## 1

### 1nc – t

#### Interpretation - the affirmative may not claim offense from anything other than the instrumental implementation of a policy stating that outer space appropriation by private entities is unjust.

#### “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 acid communism + don’t enact a policy action

#### At best they’re Extra-T, 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: defend a ban of outer space appropriation by private entities allows for communist organizing. by 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. If debate is key to their movement, their aff has to be debateable. Only we have advanced criteria about how you can weigh between relative proposals and determine debatability in the first place.

#### 2 – Clash – letting the aff pick the topic skews the balance of prep to unpredictable literature bases and ensures that our research is always irrelevant. Tying the aff to a previously agreed-upon topic is key to incentivize in-depth strategies that directly clash with the 1AC – they force us to rely on generics which results in worse debates overall and undermines the educational value of the activity.

#### Debate doesn’t have any effect on the political and the individual arguments we read have no effect on our subjectivity, even if they spur immediate reflection, those insights aren’t integrated into deep-stored memory—this means you can vote negative on presumption.

#### 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

#### T should be evaluated through competing interps – reasonability invites judge intervention

#### No impact turns and RVIs – 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

### 1nc – k

#### Settler colonialism is the 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.

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.

#### The aff operates through manipulating consent. Native people desiring survival is not consent to the existence of the settler state. Rather, it is a coercive ruse of consent designed to consolidate settler authority and control over Native life. You don’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff

Simpson 17

(Audra Simpson, Kahnawà:ke Mohawk., Associate Professor of Anthropology at Columbia University. She is the author of Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States, (2017): The ruse of consent and the anatomy of ‘refusal’: cases from indigenous North America and Australia, Postcolonial Studies, DOI: 10.1080/13688790.2017.1334283, JKS)

Would you consent to have your land taken? Are the treaties I described earlier a model for thinking through just relations on stolen land? The trick of law in settler spaces is to pretend that this in fact was not a theft that all parties consented to this fully and that appropriation of land was in fact just. And thus, matters are settled. Recent work by Heidi Stark unmasks the conceit of this as fact with recourse to events in what is now American and Indigenous history.45 Stark’s thesis is the following: the nascent U.S. and Canada constructed Indigenous people (mostly men) as criminal in order to mask their own criminality. They did so by actually converting treaties from Indigenous understandings of forms of relationship (often called ‘renewal’) to contracts and land cessions. By interpreting these agreements as contracts, they set up conditions for outright war through the sanctioning of constant incursions upon Indigenous land. These incursions ‘rendered unlawful the moment they violated the treaties that authorized their presence across Indigenous lands’.46 She then offers in painstaking detail accounts of the hangings and the incarcerations of predominantly indigenous men as they resisted these wrongful interpretations of treaty: everywhere from Modoc country, to Tsilhqot’in in what is now British Columbia, to Dakota territory in what is now Minnesota. Native male bodies were hanged, were shot, were incarcerated for the purposes of a land grab, but this land grab was also achieved in part by the interpretive move by the state: the move from the model of relationship to contract, with the subsequent move to inevitable contravention and the production of criminality. Stark then argues, this was the making and the masking of a ‘criminal empire’.47. This ‘criminal empire’ was driven by a desire for land and resources, achieved through the force of violence and executed and sealed through contractual thinking and law – a law that masked settler state criminality while producing Indians as criminals. I articulate Stark’s account and analysis to Rosas’s ethnography and also to Danaiyairi’s interviews because they all point to the press of states and law as they do their work of ‘governing’ and fail, at points, to achieve ‘perfect settler sovereignty’, ‘neoliberal sovereignty’ or what some might perceive as simply ‘governance’. The practices and techniques of institutional ‘recognition’, of bringing peoples presumed alterity into the ambit of the state through the devices of treaty, of contract, later of citizenship itself, the mechanisms of rights appear to offer fairness, protection a form of justice. All of these techniques also require concession to the authority of foreign and dispossessing political will but also serve to diminish the authority and sovereignty (even when recognised, ever so slightly), of robust Indigenous political orders. These varying accounts have demonstrated state’s effort to enclose life for land and sometimes their failure at this, but also in broad strokes, a kind of cunning practice of recognition and governance.48 In this, I mean a cal- culating effort to (in Lisa Ford’s terms) perform territorial rationality, jurisdiction and governance by any legal and discursive means necessary,49 but also to (in my terms) steal while making those who you steal from, the criminal. This is the ruse of consent, they did not consent to this fully, they know this, it is the liberal move again and again to pretend as if this ruse of consent signals freedom and the free will to consent to this. It is a ruse laid bare in these electoral moments in the U.S.A, when people are starting to point to where they think ‘the facts’ lie – where the origin stories are, and what the stur- diness of those stories is – all motivated by the specious grasp on both ethics and truth- telling by the current regime. These double moves are the conditions as well, for and of refusal. The ethnographic and historical cases here point to the multiple ways in which contrac- tual thinking and dispossession have produced historical consciousness in indigenous people that pushes against the contained, diagnostic language of politics (or perhaps pol- itical science itself) and rendered refusal an expression of this consciousness. Refusal is a symptom, a practice, a possibility for doing things differently, for thinking beyond the recognition paradigm that is the agreed-upon ‘antidote’ for rendering justice in deeply unequal scenes of articulation. A master and a slave are unequal. One owns the other. Seeking oneself in the gaze of another can be a fallacy of endless suffering if not in and of itself an impossibility. Will they see me as I ought to be seen? Turning away, as Coulthard has argued, and as I have argued and demonstrated in Mohawk Interruptus, is a technique, is a possibility.50 Every possibility is not in the gaze or the minds of the master, nor is the hope of mutuality (underwritten by a hope for sincerity) something that all seek. History is also littered with those painful, disappointing, mobilising stories of so many failed attempts at justice, and also at times, refusal. Why keep trying? One might wonder. This practice of refusal, one of various sorts, revenges the conceit of easy politics, of the very notion that Indigenous peoples had all things been equal would have consented to have things taken, things stolen from them. I have charted this out in this brief thesis on refusal. Rosas’ interlocutors smash these categorical impera- tives, what I call the ‘easy answers’. The people I work with refuse the eliminatory efforts of the state. They operate as nationals in a scene of wardship and dispossession. They are different from Rosas’ interlocutors, but they operate from a similar and flagrantly self- assured position, utterly escaping the answer that is easy to record or to analyse. My eth- nographic and analytical prerogative is to make the practice of ethnography itself a refusal in time with theirs.

#### Reducing methodological struggle to class reproduces colonialist logic

Tinker 08

[George, American Indian Liberation: A Theology of Sovereignty, 2008]

What indigenous communities want most of all is to have our cultural differentness recognized and respected as signifying distinct political entities based on specific land territories. To reduce us to some notion of class is to obviate that differentness and to replace our community identity with participation in a general class struggle for mere economic sufficiency. Such a movement must eventually impose notions of value, ethics, and aesthetics on indigenous communities, just as the colonizer governments and missionaries have always done. Only this time, the imposition is from a more liberal side of the colonizer with the “good intention” of building solidarity among a presumed class for the sake of the economic well-being and even survival of the class as a whole. Thus, our land will still not be ours but would enter into the collective possession of a much larger colonizer proletariat who are also foreign to our land and who must be considered invaders. The need to embrace “difference” will be more critical as we move forward into the future of liberation.18 Indigenous peoples want something very different. We want our lives back, our ways of being—rooted, of course, in connection to the land itself. We want back the sovereignty that was ours before the invasion of european colonizers. Class analysis presumes the validity of the modern state as much as democratic capitalism does. The difference is that class analysis usually has some vision of exerting influence or control of the state in order to mitigate the oppression of the identified class. American Indians who are most engaged in struggle and resistance refuse to acknowledge the validity or legality of the United States’ claim for the occupation and governance of north America; nor do they recognize the right of the United States to any claim on our lands or on our peoples as subjects.19 Socialist ideology wants to take over and transform the state into a more egalitarian whole; indigenous ideologies want to challenge the very legitimacy of the idea of state and claim our freedom from these larger, artificial and imposed political entities that were born out of eurowestern colonization and the will to empire.

#### The distributional logic of socialism remains wedded to the dispossession of native lands and resources.

Baker 17

(Oliver Baker, PhD Candidate Mellon Fellow American Literary Studies, Democracy, Class, and White Settler Colonialism, Public, Volume 28, Number 55, June 2017, pp. 144-153(10), JKS)

Today, Indianness continues, as Byrd puts it, to “transit U.S. empire” or put into motion, facilitate, and cohere the United States' settler imperial project that reaches around the world.12 It is through Indianness that settlers come to view the lands, resources, and bodies of the earth as spaces and objects of a barren wilderness (terra nullius) freely available for expropriation. The current and future populations living in spaces of the lands and controlling the resources that US settler imperialism attempts to seize or control are, as Byrd explains, made “Indian” or abjected as mindless terrorist-savages whose confrontation with the agents of enclosure is understood not as an attempt to resist and survive colonization, occupation, and genocide, but an irrational attack against society, civilization, humanity, and the forces of modern progress. In short, Indianness is what legitimates the process of primitive accumulation or what David Harvey calls "accumulation by dispossession," which is central to the formation, expansion, and dominance of global finance capitalism. What an understanding, then, of settler colonialism, Indigeneity, and Indianness demonstrates concerning the question of alliance-building among oppressed groups today is that political organizing through the spaces of the democratic commons or the identity of the settler wage labourer supports rather than disrupts the colonization of Indigenous peoples of North America. In the case of the democratic commons, calls for preserving and expanding the public institutions and spaces of liberal democracy in order to cultivate more radical and progressive forms of democracy is a demand not to undo or transform but to uphold the settler colonial state. As Byrd argues, “one reason why a post racial and just democratic society is a lost cause in the United States is that it is always already conceived through the prior disavowed and misremembered colonization of Indigenous lands that cannot be ended by further inclusion or more participation”14 Coulthard echoes this point, showing that “in liberal settler states...the commons' not only belong to somebody...they also deeply inform and sustain Indigenous modes of thought and behavior.”15 While it should be acknowledged that the democratic commons historically has served an important role in cultivating and producing emancipatory modes of analysis and forms of social belonging, such gains have nonetheless always depended upon the colonization of Indigenous peoples. Any defence, then, of the democratic commons today must at the same time defend Indigenous sovereignty. This means rethinking how groups relate in the spaces of the commons in ways that do not perpetuate liberal democracy's colonial project of building public institutions and democratic spaces through the seizure, theft, and colonization of Indigenous lands, bodies, and resources. Class-first models of a renewed workers' movement also risk reproducing colonial dispossession when they fail to recognize that the Indian and the settler wage labourer are structurally distinct categories of oppression. The former is constituted by dispossession through elimination, while the latter is structured by exploitation through hegemony. Even though exploited, settler wage labourers nonetheless come to experience their status in settler colonialism as a place of refuge and protection from dispossession and abjection. The role of the settler state is to ensure and safeguard the settler wage labourer's right not only to possess but not to be dispossessed of property, even if the only property the wage labourer possesses is labour power. In fact, possessing labour power as a commodity to sell on the market indexes the settler wage labourer's right and ability to enter the social contract and find security from the forms of structural exclusion naturalized in the position of the Indian. Such a status explains why, when neoliberal forms of precarious labour and exclusions from waged life increasingly target settler wage labourers, they are felt and represented as abnormal, undeserving, and, more importantly, grievable occurrences. The dispossession of settlers challenges the symbolic and material consistency of settler societies that are premised on dispossessing colonial peoples in order to reward and advantage settlers of all classes. Settler society retains and reproduces its coherence as the promised site of settler sovereignty, possession, and rights by figuring the neoliberal dispossession of settlers as the exception to be overcome if only because Indigenous dispossession remains the norm to be reproduced and repeated. The grievability of neoliberal dispossession, heard today in the refrain that globalization has “abandoned the white working class” depends upon the ungrievability and normalization of Indigenous dispossession that, in the narratives not only of manifest destiny but also the democratic commons and normative socialist futures, is depicted and accepted as a natural, inevitable, and necessary process. One of the limits, then, of calling for solidarity through the political identity of the wage labourer is that, in settler colonialism, what organized settler wage labourers demand is not necessarily an end to exploitation but the freedom, protection, and refuge from structural dispossession and exclusion that are normalized and naturalized in the social and racial ontologies of the Indian. Movements on behalf of settler labourers risk ending in reform rather than revolution precisely because they do not so much seek to confront capital as they seek refuge and protection within and through it.

#### Thus, the only alternative is decolonization

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

#### ROB is to vote for the better debater. Only evaluating the consequences of the plan allows us to determine the practical impacts of politics and preserves the predictability that fosters engagement. Rigorous contestation and third and fourth-line testing are key to generate the self-reflexivity that creates ethical subjects arbitrarily excluding offense is bad and prevents in depth clash and engagement that allows for education which is the unique purpose of debate. Solves your ipacts – just make weighing args Noys has no reason why we should have an ethical obligation to forefront getting rid of capitalis

#### Vote neg on presumption –

#### [1] Process turn – using debate as a mode of advocacy ensures the failure of anticapitalist movements– 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 – at worst you vote negative on presumption because they don’t use debate as a stepping stone for their advocacy outside the space and don’t have a net benefit to affirming the 1ac

#### [2] 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 affirming acid comunis

#### [3] Competition turn – competition ensures Los Altos refines acid communism 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

#### Plan doesn’t get rid of global institutions like the IMF and World Bank and has no way to get rid of the neoliberalism engrained in society – absent a link between ”we embrace acid communism” and “global collapse of capitalism” you should vote neg on presumption since they have no impact outside of removing capitalism entirely.

#### Psycho is wrong – it’s failed every empirical test, it’s authors only cite one another, and it’s a laughing stock in clinical neuroscience. It can’t be falsified and their authors intentionally use complex convulated vocabulary to mask the lack of warrants in their argumnets – independently, even if it’s true on an individual level, it can’t be scaled up to describe states, society, or the broader international community.

#### Fisher – if reform fails that also proves that settlerism is ontological

#### Crouch is wrong because no pure moblization + not explained

#### Capitalism is inevitable

**Kaletsky ’10**

Anatole, Masters in Economics from Harvard, Honour-Degree Graduate at King’s College and Cambrdige, editor-at-large of The Times of London, founding partner and chief economist of GaveKal Capital, He is on the governing board of the New York– based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007– 2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics outside the orthodoxy of “efficient markets.” From 1976 to 1990, Kaletsky was New York bureau chief and Washington correspondent of the Financial Times and a business writer on The Economist, “Capitalism 4 0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis”

The world did not end. Despite all the forebodings of disaster in the 2007– 09 financial crisis, the first decade of the twenty-first century passed rather uneventfully into the second. The riots, soup kitchens, and bankruptcies **predicted by many** of the world’s most respected economists **did not materialize**— and no one any longer **expects the global capitalist system to collapse**, whatever that emotive word might mean. Yet the capitalist system’s survival does not mean that the precrisis faith in the wisdom of financial markets and the efficiency of free enterprise will ever again be what it was before the bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers on September 15, 2008. A return to decent economic growth and normal financial conditions is likely by the middle of 2010, but will this imply a return to business as usual for politicians, economists, and financiers? Although **globalization will continue** and many parts of the world will gradually regain their prosperity of the precrisis period, the traumatic effects of 2007– 09 will not be quickly forgotten. And the economic costs will linger for decades in the debts squeezing taxpayers and government budgets, the disrupted lives of the jobless, and the vanished dreams of homeowners and investors around the world. For what collapsed on September 15, 2008, was not just a bank or a financial system. What fell apart that day was an entire political philosophy and economic system, a way of thinking about and living in the world. The question now is what will replace the global capitalism that crumbled in the autumn of 2008. The central argument of this book is that global capitalism will be replaced by nothing other than global capitalism. The traumatic events of 2007– 09 will neither destroy nor diminish the fundamental human urges that have always powered the capitalist system— ambition, initiative, individualism, the competitive spirit. These natural human qualities will instead be redirected and reenergized **to create a new version of capitalism** that will ultimately be even **more successful and productive** than the system it replaced. To explain this process of renewal, and identify some of the most important features of the reinvigorated capitalist system, is the ambition of this book. This transformation will take many years to complete, but some of its consequences can already be discerned. With the benefit of even a year’s hindsight, it is clear that **these consequences will be different from the nihilistic predictions** from both ends of the political spectrum at the height of the crisis. On the Left, anticapitalist ideologues seemed honestly to believe that a few weeks of financial chaos could bring about the disintegration of a politico-economic system that had **survived two hundred years of revolutions**, depressions, and world wars. On the Right, free-market zealots insisted that private enterprise would be destroyed by government interventions that were clearly necessary to save the system— and many continue to believe that the crisis could have been resolved much better if governments had simply allowed financial institutions to collapse. A balanced reassessment of the crisis must challenge both left-wing hysteria and right-wing hubris. Rather than blaming the meltdown of the global financial system on greedy bankers, incompetent regulators, gullible homeowners, or foolish Chinese bureaucrats, this book puts what happened into historical and ideological perspective. It reinterprets the crisis in the context of the economic reforms and geopolitical upheavals that have repeatedly transformed the nature of capitalism since the late eighteenth century, most recently in the Thatcher-Reagan revolution of 1979– 89. The central argument is that capitalism has **never been a static system** that follows a fixed set of rules, characterized by a permanent division of responsibilities between private enterprise and governments. Contrary to the teachings of modern economic theory, **no immutable laws govern** the behavior of **a capitalist economy**. Instead, capitalism is an **adaptive social system that** mutates and **evolves** in response to a changing environment. **When capitalism is** seriously threatened by a systemic crisis, a new version emerges that is better suited to **the changing environment** and replaces the previously dominant form. Once we recognize that capitalism is not a static set of institutions, but an evolutionary system that reinvents and reinvigorates itself through crises, we can see the events of 2007– 09 in another light: as the catalyst for the fourth systemic transformation of capitalism, comparable to the transformations triggered by the crises of the 1970s, the crises of the 1930s, and the Napoleonic Wars of 1803– 15. Hence the title of this book.

**Capitalism has made the world substantially better for marginalized individuals so none of their ethics offense is relevant – the world isn’t perfect but alternatives of acid communism are infinitely worse**

**Iacono 16** — Corey Iacono, 1-16-2016, "How Capitalism and Globalization have made the world a better place", Quillette, http://quillette.com/2016/01/16/how-capitalism-and-globalization-have-made-the-world-a-better-place/

**Throughout this week, the hashtag #ResistCapitalism was trending** on Twitter. Using this hashtag, activists have aired their grievances against an economic system which they deem to be destructive, unfair, and immoral. **In their view, the growth of global capitalism experienced over the last few decades has been only detrimental to human well-being.** Indeed, since the early 1990s, global capitalism has lapsed into “its most savage form,” according to progressive populist Naomi Klein.

**In fact, the expansion of capitalism and freer international trade has coincided with an era of slow economic growth**, high unemployment, increased child labor, skyrocketing inequality, and grinding poverty.

**Just kidding, that’s not what happened at all.** In fact, **as the world has become more capitalist and more globalized, the quality of life for the average person, and especially for the average poor person, has increased substantially. In 1990, 37% of the global population lived on less than $1.90 per day. By 2012, that number had been reduced to 12.8%, and in 2015 it was under 10%. The source of this progress isn’t** a massive **wealth redistribution** program; **it’s massive wealth creation** — that is, economic growth.

Economists David **Dollar and** Aart **Kraay found that, in a global sample of over 100 countries, changes in the income growth of the bottom 40% of the world’s income earners are highly correlated with economic growth rates**. On the other hand, **changes in inequality contributed relatively little to changes in social welfare of the poor over the last few decades.**

There is good reason to believe that **the expansion of free trade**, facilitated by international organizations like the World Trade Organization (WTO) and its predecessor, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), **have had a considerable impact in accelerating the economic development of developing countries.**

In the 1990s **GATT facilitated reforms which moved 125 countries towards freer trade by reducing the burden of government imposed trade barriers like tariffs**. This was the first serious attempt at trade reform for most developing countries at the time, and arguably presents a unique natural experiment on the economic effects of trade reform.

In fact, a paper published by the National Bureau of Economic Research (**NBER**), specifically **examined** how **trade reforms** facilitated by GATT affected the economic development of the reforming countries. In the paper, the authors compared the trends in economic growth before and after trade reform in the reforming countries. Then they compared those results to trends in economic growth of a control group of countries which didn’t undergo trade reform.

What **they found** was very encouraging for proponents of free trade. Prior to reform, the economic development of reformers and non-reformers was practically identical, but **after reform, the economic development of reforming countries accelerated while non-reforming countries saw their economies stagnate and decline**. The results suggest that **the reforms towards freer trade lead to an increase in income per capita of around 20% in the long-run, an effect so large that it almost certainly had a positive and non-trivial impact on poverty reduction.**

Similarly, **other research has shown that more free market trade policies result in lower rates of extreme poverty and child mortality in developing countries. There are other benefits as well. One study on trade reform in Indonesia found that reductions of import tariffs led to an increase in disposable income among poor households, which allowed them to pull their children out of the labor force, leading to “a strong decline” in the incidence of child labor.**

Unfortunately, many activists have reflexively taken up the cause of opposing the expansion of global capitalism, for a number of reasons. Western anti-sweatshop activists, for example, will often argue in favor of government imposed barriers to trade with poor countries because their working conditions are terrible in comparison to those in developed Western nations. In their view, western consumers should not be promoting a cycle of capitalist exploitation by buying products made in Vietnamese sweat-shops.

**Growth uniquely solves the environment -- laundry list of reasons: structural changes, public pressuring, and clean tech prove**

**Bilgili, Kocak, and Bulut 16**

(Faik, Emrah, and Ümit. Faik has a PhD in Economics, + is the professor of economics at Erciyes University, Turkey. Emrah is a researcher at Evran University. Ümut has a PhD in Economics and is the professor of economics at Ahi Evran University. “The dynamic impact of renewable energy consumption on CO2 emissions: A revisited Environmental Kuznets Curve approach.” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews)*

Some seminal papers reveal that, **within the process of economic growth, environmental pollution level first scales up and later scales down**. This is **an inverted U-shaped relationship between GDP** per capita **and pollution level** (Grossman and Krueger [3,4], Panayotou [5], Shafik [6], Selden and Song [7]). Since this relationship resembles the relationship between GDP per capita and income inequality produced by Kuznets [8], Panayotou [5] calls it Environmental **Kuznets Curve (EKC)**.¶ According to the EKC hypothesis, **the level of environmental pollution** initially intensifies because of economic growth, later **tampers after GDP per capita reaches a threshold value** (Panayotou [5], Suri and Chapman [9]; Stern [10]). Therefore, this hypothesis implies a dynamic process in which **structural change occurs together with economic growth** (Dinda [2]). Grossman and Krueger [3] first clarify how the EKC arises. They explore that **economic growth affects environmental quality through three channels:** (i) **scale effect,** (ii) **structural effect, and** (iii) **technological effect**. Fig. 1 presents the EKC within the periods of (i), (ii) and (iii).¶ According to the scale effect, given the level of technology, more resources and inputs are employed to produce more commodities at the beginning of economic growth path. Hence, more energy resources and production will induce more waste and pollutant emissions, and the level of environmental quality will get worse (Torras and Boyce [11], Dinda [2], Prieur [12]). **The structural effect states that the economy will have a structural transformation, and economic growth will affect environment positively along with continuation of growth**. In other words, **as national production grows the structure of economy changes**, and **the share of less polluting economic activities increases gradually**. Besides, **an economy experiences a transition from capital-intensive industrial sectors to service sector and reaches technology-intensive knowledge economy** (the final stage of the structural change). Due to the fact **that technology-intensive sectors utilize fewer natural sources, the impact of these sectors on environmental pollution will be less**. The last channel of the growth process is the technological effect channel. **Since a high-income economy can allocate more resources for r**esearch **and d**evelopment **expenditures, the new technological processes will emerge**. Thus, **the country will replace old and dirty tech**nologies **with new and clean tech**nologies, **and environmental quality will deepen** (Borghesi [13], Copelan and Taylor [14]). Consequently, **environmental pollution** initially increases and later **decreases as a result of scale, structural and tech**nological **effect emerging along with growth path**.¶ Some studies of EKC hypothesis consider income elasticity of clean environment demand (Beckerman [15], Selden and Song [16], McConnel [17], Panayotou [18], Carson et al. [19], Brock and Taylor [20]). Accordingly, the share of low-income people’s expenditures for food and basic necessities is higher than that of high-income societies’ expenditures for the same type of commodities (Engel’s Law). **As income level and life standards rise in conjunction with economic growth, the societies’ demand for clean environment advances**. Besides, **societies make often pressure on policy makers to protect the environment through new regulations**. One might argue that, because of these reasons, clean environment is a luxury commodity and the **demand elasticity of clean environment is higher than unity** (Dinda [2]).