### 1NC Util

#### 2nr

**AT: BRI Bad**

**BRI helps industrialize developing nations and solves global inequality while connecting nations to global communism to resolve existential threats.**

**Bhattacharyya, 19**

[Saikat, Research Fellow @ Jadavpur University (India): “Time for Global Communists to Unite under Xi and the Communist Party of China,” published 3-25-2019, https://qutnyti.wordpress.com/2019/03/25/time-for-global-communists-to-unite-under-xi-and-the-communist-party-of-china/]//AD

By 1970s West underwent tremendous change and started to use debt to create demand and started negating the role of the state. State’s involvement often said to be inefficient and end up as a disincentive to work hard. Based on petrodollar credit channel, USA assured itself of unlimited external credit and with this inflated its asset prices and then made a profit by trading in assets. Thus, capitalists could find profit in asset trading and overproduction crisis was temporarily solved. Gradually Western countries especially the USA started exporting its manufacturing base to Third World countries for making more profit by using the latter’s cheap labour while them-selves started to make a profit by asset trading. Deng understood the opportunity of getting Western technology, capital and market to industrialize China quickly. Deng took the opportunity. Many people across the globe thought that Deng was moving towards capitalism. They failed to get that Deng is reacting to the changed material condition. Capitalism has transformed itself from monopoly production capitalism to monopoly financial capitalism. Debt to create demand has become more important than production to supply. Consumers became more important than labourers. This simply assures the fact capitalism is transforming itself in reaction to the overproduction crisis. And this transformation presented China a historical opportunity clearly noted by Deng in his thesis. Deng also said that China with communist leadership and state enterprises’ leading role will be able to invest more in infrastructures and move to higher value chain than liberal democracies which are dominated by the private sector. Deng also clearly understood that in the global supply chain, capital can move from a country of a higher wage to the country of lower wage and thus reducing working class bargaining power across the globe significantly. But **once China will raise its per capita income to the levels of imperialist countries of the West, other Third World countries will start following China.** As wage rate difference will reduce between Third World and imperialist West, the bargaining power of the working class will rise again. Then the working class will become stronger than ever across the globe. Deng predicted China will narrow the gap with imperialist countries in terms of per capita income and wage rate by 2049. After 2049, most countries will start following the socialist mode of China and global working class will be stronger than ever before. China began to industrialize itself using capital and technology from the USA, Europe and Japan while the USA continues to take debt from China and other countries and generate demand for Chinese made products. The process started in the 1980s but after the 2007-08 global financial crisis, this process came under severe doubts. China’s economy has grown to more than the USA’s in purchasing power parity. China’s economy becoming too big to rely on debt created demand of the US economy. The USA also found itself indebted to a lot of countries and as its asset trading business in crisis, people started to question the deindustrialization process that went side by side with the growth of asset trading in the USA. So the crisis is back in Western capitalism. Xi Era Xi Jinping came to lead China in this critical situation. He and his comrades understood that the old system of globalization cannot go on. Since the USA will no longer be able to generate enough demand for Chinese products and so the curse of overproduction is on the Chinese economy now. How to react then? One way is following USA and West, China can start doling out debt to inflate asset prices and profit from asset trading and export its manufacturing base to some other less developed Third World countries like South-East Asia, India, Bangladesh or Africa. An important problem in following this step for China is that China does not have any petrodollar type credit channels and its impossible for China to make one. This is simply because the petrodollar reflects three centuries of Anglo Saxon global domination. **China has neither a history of global domination nor it is interested in**. So China can never have an unlimited inflow of real external debt, unlike the USA. Another shortcoming of this step is that China will then face similar problems of deindustrialization USA is facing today. Hence under Xi’s leadership, China came up with a different idea to counter the overproduction crisis. China came up with the Belt Road initiative which is about **investing in infrastructure** like ports, railways, roads across the globe and help different poor regions to develop and share the prosperity of China. China has a huge trade surplus and it is still growing funding infrastructure worldwide will not be a problem. But long gestation period i.e. non-profitability for a long period of time is often considered to be a great problem for Belt Road Initiative. It may lead to the indebtedness of many countries to China. But will this be a real problem for China? Remember Xi’s Speech: Marxist Root China can go for Belt Road while Japan or Germany with a huge trade surplus cannot. This is because China can endure a long gestation period and long term losses while the Western system cannot. In the Chinese economy mode of surplus value appropriation just like the Western system is essentially capitalist in nature. That means capitalist appropriate surplus value created by wage labour by having ownership of machines and other means of production. But while in West how to use surplus value is decided by private capitalist and banker class, in China the same is decided by the leadership of the communist party. Thus, the communist leadership may enforce investment with long gestation period which is highly avoided by private capitalist and banker class. Thus while the Western system is more prone to go for short term profit making but unproductive asset trading, China can go for productive but non-profitable investment with long gestation period. This also shows China will keep resource allocation power more hands of State than in hands of private capitalists. The recent crackdown on top executives of Aubang, Wanda, etc. clearly shows this. Most of Belt Road project to be developed by state-owned banks and infrastructural corporations. Similarly, Western media trying to show Belt Road as a major cause of indebtedness of many Third World countries like Sri Lanka and Pakistan. But the point is Sri Lanka and Pakistan has just 12.5% and 10% of their total external debt owing to China. **They are indebted mostly to Western financial institutions, not China**. China also gave debt waiver to Gambia, Zimbabwe and Venezuela while the changed the decision of investment in Kenya and Malaysia according to the request of their respective governments. Many Third World countries still failed to annihilate feudalism and so their productive potential for industrial development cannot be released yet. So Belt Road Initiative may not be enough for developing these countries but definitely, it can act as a stimulant. Recently during the trade war, the USA has repeatedly asked China to reduce the role of state-owned enterprises and give more level playing field to private sector citing the fact that the private sector is more profitable. China repeatedly replied that China has right to follow its own path of development and clarified that state-owned enterprises are less profit making because they are often given duty to generate demand by investing which helps the private sector to remain profitable. As Chinese reliance on export demand will fall, Chinese reliance of state enterprises to generate demand will rise. Conclusion We can thus conclude that **China never actually moved away from Marxist approach** but changed course as time and material conditions changed. Under Xi, state companies will do more infrastructural investments often incurring losses. By 2035, the Communist Party of China has assessed that **China will outcompete the USA not only in production but also in finance and military.** It is then that socialism will be popular across the globe again. Following China, as different Third World countries will narrow per capita income gap and wage rate gap with imperialist countries, the capital’s bargaining power will reduce and working class bargaining power will rise considerably. Then working class revolutions will spring across the globe again. Belt Road Initiative is one way to develop the Third World quickly. Definitely issue of national self-determination and land reforms still remains not done in many Third World countries and this is destroying the productive potential of these countries. Just Belt Road Investment is not enough. Hence, now it is ideal time when **global communists must unite under the leadership of Xi and Communist Party of China** and start to raise all major issues which will help Belt Road to become a major success in developing Third World. Third World development will be followed by an increase in the power of the working class throughout the globe. **Neoliberal globalization is already dying out** and **there is no strong political ideology strong enough to take the opportunity**. Global **communists** must grasp the opportunity.

#### The standard should be preserving human life

#### Epistemic modesty breaks any tie and answers all AC pre-empts.

#### Bostrom 12 (Nick Bostrom, Existential Risk Prevention as a Global Priority, 2012. NS)

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving—and ideally improving—our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.

#### Extinction justifies moral loopholes

Bok, 1988 (Sissela Bok, Professor of Philosophy, Brandeis, Applied Ethics and Ethical Theory, Ed. David Rosenthal and Fudlou Shehadi, 1988)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through actions a law-making member in a universal Kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be, as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy.” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake.For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such a responsibility seriously—perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish.

#### Our Offense

#### Disregarding foreseeable harm reifies structures of domination

**McCluskey 12** – JSD @ Columbia, Professor of Law @ SUNY-Buffalo

(Martha, “How the "Unintended Consequences" Story Promotes Unjust Intent and Impact,” Berkeley La Raza, doi: dx.doi.org/doi:10.15779/Z381664)

**By similarly making structures of inequality appear beyond the reach of law** reform, **the "unintended consequences" message helps update and reinforce the narrowing of protections against intentional racial harm. Justice is centrally a question of whose** interests and whose **harms should count**, in what context and in what form and to whom. **Power is centrally about being able to act without having to take harm to others into account**. **This power to gain by harming others is strongest when it operates through** systems and **structures that make disregarding that harm appear** routine, rational, and beneficial or at least **acceptable** or perhaps inevitable. By portraying law's unequal harms as the "side effects" of systems and structures with unquestionable "main effects," **the** "**unintended consequences" story helps affirm the resulting harm** even as it seems to offer sympathy and technical assistance. In considering solutions to the financial market problems, the policy puzzle is not that struggling homeowners' interests are overwhelmingly complex or uncertain. Instead, the bigger problem is that overwhelmingly powerful interests and ideologies are actively resisting systemic changes that would make those interests count. The failure to criminally prosecute or otherwise severely penalize high-level financial industry fraud is not primarily the result of uncertainty about the harmful effects of that fraudulent behavior, but because the political and justice systems are skewed to protect the gains and unaccountability of wealthy executives despite the clear harms to hosts of others. **The unequal effects of** the prevailing **policy** response to the crisis **are foreseeable and obvious, not accidental or surprising**. It would not take advanced knowledge of economics to readily predict that modest-income homeowners would tend to be far worse off than bank executives by a policy approach that failed to provide substantial mortgage forgiveness and foreclosure protections for modest-income homeowners but instead provided massive subsidized credit and other protections for Wall Street. Many policy actions likely to alleviate the unequal harm of the crisis similarly are impeded not because consumer advocates, low-income homeowners, or racial justice advocates hesitate to risk major changes in existing systems, or are divided about the technical design of alternative programs or more effective mechanisms for enforcing laws against fraud and racial discrimination. Instead, the problem is that these voices pressing for effective change are often excluded, drowned out or distorted in Congress and in federal agencies such as the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve, or in the media, in the mainstream economics profession, and to a large extent in legal scholarship about financial markets. More generally, those diverse voices from the bottom have been largely absent or marginalized in the dominant theoretical framework that constructs widespread and severe inequality as unforeseeable and largely inevitable, or even beneficial. Moreover, **justice requires careful attention to both harmful intent and to complex harmful effects**. But **the concept of "unintended consequences" inverts justice by suggesting that the best way to care** for those at the bottom **is to not care to make law more attentive** to the bottom. "**Unintended consequences" arguments promote a simplistic moral message in the guise of sophisticated intellectual critique**-the message that those who lack power should not seek it because the desire for more power is what hurts most. Further, **like Ayn Rand's overt philosophy of selfishness, that message promotes the theme that those who have power to ignore** their **harmful effects on others need not-indeed should not-be induced by law to care about this harm**, because this caring is what is harmful. One right-wing think tank has recently made this moral message more explicit with an economic values campaign suggesting that the intentional pursuit of economic equality is a problem of the immoral envy of those whose economic success proves they are more deserving.169 **Legal scholars and advocates who intend to put intellectual rigor and justice ahead of service to** financial **elites should reject stories of "unintended consequences" and instead scrutinize the power and laws that have so effectively achieved the intention of making devastating losses to so many of us seem natural, inevitable, and beneficial**.

#### predictions are possible and useful

**Mearsheimer, 01** (John, professor of political science at the University of Chicago, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, 2001 p. 8, googleprint)

As a result, all political forecasting is bound to include some error. Those who venture to predict, as I do here, should therefore proceed with humility, take care not to exhibit unwarranted confidence, and admit that hindsight is likely to reveal surprises and mistakes. Despite these hazards, social scientists should nevertheless use their theories to make predictions about the future. Making predictions helps inform policy discourse, because it helps make sense of events unfolding in the world around us. And by clarifying points of disagreement, making explicit forecasts helps those with contradictory views to frame their own ideas more clearly. Furthermore, trying to anticipate new events is a good way to test social science theories, because theorists do not have the benefit of hindsight and therefore cannot adjust their claims to fit the evidence (because it is not yet available). In short, the world can be used as a laboratory to decide which theories best explain international politics. In that spirit I employ offensive realism to peer into the future, mindful of both the benefits and the hazards of trying to predict events.

## 1NC

#### 1] 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 is a misdirect for settler control – their advantage scenarios describe why one group of settlers is more destined to manage territory than another, silencing debate about colonization – turns case – they proliferate settler myths that are crucial tenets of capitalist ideology.

Lister, 18

[Majerle, Marxist Diné Scholar: "‘The Only Way to Save the Land is to Give It Back’: A Critique of Settler Conservationism," Red Nation, published 7-23-2018. https://therednation.org/the-only-way-to-save-the-land-is-to-give-it-back-a-critique-of-settler-conservationism/]//AD

The history of the US conservation movement is a history settler colonialism.

Settler colonialism operates on certain myths so that it can reproduce itself. One of those myths is that Indigenous people of the U.S. were unproductive with the land therefore white settlers were entitled to the land. There are two main points in this myth, the capitalistic characteristic of productivity and the notion of white supremacy. When settlers came over, they deemed the land unproductive despite the complex use of the land by Indigenous people. Following this, they believed they were entitled to the land because they thought themselves superior to manage land and labor. This white supremacy ideology initiated the Indigenous genocide, Indigenous land dispossession, and the enslavement of the African people. Settler land management operates on this notion that indigenous people cannot management their lands themselves despite the romanticism of the “ecological” Indian. If Indigenous people cannot manage the land, who should be in charge? The discussion of control of stolen land shifts to a discussion of the public vs the private.

Indigenous people are quick to recognize the land grabs by the Federal government, or any other government, as the continuation of colonial land accumulation. Yet on the other end, conservationists see it [is seen] as consolidating lands for the public. The conservationists rally around the term “Public lands” harkening to the spirit of Wood Guthrie’s, “This Land is Your Land.” This shifts the narrative away from Indigenous land claims and dispossession towards a discussion of the public good. Indigenous lands become the public’s land and “the public” — which excludes the original owners of the land — should be the ones who manage and control the land. Examples demonstrating the shift away from Indigenous land control are seen by corporations and non-profits, such as Sierra Club and Patagonia.

[IMAGE OMITTED -- TEXT READS:]

The President Stole Your Land

In an illegal move, the president just reduced the size of Bears Ears and Grand Staircase Escalante National Monuments. This is the largest elimination of protected land in American history.

[END OMMITTED IMAGE TEXT]

The photo above was spread throughout social media and many individuals rallied behind it not fully recognizing the harm it does for indigenous people whose land the public claimed was theirs. Patagonia called it an illegal move because it was an affront to the settler public but the corporation would not recognized the determinate factor behind the foundation of the U.S., Indigenous land dispossession.

Furthermore, Sierra Club posted an image of a white woman wearing a shirt that said “hands off our lands” intended to sell the shirt, and it included #PublicLands in the post. The irony behind a white person wearing a shirt is part of the settler context.

These are small ways in which Indigenous land claims are threatened by the way conservation groups and pro-conservation businesses advance settler colonialism.

Many conservationists can argue that Indigenous people are part of the public therefore it is inclusive. Due to mass genocide, Indigenous people are a small fraction of the settler public and it becomes apparent that indigenous people are rarely invited to the table let alone given much decision-making power — but that doesn’t make their concerns less important. Tribal consultation is usually unilateral or ignored when it comes to use of lands. It is obvious why the notion of public control is questionable from the standpoint of Indigenous people: they are a minority within the public.

The oppression of Indigenous people, via land dispossession, will be not be hidden by putting the sticker “environmentalism” on it. Trump’s attack on Indigenous lands is a clear manifestation of settler colonialism; but conservationism’s shift towards public lands rather than returning Indigenous lands to Indigenous people is little more than theft. (Also, Trump, a violent racist and nationalist, has more in common with Teddy Roosevelt than most conservationists care to admit.) Conservation must be seen for what it is and how it operates in settler-colonialism. The land does not belong to “the public.” It is necessary that it be returned to the management and control of Indigenous people. The only way to “save” the land is to return it to its rightful caretakers — Indigenous people.

#### --] The notion of the “commons” has historically been weaponized to build a state-sanctioned trust in white humanity – extending that trust to the stars does not make it less white supremacist, and doing it in the name of “pragmatism” does not make it less colonialist.

Goldstein, 18

[Alyosha, Prof. American Studies @ UNewMexico, PhD @ NYU: “By Force of Expectation: Colonization, Public Lands, and the Property Relation,” published by UCLA Law Review on 3-1-2018. https://www.uclalawreview.org/by-force-of-expectation/]//AD

Over the course of the long nineteenth century, land policy was increasingly deployed as a means of encourages western settlement, while also being symptomatic of the tensions among federal administration, private speculators, and extra-legal settler encroachment.13 As is often noted in scholarship on the public domain—but infrequently emphasized in discussions of the United States more generally—almost one-third of all land in the United States is administered by the federal government. This land is disproportionately concentrated in the western states, with federal acreage totaling nearly 80 percent of Nevada, 63 percent of Utah, and 53 percent of Oregon.14 Considered a revenue source for federal war debt during the early national era, public land policy operated initially to survey, secure, and dispose collateral in the service of national solvency in accordance with the Land Ordinance of 1785.15 Enormous giveaways and preferential lease arrangements for railroad corporations and extractive industries accompanied the aftermath of the Civil War. The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934 inaugurated a new era in federal management of public lands by instituting grazing fees for use of the public domain and effectively ending homesteading.16 In 1976, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act mandated multiple-use standards—including environmental protections aligned with the 1969 National Environmental Policy Act—that continue to govern Bureau of Land Management oversight.17 It was in the context of increased federal management and conservationist legislation that ranchers such as the Bundys increasingly cast themselves as victims of government overreach, as the true embodiment of the American people oppressed by governmental tyranny. Moreover, as has been the case in other settler uprisings in the west, the Bundys displayed no interest whatsoever in the actual and still-present Native peoples whose land they occupied as anything other than a historical metaphor for contemporary white injury. As Ryan Bundy remarked during the 2016 occupation of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge in Oregon, the militia “recognize that the Native Americans had the claim to the land . . . but they lost that claim. . . . There are things to learn from cultures of the past, but the current culture is the most important.”18 In fact, a variety of claims to land are made in the name of “the public” and “the people” as a collective interest in opposition to the federal government, the extractive industries, or the supposedly special interests of Native American tribes.19 Here, generalized claims to representing “the public” and “the people” obscure the particular and often antagonistic positions that galvanize such claims, as well as casts tribes as a single interest group that fraudulently make claims in the name of sovereignty and treaty rights. The spectrum of debate on public lands today tends to naturalize the white nationalism espoused by the Bundys—even when ostensibly criticizing the occupations as extremist or without merit—by recourse to conceptions of the national public and natural resources as national commons.20 The notion of the commons itself is a logic of apparent universal access and public good that is used to justify indigenous dispossession, depicting the particular and historical belonging of Native peoples as an overly self-interested obstacle to the greater good of the commons.At the same time, recourse to an exceptionalist discourse that casts public lands as “the common birthright of all Americans” has become a frequent rejoinder to either plans for the large-scale transfer of federal lands to states and private industry. For instance, Utah Congressman Jason Chaffetz’s proposed Disposal of Excess Federal Lands Act in January 2017 was abruptly withdrawn after criticism from groups such as Backcountry Hunters and Anglers proclaimed: “It seems the politicians on Capitol Hill have forgotten to whom the land actually belongs. You, me and every other citizen of this country.”21 The substance of the bill echoed both Utah’s 2012 Transfer of Public Lands Act (which demanded that the U.S. Congress convey federal public lands to the state) and the 2016 Republican Party campaign platform (which likewise called for the devolution of public lands to states), even as it remained out of step with public statements by Donald Trump and Montana representative Ryan Zinke, then Trump’s likely nominee on his way to becoming the Secretary of the Interior, who sought to maintain federal control while increasing deregulation to allow for expanded access for private industry.22 Yet both proponents of the populist “to whom the land actually belongs” and legislators espouse a defensive nationalism and incontrovertible possession contingent upon the presumed comprehensive dispossession of indigenous peoples.The pattern of settler trespass and land claims over and against indigenous peoples in excess of imperial or state sanction led to the British colonial government’s Proclamation of 1763. Although the proclamation ultimately served as a justification for the U.S. War of Independence because of its supposedly unjust limitation on territorial expansion by the colonies, it also provided a model for the subsequent U.S. federal government’s authority over constituent states and settlers.23 During the early national period when the federal government administered public lands primarily as a source of revenue, legal and military action sought to curb and control widespread settler trespass and unlawful habitation. In the wake of the Louisiana Purchase, Congress authorized the army to forcibly eject squatters. The 1807 Unlawful Intrusions Act increased criminal sanctions and penalties for settling or occupying public lands without legal claim, but ultimately did little to limit the expectations and incursions of settlers west of the Mississippi River. These expectations and settler claims were first given legal endorsement following the War of 1812 when Congress conferred partial preemption rights to squatters in Louisiana and the Illinois and Missouri Territories. The right of preemption—the preferential right granted to squatters to purchase the lands they occupied prior to public sale at a minimum price per acre—essentially authorized settler illegality and theft as a means of further consolidating colonization. Legislative debates over the regulation of settler trespass intensified throughout the 1820s, eventually resulting in a series of expansive preemption acts between 1830 and 1841.24 In 1862, Congress passed the first of the Homestead Acts, which gave federal land to settlers for farming as a means to encourage westward migration over and against the sovereign territorial claims of indigenous peoples. It similarly encouraged the western settlement of European immigrants as a palliative means of economic mobility intended to defuse full blown class war among the settler population in the east.25 At the same time, the lackluster and minimally implemented Southern Homestead Act of 1866—intended to support landownership by formerly enslaved African Americans—makes clear the unevenly racialized and white nationalist terms of settlement.26 II. The White Republic of Cliven Bundy The historical imaginary expressed in the Bundy occupations is predicated on claiming to defend the true legacy of the American Revolution, the principles of the U.S. Constitution, and the heritage of conquest in the U.S. West. The “Sagebrush Rebellion” of the 1970s restaged the possessive expectations of settlers and western ranchers manifest in reaction to Progressive-era conservationist legislation during the 1890s, including the Forest Reserve Act of 1891 and the Forest Service Organic Administration Act of 1897, which allowed the federal agency to designate areas to be reserved and protected from development. Statements by the Bundys on the illegitimacy of federal authority deliberately align them with this reactionary moment, as well as with historical lineage of white supremacist Posse Comitatus during the 1970s and 1980s, the militia and “county supremacist” movements of the 1990s, and the more recent “sovereign citizen” movement. Distinct in many ways, each of these movements nonetheless claimed to defend private property against federal tyranny.27 For the Bundys and other Western ranchers, these three themes—the American Revolution, the U.S. Constitution, and the so-called frontier—converge most saliently on the issue of land held in the public domain.28 Ignoring not only the ongoing and genocidal history of indigenous displacement, but also the historical consolidation of cattle baron monopolies through their brutal reign of terror and class war against impoverished homesteaders, the Bundy narrative highlights claims of rancher oppression and dispossession. Similar claims were reignited in opposition to the environmental movement in the 1960s and 1970s and legislation such as the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, which encouraged federal agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management and the National Forest Service to manage natural resources for purposes other than grazing, mining, and logging.29 The county supremacy, wise use, and white nationalist movements share the idea that the U.S. Constitution does not allow federal ownership of public lands within the borders of a state.30 They argue that federal lands should have been relinquished to the states upon their admission to the Union under the so-called “equal footing doctrine.” Originating with the state land cessions negotiated on behalf of the Articles of Confederation as a means of securing the political unification of the states, and further articulated in the expansionist terms of the 1787 Northwest Ordinance, the equal footing doctrine requires that new states be admitted to the Union as political equals of the existing states. Although all of the continental western states had clauses in their admissions acts disclaiming any right to unappropriated public lands within their borders, these groups contend that such clauses are unconstitutional under the equal footing doctrine, and therefore invalid.31 As empirically spurious as such assertions are, they link claims to public land, such as those made by the Bundys, to state’s rights agendas and the terms of continental colonization negotiated among settlers, states, and the federal government. In April 2014, Cliven Bundy’s confrontation with the Bureau of Land Management in the aptly named Bunkerville, Nevada—an unincorporated town founded by Mormons in 1877 and 82 miles northeast of Las Vegas—gained widespread news coverage. Since 1989, Bundy had accumulated more than $1.2 million in unpaid grazing fees for use of public lands. When in 2014, as a response to Bundy’s refusal to pay these fees, the BLM began confiscating Bundy’s cattle, he issued a call to militia across the country to come to his ranch and take up arms against the federal government.32 Although the Bundy family only purchased their ranch land in 1948 and did not begin grazing cattle until 1954, Bundy insisted on his ancestral and preemption-derived rights: “My forefathers . . . have been up and down the Virgin Valley here since 1877. All these rights I claim have been created through pre-emptive rights and beneficial use of the forage and the water and the access and range improvements.”33 At no point has Bundy substantively addressed the Moapa Band of Paiutes, whose homeland was appropriated as the public domain to which he claimed to have rights by virtue of ancestry, preemption, and American citizenship. Nor did Bundy’s advocates make the comparison between the federal government’s treatment of the Nevada rancher and its considerably more severe, violent, and illegal actions toward the nearby Western Shoshone and the Dann sisters.34 Although Bundy had little to say regarding the Southern Paiute he did have thoughts to share on the place of African Americans in the United States. “I want to tell you one . . . thing I know about the Negro,” he said. Referring to a public-housing project in North Las Vegas, he decried “government subsidy” as leading to immoral abortion and crime. He concluded with a nostalgic gloss on slavery by remarking that he’d “often wondered, are they better off as slaves, picking cotton and having a family life and doing things, or are they better off under government subsidy?”35 Indeed, he contended that African Americans taking government assistance were less free than slaves. Las Vegas as a site of escalating racialized struggle over housing and displacement was of little concern for Bundy. Likewise, his criticism of federal land policy omitted any mention of how the 1998 Southern Nevada Land Management Act opened up federal lands for rapid development, and paved the way for the real estate boom in the Las Vegas Valley. During the 1990s, Nevada had the fastest growing population in the country and was subsequently among the state’s most impacted by the 2008 foreclosure crisis.36 Especially relevant for the frame of expectation as property, Cliven Bundy’s racial imaginary and racialization of the state articulate familiar reactionary tropes in response to the gains of the civil rights movement and grudging expansion of the semi-welfare state during the 1960s. These have historically accompanied the assertion of states’ rights and the burgeoning white hostility to federal authority—manifest in struggles such as those against taxation and school integration—and advanced the further devolution and downsizing of government. Likewise, the reactionary 1970s “taxpayer revolt” and successive antiwelfare campaigns disputed what they characterized as the inordinate tax burden placed on them by the state.37 More recently the link between states’ rights claims and efforts to dismantle civil rights legislation such as the Voting Rights Act has been evident in such conservative jurisprudence as the U.S. Supreme Court’s 2013 decision in Shelby County v. Holder.38 Acknowledging the ways in such hostility to federal authority is articulated in terms of declarations of patriotism and claims to represent fundamental constitutionally based American values suggests the importance of understanding how antiwelfare discourse evokes American exceptionalist conceptions of the nation. Underwritten by Lockean notions of property and proper possession, as well as the “doctrine of discovery,” the settler construct of the independent and rugged individualist pioneer that has long served as foundational to the mythology of white nationalism remains predicated upon not only indigenous dispossession and its disavowal, but on the attributions of dependency and devaluation to racialized others more broadly. This is where the white republic of Cliven Bundy is an aspiration to a racially specific national belonging that evokes its own vision of common inheritance and birthright. Bundy’s white republic is at once exclusive, possessory, and an expansive claim to be and to defend America that denies its own dependence on lands and labor taken by attributing reprehensible dependency to those who have been dispossessed and racialized as socially expendable. III. A Certain Public The case of Gold Butte is useful to briefly consider in this regard. Gold Butte is land formation with numerous petroglyphs, historical artifacts, and sacred sites that is part of the traditional territory of the Moapa Band of Paiutes to the south of Bunkerville and on which Bundy had been grazing his cattle.39 In the wake of Mormon-led colonization efforts in the region that began during the mid-nineteenth century and through which settlers seized the most arable Southern Paiute land, the federal government established the Moapa River Indian Reservation in 1873. Initially 2.5 million acres—including much of present-day Moapa, Logandale, Overton, Virgin Valley, and the Gold Butte area—the reservation was reduced to a mere 1,000 acres two years later to make way for mining industry interests. A claim filed with the Indian Claims Commission by the Moapa Paiute in 1951 provided limited compensation for lands taken and legislation in 1980 returned 70,000 acres to the tribe.40 Legislation introduced in 2014 that would have further reinstated land to the tribe failed in committee, but provoked criticism from various settler factions. Real estate developers in the area complained that this would be a “negative economic legacy to the state of Nevada in perpetuity,” and a spokesperson for the organization Partners in Conservation expressed concerns about lack access for non-tribal members and “families that have traditional, historic, and cultural ties to that area . . . . We have lost a lot in the past years with all the various restrictions on federal lands.”41 In addition to such acquisitive hostilities, the Moapa and the Las Vegas Paiute have also fought against the toxic consequences of military test sites and extractive energy projects throughout the region, such as the Yucca Mountain Repository for nuclear waste and the Reid Gardner coal plant.42 Facing resistance to regaining stolen lands, the Moapa worked with the environmentalist group Friends of Gold Butte and Sierra Club, and successfully lobbied outgoing President Obama to establish the Gold Butte National Monument. Former tribal council member Vernon Lee observed: “We want to protect the lands, we want to protect the animals and we want our sacred sites protected . . . . Right now, the best thing we can think of is to go on the side of this creation of a monument.”43 This protection required the Moapa to strategically partner with environmentalists so as to advocate on behalf of the public interest and lobby for a national monument to be established under the Antiquities Act for a nation other than itself and antiquities that would symbolically be conserved as an inheritance for the people of the United States generally. This general public is always already a particular settler public—itself composed of specific antagonisms and divisions—that strives to secure national certainty and capacity through indigenous dispossession.It is instructive to compare Lee’s statement with Nevada Senator Harry Reid, who championed the initiative to set aside Gold Butte as a national monument. Reid declared: “Threats to our public lands are threats to our economy, our environment, and our culture. When we preserve our lands, we preserve America.”44 The force of colonial dispossession and disavowal as settler common sense obscures the gap between the strategic pragmatism of “right now, the best thing we can think of” espoused by Lee—a pragmatism I take to be ultimately in the service of tribal sovereignty—and the national purpose invoked by Reid, that “we preserve America.” Where Lee speaks to the limited options for asserting Moapa relations to place and Moapa authority in relation to lands taken under colonization, Reid’s remarks suggest the ways in which the past and futurity of the United States are at stake in preserving a uniquely American heritage and landscape. To ignore the racial and colonial constitution of the property relation threatens not only to perpetuate, but also to intensify the ways in which property itself as a historical and material relation is predicated upon racial and colonial dispossession. Nor, is it possible to simply substitute a supposedly colorblind ethic—such as ending de jure racist property exclusions or redlining in real estate markets—that renders the property relation more equitable. Colonization and the differential devaluation of racialized peoples remain constitutive. This is not to say that property is exclusively a manifestation of these historical relations of power, but it is to suggest that it remains in significant ways enmeshed with and disposed by these relations. In prevailing conceptions of possession and property, as Eva Mackey points out, “jurisprudence has legally entrenched and attempted to materialize the fantasy of certainty and stability for settlers”—precisely the certainty and stability upon which expectation depends.45 Taking seriously the notion that property is a social relation requires looking at the specificity of that relation as it is continuously remade in the broader social circumstances in which it is situated and social struggles of which it is part. This perpetual need for its remaking and reiteration, in effect, conveys in part how the property relation as a colonial relation remains uncertain, unstable, and open to contestation. The genealogy of white supremacy in the United States is made in shifting material relations of colonial and racial dispossession. Both white supremacy and what Mark Rifkin calls “settler common sense” are used to mediate inequalities among white people over and against indigenous peoples, people of color, and migrants.46 The Bundy claims provide an example of these ideologies, which assert a particular conception of collective belonging and nationalist imaginary. This is a settler nation that gains a semblance of coherence over and against indigenous and racialized others. To challenge this claim by asserting a more inclusive national public and the celebration of national commons may provide a seemingly effective counter-discourse, but it does so only by further inscribing settler prerogative and naturalizing colonial and racialized dispossession. Putatively antigovernment white supremacy in the United States conjoins colonial and racial dispossession in its attacks on the U.S. state. Rather than simply being anti-statist, such maneuvers are attempts to capture and redeploy state power in particular ways, while at the same time categorically denying the historical co-constitution of colonial and racial dispossession and how this remains crucial in the current conjuncture. These are the ideational and material sources of expectation as property.

#### --] Space management cannot be understood outside of settler colonialism. The infrastructure, institutions, and Eurocentric values of space policy are considered the hallmarks of science and progress, which become weaponized against Indigenous resistance.
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Mauna Kea is a dormant volcano and the highest point on the archipelago of Hawai’i. When measured from its base at seafloor, it is the tallest mountain on earth. These towering heights, in a region of the world with minimal light pollution has also earned Mauna Kea recognition of being one of the best spots on the planet for examining the cosmos. Long before the development of modern space infrastructure, however, the peak of Mauna Kea was regarded by native Hawaiians as among the most sacred places on the archipelago of Hawai’i. The place where earth meets the heavens. These divergent perspectives are embedded within a larger relationship of imperial domination that has seeded a century of unrest. While the primary focus of the protest was to challenge a half-century disregard for this sacred site by numerous entities and interests, the Battle for Mauna Kea cannot be understood outside Hawaii’s 125 year-long history of colonial occupation. In 1893, the Hawaiian Kingdom and its Queen, Lydia Kamaka’eha Lili’uokalani, were overthrown by a US led military coup (Long, 2017). Speaking to a spirit of resistance that has existed on the islands since the coup, scholar-activist K. Kamakaoka’ilima Long (2017: 15) states: “four decades of land struggles and cultural historical recovery… have grown a Hawaiian sovereignty movement… playing out in both land defense and as a movement to re-realize Hawaiian political independence as a sovereign state.” This recent assertion of self-determination, now known as the battle for Mauna Kea, has grown to become a global movement with broad support from high-profile figures and the hashtags #Wearemaunakea, #ProtectMaunaKea, and #TMTshutdown trending widely on social media. More than just a source of inspiration for the groundswell anti-colonial movements around the world, this story provides a context to better understand ongoing colonial occupation that is reinforced through the constitutive power of space infrastructure. Working from decades of resistance that culminated in the “battle for Mauna Kea,” we engage the notion of colonial totality to conceptualize the resistance to space infrastructure and the ongoing US occupation of Hawaii, reflecting on what this movement provides for better understanding totality and the relationship between space infrastructure and the shifting nature of colonial occupation more broadly. The notion of totality describes the process by which occupied spaces are coded with Western values in the form of normalized cultures, epistemologies, and institutions that produces an “atomistic image of social existence” (Quijano, 2007: 174). The institutions, ideologies and systems that advocate for the construction of space infrastructure exemplify this process. Astronomers frame the building of the observatory infrastructure as an essential piece in advancing our knowledge of outer space and ultimately achieving ‘universal’ progress. The resistance to development of these infrastructural systems is an invitation to consider the relationship between space as a frontier of discovery and ongoing questions of settler colonialism; the blockade has made visible the inherent relationship between the infrastructure of scientific exploration and the logic of totalizing colonial rationality that enables the development of massive telescopes on occupied land. While these perspectives of colonial totality provide a useful understanding of power and institutions that shape this conflict, we suggest that the Hawaiian land defenders’ refusal of the normalizing force of space infrastructure demonstrates the complexities and conditions relating to the notion of totality and ultimately the inadequacies of the concept. During a public comment period at 2015 University of Hawai‘i Board of Regents meeting, Dr. Pualani Kanaka’ole Kanahele gestures to both the totalizing colonial discourse that suppresses her cultural beliefs and the importance of fighting back against these systems: … we believe in the word of our ancestors…they say we are the products of this land and that is our truth…and that is what we are fighting for. This is our way of life. This is not our job. We don’t earn money from doing this. But for generations after generations, we will continue to be doing what we are doing today. What Dr. Kanahele speaks of goes beyond the physical destruction of the sacred ancestral site, to describe a hegemonic normalization and occupation that actively effaces traditional Hawaiian ways of being in the world. The words and actions of the land defenders challenge totalizing structures that classify space according to a narrow set of beliefs about the world. Working from these acts of resistance, we want to suggest that the Hawaiian sovereignty movement illuminates how systems of scientific thought and the project of space exploration rely on Euro-western values being the standard by which all other values are measured. It is this wide acceptance of these structures and principles of reasoning that serve to justify the construction of infrastructure that at once reproduces and fortifies these myths. This self-reinforcing relationship between the production of space infrastructure and the logics that justify it speaks to a powerful aspects of colonial totality: the way it gains power by rendering illegible the very elements relied upon to actively produce the other. The generally unquestioned salience of space infrastructure is a powerful example of this. As Quijano (2007: 174) describes, the relationship between colonialism and scientific discourse is a mutually reinforcing and “part of, a power structure that involved the European colonial domination over the rest of the world.” In Hawai’i, we see the settler colonial process of cultural attrition operating through a totalizing force of colonial knowledge systems that extend beyond physical occupation of land to include an erasure of Indigenous Hawaiian ways of knowing. Although the spatialities and technologies associated with this form of stellar navigation are radically dissimilar, we suggest that on a basic level, this form of space exploration is continuous with a lineage of Euro-western projects of discovery. In short, space as the ‘final frontier’ is not simply a metaphor but speaks to the role of astronomy in upholding the ongoing projection of values onto new territories and extending power and acquisition of territory to those complicit in colonial processes. This extends both to the world’s highest peaks and into the heavens. Space infrastructure is central to this ongoing frontier process that seeks to code ‘new’ territories as knowable according to certain values and, as a result, casts inhabitants who fall outside this paradigm as irrational, less-than-human, and exploitable. However, as Lowe (2015: 2) warns, these abstract promises of human freedoms and rational progress are necessarily discordant with the “global conditions on which they depend.” Which is to say that these atomistic systems dispose of the very relationships and elements of life that make them possible. A belief in respecting the sacredness of the world is just one example of this. It is also essential to recognize the process of establishing colonial totality is one that imperial forces have worked tirelessly to instill. Recognizing this helps to disrupt an appearance of givenness that colonial occupation relies upon. The land defenders have been vocal about this, reminding of us of the fact that since the arrival of James Cook to the Hawaiian Islands in 1778, settler colonial campaigns have been advancing longstanding patterns of cultural removal, fueled by beliefs in colonial supremacy. Following the coup and overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy by US-led forces, a colonial oligarchy banned Hawaiian languages from schools and formalized English as the official language for business and government relations (Silva, 2004: 2-3). This legislation eroded language, culture, and sacred practice; and is an example of what Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o (cited in Silva, 2004: 3) describes as a “cultural bomb” of settler colonialism that serves to “annihilate a people’s belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves.” According to Chickasaw theorist Jodi Byrd, continually reflecting on the historical and ongoing work that maintains the conditions of settler colonialism is essential to resisting the tendency for colonial constraint to appear inevitable, unresolvable, and complete (Byrd, 2011; see also Simpson, 2014). There was nothing, easy, given, or natural about processes of colonial occupation. While we acknowledge the usefulness of totality for thinking about colonial supremacy, we have concerns about its tendency to inscribe an inaccurate depiction of Euro-western superpower with total ideological control over subjugated Indigenous population. Put differently, we are cautious of the work that the notion of totality does to reinforce a too widely accepted view of Indigenous populations as helplessly dominated, or even anachronistic. The Hawaiian sovereignty movement demonstrates that this is not the case. What the battle at Mauna Kea has shown—akin to other efforts of refusal, such as those at Standing Rock—is that the war against colonialism is ongoing. At present, it appears the land protectors have been successful in their goals of halting construction, as the development team behind the project has begun considering secondary sites for the telescope. The resistance at Mauna Kea, then, is a powerful symbol of the possibility of rupturing the normative totality of Modernist scientific rationality, but it also underscores the recalcitrance of the structures of control and the challenges of pushing back against colonial occupation. However, despite this rupturing of hegemonic ideas of science and progress through the resistance movement, the dominant response from the scientific community has been largely one of confusion and perplexity. This reaction to the uprising speaks to the power of the narratives that cement the Western framework as ‘truth,’ ‘natural,’ and ‘given.’ For these representatives of state and international institutions, violent control is re-framed as co-existence to achieve Modernist notions of progress, while the claims of Indigenous people are reduced to frivolous demands with primitive and irrational connections to the past. This, of course, exists with little consideration of the irony of how this frenzy to build infrastructure that works to “know” the cosmos may be read as equally irrational. This essay has sought to consider the relationship between infrastructure and colonialism, emphasizing that even the most futuristic space telescopes have embedded within them a lineage of Euro-western cultural supremacy. It is important to recognize the extant materiality of these infrastructures as a manifestation of hegemonic systems that perpetuate myths of rationality and Euro-western cultural supremacy. The battle for Mauna Kea movement highlights the importance of remembering the long historical processes and extensive exertion of colonial constraint and cultural removal that has been necessary to maintain control of the land. Despite the social processes that naturalize colonial infrastructure, there is nothing essential, necessary, or pre-ordained about enormous telescopes. The success of the land defenders at Mauna Kea, and the support the movement gained around the world, shows us that Euro-western forces and the infrastructure that is central to maintaining their normative influence, are replete with fissures and contradictions worth pushing against. In spite of the hegemonic forces of modernity and rationality behind the construction of the TMT and a continued attempt to assert colonial totality, the battle at Mauna Kea indicates these hegemonic forces have been far from totalizing. The colonial powers do not have the final word. The land defenders at Mauna Kea have demonstrated a powerful vision for disrupting normative ways of occupying land and knowing the cosmos inspiring us to think further on the complexities of mobilizing infrastructure to resist colonialism. It is within these ruptures that we see a potential for a continued learning from the stars and our social existence.

#### --] This debate is not private space good/bad, but instead a question of Native sovereignty and the power to invoke the plan. The 1AC eclipses the authority of Native nations, so in response we affirm the long tradition of Indigenous internationalism across colonial borders.
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The Treaty Council, however, was not the first or only version of what historian Daniel Cobb calls a “global Indigenous identity.” Rather, it belonged to and drew from a long tradition of Indigenous internationalism.5 Prior to European contact, Indigenous nations had often entered into relations with each other for alliance, kinship, war, peace, or trade. As shown in previous chapters, agreements were made not solely between human nations, but also among nonhuman nations as well, such as the buffalo and the land. Such treaties were, and continue to be, the basis of diplomacy and the evidence of a prior and continuing status of Indigenous nationhood. Sovereign nations do not enter into international relations or treaties with domestic or “internal” populations. On the contrary, the very basis of sovereignty is the power to negotiate relationships between those who are seen as different— between other sovereigns and nations. But concepts of “sovereignty” and “nation” possess different meanings for Indigenous peoples than for their European-derived counterparts. And they are not entirely consistent, either, with the aspirations for a nation-state that came to define decolonization movements in the Third World. While doing important defensive work, on face value these Western and Third World concepts only partially reflect traditions of Indigenous resistance. Far beyond the project of seeking equality within the colonial state, the tradition of radical Indigenous internationalism imagined a world altogether free of colonial hierarchies of race, class, and nation. This vision allowed revolutionary Indigenous organizations such as the Treaty Council to make relatives, so to speak, with those they saw as different, imagining themselves as part of Third World struggles and ideologies, and entirely renouncing the imperialism and exceptionalism of the First World (while still living in it). They were in the First World but not of it—much like American Indians are in, but not entirely of, the United States. Indigenous peoples across North America and the world have fought, died, and struggled to reclaim, restore, and redefine these powerful ideas. Their goal has been to take their proper place in the family of nations. Radical Indigenous internationalism, however, predates AIM and the Treaty Council. Contemporary pan-Indigenous movements were a result of more than a decade of Red Power organizing that began in the early 1960s, nearly a decade before the creation of AIM. Earlier, in the 1950s, Flathead scholar and writer D’Arcy McNickle and the National Congress of American Indians had explored a similar intellectual and political terrain of internationalism. And before that, the Society of American Indians advocated for a seat at the table during the 1919 Paris peace talks and representation at the League of Nations. Each distinct instance posed a similar question: If Indigenous peoples are nations, why are they not afforded the right to self-determination? Two strands of thinking about self-determination for the colonial world prevailed following the First World War. In the first, US President Woodrow Wilson argued for self-determination with a limited set of rights that would not radically upset the colonial order. Such liberal internationalism, however, glaringly omitted Indigenous peoples, as they understood themselves as nations that existed prior to the formation of settler states. Rarely were Wilson’s principles applied to North America or the United States; nor were they ever intended to extend to Indigenous peoples. A second, more radical vision put forward by Communist revolutionary V. I. Lenin argued for the right of colonized nations to secede and declare independence from their colonial masters. This view was echoed by the Third World decolonization movement, as part of a global Socialist and Communist revolution, and it has frequently been applied in the Asian, African, and South American contexts. But this view remained almost entirely absent in North America, except among radical Indigenous, Black, Asian, Caribbean, and Chicanx national liberation movements. The Treaty Council advocated Indigenous nationhood as part of this global anti-colonial movement and in line with Third World liberation movements. After decades of experiencing land loss, enduring bare survival, attempting to work with federal programs, filing court cases, defeating termination legislation, and facing mass relocation, an assertion of Oceti Sakowin sovereignty went from ambition to prescription. Few avenues remained other than the pursuit of international treaty rights. Treaties made with the United States were proof of nationhood. But what legal institution would uphold this position if the United States refused to? If the goal was to reverse the unjust occupation of an entire continent, the advancement of Indigenous rights through the very legal and political systems that justified that occupation in the first place had proven limited in some instances, and hopeless in others. To survive, AIM and the Treaty Council therefore had to look elsewhere to make their case—beyond the confines of the most powerful political construct in world history, the nation-state. Prior to and during colonization, Indigenous nations had self-organized into deliberate confederacies, alliances, and governments. The Nation of the Seven Council Fires (the Oceti Sakowin), for instance, is a confederacy of seven different nations of Lakota-, Dakota-, and Nakota-speaking peoples in the Northern Plains and Western Great Lakes. They are hardly unique; in North America alone there are the Creek Confederacy in the Southeast, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy of Six Nations in the Northeast, the Council of Three Fires (made up of Ojibwes, Odawas, and Potawatomis) in the Great Lakes region, the United Indian Nations in the Ohio River valley (under the Shawnee leadership of Tecumseh), the All Indian Pueblo Council of the Southwest, and the Iron Confederacy of the Northern Plains. Many other political confederacies also flourished prior to, alongside, and in spite of settler states in North America. And their legacies are hardly relegated to the primordial past. Modern Oceti Sakowin internationalism, for instance, traces its origins to the early twentieth century, an era generally viewed as a low point for Indigenous activism and resistance. In North America alone, an estimated precolonial population of tens of millions of Indigenous peoples had been reduced to about 300,000, and for Flathead historian D’Arcy McNickle, writing in 1949, two processes contributed greatly to this decimation: the institution of private property and the destruction of Indigenous governance that once held land in common. Indigenous nations at the time also possessed little in the way of either collective property or political power, as Indigenous territory had been drastically diminished, and the reservation system had overthrown or almost entirely dissolved customary governments. If Indigenous peoples once constituted the tree of the Americas, whose roots deeply entwined in the land, the cultivation of “growth from the severed stump,” McNickle argued, was the pivotal challenge of the twentieth century.7 Physical extermination and the repression of Indigenous political power verified the United States’ genocidal intent, but these had not accomplished their purpose. And despite otherwise stating pluralistic claims to inclusion, McNickle concluded that the United States simply “can not tolerate a nation within a nation.” If Natives were to be assimilated, they would be assimilated as individuals and not as nations. In the popular imaginary, Natives disappeared into the wilderness of history, were never truly nations, and had been overpowered by a superior civilization. If they were nations, they were eclipsed and replaced by the real nation—the United States. Such erasure notwithstanding, vibrant Indigenous political traditions persisted. But to the untrained eye, nothing was awry. From the severed stump began to regrow the tree of life—the tree of resistance that would blossom into revolt decades later.

#### --] The process and agents of political change matter. Indigenous internationalism must be asserted through Native sovereignty and organizing. We preempt the perm and the plan- they still collude with settlerism, which trades off with meaningful resistance.
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PLACE-BASED INTERNATIONALISM

Eve: One idea that Wayne and I floated in our call for papers is that how a person or community understands the roots or source of injustice will have implications for how they go about undoing that injustice. Does this make sense to you? Might it be too simplistic or problematic?

Leanne: I think we need to be a bit careful here, particularly in the academy. I think Indigenous peoples understand pretty well injustice in their own lives whether or not they can articulate it using the language of colonialism or decolonization. I think movements that link social realities with political systems and focus on creating real-world-on-the-ground alternatives are powerful. I worry that too much of our energy goes into trying to influence the system rather than creating the alternatives. It matters to me how change is achieved. Change achieved through struggle, organizing, and creating the alternatives produces profoundly different outcomes than change achieved through recognition-focused protest, and pressuring the state to make the changes for us. That is a recipe for co-option. I think it is important to understand root causes of injustice, but it is also important to understand think strategically and intelligently about approaches to undoing that injustice. I think that diagnosis and strategic action must be done within grounded normativity. Indigenous thought has a tradition of place-based internationalism that I think is this beautifully fertile spot because it links place-based thinking and struggle with the same decolonial pockets of thinking throughout the world. Nishnaa- beg have been linking ourselves to the rest of the world since the beginning of time, and throughout our resistance to colonialism we have our people traveling throughout the world to link with other communities of resistors. Grassy Narrows First Nation comes to mind in their nearly four- decade fight against mercury poisoning in their river system and the relationship they have made with the Japanese community in Mnimata.6 We need to use our experiences in the past to think critically about how we respond to injustice today. Right now, Indigenous peoples in Canada need to be thinking critically about the implications of seeking recogni- tion within the colonial state because we have a government that is very good at neoliberalism and seducing our hope for their purposes. Again, Glen Sean Coulthard, in Red Skin, White Masks, using the Dene nation’s experience in the 1970s, provides a blistering critique of the pitfalls of seeking political recognition within state structures. He makes the point that continually seeking recognition with the settler-colonial state is a process of co-option and neutralization, and is a way of bringing Indigenous peoples into the systems that guts our resistance movements, for instance, and we get very little in return.7 In fact, in terms of dispossession—that is, the removal, murdering, displacement, and destruction of the relation- ship between Indigenous bodies and Indigenous land—this serves only to facilitate land loss, not improve things. Engagement with the system changes Indigenous peoples more than it changes the system. This can be destructive in terms of resurgence because resurgent movements are trying to do the opposite—we are trying to center Indigenous practices and thoughts in our lives as everyday acts of resistance, and grow those actions and processes into a mass mobilization. I think it is useful to apply this same critique of recognition to orga- nizing and mobilizing with the purpose of making a switch from mobi- lizing around victim-based narratives—that is, publically demonstrating the pain of loss as a mechanism to appeal to the moral and ethical fabric of Canadian society (which has over and over again proven to be morally bankrupt when it comes to Indigenous peoples)—to using that same pain and anger to fuel resurgent actions. This organizing from within grounded normativity has always fueled Indigenous resistance and continues to happen all the time in Indigenous communities—it is just often misread by others. The community of Hollow Water First Nation created the Community Holistic Circle of Healing as a Nishnaabeg restoration of relationships, or a restorative justice model to address sexual violence in their community.8 Christi Belcourt’s Walking with Our Sisters exhibit has created a traveling display of 1,800 moccasin vamps as a way of honoring and commemorating missing and murdered Indigenous women and children in Canada and the United States. The exhibit does not rely on state funding.9 Thousands of volunteers made the vamps. The exhibit works with local communities and their cultural and spiritual practices to install the exhibit and do the necessary ceremony and community processes. Walking with Our Sisters works with local organizers a year in advance of installation, using Indigenous processes to embed the art in community on the terms of the local community. There is also the work of countless urban Indigenous organizations supporting the families of MMIWG2S people. The Native Youth Sexual Health Network provides on-the-ground, community-embedded, peer-to-peer support around sex- ual health and addiction for youth.10 The Akwesasne Freedom School provides Mohawk education for Mohawk children.11 The Iroquois national and Haudenosaunee women’s lacrosse teams travel using Haudenosau- nee passports instead of American or Canadian ones.12 The Unist’ot’en Camp pursues land protection resurgent action and the reclamation of the original name of Mount Douglas, PKOLS, in the city of Victoria, British Columbia.13

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

Carlson 16

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

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

### Must Read

#### Plan: The appropriation of space by private entities is unjust, except for companies incorporated in the People’s Republic of China. [Adjust by aff]

#### Private Chinese space companies are set to outpace America in the squo.

Autry and Kwast 18

Greg Autry, professor of space leadership, policy, and business @ ASU, served on the 2016 NASA transition team Steve Kwast, Lieutenant General and commander for the Air Force, fellow in public policy @ Harvard, 12-8-2018, "America Is Losing the Second Space Race to China," Foreign Policy, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/08/22/america-is-losing-the-second-space-race-to-china/> //MLT

China’s aggressive investment in space solar power will allow it to provide cheap, clean power to the world, displacing U.S. energy firms while placing a second yoke around the developing world. Significantly, such orbital power stations have dual use potential and, if properly designed, could serve as powerful offensive weapons platforms. China’s first step in this process is to conquer the growing small space launch market. Beijing is providing nominally commercial firms with government-manufactured, mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles they can use to dump launch services on the market below cost. These start-ups are already undercutting U.S. pricing by 80 percent. Based on its previous success in using dumping to take out U.S. developed industries such as solar power modules and drones, China will quickly move upstream to attack the leading U.S. launch providers and secure a global commercial monopoly. Owning the launch market will give them an unsurmountable advantage against U.S. competitors in satellite internet, imaging, and power.

#### Chinese space dominance is k2 global hegemony.

Jaewoo 21

Jaewoo Choo, professor of international politics @ Kyung Hee U, director of China Research Center, 3-11-2021, "The United States and China: Competition for superiority in space to protect resources and weapon systems," OpenAsia | Thoughts and Ideas about Asia, <https://www.openasia.asia/the-united-states-and-china-competition-for-superiority-in-space-to-protect-resources-and-weapon-systems/> //MLT

Whoever rules space rules the future There is one reason why the two countries' space strategy competition will inevitably lead to a hegemony competition. This is because they try to conquer the space order. Conquering the space order is to define and establish the space order. Those who dominate space will dominate almost all sectors of the future world, including economy, technology, environment, cyberspace, transportation and energy. That's why the United States is considered as a hegemonic country on Earth today. The U.S. is recognized as a hegemonic country because it establishes and leads the economic, financial, trade, political, and diplomatic order. There are two areas in the world today where international order has not been established. One is virtual space, which is the cyber world. The other is the space. Since the international order of these two areas is closely correlated with each other, it is likely that the establishment of the order in these two areas will be pursued simultaneously. This means that cyber order cannot be discussed without discussing satellite issues. The Communist Party of China recognized this early on. At the 19th National Communist Party Congress in 2017, it expressed its justification for establishing space order. President Xi Jinping declared that China's diplomatic stage in the 21st century has expanded beyond the Earth into space and virtual space. It was the moment when China defined the concept of diplomatic space as the "universe" beyond the Earth. He then explained that the establishment of a system that can even manage the order of the universe and the virtual world eventually means the establishment of practical governance. Therefore, he justified that China's diplomatic horizon has no choice but to expand into space. Furthermore, he stressed that he is confident that the ideation of building such governance serves as the foundation for the community of common destiny for mankind which China pursues. In other words, he publicly urged China to have the capabilities and means to become a key country in building governance in these two areas.

**Chinese leadership solves extinction.**

Shen **Yamei 18**, Deputy Director and Associate Research Fellow of Department for American Studies, China Institute of International Studies, 1-9-2018, "Probing into the “Chinese Solution” for the Transformation of Global Governance," CAIFC, http://www.caifc.org.cn/en/content.aspx?id=4491

As the world is in a period of great development, transformation and adjustment, the international power comparison is undergoing profound changes, global governance is reshuffling and traditional governance concepts and models are confronted with challenges. The international community is expecting China to play a bigger role in global governance, which has given birth to the Chinese solution. A. To Lead the Transformation of the Global Governance System. **The “shortcomings” of the existing global governance system are prominent, which can hardly ensure global development. First, the traditional dominant forces are seriously imbalanced**. The US and Europe that used to dominate the global governance system have been beset with structural problems, with their economic development stalling, social contradictions intensifying, populism and secessionism rising, and states trapped in internal strife and differentiation. These countries have not fully reformed and adjusted themselves well, but rather pointed their fingers at globalization and resorted to retreat for self-insurance or were busy with their own affairs without any wish or ability to participate in global governance, which has encouraged the growth of “anti-globalization” trend into an interference factor to global governance. Second, the global governance mechanism is relatively lagging behind. Over the years of development, the strength of emerging economies has increased dramatically, which has substantially upset the international power structure, as the developing countries as a whole have made 80 percent of the contributions to global economic growth. These countries have expressed their appeal for new governance and begun policy coordination among themselves, which has initiated the transition of global governance form “Western governance” to “East-West joint governance”, but **the traditional governance mechanisms such as the World Bank, IMF and G7 failed to reflect the demand of the new pattern, in addition to their lack of representation and inclusiveness.** Third, the global governance rules are developing in a fragmented way, with governance deficits existing in some key areas. With the diversification and in-depth integration of international interests, the domain of global governance has continued to expand, with actors multiplying by folds and action intentions becoming complicated. As relevant efforts are usually temporary and limited to specific partners or issues, global governance driven by requests of “diversified governance” lacks systematic and comprehensive solutions. Since the beginning of this year, there have been risks of running into an acephalous state **in such key areas as global economic governance and climate change**. **Such emerging issues as nuclear security and international terrorism have suffered injustice because of power politics**. **The governance areas in deficit, such as cyber security, polar region and oceans, have “reversely forced” certain countries and organizations to respond hastily**. All of these have made the global governance system trapped in a dilemma and call urgently for a clear direction of advancement. B. To Innovate and Perfect the International Order. Currently, whether the developing countries or the Western countries of Europe and the US are greatly discontent with the existing international order as well as their appeals and motivation for changing the order are unprecedentedly strong. The US is the major creator and beneficiary of the existing hegemonic order, but it is now doubtful that it has gained much less than lost from the existing order, faced with the difficulties of global economic transformation and obsessed with economic despair and political dejection. Although the developing countries as represented by China acknowledge the positive role played by the post-war international order in safeguarding peace, boosting prosperity and promoting globalization, they criticize the existing order for lack of inclusiveness in politics and equality in economy, as well as double standard in security, believing it has failed to reflect the multi-polarization trend of the world and is an exclusive “circle club”. Therefore, there is much room for improvement. For China, to lead the transformation of the global governance system and international order not only supports the efforts of the developing countries to uphold multilateralism rather than unilateralism, advocate the rule of law rather than the law of the jungle and practice democracy rather than power politics in international relations, but also is an important subject concerning whether China could gain the discourse power and development space corresponding to its own strength and interests in the process of innovating and perfecting the framework of international order. C. To Promote Integration of the Eastern and Western Civilizations. Dialog among civilizations, which is the popular foundation for any country’s diplomatic proposals, runs like a trickle moistening things silently. Nevertheless, in the existing international system guided by the “Western-Centrism”, the Western civilization has always had the self-righteous superiority, conflicting with the interests and mentality of other countries and having failed to find the path to co-existing peacefully and harmoniously with other civilizations. **So to speak, many problems of today, including the growing gap in economic development between the developed and developing countries against the background of globalization, the Middle East trapped in chaos and disorder, the failure of Russia and Turkey to “integrate into the West”, etc., can be directly attributed to lack of exchanges, communication and integration among civilizations.** Since the 18th National Congress of CPC, Xi Jinping has raised the concept of “Chinese Dream” that reflects both Chinese values and China’s pursuit, re-introducing to the world the idea of “all living creatures grow together without harming one another and ways run parallel without interfering with one another”, which is the highest ideal in Chinese traditional culture, and striving to shape China into a force that counter-balance the Western civilization. He has also made solemn commitment that “we respect the diversity of civilizations …… cannot be puffed up with pride and depreciate other civilizations and nations”; “facing the people deeply trapped in misery and wars, we should have not only compassion and sympathy, but also responsibility and action …… do whatever we can to extend assistance to those people caught in predicament”, etc. China will rebalance the international pattern from a more inclusive civilization perspective and with more far-sighted strategic mindset, or at least correct the bisected or predominated world order so as to promote the parallel development of the Eastern and Western civilizations through mutual learning, integration and encouragement. D. To Pass on China’s Confidence. Only a short while ago, some Western countries had called for “China’s responsibility” and made it an inhibition to “regulate” China’s development orientation. Today, China has become a source of stability in an international situation full of uncertainties. Over the past 5 years, China has made outstanding contributions to the recovery of world economy under relatively great pressure of its own economic downturn. Encouraged by the “four confidences”, the whole of the Chinese society has burst out innovation vitality and produced innovation achievements, making people have more sense of gain and more optimistic about the national development prospect. It is the heroism of the ordinary Chinese to overcome difficulties and realize the ideal destiny that best explains China’s confidence. When this confidence is passed on in the field of diplomacy, it is expressed as: first, China’s posture is seen as more forging ahead and courageous to undertake responsibilities ---- proactively shaping the international agendas rather than passively accepting them; having clear-cut attitudes on international disputes rather than being equivocal; and extending international cooperation to comprehensive and dimensional development rather than based on the theory of “economy only”. In sum, China will actively seek understanding and support from other countries rather than imposing its will on others with clear-cut Chinese characteristics, Chinese style and Chinese manner. Second, China’s discourse is featured as a combination of inflexibility and yielding as well as magnanimous ---- combining the internationally recognized diplomatic principles with the excellent Chinese cultural traditions through digesting the Chinese and foreign humanistic classics assisted with philosophical speculations to make “China Brand, Chinese Voice and China’s Image get more and more recognized”. Third, the Chinese solution is more practical and intimate to people as well as emphasizes inclusive cooperation, as China is full of confidence to break the monopoly of the Western model on global development, “offering mankind a Chinese solution to explore a better social system”, and “providing a brand new option for the nations and peoples who are hoping both to speed up development and maintain independence”. II.Path Searching of the “Chinese Solution” for Global Governance Over the past years’ efforts, China has the ability to transform itself from “grasping the opportunity” for development to “creating opportunity” and “sharing opportunity” for common development, hoping to pass on the longing of the Chinese people for a better life to the people of other countries and promoting the development of the global governance system toward a more just and rational end. It has become the major power’s conscious commitment of China to lead the transformation of the global governance system in a profound way. A. To Construct the Theoretical System for Global Governance. The theoretical system of global governance has been the focus of the party central committee’s diplomatic theory innovation since the 18th National Congress of CPC as well as an important component of the theory of socialism with Chinese characteristics for a new era, which is not only the sublimation of China’s interaction with the world from “absorbing and learning” to “cooperation and mutual learning”, but also the cause why so many developing countries have turned from “learning from the West” to “exploring for treasures in the East”. In the past 5 years, the party central committee, based on precise interpretation of the world pattern today and serious reflection on the future development of mankind, has made a sincere call to the world for promoting the development of global governance system toward a more just and rational end, and proposed a series of new concepts and new strategies including engaging in major power diplomacy with Chinese characteristics, creating the human community with common destiny, promoting the construction of new international relationship rooted in the principle of cooperation and win-win, enriching the strategic thinking of peaceful development, sticking to the correct benefit view, formulating the partnership network the world over, advancing the global economic governance in a way of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, advocating the joint, comprehensive, cooperative and sustainable security concept, and launching the grand “Belt and Road” initiative. The Chinese solution composed of these contents, not only fundamentally different from the old roads of industrial revolution and colonial expansion in history, but also different from the market-driven neo-liberalism model currently advocated by Western countries and international organizations, stands at the height of the world and even mankind, seeking for global common development and having widened the road for the developing countries to modernization, which is widely welcomed by the international community. B. To Supplement and Perfect the Global Governance System. Currently, the international political practice in global governance is mostly problem-driven without creating a set of relatively independent, centralized and integral power structures, resulting in the existing global governance systemcharacterized as both extensive and unbalanced. China has been engaged in reform and innovation, while maintaining and constructing the existing systems, producing some thinking and method with Chinese characteristics. First, China sees the UN as a mirror that reflects the status quo of global governance, which should act as the leader of global governance, and actively safeguards the global governance system with the UN at the core. Second, China is actively promoting the transforming process of such recently emerged international mechanisms as G20, BRICS and SCO, perfecting them through practice, and boosting Asia-Pacific regional cooperation and the development of economic globalization. China is also promoting the construction of regional security mechanism through the Six-Party Talks on Korean Peninsula nuclear issue, Boao Forum for Asia, CICA and multilateral security dialog mechanisms led by ASEAN so as to lay the foundation for the future regional security framework. Third, China has initiated the establishment of AIIB and the New Development Bank of BRICS, creating a precedent for developing countries to set up multilateral financial institutions. The core of the new relationship between China and them lies in “boosting rather than controlling” and “public rather than private”, which is much different from the management and operation model of the World Bank, manifesting the increasing global governance ability of China and the developing countries as well as exerting pressure on the international economic and financial institution to speed up reforms. **Thus, in leading the transformation of the global governance system, China has not overthrown the existing systems and started all over again, but been engaged in innovating and perfecting; China has proactively undertaken international responsibilities, but has to do everything in its power and act according to its ability.** C. To Reform the Global Governance Rules. Many of the problems facing global governance today are deeply rooted in such a cause that the dominant power of the existing governance system has taken it as the tool to realize its own national interests first and a platform to pursue its political goals. Since the beginning of this year, the US has for several times requested the World Bank, IMF and G20 to make efforts to mitigate the so-called global imbalance, abandoned its commitment to support trade openness, cut down investment projects to the middle-income countries, and deleted commitment to support the efforts to deal with climate change financially, which has made the international systems accessories of the US domestic economic agendas, dealing a heavy blow to the global governance system. On the contrary, the interests and agendas of China, as a major power of the world, are open to the whole world, and China in the future “will provide the world with broader market, more sufficient capital, more abundant goods and more precious opportunities for cooperation”, while having the ability to make the world listen to its voice more attentively. With regard to the subject of global governance, China has advocated that what global governance system is better cannot be decided upon by any single country, as the destiny of the world should be in the hands of the people of all countries. In principle, all the parties should stick to the principle of mutual consultation, joint construction and co-sharing, resolve disputes through dialog and differences through consultation. Regarding the critical areas, opening to the outer world does not mean building one’s own backyard, but building the spring garden for co-sharing; the “Belt and Road” initiative is not China’s solo, but a chorus participated in by all countries concerned. **China has also proposed international public security views on nuclear security, maritime cooperation and cyber space order, calling for efforts to make the global village into a “grand stage for seeking common development” rather than a “wrestling arena”; we cannot “set up a stage here, while pulling away a prop there”, but “complement each other to put on a grand show”**. From the orientation of reforms, efforts should be made to better safeguard and expand the legitimate interests of the developing countries and increase the influence of the emerging economies on global governance. Over the past 5 years, China has attached importance to full court diplomacy, gradually coming to the center stage of international politics and proactively establishing principles for global governance. By hosting such important events as IAELM, CICA Summit, G20 Summit, the Belt and Road International Cooperation Forum and BRICS Summit, China has used theseplatforms to elaborate the Asia-Pacific Dream for the first time to the world, expressing China’s views on Asian security and global economic governance, discussing with the countries concerned with the Belt and Road about the synergy of their future development strategies and setting off the “BRICS plus” capacity expansion mechanism, in which China not only contributes its solution and shows its style, but also participates in the shaping of international principles through practice. On promoting the resolution of hot international issues, China abides by the norms governing international relations based on the purposes and principles of the UN Charter, and insists on justice, playing a constructive role as a responsible major power in actively promoting the political accommodation in Afghanistan, mediating the Djibouti-Eritrea dispute, promoting peace talks in the Middle East, devoting itself to the peaceful resolution of the South China Sea dispute through negotiations. In addition, China’s responsibility and quick response to international crises have gained widespread praises, as seen in such cases as assisting Africa in its fight against the Ebola epidemic, sending emergency fresh water to the capital of Maldives and buying rice from Cambodia to help relieve its financial squeeze, which has shown the simple feelings of the Chinese people to share the same breath and fate with the people of other countries. D. To Support the Increase of the Developing Countries’ Voice. The developing countries, especially the emerging powers, are not only the important participants of the globalization process, but also the important direction to which the international power system is transferring. With the accelerating shift of global economic center to emerging markets and developing economies, the will and ability of the developing countries to participate in global governance have been correspondingly strengthened. As the biggest developing country and fast growing major power, China has the same appeal and proposal for governance as other developing countries and already began policy coordination with them, as China should comply with historical tide and continue to support the increase of the developing countries’ voice in the global governance system. To this end, China has pursued the policy of “dialog but not confrontation, partnership but not alliance”, attaching importance to the construction of new type of major power relationship and global partnership network, while making a series proposals in the practice of global governance that could represent the legitimate interests of the developing countries and be conducive to safeguarding global justice, including supporting an open, inclusive, universal, balanced and win-win economic globalization; promoting the reforms on share and voting mechanism of IMF to increase the voting rights and representation of the emerging market economies; financing the infrastructure construction and industrial upgrading of other developing countries through various bilateral or regional funds; and helping other developing countries to respond to such challenges as famine, refugees, climate change and public hygiene by debt forgiveness and assistance.

**We should embrace Chinese soft power- it’s based on principles of self-determination and cooperation that will reduce war and improve global living conditions.**

**Li, PhD, ‘18**

(Eric X., PoliSci@FudanUniversity, CouncilMember@InternationalInstituteStrategicStudies, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/08/20/the-rise-and-fall-of-soft-power/>, August 20) BW

It is possible to aspire to something better this time. And this is where China may come in. In Nye’s original soft power article, China rarely came up. And when it did, it was either lumped in with the Soviet Union or brushed off as a country lacking any ability, hard or soft, to challenge Western dominance. Thirty years later, Nye’s omission seems strange. In the era of soft power, China was the only major country that bucked the trend. It integrated itself into the post-World War II international order by expanding deep and broad cultural and economic ties with virtually all countries in the world. It is now the largest trading nation in the world and in history. But it steadfastly refused to become a customer of Western soft power. It engineered its own highly complex transition from a centrally planned economy to a market economy, yet it refused to allow the market to rise above the state. It rejected Western definitions of democracy, freedom, and human rights, and it retained and strengthened its one-party political system. In soft power terms, China did not agree to want what the West wanted—culturally, ideologically, or institutionally. The result? Contrary to most of the countries that went through the great conversion, China succeeded at a speed and scale unprecedented in human history. The country turned from a poor agrarian backwater into the largest industrial economy in the world by purchasing power parity. In the process of doing so, **it lifted 700 million people out of poverty.** Harvard University’s Graham Allison calls this miracle the “pyramid of poverty.” Forty years ago, nine out 10 Chinese lived under the “extreme poverty line” set by the World Bank. Today, the pyramid has been flipped, with only around 10 percent of Chinese living under that line. Without that reversal, global poverty would likely have increased rather than decreased over the last several decades. Such achievements could be the content of a **new kind of soft power.** Nearly two decades ago, Chinese grand strategist Zheng Bijian coined the term **“peaceful rise”** to articulate China’s aspirations for itself. Over the years, the notion of peaceful rise has encountered much suspicion. Critics, for example, point to tensions in the South China Sea to show that China’s intentions are not, in fact, peaceful. And Allison has warned that, whatever their intentions, the United States and China could still fall into a Thucydides trap, in which the strength of a rising power (China) strikes fear in the incumbent power (the United States), resulting in war. In his recent book, Destined for War, Allison pointed out that most of the 16 such cases of a rising power in history resulted in bloodshed. However, stepping back, it is plain to see that **China’s peaceful rise has already happened**. It is a fact on the ground, as evidenced by the enormity of its economy, its trading volume, and, yes, its increasing military strength. Compared to the rise of other great powers in history—the Athenian Empire, the Roman Empire, the British Empire, America’s manifest destiny, modern Germany, France, and Japan, all of which were accompanied by tremendous violence—China’s rise so far has been bigger and faster than them all. And yet, it has happened peacefully. **No invasion of any other country, no colonization, no war.** Yes, Allison may be right that the psychology of the Thucydides trap is still true. But in **substance, the world has already passed the point** at which such a conflict could be contemplated responsibly. And that is perhaps why China is now refocusing from hard power to soft, even as the rest of the world has seemed to go in the opposite direction. President Xi Jinping, for example, has called for “a community of shared destiny,” in which nations are **allowed their own development paths while working to increase interconnectedness.** In the policy arena, such soft power mostly takes the form of the Belt and Road Initiative, which leverages China’s massive capital and capacity to drive infrastructure-led development in other countries to spur economic growth that would ultimately benefit China itself. It is a new potential soft power proposition: “You don’t have to want to be like us, you don’t have to want what we want; you can participate in a new form of globalization while **retaining your own culture, ideology, and institutions.**” **This is**, in many ways, **the opposite of Nye’s formulation, with all the downfalls that approach entails: overreach, the illusion of universal appeals, and internal and external backlashes.** In the post-Cold War era, the West linked soft power and liberalism, but that coupling was never necessary. In the next century, it may well be soft power decoupled from ideology that could rule the day. There is no illusion, not least in Beijing, that any kind of soft power can exist and succeed without hard power. But China’s proposition is more accommodating of difference. By not forcing other countries into its own mold, China’s new form of soft power can mean a **more peaceful 21st century.** The world should embrace it.

## Case

#### Commercialization is inevitable, and the benefits of space exploration outweigh any defects that it doesn’t already solve for Sharma 9/07/21

(Maanas Sharma, September 7, 2021, Sharma is a journalist for the Journal of Interdisciplinary Public Policy, “The privatized frontier: the ethical implications and role of private companies in space exploration”, [https://www.thespacereview.com/article/4238/1 //](https://www.stltoday.com/opinion/columnists/unions-ignore-long-history-of-excluding-minorities-from-jobs/article_ef58bccd-f04a-5172-8dbd-18b8ee5eb9e2.html%20/)NL)

Another key matter to note is restricted capitalism in space “could also be our salvation.”[11] Private space **exploration could** reap **increas**ed **access to resources and other benefits that can be used to solve the very problems on Earth that critics of capitalism identify**. Since governments offset some of their projects to private companies, **government agencies can focus on altruistic projects that** otherwise would not fit in the budget before and do **not have the immediate commercial use that private companies look for**. Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor of aeronautics and astronautics at Stanford University, discusses how “this strategy allows the space agency to continue ‘exploring the fringe where there really is no business case’” but still has important impacts on people down on Earth.[12] Indeed, this idea is a particularly powerful one when considering the ideal future of private companies in space exploration. Though there is no one set way **governments** will interact with companies, the consensus is that they **must radically reimagine their main purpose as the role of private space exploration continues to grow.** As governments utilize services from private space companies, “[i]nstead of being bogged down by the routine application of old research, **NASA can prioritize** their limited budget to **work** more **on research** of other unknowns **and development of new** long-term space travel **tech**nologies.”[13] According to the Council on Foreign Relations**, such technologies have far-reaching benefits on Earth as well.** Past developments obviously include communications satellites, by themselves a massive benefit to society, but also “refinements in artificial hearts; improved mammograms; and laser eye surgery… thermoelectric coolers for microchips; high-temperature lubricants; and a means for mass-producing carbon nanotubes, a material with significant engineering potential; [and h]ousehold products.”[2**] Agencies like NASA are the only actors able to pursue the next game-changing missions**, “where the profit motive is not as evident and where the barriers to entry are still too high for the private sector to really make a compelling business case.”[8] These technologies have revolutionized millions, if not billions, of lives, demonstrating the remarkable benefits of space exploration. It follows then that **it is net ethical to prioritize these benefits**.