Wasicu (settler Canadian and American), whose Swedish, Saami, German, Scots-Irish, and English ancestors have settled on lands of the Anishinaabe and Omaha Nations which were unethically obtained by the US government. Elizabeth lives on Treaty 1 territory, the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, Nehiyawak, Dakota, Nakota, and Red River Metis peoples currently occupied by the city of Winnipeg, the province of Manitoba, (2016): Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies, Settler Colonial Studies, DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241213) // recut SJ DL

Arlo Kempf says that ‘where anticolonialism is a tool used to invoke resistance for the colonized, it is a tool used to invoke accountability for the colonizer’.**42** Relational accountability should be a cornerstone of settler colonial studies.I believe settler colonial studies and scholars should ethically and overtly place themselves in relationship to the centuries of Indigenous oral, and later academic scholarship that conceptualizes and resists settler colonialism without necessarily using the term: SCT may be revelatory to many settler scholars, but Indigenous people have been speaking for a long time about colonial continuities based on their lived experiences. Some SCTs have sought to connect with these discussions and to foreground Indigenous resistance, survival and agency. Others, however, seem to use SCT as a pathway to explain the colonial encounter without engaging with Indigenous people and experiences – either on the grounds that this structural analysis already conceptually explains Indigenous experience, or because Indigenous resistance is rendered invisible.43 Ethical settler colonial theory (SCT) would recognize the foundational role Indigenous scholarship has in critiques of settler colonialism. It would acknowledge the limitations of settler scholars in articulating settler colonialism without dialogue with Indigenous peoplesand take as its norm making this dialogue evident. In my view, it is critical that we not view settler colonial studies as a new or unique field being established, which would enact a discovery narrative and contribute to Indigenous erasure, but rather take a longer and broade\_r view. Indigenous oral and academic scholars are indeed the originators of this work. This space is not empty. Of course, powerful forces of socialization and discipline impact scholars in the academy. There is much pressure to claim unique space, to establish a name for ourselves, and to make academic discoveries. I am suggesting that settler colonial studies and anti-colonial scholars resist these hegemonic pressures and maintain a higher anti-colonial ethic. As has been argued, ‘the theory itself places ethical demands on us as settlers, including the demand that we actively refuse its potential to re-empower our own academic voices and to marginalize Indigenous resistance’.44 As settler scholars, we can reposition our work relationally and contextually with humi- lity and accountability. We can centre Indigenous resistance, knowledges, and scholarship in our work, and contextualize our work in Indigenous sovereignty. We can view oral Indigenous scholarship as legitimate scholarly sources. We can acknowledge explicitly and often the Indigenous traditions of resistance and scholarship that have taught us and pro- vided the foundations for our work. If our work has no foundation of Indigenous scholarship and mentorship, I believe our contributions to settler colonial studies are even more deeply problematic.

#### At: phil before theory –

#### No, c/a the work I did above to answer eductaion

#### This is incoherent – you have to win your phil is good before you get to win it – this answers the phil so it doesn’t apply

## Case

### Theory

#### Preround asking helps – it’s a simple mistake – I have every other round up with all the right stuff which is why they don’t include it in the screenshot

#### At: clash – no you could ask as well as theres a turn: lack of neg dislosure is good if forces the aff to do more critical thinking on the stop which is better for ed

#### You link just as hard – you don’t disclose ozone as part of this aff – all your reasons why can be cross applied here

#### Dishonesty – its not a question of lying but of natural human mistake – its differnet

### underview

#### Permissibility and presumption negate.

#### More likely to be false than true - infinitely many ways to be wrong, only one way to be entirely right.

#### Incentivizes cheap shots like skep and trivialism which makes negating impossible

#### Risk of offense always flows in the direction of change i.e: the aff - even if you don't think there's any offense either direction, siding with the side of least change is most logically sound because there's always a risk its a bad idea

#### Name example makes no sense - that's because of socialized norms of trust because its known to be good to trust people like that, doesn't correspond to debate at all

#### no time skew - infinite aff prep + last word and judge psychology + same speech times even it out

### case

#### at: subjectivity has no meaning – no reason why the aff is specific to this

#### at: knowledge – c/a rifkin

#### OVERVIEW

#### TURN: The aff imposes a sweeping judgment about ALL types of private appropriation of outer space which precludes the case-by-case evaluation their framework requires – maybe colonies are a bad idea but asteroid mining is a good idea – the aff is an overbroad judgment which is non-pragmatic.

#### TURN: The plan precludes deliberation on a procedural level -- fiat is immediate and guaranteed -- this leaves no room for societies to deliberate beforehand about whether the plan is a good idea and reject it if it's not -- comes first under their framework as per their impact calculus.

#### TURN: The plan is an overbroad judgment because it applies to all private entities – different circumstances may make private entities a good idea for different actors – countries harmed by mining may turn to private asteroid mining as a way of preventing terrestrial harms which would avoid their links proving the AC is non-pragmatic

#### TURN: The plan precludes us from experimenting with different regulatory approaches to address the problems of the aff – private appropriation has potential upsides such as solving resource shortages or providing space based solar energy that can never be realized if you impose a blanket prohibition which is antithetical to prag

#### On Stockwell:

#### Nonunique, this isn’t about appropriation specifically and other types of private space use thump

#### No warrants, it’s a short buzzword-filled card

#### Doesn’t apply to all possible types of private space appropriation for example nonprofits or poorer countries would delink which proves it’s nonpragmatic

#### On property analytic:

#### You can appropriate unowned property which avoids the link and it’s what would occur in space which is unowned

#### Contradicts prag because societies can deliberate about whether property is a good idea

#### Misunderstands their framework, it’s not a consequentialist framework about maximizing deliberation but a procedural argument about deliberating before taking action, sociieties can deliberate and say private appropriation is a good idea

#### No society would want zero form of private property e.g. not even owning your toothbrush which proves this argument is nonpragmatic, that would be a rejected experiment

### Advantage

#### Hydrogen fuel solves ozone loss.

Dr. Martin Ross, NASA and Air Force scientist, et. al write for the Center for Space Policy and Strategy, 2018: [Martin Ross Dr. Martin Ross is senior project engineer for commercial launch projects. In that capacity, he leads research concerning the effects of space systems on the stratosphere—mainly, the impact of rocket-engine emissions on stratospheric ozone and climate forcing. He is developing new interagency strategies to better understand the scientific, economic, and policy implications of these phenomena. Ross conceived and implemented the Rockets Impacts on Stratospheric Ozone (RISO) program for the Air Force, managing simultaneous airborne sampling and ground-based remote sensing of rocket plumes. He also served as mission scientist for the joint NASA/NOAA/Air Force Atmospheric Chemistry of Combustion Emissions Near the Tropopause (ACCENT) project and is a contributor to the World Meteorological Organization’s Quadrennial Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion reports. He has written more than 50 publications and holds a Ph.D. in planetary and space physics from UCLA. James Vedda Dr. James A. Vedda is senior policy analyst in the Center for Space Policy and Strategy. In this role, he performs analyses on national security, civil, and commercial space issues for NASA, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Commerce, the Air Force, and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency. Vedda is the author of two books: Choice, Not Fate: Shaping a Sustainable Future in the Space Age (2009), and Becoming Spacefarers: Rescuing America’s Space Program (2012). He holds an M.A. in science, technology, and public policy from George Washington University and a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Florida. “THE POLICY AND SCIENCE OF ROCKET EMISSIONS” The Center for Space Policy and Strategy is dedicated to shaping the future by providing nonpartisan research and strategic analysis to decisionmakers. The Center is part of The Aerospace Corporation, a nonprofit organization that advises the government on complex space enterprise and systems engineering problems. April 2018. https://aerospace.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/RocketEmissions\_0.pdf]

While the magnitude and variety of rocket emission impacts are not well known, we can describe the overall picture across the various propellant combinations with some confidence. CO2 and H2O emissions, which make up the main portion of all rocket exhaust, are unimportant, even at launch rates orders of magnitude greater than today. This is a key aspect of rocket emissions. Research has shown that a fleet of hydrogen-fueled launch vehicles, whose emissions are nearly entirely water vapor, could launch at any rate possible without risk of regulatory attention.13 Rocket CO2 and H2O emissions are not of any concern with respect to atmospheric impacts.4

#### The particulates that cause ozone depletion also reverse climate change.

Dr. Martin Ross, NASA and Air Force scientist, et. al write for the Center for Space Policy and Strategy, 2018: [Martin Ross Dr. Martin Ross is senior project engineer for commercial launch projects. In that capacity, he leads research concerning the effects of space systems on the stratosphere—mainly, the impact of rocket-engine emissions on stratospheric ozone and climate forcing. He is developing new interagency strategies to better understand the scientific, economic, and policy implications of these phenomena. Ross conceived and implemented the Rockets Impacts on Stratospheric Ozone (RISO) program for the Air Force, managing simultaneous airborne sampling and ground-based remote sensing of rocket plumes. He also served as mission scientist for the joint NASA/NOAA/Air Force Atmospheric Chemistry of Combustion Emissions Near the Tropopause (ACCENT) project and is a contributor to the World Meteorological Organization’s Quadrennial Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion reports. He has written more than 50 publications and holds a Ph.D. in planetary and space physics from UCLA. James Vedda Dr. James A. Vedda is senior policy analyst in the Center for Space Policy and Strategy. In this role, he performs analyses on national security, civil, and commercial space issues for NASA, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Commerce, the Air Force, and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency. Vedda is the author of two books: Choice, Not Fate: Shaping a Sustainable Future in the Space Age (2009), and Becoming Spacefarers: Rescuing America’s Space Program (2012). He holds an M.A. in science, technology, and public policy from George Washington University and a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Florida. “THE POLICY AND SCIENCE OF ROCKET EMISSIONS” The Center for Space Policy and Strategy is dedicated to shaping the future by providing nonpartisan research and strategic analysis to decisionmakers. The Center is part of The Aerospace Corporation, a nonprofit organization that advises the government on complex space enterprise and systems engineering problems. April 2018. https://aerospace.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/RocketEmissions\_0.pdf]

The important emissions of concern with respect to global impacts are chlorine and alumina particles from solid rocket motors (SRMs) and soot particles (hereafter, black carbon or BC), mainly, though not exclusively, from kerosene fueled engines. Chemical reactions involving chlorine and the surface of alumina particles cause ozone loss directly.14 Alumina and BC particles accumulate in the stratosphere in distinct layers and intercept incoming solar radiation.15 As the lifetime of small particles injected into the stratosphere is as long as four years, the steady state BC and alumina loading represents the contribution from all global launches during the past several years. These alumina and BC layers reflect and absorb a small portion of the downward solar flux, respectively.4,14 The energy from the intercepted solar flux warms the stratosphere, indirectly adding to ozone loss by accelerating ambient ozone-destroying reactions. Importantly, solar flux is reduced beneath the alumina and BC layers which act as a sort of “stratospheric umbrella” producing a negative radiative forcing that cools the Earth’s surface. Rocket emissions therefore act in the same manner as geoengineering schemes to counteract the warming from greenhouse gases. This equivalence may have policy implications.

#### The magnitude of loss is small.

Dr. Martin Ross, NASA and Air Force scientist, et. al write for the Center for Space Policy and Strategy, 2018: [Martin Ross Dr. Martin Ross is senior project engineer for commercial launch projects. In that capacity, he leads research concerning the effects of space systems on the stratosphere—mainly, the impact of rocket-engine emissions on stratospheric ozone and climate forcing. He is developing new interagency strategies to better understand the scientific, economic, and policy implications of these phenomena. Ross conceived and implemented the Rockets Impacts on Stratospheric Ozone (RISO) program for the Air Force, managing simultaneous airborne sampling and ground-based remote sensing of rocket plumes. He also served as mission scientist for the joint NASA/NOAA/Air Force Atmospheric Chemistry of Combustion Emissions Near the Tropopause (ACCENT) project and is a contributor to the World Meteorological Organization’s Quadrennial Scientific Assessment of Ozone Depletion reports. He has written more than 50 publications and holds a Ph.D. in planetary and space physics from UCLA. James Vedda Dr. James A. Vedda is senior policy analyst in the Center for Space Policy and Strategy. In this role, he performs analyses on national security, civil, and commercial space issues for NASA, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Department of Commerce, the Air Force, and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency. Vedda is the author of two books: Choice, Not Fate: Shaping a Sustainable Future in the Space Age (2009), and Becoming Spacefarers: Rescuing America’s Space Program (2012). He holds an M.A. in science, technology, and public policy from George Washington University and a Ph.D. in political science from the University of Florida. “THE POLICY AND SCIENCE OF ROCKET EMISSIONS” The Center for Space Policy and Strategy is dedicated to shaping the future by providing nonpartisan research and strategic analysis to decisionmakers. The Center is part of The Aerospace Corporation, a nonprofit organization that advises the government on complex space enterprise and systems engineering problems. April 2018. https://aerospace.org/sites/default/files/2018-05/RocketEmissions\_0.pdf]

The research done in the past two decades, while inadequate for detailed assessments, does allow for order-of-magnitude estimates for the ozone depletion and radiative forcing from the global launch fleet. Present-day global direct ozone loss from chlorine, reactive alumina surfaces, and from the BC accumulation is estimated to be greater than 0.01% and less than 0.1%.7 For comparison, the global ozone loss from long banned ozone depleting substances (ODSs) is about 3%.16 Clearly, if launch emissions were to increase by a factor of ten, the associated rocket ozone loss could be of an order comparable to ODS loss.

#### The ozone layer doesn’t matter

Matt Ridley, Fellow of the Academy of Medical Sciences, writes for The Times, 2014:[Matt, DPhil from Oxford, Fellow of the Academy of Medical Sciences, The Times, September 15, 2014, “The ozone hole isn’t fixed. But that’s no worry,” http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/opinion/columnists/article4206440.ece]

How much damage did the ozone hole ever threaten to do anyway? It is fascinating to go back and read what the usual hyperventilating eco-exaggerators said about ozone thinning in the 1980s. As a result of the extra ultraviolet light coming through the Antarctic ozone hole, southernmost parts of Patagonia and New Zealand see about 12 per cent more UV light than expected. This means that the weak September sunshine, though it feels much the same, has the power to cause sunburn more like that of latitudes a few hundred miles north. Hardly Armageddon. The New York Times reported “an increase in Twilight Zone-type reports of sheep and rabbits with cataracts” in southern Chile. Not to be outdone, Al Gore wrote that “hunters now report finding blind rabbits; fisherman catch blind salmon”. Zoologists briefly blamed the near extinction of many amphibian species on thin ozone. Melanoma in people was also said to be on the rise as a result. This was nonsense. Frogs were dying out because of a fungal disease spread from Africa — nothing to do with ozone. Rabbits and fish blinded by a little extra sunlight proved to be as mythical as unicorns. An eye disease in Chilean sheep was happening outside the ozone-depleted zone and was caused by an infection called pinkeye — nothing to do with UV light. And melanoma incidence in people actually levelled out during the period when the ozone got thinner.

Then remember that the ozone hole appears when the sky is dark all day, and over an uninhabited continent. Even if it persists into the Antarctic spring and spills north briefly, the hole allows 50 times less ultraviolet light through than would hit your skin at the equator at sea level (let alone at a high altitude) in the tropics. So it would be bonkers to worry about UV as you sailed round Cape Horn in spring, say, but not when you stopped at the Galapagos: the skin cancer risk is 50 times higher in the latter place.