# 1NC vs Little Rock Central MG Octos

## 1

### 1nc – t

#### Interpretation - the affirmative must defend the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust.

#### This does not require the use of any particular style, type of evidence, or assumption about the role of the judge — only that the *topic* should determine the debate’s subject matter.

#### “Resolved” means enactment of a law.

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition (Multi-volume set of judicial definitions). “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word **“resolve,”** given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It **is** of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”.**

#### Violation – they defend transpacific reimaginings, not the resolution – clear in CX

#### At best they’re Extra-T because they garner methodological offense, which is a voter for Limits since they can add any amount of infinite planks to the aff to solve for all neg arguments, or Effects-T which is worse, since any small aff can spill up to the res.

#### Topical version of the aff:

#### 1) American demilitarization in space, with advantages about imperialism and the china threat paradigm – 1AC klinger explicitly critiques debris removal and asteroid infrastructure, which are both topical affs under our model

#### 2) The aff they have read until this round, which endorses transpacific reimaginings as a method for reducing private appropriation

#### Disads to the TVA just prove there is neg ground and that it’s a contestable stasis

**Vote Neg – The resolution is the only common stasis point that anchors negative preparation. Allowing any aff deviation from the resolution is a moral hazard which justifies an infinite number of unpredictable arguments with thin ties to the resolution. Because debate is a competitive game, their interpretation incentivizes affirmatives to run further towards fringes and revert to truisms which are exceedingly difficult to negate**

#### 1 – Fairness is necessary for useful debates—it lets the aff train with the heavy bats of prepared negative strategies which internal link turns their ability to advocate change outside of debate. It enables both teams to more effectively challenge injustice and support movements for change.

#### 2. The competitive incentive from debate creates pressures for research and focused clash which generates important skills and makes debate a training ground for future work. The impact is movements -- activism is not automatic, but requires learning to defend a proposal against rigorous negation to develop skills for strategy, organizing, problem-solving, using resources, and creating coalitions---their impact turns aren’t unique because the government will inevitably try to capture public worry, the only question is creating alternative incentives for people to organize.

Lakey 13. (George Lakey co-founded Earth Quaker Action Group which just won its five-year campaign to force a major U.S. bank to give up financing mountaintop removal coal mining. Along with college teaching he has led 1,500 workshops on five continents and led activist projects on local, national, and international levels. Among many other books and articles, he is author of “Strategizing for a Living Revolution” in David Solnit’s book Globalize Liberation. 8 skills of a well-trained activist. June 11, 2013. <https://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/8-skills-of-a-well-trained-activist/>)

Why more training now? The history of training is a history of playing catch-up. Very few movements seem to realize that the pace of change can accelerate so rapidly that it outstrips the movement’s ability to use its opportunities fully. In Istanbul a small group of environmentalists sit down to save a park, and suddenly there are protests in over 60 Turkish cities; the agenda expands, from green space to governance to capitalism; doors open everywhere. It would be a good moment to have tens of thousands of skilled organizers ready to seize the day, supporting smart direct action and building prefigurative institutions. But excitement alone may slacken; as with the Occupy movement, spontaneous creativity has its limits. With the right skills, movements can sustain themselves for years against punishing, murderous resistance. The mass direct action phase of the civil rights movement pushed on effectively for a decade after 1955. Mass excitement doesn’t need to fizzle in a year. A movement thrives by solving the problems it faces. Anti-authoritarians don’t want to count on a movement’s top leaders to be the problem-solvers, but instead to develop shared leadership by fostering problem-solving smarts at the grassroots. There’s nothing automatic about grassroots problem-solving. How well people strategize, organize, invent creative tactics, reach effectively to allies, use the full resources of the group and persevere at times of discouragement — all that can be enhanced by training. Nothing is more predictable than that there will be increased turbulence in the United States and many other societies. Activists cause some of the turbulence by rising up; other turbulence results from things like climate change, the 1 percent’s austerity programs and other forces outside activists’ immediate control. Increased turbulence scares a lot of people. It’s only natural that people will look around for reassurance. The ruling class will offer one kind of reassurance. The big question is: What reassurance will the movement offer? When students in Paris in May 1968 launched a campaign that quickly moved into nationwide turbulence, with 11 million workers striking and occupying, there was a momentary chance for the middle class to side with the students and workers instead of siding with the 1 percent. The movement, though, didn’t understand enough about the basic human need for security and failed to use its opportunity. That was a strategic error, but to choose a different path the movement would have required participants with more skills. Training would have been necessary. We can learn from this, inventory the skills needed and train ourselves accordingly. What is training ready to do for us? Here are a few of the key benefits that we should expect to gain from one another through training: 1. Increase the creativity of direct action strategy and tactics. The Yes Men and the Center for Story-Based Strategy lead workshops in which activist groups break out of the lockstep of “marches-and-rallies.” We need to have a broad array of tactics at our disposal, and we have to be ready to invent new ones when necessary. 2. Prepare participants psychologically for the struggle. The Pinochet regime in Chile depended, as dictatorships usually do, on fear to maintain its control. In the 1980s a group committed to nonviolent struggle encouraged people to face their fears directly in a three-step process: small group training sessions in living rooms, followed by “hit-and-run” nonviolent actions, followed by debriefing sessions. By teaching people to control their fear, trainers were building a movement to overthrow the dictator. 3. Develop group morale and solidarity for more effective action. In 1991 members of ACT UP — a militant group protesting U.S. AIDS policy — were beaten up by Philadelphia police during a demonstration. The police were found guilty of using unnecessary force and the city paid damages, but ACT UP members realized they could reduce the chance of future brutality by working in a more united and nonviolent way. Before their next major action they invited a trainer to conduct a workshop where they clarified the strategic question of nonviolence and then role-played possible scenarios. The result: a high-spirited, unified and effective action. 4. Deepen participants’ understanding of the issues. The War Resisters League’s Handbook for Nonviolent Action is an example of the approach that takes even a civil disobedience training as an opportunity to assist participants to take a next step regarding racism, sexism and the like. When we understand how seemingly separate struggles are connected, it helps us create a broader, stronger, more interconnected movement. 5. Build skills for applying nonviolent action in situations of threat and turbulence. In Haiti a hit squad abducted a young man just outside the house where a trained peace team was staying; the team immediately intervened and, although surrounded by twice their number of guards with weapons, succeeded in saving the man from being hung. Through training, we can learn how to react to emergencies like this in disciplined, effective ways. 6. Build alliances across movement lines. In Seattle in the 1980s, a workshop drew striking workers from the Greyhound bus company and members of ACT UP. The workshop reduced the prejudice each group had about the other, and it led some participants to support each other’s struggle. Trainings are a valuable opportunity to bring people from different walks of life together and help them work toward their common goals. 7. Create activist organizations that don’t burn people out. The Action Mill, Spirit in Action, and the Stone House all offer workshops to help activists to stay active in the long run. I’ve seen a lot of accumulated skill lost to movements over the years because people didn’t have the support or endurance to stay in the fight. 8. Increase democracy within the movement. In the 1970s the Movement for a New Society developed a pool of training tools and designs that it shared with the grassroots movement against nuclear power. The anti-nuclear movement went up against some of the largest corporations in America and won. The movement delayed construction, which raised costs, and planted so many seeds of doubt in the public mind about safety that the eventual meltdown of the Three Mile Island plant brought millions of people to the movement’s point of view. The industry’s goal of building 1,000 nuclear plants evaporated. Significantly, the campaign succeeded without needing to create a national structure around a charismatic leader. Activists learned the skills of shared leadership and democratic decision-making through workshops, practice and feedback. In my book Facilitating Group Learning, I share many lessons that have evolved from Freire’s day to ours. I hope that readers of this column will add to the list of training providers in the comments, since I’ve only named some. My intention is to remind us that this could be the right moment, before the next wave of turbulence has all of us in crisis-mode again, to increase training capacity for grassroots skill-building. We’ll be very glad we did.

#### SSD solves their offense - playing devils advocate and researching and debating both sides encourages debaters to modify and adapt their own positions on critical issue which encourages better affs in the future. Debate doesn’t have any effect on the political and the individual arguments we read have no effect on our subjectivity

#### They don’t get to weigh the aff – wasn’t able to engage with it due to a lack of preparation

#### T should be evaluated through competing interps – reasonability invites judge intervention which reentrenches racist opinions

#### Drop the debater on T – the round is already skewed from the beginning because their advocacy excluded by ability to generate NC offense– letting them sever doesn’t solve any of the abuse

#### No impact turns and RVIs –

#### 1) presumes that your args are evaluated fairly + we don’t force a norm but just say that a certain interpretation is good since it’s a question of models of debate

#### 2) Impact turns that indicate that the neg’s interpretation recreates Asian violence should be rejected on face for attempting to fracture Asian resistance and coalitions by pitting Asians against each other

## 2

### 1nc – k

#### Settler colonialism is the ontological permeating structure of the nation-state which requires the elimination of indigenous life and land via the occupation of settlers. The appropriation of land turns Natives into ghosts and chattel slaves into excess labor. Their method begins and ends with mental “orientations” or epistemologies” – when they reference “the decolonial … work that Asian American rhetoric can and must do,” they make decolonization a metaphor which turns the aff.

Tuck and Yang 12

(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

Our intention in this descriptive exercise is not be exhaustive, or even inarguable; instead, we wish to emphasize that (a) decolonization will take a different shape in each of these contexts - though they can overlap - and that (b) neither external nor internal colonialism adequately describe the form of colonialism which operates in the United States or other nation-states in which the colonizer comes to stay. Settler colonialism operates through internal/external colonial modes simultaneously because there is no spatial separation between metropole and colony. For example, in the United States, many Indigenous peoples have been forcibly removed from their homelands onto reservations, indentured, and abducted into state custody, signaling the form of colonization as simultaneously internal (via boarding schools and other biopolitical modes of control) and external (via uranium mining on Indigenous land in the US Southwest and oil extraction on Indigenous land in Alaska) with a frontier (the US military still nicknames all enemy territory “Indian Country”). The horizons of the settler colonial nation-state are total and require a mode of total appropriation of Indigenous life and land, rather than the selective expropriation of profit-producing fragments. Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain. Thus, relying solely on postcolonial literatures or theories of coloniality that ignore settler colonialism will not help to envision the shape that decolonization must take in settler colonial contexts. Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article.) Land is what is most valuable, contested, required. This is both because the settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence. This violence is not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is reasserted each day of occupation. This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that settler colonialism is a structure and not an event. In the process of settler colonialism, land is remade into property and human relationships to land are restricted to the relationship of the owner to his property. Epistemological, ontological, and cosmological relationships to land are interred, indeed made pre-modern and backward. Made savage. In order for the settlers to make a place their home, they must destroy and disappear the Indigenous peoples that live there. Indigenous peoples are those who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they came to be in a particular place - indeed how we/they came to be a place. Our/their relationships to land comprise our/their epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies. For the settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and over time and through law and policy, Indigenous peoples’ claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource. Indigenous peoples must be erased, must be made into ghosts (Tuck and Ree, forthcoming). At the same time, settler colonialism involves the subjugation and forced labor of chattel slaves, whose bodies and lives become the property, and who are kept landless. Slavery in settler colonial contexts is distinct from other forms of indenture whereby excess labor is extracted from persons. First, chattels are commodities of labor and therefore it is the slave’s person that is the excess. Second, unlike workers who may aspire to own land, the slave’s very presence on the land is already an excess that must be dis-located. Thus, the slave is a desirable commodity but the person underneath is imprisonable, punishable, and murderable. The violence of keeping/killing the chattel slave makes them deathlike monsters in the settler imagination; they are reconfigured/disfigured as the threat, the razor’s edge of safety and terror. The settler, if known by his actions and how he justifies them, sees himself as holding dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as the anthropocentric normal, and as more developed, more human, more deserving than other groups or species. The settler is making a new "home" and that home is rooted in a homesteading worldview where the wild land and wild people were made for his benefit. He can only make his identity as a settler by making the land produce, and produce excessively, because "civilization" is defined as production in excess of the "natural" world (i.e. in excess of the sustainable production already present in the Indigenous world). In order for excess production, he needs excess labor, which he cannot provide himself. The chattel slave serves as that excess labor, labor that can never be paid because payment would have to be in the form of property (land). The settler's wealth is land, or a fungible version of it, and so payment for labor is impossible.6 The settler positions himself as both superior and normal; the settler is natural, whereas the Indigenous inhabitant and the chattel slave are unnatural, even supernatural. Settlers are not immigrants. Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies. Therefore, settler nations are not immigrant nations (See also A.J. Barker, 2009). Not unique, the United States, as a settler colonial nation-state, also operates as an empire - utilizing external forms and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the settler colonial project. This means, and this is perplexing to some, that dispossessed people are brought onto seized Indigenous land through other colonial projects. Other colonial projects include enslavement, as discussed, but also military recruitment, low-wage and high-wage labor recruitment (such as agricultural workers and overseas-trained engineers), and displacement/migration (such as the coerced immigration from nations torn by U.S. wars or devastated by U.S. economic policy). In this set of settler colonial relations, colonial subjects who are displaced by external colonialism, as well as racialized and minoritized by internal colonialism, still occupy and settle stolen Indigenous land. Settlers are diverse, not just of white European descent, and include people of color, even from other colonial contexts. This tightly wound set of conditions and racialized, globalized relations exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization, and by solidarity, against settler colonial forces. Decolonization in exploitative colonial situations could involve the seizing of imperial wealth by the postcolonial subject. In settler colonial situations, seizing imperial wealth is inextricably tied to settlement and re-invasion. Likewise, the promise of integration and civil rights is predicated on securing a share of a settler-appropriated wealth (as well as expropriated ‘third-world’ wealth). Decolonization in a settler context is fraught because empire, settlement, and internal colony have no spatial separation. Each of these features of settler colonialism in the US context - empire, settlement, and internal colony - make it a site of contradictory decolonial desires7. Decolonization as metaphor allows people to equivocate these contradictory decolonial desires because it turns decolonization into an empty signifier to be filled by any track towards liberation. In reality, the tracks walk all over land/people in settler contexts. Though the details are not fixed or agreed upon, in our view, decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonization is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity. “Decolonization never takes place unnoticed” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). Settler colonialism and its decolonization implicates and unsettles everyone.

#### Cards from the 1AC that are particularly nauseating:

#### 1) Their 1AC Wan & Young evidence claim’s that the nation state

perform its own violence in contexts such as relations with Native Hawaiians, indigenous nations, or other racialized communities in the United States.

#### proves that the aff’s attempt to explain indigenous oppression through racialization and tossing in of indigenous people that one that assimilates Natives into the broader ethos of liberal democracy ignoring it’s not a race but a subject position

#### 2) The 1AC Park evidence represents a tossing in and stirring of indigenous populations who are completely unrelated to the idea of Asian technoorentalism, but are instead used as a token to preempt settlerism. Their claim that the

#### European “discovery” of the Americas resulted in the loss of 95% of the indigenous population

#### also proves that you ought to prioritize our impacts first because they controlled the RC and created the conditions for hegemonic domination

**Techno-orientalism is reliant and constitutive of settler colonialism – turns case because the aff serves to reproduce itself**

**Arvin 18** [Maile Arvin Dr. Maile Arvin is an assistant professor of History and Gender Studies at the University of Utah. She is a Native Hawaiian feminist scholar who works on issues of race, gender, science and colonialism in Hawai‘i and the broader Pacific. At the University of Utah, she is part of the leadership of the Pacific Islands Studies Initiative, which was awarded a Mellon Foundation grant to support ongoing efforts to develop Pacific Islands Studies curriculum, programming and student recruitment and support. “Polynesia Is a Project, Not a Place : Polynesian Proximities to Whiteness in Cloud Atlas and Beyond” 2018 <https://laulima.hawaii.edu/access/content/user/kfrench/sociology/Family_Text/SOC%20214/Beyond%20Ethnicity%20Hawaii/Chapter_1_Polynesia%20is%20a%20Project%2C%20not%20a%20place.pdf> ] // aaditg

SETTLER COLONIALISM MEETS TECHNO-ORIENTALISM ON THE PACIFIC RIM In addition to those about Polynesians transcending race (in my analysis, being possessed by Whiteness), another troubling narrative in Cloud Atlas is the story of Sonmi, a female cyborg-slave played by Korean actress Doona Bae in a fastfood restaurant in Neo-Seoul. Her political awakening and escape, aided by an underground revolutionary network, leads her to become a prophetess and martyr for the cause of cyborg abolition. Although not set directly in the Pacific Islands, a key subplot links the stories: namely, Sonmi becomes a goddess that future Pacific Islanders worship. Thus, the Sonmi narrative’s inclusion in Cloud Atlas is suggestive of some of the ways that **Orientalism and settler colonialism are embedded in each other and mutually constitutive**. Considering the Asia Pacific pivot military strategy of the United States, the so-called Pacific Rim and the often-overlooked Pacific Islands are tightly enmeshed. At work in the Sonmi narrative is a familiar form of Orientalism often found in science fiction, what David Morley and Kevin Robins have termed technoOrientalism. 59 In their formulation, techno-Orientalism ties older forms of Orientalism, in which the East is an exotic and excluded Other from the West, to fears about Asia’s seeming technological, and increasingly economic, superiority. 60 Where Morley and Robins relate techno-Orientalism to the rise of Japan in the 1980s and the overwhelming postmodern and decentered metropolis of Tokyo in movies such as Blade Runner, other scholars, including Aimee Bahng, have shown how techno-Orientalism continues to move and reemerge in places like Singapore, which markets itself as a future hub of finance, biotechnology, and engineering. 61 Cloud Atlas locates the Sonmi story in a future South Korea but differs little from these other articulations of techno-Orientalism. In all articulations, the “future is technological,” and thus the future is Asian, “a future that seems to be transcending and displacing western modernity.” Morley and Robins note that “**The association of technology and Japaneseness now serves to reinforce the image of a culture that is cold, impersonal and machine-like, an authoritarian culture lacking emotional connection to the rest of the world.”** 62 In line with such techno-Orientalism, Cloud Atlas places Sonmi as a nearly indistinguishable cog in a cold, machine-filled, authoritarian Orient. Sonmi’s realization of her true humanity—that she has emotions and deserves to live outside the indignities and sexual exploitation of the restaurant she is trapped in—leads her to become the figurehead and martyr of the cyborg and allied human revolution. This narrative then operates as a cautionary tale about the consequences of allying with a rising, authoritarian Asia instead of the original capitalists, the West, who are equally rapacious but, this story seems to indicate, fundamentally more caring and more human. Neo-Seoul is presented as a doomed enterprise that will never eliminate the true human spirit, which audiences will recognize as a uniquely individualistic American spirit. Though Sonmi is represented as a Korean cyborg, her femininity and the love story interwoven with her escape and martyrdom make her an appropriate sexual object of Western audiences, and her belief in democracy and freedom bestows upon her a kind of honorary Whiteness. The reemergence of Sonmi in the Pacific Islander story of Zachry uses the **narrative of Western freedom as always triumphant over Oriental authoritarianism to further instruct audiences to view the Pacific as naturally aligned with the West rather than the East.** Revealing a towering statue of Sonmi at the summit of a volcano on Zachry’s island, the movie suggests that Pacific Islanders were tricked into superstitiously believing that Sonmi was a goddess when she was really just a cyborg. When Halle Barry’s character Meronym explains this to Zachry, one possible implication is that his Pacific Islander people are mistaken for believing in an Oriental future, rather than a Western one. Sonmi’s true spirit, after all, was a Western one, which modern people may admire but do not worship in such a Native or Oriental fashion. In any case, Meronym highlights that the admiration for Sonmi among Zachry’s people should be for her Western traits of a strong belief in freedom and democracy. Considering the juxtaposition of Neo-Seoul against the future Big Island of Zachry’s narrative, we can also see the Pacific Islands as operating directly as an antidote to the overwhelming, post-apocalyptical metropolis of Asian countries. The Big Island is visually portrayed as empty of any markers of modern life, inhabited primarily by goat herders who live in shacks and the roaming savages who prey on the goat herders. Here again, the two types of Polynesian noted by Louis Sullivan, as discussed earlier, **emerge to represent rustic but innocent Whiteness on the one hand, and barbaric savagery that must be eradicated in the name of that innocence on the other hand**. Where Neo-Seoul is overwhelmingly disorienting, the Big Island is still pristine, even in the distant future when the rest of the world is destroyed. **The Pacific is the place where the West survives the East; it is a safer, experimental Orient that reorients the hegemony of the West. In this story, settler colonialism is the salve of a failed imperial contest, as the successful settlement of the Pacific Islands will allow the West to rise again and last beyond the boom and busts of Asia**. Thus, we must recognize that **stories that are techno-Orientalist also often depend on naturalizing settler colonialism in the Pacific and present occupation of the welcoming feminine Pacific as a solution to threats from the technological advances of the Asian metropolis.** More specifically, the presence of Sonmi as a Pacific Islander goddess also naturalizes the presence of Asians in the Pacific, rather than situating that presence as historical and political. **Asian settler colonialism**, a field of scholarship that has grown in recent years**, attempts to reframe such naturalized Asian and Asian American relationships to land in Hawai‘i.** Although Asian settler colonialism has existed as a concept since at least the 1990s, stemming from Haunani-Kay Trask’s insistence that Asian Americans in Hawai‘i are settlers rather than immigrants, the project has more recently coalesced with the 2008 publication of the volume Asian Settler Colonialism, 63 The contributors to the volume identify themselves as Asian settler scholars who are committed to respectfully confronting the ways that Asian Americans living in Hawai‘i have long erased Native Hawaiian claims to land and sovereignty. In contrast to histories that laud the first generations of Japanese and Chinese plantation workers as the foundation for the contemporary Asian American middle class in Hawai‘i, these scholars seek to reposition themselves and their communities outside U.S. national frames and within a squarely settler colonial one. 64 Although criticism of the term “Asian settler” has denounced the potential for lumping Asians and Asian Americans along with White settlers into a category starkly opposed to Native Hawaiians, the Asian settler scholars of the volume repeatedly position their critiques as ones that do not seek to reproach Asian Americans in Hawai‘i for their presence there but rather to challenge Asian affiliations with the American nation-state. In other words, Asian settler colonialism reminds everyone (to recall Edouard Glissant and Dean Saranillio’s words) that America is a project, not a place, not only in Hawai‘i but also in Alaska, the continent, and other outposts of American empire. What does recognizing America “as a project, not a place” mean for intervening into settler colonialism and possessive forms of Whiteness in the Pacific? For Asian settler colonialism, it means asking for Asian settlers to disavow the project, not the place, and for the place to be recognized as Hawai‘i nei, not America, and not a U.S. state. Here, I understand the discourse of Asian settler colonialism as one that dovetails with Victor Bascara’s theorizing of model minority imperialism. Bascara reminds us that critiques of the Asian American model minority stereotype are also critiques of U.S. imperialism. **Rather than an effort to name and divide populations into settlers and indigenes, Asian settler colonialism is a critique of, as Bascara says, the use of “the success stories of Asian Americans” to erase both the conditions of empire that involved Asians in the racial-capitalist project of America and to mask the “new terms of empire” under the more recent names of multiculturalism and globalization.** 65 To be sure, Asian settler scholars are not interested in dishonoring “the struggles of their grandparents and greatgrandparents, the early Asian settler laborers who demonstrated tremendous courage and resourcefulness,” only in reclaiming their stories within narratives Fojas, C., Guevarra, R. P., & Sharma, N. T. (Eds.). (2018). Beyond ethnicity : New politics of race in hawai'i. Retrieved from http://ebookcentral.proquest.com Created from wcc-ebooks on 2019-10-08 20:28:20. Copyright © 2018. University of Hawaii Press. All rights reserved. that do not valorize the settler colonial project of America. 66 In a similar vein, Asian American writer Dennis Kawaharada writes about the need for all residents of Hawai‘i to educate themselves about Hawaiian language and culture, rather than assume that the plantation experience and pidgin language that developed on the plantations reflects everyone’s experience. He points to the work of Native Hawaiian poet Dana Naone Hall to remind his readers that, for many Native Hawaiians, “identity is rooted not in the plantation experience, but in the mythic world of nature and ancestral gods,” where “K nehekili / flashes in the sky / and Moanonuikalehua changes / from a beautiful woman / into a lehua tree / at the sound of the pahu.” Kawaharada further points out that resistance on the part of Asian American residents of Hawai‘i to learning more about Hawaiian culture and history often stems from “the hurt and rejection they feel when they discover they cannot become Hawaiian by moving here or living here, which they believe is their right as Americans, based on the cultural myth that a person is free to be anything he or she wants to be.” 67 Kawaharada’s work points out though both Asians and Native Hawaiians were crucially part of the material to be “melted” in the American melting pot image of Hawai‘i, both would assimilate and effectively disappear into Whiteness. Rather than transferring the privileges and property of Whiteness to Asians and Native Hawaiians, this logic simply strengthened the structure of Whiteness and White supremacy, allowing White American settlers to be understood as the natural leaders and owners of Hawai‘i. Asian American proximity to Whiteness thus notably works similarly to Native Hawaiian proximity to Whiteness. The model minority myth, Bascara writes, trotted Asian Americans out as, in the language of Aiiieeee!, “miracle synthetic white people.” 68 Not being able to assume that synthetic Whiteness in any secure, consistent way, however, puts Asian Americans in a similar if incommensurable position to Native Hawaiians in respect to Whiteness: each is engaged in the project of America by being possessed through Whiteness, but is not extended the possession of Whiteness.

#### Vote negative for a politics of decolonization – refuse settler futurity, refuse the 1AC, and refuse to flinch from an ethic of incommensurability. Solves the aff – creates an open space for future work to resist imperial and hegemonic domination

Tuck and Yang 12

(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework. We want to say, first, that decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions - decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity. Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics - moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone - these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability.*when you take away the punctuation he says of lines lifted from the documents about military-occupied land its acreage and location you take away its finality opening the possibility of other futures* -Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012)

Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.

#### Asterisks DA – the permutation is a token gesture and settler move to innocence that moves indigenous nations to the margins and assimilates Native sovereignty

Tuck and Yang 12

(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

Moves to innocence V: A(s)t(e)risk peoples This settler move to innocence is concerned with the ways in which Indigenous peoples are counted, codified, represented, and included/disincluded by educational researchers and other social science researchers. Indigenous peoples are rendered visible in mainstream educational research in two main ways: as “at risk” peoples and as asterisk peoples. This comprises a settler move to innocence because it erases and then conceals the erasure of Indigenous peoples within the settler colonial nation-state and moves Indigenous nations as “populations” to the margins of public discourse. As “at risk” peoples, Indigenous students and families are described as on the verge of extinction, culturally and economically bereft, engaged or soon-to-be engaged in self-destructive behaviors which can interrupt their school careers and seamless absorption into the economy. Even though it is widely known and verified that Native youth gain access to personal and academic success when they also have access to/instruction in their home languages, most Native American and Alaskan Native youth are taught in English-only schools by temporary teachers who know little about their students’ communities (Lomawaima and McCarty, 2006; Lee, 2011). Even though Indigenous knowledge systems predate, expand, update, and complicate the curricula found in most public schools, schools attended by poor Indigenous students are among those most regimented in attempts to comply with federal mandates. Though these mandates intrude on the sovereignty of Indigenous peoples, the “services” promised at the inception of these mandates do little to make the schools attended by Indigenous youth better at providing them a compelling, relevant, inspiring and meaningful education. At the same time, Indigenous communities become the asterisk peoples, meaning they are represented by an asterisk in large and crucial data sets, many of which are conducted to inform public policy that impact our/their lives (Villegas, 2012). Education and health statistics are unavailable from Indigenous communities for a variety of reasons and, when they are made available, the size of the n, or the sample size, can appear to be negligible when compared to the sample size of other/race-based categories. Though Indigenous scholars such as Malia Villegas recognize that Indigenous peoples are distinct from each other but also from other racialized groups surveyed in these studies, they argue that difficulty of collecting basic education and health information about this small and heterogeneous category must be overcome in order to counter the disappearance of Indigenous particularities in public policy. In U.S. educational research in particular, Indigenous peoples are included only as asterisks, as footnotes into dominant paradigms of educational inequality in the U.S. This can be observed in the progressive literature on school discipline, on ‘underrepresented minorities’ in higher education, and in the literature of reparation, i.e., redressing ‘past’ wrongs against non- white Others. Under such paradigms, which do important work on alleviating the symptoms of colonialism (poverty, dispossession, criminality, premature death, cultural genocide), Indigeneity is simply an “and” or an illustration of oppression. ‘Urban education’, for example, is a code word for the schooling of black, brown, and ghettoized youth who form the numerical majority in divested public schools. Urban American Indians and Native Alaskans become an asterisk group, invisibilized, even though about two-thirds of Indigenous peoples in the U.S. live in urban areas, according to the 2010 census. Yet, urban Indians receive fewer federal funds for education, health, and employment than their counterparts on reservations (Berry, 2012). Similarly, Native Pasifika people become an asterisk in the Asian Pacific Islander category and their politics/epistemologies/experiences are often subsumed under a pan-ethnic Asian-American master narrative. From a settler viewpoint that concerns itself with numerical inequality, e.g. the achievement gap, underrepresentation, and the 99%’s short share of the wealth of the metropole, the asterisk is an outlier, an outnumber. It is a token gesture, an inclusion and an enclosure of Native people into the politics of equity. These acts of inclusion assimilate Indigenous sovereignty, ways of knowing, and ways of being by remaking a collective-comprised tribal identity into an individualized ethnic identity. From a decolonizing perspective, the asterisk is a body count that does not account for Indigenous politics, educational concerns, and epistemologies. Urban land (indeed all land) is Native land. The vast majority of Native youth in North America live in urban settings. Any decolonizing urban education endeavor must address the foundations of urban land pedagogy and Indigenous politics vis-a-vis the settler colonial state.

## Case

#### 1) The ROB is to vote for the better debater – anything else is self-serving and arbitrary. This is key to fairness and clash and preserves substantive education – reading technoorientalism under this ROB solves your offense by just weighing

#### 2) All our offense falls under their ROB – we have the “best resistance strategy to challenge structural oppression” with all args we read. T proves that movements are key to solve oppression, the K criticizes the aff’s advocacy and indicates that it furthers oppression, and the DA posits that the aff’s advocacy is bad and should be rejected because it causes mass extinction which is definitively the biggest amount of oppression

#### 3) Vote neg on presumption –

#### a) Process turn – using debate as a mode of advocacy ensures the failure of Asian resistance– competition means debaters ally themselves with individuals who vote for them and alienate those who are positioned with the burden of rejoinder and forced to negate

#### b) Academia turn – the 1ac is a regurgitation of knowledge that already exists within academia which proves they aren’t a departure from the status quo and voting aff is not intrinsic to deconstructing techno

#### c) Competition turn – competition ensures Little Rock refines their aff according to what best wins them ballots from judges not according to what actually best resolves violence for individuals outside debate – ensures their method can’t scale up and gets coopted by problematic norms in the debate community

#### d) even if they win the aff does something that magnifies the link to all of our offense because it proves that their advocacy is a bad orientation

#### e) their method leads to cooption by white judges, which their evidence criticizes, and turns their method of transpacific reimaginings

#### 4) Reading Technoorientalism against an Asian debater is a double turn with their method & results in psychological violence –1AC ev indicates that the technoorientalist discourse encompasses Indians – Green

1AC Roh et al 15. \*David S. Roh is associate professor of English and director of the Digital Matters Lab at the University of Utah, where he specializes in digital humanities and Asian American literature. \*\*Betsy Huang is an associate professor of English and former inaugural Chief Officer of Diversity and Inclusion at Clark University. \*\*\*Greta A. Niu writes about Asian stuff and tech [“Techno-Orientalism,” 2015, *Imagining Asia in Speculative*]//vikas

Throughout the twentieth century, variations of that premodern-hypermodern dynamic in speculative visions of Asia and Asians have been recycled numerous times. 2 Exemplars include the villainous Khan Noonien Singh in Gene Roddenberry’s Star Trek universe, the leader of a group of superhumans who attempt to take control of the Starship Enterprise; the Chinese scientist Dr. X in Neal Stephenson’s novel, The Diamond Age (1995),a counterfeiter using “a gallimaufry of contraband technology” (73) to steal Western innovations; and most recently The Mandarin in Iron Man 3 (2013), a clear revival of Dr. Fu Manchu played cleverly by Ben Kingsley in a tongue-in-cheek fashion. 3 But **Western speculations of an Asianized future are not always consolidated in a singular fictional figure** as in Fu Manchu, Dr. X, or The Mandarin. **The yellow peril anxiety of an earlier, industrial-age era** embodied by Fu Manchu **found new forms across cultures and hemispheres as Asian economies become more visible competitors in the age of globalization and rapid technological innovations**. One needs to witness only the speculative fictional worlds of Maureen McHugh’s novel China Mountain Zhang (1992), Joss Whedon’s television series Firefly (2002), and Gary Shteyngart’s novel Super Sad True Love Story (2010) to trace persisting anxieties over the past three decades of a China dominated future. All of **these worlds feature Western protagonists struggling to navigate a sociopolitical landscape in which China is the dominant global empire with a superior technological edge**. Beyond the focus on China, paradigmatic works such as William Gibson’s Japan-based oeuvre (including Neuromancer), Ridley Scott’s Blade Runner, and the Wachowskis’ The Matrix films have also burnished in the Western consciousness Asian-influenced visions of the future underpinned by a familiar yet estranged mixture of Orientalist sensibilities.

**These** examples **perfectly illustrate** our definition of **techno-**Orientalism: the **phenomenon of imagining Asia and Asians in** hypo- or hypertechnological terms **in** cultural productions **and** political discourse.4 **Techno-Orientalist imaginations are infused with** the **languages and codes of the technological and the futuristic**. These **developed alongside industrial advances in the West and** have become **part of the West’s project of securing dominance as architects of the future**, **a project** that **requires configurations of the East as the very technology with which to shape it.** Techno-Orientalist speculations of an Asianized future **have become** ever more prevalent **in the wake of neoliberal** trade policies that enabled greater flow of information and capital **between the East and the West**. Substantial criticism of techno-Orientalism emerged in the mid-1990s when cultural theorists began to trace its manifestations and theorize its causes and implications. Kevin Morley and David Robins, Toshiya Ueno, and Kumiko Sato, principal trailblazers of the field, laid much of the valuable groundwork. Morley and Robins’s Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes, and Cultural Boundaries (Routledge, 1995), in which a definition of “techno-Orientalism” first saw print, remains the most cited in critical assessments of technological and Orientalist discourses; however, Ueno has probably written most extensively about techno-Orientalism as a discursive cultural phenomenon in the era of what he identifies as the “post-Fordist social environment of globalization” (223). “The basis of Orientalism and xenophobia is the subordination of Others through a sort of ‘mirror of cultural conceit,’” Ueno explains. “**The Orient exists in so far as the West needs it**, **because it brings the project of the West into focus**” (223).

Whereas Orientalism, as a strategy of representational containment, arrests Asia in traditional, and often premodern imagery, **techno-Orientalism presents a broader, dynamic, and often** contradictory spectrum **of images**, constructed by the East and West alike, **of an “Orient” undergoing rapid economic and cultural transformations**. **Techno-Orientalism**, like Orientalism, **places great emphasis on the project of modernity**—cultures privilege modernity and fear losing their perceived “edge” over others. Stretching beyond Orientalism’s premise of a hegemonic West’s representational authority over the East, **techno-Orientalism’s scope is** much more expansive and bidirectional, its discourses mutually constituted by the flow of trade and capital across the hemispheres. As Ueno observes, techno-Orientalism is first and foremost an effect of globalism. “If the Orient was invented by the West,” he writes, “then **the Techno-Orient was also invented by the world of information capitalism**” (228). **Technological developments**, driven by the imperial aspirations and the appetites of consumerist societies on both sides of the Pacific, **propel the engines of invention and production**. In its wake, **Western nations** vying for cultural and economic dominance with Asian nations **find in techno-Orientalism an** expressive vehicle for their aspirations and fears. Our volume, Techno-Orientalism: Imagining Asia in Speculative Fiction, History, and Media, documents past and current constructions of the role of Asia in a technologized future and critically examines this proliferating phenomenon.

Dr. Fu Manchu illustrates just one way in which techno-Orientalist imagery pervades Western cultural productions in the early twentieth century. The principal locales of techno-Orientalist projects as they developed in the late twentieth century have primarily been Japan and China. Ueno, whose influential analyses of “Japanimation” in the mid-1990s seeded the field of techno-Orientalist studies, observes, “In Techno-Orientalism, Japan is not only located geographically, but is also projected chronologically. Jean Baudrillard once called Japan a satellite in orbit. Now Japan has been located in the future of technology” (228). Morley and Robins put a finer point on the temporal dimension of the spatial construction: “If the future is technological, and if technology has become ‘Japanised,’ then the syllogism would suggest that the future is now Japanese, too. The postmodern era will be the Pacific era. Japan is the future, and it is a future that seems to be transcending and displacing Western modernity” (168).

Whereas Japan’s dubious honor as the original techno-Orient was bestowed in the eighties with the help of the cyberpunk movement, the techno-Orientalizing of China occurred roughly a decade later. 5 China was not yet a competitor in the global economy in the1980s, when the West focused its wary gaze on what it saw as an invasion of Japanese capital investments and imports into Western economies. When China was recognized as a newly industrialized country (NIC) in the 1990s and its influence in the global economy increased, it, too, became once again a target of techno-Orientalist fashioning. The discourse on China’s “rise” in the U.S. context, consistent with techno-Orientalist contradictions, has focused on constructing its people as a vast, subaltern-like labor force and as a giant consumer market whose appetite for Western cultural products, if nurtured, could secure U.S. global cultural and economic dominance. This dual image of China as both developing-world producers and first world consumers presents a representational challenge for the West: Is China a human factory? Or is it a consumerist society, like the United States, whose enormous purchasing power dictates the future of technological innovations and economies?

**Japan and China are** thus **signified** differently in the techno-Orientalist vocabulary. Both are constructed **as competitors and therefore** threats **to the U.S. economy**; but **while Japan competes with the United States for dominance in technological innovation**, **China competes with the United States in labor and production**. To put it in starker terms, Japan creates technology, but China is the technology. In the eyes of the West, **both are crucial engines of the future**: **Japan innovates and China manufactures**. And as Asia, writ large, becomes a greater consumerist force than the West,6 its threat/value dualism commensurately increases. These differences in the technological signification of **Japan and China manifest themselves in the fictive forecasts of the Asian-tinged future**. If **Japan is a screen on which the West has** projected its technological fantasies, then **China is a screen on which the West projects its** fears of being colonized, mechanized, and instrumentalized in **its own pursuit of technological dominance**.

India, another NIC, has also found itself under the techno-Orientalist gaze as a consequence of U.S. outsourcing practices. Asa much maligned business strategy, outsourcing has provoked extremely negative public sentiments in the United States. These opinions find expression in a particular strand of techno-Orientalist discourse that consolidates China and India as the chief threats to the U.S. service and labor sectors. These Asian nations serve as the scapegoats for corporate decisions to move service and manufacturing jobs abroad and bear the brunt of the resulting xenophobic antipathies. Chinese and Indian workers, for instance, are routinely portrayed in techno-Orientalist and technophobic vocabularies; call center employees in India adopt Western Christian names and mimic the linguistic and idiomatic style of Americans, a practice so ubiquitous as to be parodied cinematically in romantic comedies such as Outsourced (2006), conjuring images of Dickian androids (or Blade Runner’s “replicants”) **who simulate human behavior and** threaten the distinction between “real” and “fake” Americans. Glossy spreads of endless rows of Chinese workers in corporate factories and towns in mainstream magazines such as Time and Wired seal the visual vocabulary of Asians as the cogs of hyperproduction. In the NIC contexts, **techno-Orientalist discourse constructs Asians as** mere simulacra **and maintains a** prevailing sense of the inhumanity of Asian labor—**the** very antithesis of **Western liberal** humanism**.**

#### 5) Homogenizing and essentializing all of Asians recreates psychological violence and turns the case – Japanese and Chinese wars, India and Pakistan tensions, etc. all prove that geography =/= agreement – proven by how no one says “I’m Asian” but instead “I’m Indian” or “I’m Chinese.” Homogenization of Asianness is unproductive, ahistoric, and flattens meaningful difference that has been advocated for by various groups of Asian people. Rao 18

Sonia Rao, 2018, Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/the-term-asian-american-was-meant-to-create-a-collective-identity-is-it-necessary-in-2018/2018/07/27/c30e7eb0-8e90-11e8-b769-e3fff17f0689_story.html>

Rain pools in the seats of folding chairs arranged haphazardly near an outdoor stage. Parents, huddling under umbrellas, had pushed the chairs aside, determined to get photographs of their children performing a traditional Filipino dance against the backdrop of the U.S. Capitol. An announcer thanks the families for spending their Saturday afternoon this way, despite the inclement weather.

“Anyway, for Asians, this is a blessing,” she says of the rain.

Such sweeping statements are true to the nature of Fiesta Asia, an annual festival held in Washington that aims to broadly celebrate Asian heritage in the United States — essentially, commemorating the “Asian American” experience.

That term — Asian American — encompasses dozens of distinct ethnic identities, which, in our labels-obsessed era, has splintered the community’s attitudes toward it. Some appreciate being lumped into the collective, while others question its utility.

Uncertainty remains: What does it actually mean to identify as Asian American in 2018?

Melissa dela Cuesta stands under one of the many tents at Fiesta Asia, dressed in a purple dress with puffy sleeves. She wears a sash across her torso denoting her place as second runner-up in a Miss Teen Philippines pageant and looks surprised when asked how she would identify herself. Isn’t the answer obvious?

“I am Filipino American,” declares the 17-year-old. The explanation gushes out: She is “in love” with her culture and feels as though it influences every aspect of her being. She doesn’t understand why anyone would reject their ethnic identity, especially with their skin color as evidence. She proudly calls herself “morena,” a Spanish word used in the Philippines to describe women with darker skin and hair.

This isn’t uncommon among first-generation Americans, according to sociologist Dina Okamoto. If someone were to ask them the dreaded “But where are you really from?” question, the answer would most likely be the country their parents came from, not the continent. About two-thirds of Asian Americans identify primarily with their specific ethnicity, according to the research organization AAPI Data.

They “reject the [broader] label because they view it as homogenizing, and they don’t believe it really captures who they are,” says Okamoto, 47, author of “Redefining Race.”

In the past, it was targeted discrimination that motivated the strong connections to their family’s country of origin. When Japanese Americans were incarcerated during World War II, for example, some Chinese Americans wore buttons or carried signs that stated their ethnicity so they wouldn’t meet the same fate. A pan-ethnic identifier would have made little sense to them.

#### 6) Their model presents no way for Asian debaters to engage with their aff – there’s no role for the neg if you’re Asian because it results in the fracturing of Asian communities – the menu of neg options that they offer us is uncomfortable for me to debate

#### 7) Public sector thumps – regardless of private or not the US would try to protect space as part of its technoorientalist fantasy, which turns the case and makes their impacts inevitable

#### 8) The 1AR’s inevitable argument that appropriation of space excludes Asian countries is nonsensical because the Asian continent definitively has some of the most expansive space industries thing about Japan, SoKo, China. India – so they don’t solve

#### 9) Park implicates that none of their offense applies because it is theoretical, about film and fiction, and NASA’s documentations – blue

#### 1AC Park, 16

[Kelly Jiyoon Park is a medical student and science fiction enthusiast based in Los Angeles. She is passionate about reproductive rights, mental health literacy in immigrant communities, and not actively contributing to the medical industrial complex. In her free time, she enjoys choral singing and having strong feelings about social justice, books, and the internet. “A People’s History of Outer Space,” 22 July 2016, <https://freerads.org/2016/07/22/a-peoples-history-of-outer-space/>] Cgilbert

Until the mid-20th century, however, characterizations of outer space remained mostly theoretical. This changed with the advent of modern physics and engineering; suddenly, the stars were quite literally in our grasp. The time between the first aerial circumnavigation and the first orbit of Earth from space was less than 40 years. The Cold War’s Space Race and real-life Star Wars (more officially known as the Strategic Defense Initiative) were fought between U.S. and Communist powers to establish dominance over the skies. For the first time, the battle over space surpassed ideology and entered physical reality. **The Space Race undoubtedly yielded important scientific discoveries, but this was secondary to political and military agendas concerning missiles and nuclear armament**. And although the conversation around international space programs has evolved to include talks of peace, collaboration, and friendly science, billions of dollars are still spent every year by the United States government on military space initiatives. Now that human space exploration seems destined to occur in our lifetime, it is more important than ever that we remain vigilant about its potential costs. Despite the aspirational nature of outer space – exemplified in the deployment of space communicators such as Bill Nye and Neil DeGrasse Tyson into STEM classrooms – it’s hard not to notice the imperialist undertones lurking within the seemingly benign discourse of curiosity. On July 22, the most recent installment in the Star Trek franchise premiered with the following familiar words: “Space: the final frontier. These are the voyages of the starship Enterprise. Its five-year mission: to explore strange new worlds, to seek out new life and new civilizations, to boldly go where no man has gone before.” As a Trek devotee myself, I have been known to tear up at these words, to lose myself in their cheap sentimentality, to dream one day of traveling outer space for myself. But on closer examination, they construct space as a territory to be penetrated, explored, and possibly conquered. **The concept of the “final frontier” is not new: Manifest Destiny**, for example, was a narrative that encouraged and **legitimized 19th-century American expansionism**. But the frontier has traditionally been an inhospitable, bloody place for people of color. The phrases “to boldly go” and “explore strange new worlds,” while perhaps intended to captivate the imagination, belong to a broader rhetoric of imperialism and exploitation. After all, the European “discovery” of the Americas resulted in the loss of 95% of the indigenous population and the subsequent establishment of the Trans-Atlantic slave trade. Although the original Star Trek creatives (to their credit) likely developed the Prime Directive as a critique of U.S. foreign policy in Southeast Asia, contemporary works of **science fiction** are **replete with narratives of settler colonialism**. **The short-lived TV show Firefly (2002),** in which humans terraform planets for colonization, borrows heavily from colonial/pioneer imagery in an ode to westerns (and from techno-Orientalismas well, but that’s another story). While scientists like to nitpick the technical verisimilitude in these depictions, they are also deeply committed to the possible colonization of Mars, as outlined in a 36-page NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) document titled Journey to Mars: Pioneering Next Steps in Space Exploration. We seem not to have much choice in the matter, however. The ever-present fear of alien enemy combatants invading Earth not only fuels TV and movie franchises but also ensures that society look to authoritarian institutions (such as the military) with gratitude and relief **instead of suspicion**. Even the more domestic threat of resource scarcity and environmental collapse looms over any attempt

#### 10) Klinger says nothing – this card would be great for a policy aff, not so much your aff. They are missing an internal link between their claim about space and their giant claims about a “colonial geography of extraction” – that is

#### a) what do you know? Another link! Their analytic of coloniality naturalizes

#### settler colonial occupation by propagating the myth of the post-colonial society

Speed 17 [Speed, Shannon (Chickasaw Nation). Associate Professor of Anthropology and Director of Native American and Indigenous Studies at UCLA. "Structures of settler capitalism in Abya Yala." American Quarterly 69, no. 4 (2017): 783-790// HRK-HDM]

The land–labor divide played out differently in different regions of the continent and (settler-imposed) national contexts, and thus approaching the area of the continent understood as Latin America provides ample fodder for discussion and debate about the nature of settler colonialism. However, I argue that Latin American states are settler states for reasons that are not debatable. Another premise of settler colonialismas set out by Wolfe—a far more fundamental one from my perspective—is that “the colonizers come to stay,” making “invasion . . . a structure not an event.”6 Unlike metropole or administrative colonialism imposed in other parts of the world, in Latin America white Europeans came to stay. And stay they did. In much of Latin America, the “colonial period” (the three-hundred-plus-year period from invasion to independence) was characterized by evolving tensions between the metropole and the settlers—the Crown and the Peninsulares and Criollos—precisely because of the power dynamics created by developing settler power.7 Richard Gott, one of the few analysts who has argued that Latin American states should be understood as settler, argues that it is in fact with independence that they fully realize settler character. He states: The characteristics of white settler states of the European empires are generally familiar. The settlers sought to expropriate the land, and to evict or exterminate the existing population; they sought where possible to exploit the surviving indigenous labor force to work on the land; they sought to secure for themselves a European standard of living; to justify or make sense of their global migration; they treated the indigenous peoples with extreme prejudice, drafting laws to ensure that those who survived the wars of extermination remained largely without rights, as second or third class citizens. Latin America shares all of these characteristics and clearly falls into the category of “settler colonialism,” even though the colonial powers are no longer present, having been forced out in the course of the nineteenth century.8 Gott locates the birth of the settler Latin American state with independence, when outside settlers gained full control of the Native population and its land. Importantly, he contests the notion that colonialism ends with Independence, which is the prevailing wisdom in Latin America, leading most theorists to view current conditions as neocolonial, “internal colonialism” (either in Pablo Gonzalez Casanova or in Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui’s iterations), or “coloniality” (Anibal Quijano), all theories that seek to address the ongoing colonial nature of power relations but that view it as residual or a legacy of past colony rather than an ongoing settler colonial process. This point particularly matters for indigenous people not only because it is inaccurate but because of the counterpart narrative that Kahuanui has highlighted in relation to the United States: “the myth that indigenous peoples ended when colonialism ended.”10 While certainly theorists of internal colonialism or coloniality of power are not perpetrators of that myth, it can be said to have been the prevailing one in much of Latin America until at least the 1990s, when quincentenary protests of 1992 and major revolts such as the Zapatista uprising in Chiapas took nonindigenous people and their governments throughout the hemisphere by surprise. The problem with internal colonialism and coloniality of power analyses (and I do not mean to conflate the two; they are distinct positions and emerge from distinct positionalities that are significant) is that by failing to address settler colonialism as settler, they accept the basic premise that the settler has settled, and is now from here, rather than acknowledging that there is a state of ongoing occupation, in Latin America as elsewhere in the hemisphere.

#### b) irrelevant to the aff’s thesis – their ev is about NASA specific rocket launches (and rodents?) none of which the aff can rectify – blue

**1AC Klinger 19** (Julie Michelle Klinger - geographer and Assistant Professor of International Relations at the Frederick S. Pardee School of Global Studies at Boston University. "Environmental Geopolitics and Outer Space" Geopolitics <http://www.bu.edu/pardeeschool/files/2019/03/Environmental-Geopolitics-and-Outer-Space.pdf>, DOA: 5/27/19, kbb)

Reaching outer space requires Earthly infrastructure, which means that space launches have concrete footprints that change according to developments in launch technologies. The placement of outer space related infrastructure on Earth is a question of environmental (in)justice. Which sites are chosen, who is expropriated, and which environments are impacted is subject to strategic geopolitical calculations, which, more often than not, employ classical geopolitical reasoning (Hickman and Dolman 2002; Ingold 2006; Meira Filho, Guimarães Fortes, and Barcelos 2014; NDRI 2006). Launch sites are tightly controlled to reduce the risk of interference or failure, therefore situating launch sites in remote areas is often explained in terms of safety and security (Zapata and Murray 2008). No doubt this is important: rockets are composed of many tonnes of material and combustive fuel, so they must be launched in places where damage from routine as well as potentially catastrophic explosions can be contained. For humans to reach “the final frontier,” they must first find a frontier space on Earth that can be made into an empty space in which controlled explosions can be routine. Frontiers are seldom as empty as those aiming to conquer them would claim. Where they are not populated by people, they are filled with other sorts of meanings and life forms (Klinger 2017; Tsing 2005). Potential launch sites and testing ranges deemed by government authorities to be simultaneously remote, safe, and suitable to contain the risks of rocket launch must first be made empty of people, with prior land use regimes or territorial claims pushed beyond designated buffer zones (Gorman 2007; Mitchell 2017). Hence the placement of space infrastructure follows colonial geographies of extraction, sacrifice, and risk (Mitchell 2017; Redfield 2001). As Gorman (2007) put it: “because of their distance from the metropole, these places lend themselves to hosting prisons, detention camps, military installations, nuclear weapons, and nuclear waste. All of these establishments, including rocket ranges, have inspired reactions of protest.” These so-called 12 J. M. KLINGER ‘peripheral’ spaces are nevertheless central to their inhabitants and their neighbors, who question the logic of extraglobal conquest in the face of unresolved Earthly injustices. Consider, for example, the case of the launch site in Alcântara, Brazil, which has been well documented by Araújo and Filho (2006) and Mitchell (2017). Through a close examination of local, national, and international politics, these authors document how the government’s racialized approach to the subsistence communities displaced by space infrastructure deepened structural inequalities. Grassroots opposition to the launch site grew not out of an a priori ideological opposition of poor people to national progress in outer space, as some officials alleged, but rather resulted from the failure to account for the food insecurity generated by state resettlement projects. The resettlement schemes were themselves misinformed by impoverished notions of local livelihoods. Local claims against the deprivations caused by statesponsored space practices have deepened schisms between the military and civilian space programs at the federal government level. Through the lens of classical geopolitics, these structural inequalities scarcely register, with the result that the ‘crawling’ progress of Brazil’s space program is pathologized as poor management practices symptomatic of an inadequately implemented national development vision (Amaral 2010). Critical geopolitics helps deconstruct the nationalist performativity of such endeavors by considering the political and economic value placed on the spectacle of spaceflight (Boczkowska 2017; Macdonald 2008, 2010; Sage 2016). Feminist geopolitics draws our attention to the racialized and gendered dispossession advanced by the state, through the construction of space infrastructure and exercised through access to land. The fact that environmental and public health impacts were only considered by the authorities after years of mobilization by Black social movements, religious communities, and scholars highlights the ways in which inattention to the local in the pursuit of space power perpetuates environmental injustice, which in turn interrupts national plans for space progress. Rocket launches affect local and global environments through the construction of infrastructure, the exposure of local environments to toxic residues, and the dispersal of pollutants in land, air, and sea. Rockets are the only source of direct anthropogenic emissions sources in the stratosphere. Ozone-depleting substances (ODS) such as nitrous oxide, hydrogen chlorine, and aluminum oxide are emitted by rockets, and can destroy 105 ozone molecules before degrading (Voigt et al. 2013). The ozone layer prevents cancer and cataract-causing ultraviolet-b waves from reaching the Earth. As of 2013, rocket launches accounted for less than 1% of ODS emissions. As other ODS are phased out under the Montreal Protocol and the frequency of lower cost space launches increases, the proportion and quantity is likely to increase (Durrieu and Nelson 2013; Ross et al. 2009). GEOPOLITICS 13 Although affluent economies in the northern hemisphere are responsible for most ODS emissions (Polvani 2011; Rousseaux et al. 1999), the geography of exposure disproportionately affects an overall higher population in remote regions and in the southern hemisphere (Norval et al. 2011; Robinson and Erickson 2015; Thompson et al. 2011) because ozone depletion is most serious in regions where high altitude stratospheric clouds are most likely to form: above the polar regions and major mountain ranges (Carslaw et al. 1998; Perlwitz et al. 2008). This is an example of environmental injustice on a global scale, where the global south bears the environmental burden of actions predominately taken in the global north, rocket launches included. In the process, global power relations are reinscribed through the uneven distribution of harm to peripheral and southern bodies, mediated in this case through the redistribution of gases in the stratosphere that increase exposure to solar radiation. Coming closer to Earth, environmental geopolitics of outer space are manifest in the dispersal of particulate matter into ecosystems surrounding active launch sites. This is more than a strictly local environmental concern, because which spaces are subject to the hazards of launch sites involves careful calculations weighing financial cost, state power, and multifarious territorial interests. With each launch, surrounding areas are showered with toxins, heavy metals, and acids over a distance that varies widely with wind, weather, and precipitation patterns at the moment of lift-off.3 The most researched of these pollutants are hydrogen chloride, aluminum oxide, and various aerosolized heavy metals. Release of these pollutants from rocket launches results in localized regional acid rain (Madsen 1981), plant death, fish kills, and failed seed germination of native plants in launch sites (Marion, Black, and Zedler 1989; Schmalzer et al. 1992). These effects, and research on them, are mostly concentrated within one kilometer of the launch site. But they have been recorded several kilometers away under certain weather conditions (Schmalzer et al. 1998). Recent studies on the concentration of trace elements in wildlife in areas near NASA launch activities in Florida, USA, found that more than half of the adults and juvenile alligators had “greater than toxic levels” of trace elements in their liver (Horai et al. 2014). Both the subject, and the vague statement of findings, highlights the lack of research into the impacts on downstream human and non-human communities. In contrast to the precautions taken to protect workers in buildings adjacent to facilities where these technologies are developed (Bolch et al. 1990; Chrostowski, Gan, and Campbell 2010), much less consideration is given to communities within the dynamic pollutant shadow of rocket launches. In Kazakhstan, Russia, and China, researchers have begun examining the effects of the highly toxic liquid propellant, unsymmetrical dimethylhydrazine 14 J. M. KLINGER (UDMH), which has been in use since the dawn of the space age. It has noted carcinogenic, mutagenic, convulsant, teratogenic, and embryotoxic effects (Carlsen, Kenesova, and Batyrbekova 2007), and it has been found to cause DNA damage and chromosomal aberrations in rodents living near the Baikonur cosmodrome in Kazakhstan (Kolumbayeva et al. 2014). Despite these known hazards, methods to detect UDMH at the trace concentrations at which toxic effects begin to manifest in humans do not yet exist (Kenessov, Bakaikina, and Ormanbekovna 2015), meaning that there is no knowledge of how this circulates in the environment, bioaccumulates up the food chain, or could potentially be sequestered through soil or plant filtration. The lack of technology or methodology to adequately track the dispersal of hazardous pollutants that have been used for decades in the surrounding environment illustrates another aspect of environmental injustice: the preference on the part of political and economic elites to create spaces of waste rather than allocate adequate resources to maintain safe and non-toxic environments.4 The hyper-local politics of basic livelihood security shape long-term access to outer space and space geopolitics at multiple scales. Attending to the local matters is important, not just because it sheds light on broader geopolitical processes, but because failing to do so leaves the substantive matters of human engagement with outer space entirely overlooked, at best. At worst, ignoring local environmental conditions recasts them as places to be “left behind,” casualties in a Darwinian race to the cosmos in which the poor have no place. Attending to the environmental geopolitics of outer space on Earth shows the co-production of Earth and space. Earthly environments and social relations are remade in our evolving relationship with outer space and reconceived alongside evolving deliberations on the prospects for human survival.

#### 11) The framework preempts – The argument about needing to interrogate injustices around Anti-Asian violence is solved by the TVA, so irrel

#### 12) Roh evidence doesn’t indict any of our arguments since it’s about commercial tech, not china – independently no terminal to what this card says besides just a definition of what technoorientalism is

#### 13) Watson is almost entirely about AUSTRALIA – all their empirical examples and personal travels that informed their method happened in Australia, their only reference to the US is about student demographics at NYU’s campus IN AUSTRALIA – that’s not sufficient to make broad claims about the US writ large or to establish any kind of solvency for “transpacific reimagining”

#### 14) Wan and Young – don’t allow for any pre-fiat performative offense – the NC and NR are also instances of Asian performance and identity within the debate space and there’s no pre and post-fiat distinction either way. If they win that their reading of the 1AC spills up then the act of us reading the DA or K clearly spills up as well. If we prove that the act of getting private corporations out of space is bad then that means their performative act of rejecting it is unethical and bad so you should vote NEG