**SET COL K**

**Framing**

Framing for this round is focusing on the discussion of the settler-colonial narrative and how to best address its impact within the world in order to address the consistent narrative. Descendants of colonizers who live on stolen lands have a responsibility to address the perpetual system of settler colonialism. Settler colonialism works to erase indigenous histories and cultures, normalizing their deaths and locking them into a system that perpetuates settlers’ usage of stolen land.

**Cox 17:**

Alicia Cox 26 July 2017. “Settler Colonialism.” *Oxford Bibliographies*, https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0029.xml.

**Settler colonialism is an ongoing system of power that perpetuates the genocide and repression of indigenous peoples and cultures**. Essentially hegemonic in scope, settler colonialism **normaliz[ing]** the **continuous settler occupation, exploiting lands and resources to which indigenous peoples have genealogical relationships**. **Settler colonialism includes interlocking forms of oppression, including racism, white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, and capitalism**. This is because settler colonizers are Eurocentric and assume that European values with respect to ethnic, and therefore moral, superiority are inevitable and natural. However, these **intersecting dimensions of settler colonialism coalesce around the dispossession of indigenous peoples’ lands, resources, and cultures**. The evolving field of settler colonialism studies arose from scholarship in Native American and indigenous studies that engages with postcolonial studies and critiques the post- in “postcolonial” as inappropriate for understanding ongoing systems of domination **in such places as the United States**, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, where **colonialism is not a thing of the past because the settlers have come to stay, displacing the indigenous peoples and perpetuating systems that continue to erase native lives, cultures, and histories.** Foundational theories in settler colonialism studies distinguish settler colonialism from classical colonialism through work that demonstrates that settler colonizers destroy indigenous peoples and cultures in order to replace them and establish themselves as the new rightful inhabitants. In other words, settler colonizers do not merely exploit indigenous peoples and lands for labor and economic interests; they displace them through settlements. In his groundbreaking theory of the “logic of elimination,” Patrick Wolfe shows that **settler colonialism is a system**, not a historical event, and **that** as such it **perpetuates the erasure of native peoples as a precondition for settler expropriation of lands and resources**, providing the necessary conditions for establishing the present-day ideology of multicultural neoliberalism.

**Link**

**The affirmation of the resolution continues to push the narrative of the “white man’s burden”, as well as perpetuating the United States as a legitimate government and owner of the land that it occupies, as the World Trade Organization originated through the push of the United States and other Western nations to create an international trading system.**

**Cimino-Isaacs et al. 20:**

Cathleen D. Cimino-Isaacs, Coordinator Analyst in International Trade and Finance,  Rachel F. Fefer, Analyst in International Trade and Finance, and Ian F. Fergusson, Specialist in International Trade and Finance. “World Trade Organization: Organization and Future Direction.” *Congressional Research Service*, August 21 2020, https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/R/R45417.

Historically, **the United States’ leadership of the global trading system has ensured the United States** a seat at the table to **shape[s] the international trade agenda in ways that** both **advance and defend U.S. interests**. The evolution of U.S. leadership and the global trading system remain of interest to Congress, which holds constitutional authority over foreign commerce and establishes general and principal U.S. trade negotiating objectives through legislation. **Congress has recognized the World Trade Organization (WTO) as the “foundation of the global trading system”** within trade promotion authority (TPA) **and plays a direct legislative and oversight role over WTO agreements**. The statutory basis for U.S. WTO membership is the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (P.L. 103-465), and U.S. priorities and objectives for the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)/WTO have been reflected in various TPA legislation since 1974. Congress also has oversight of the U.S. Trade Representative and other agencies that participate in WTO meetings and enforce WTO commitments.

The WTO is a 164-member international organization that was created to oversee and administer multilateral trade rules, serve as a forum for trade liberalization negotiations, and resolve trade disputes. **The United States was a major force behind the establishment of the WTO** in 1995, **and the rules and agreements resulting from multilateral trade negotiations** since 1947. The WTO encompassed and succeeded the GATT, established in 1947 among the United States and 22 other countries. **Through the** GATT and **WTO, the United States**, with other countries, **sought to establish a more open, rules-based trading system in the postwar era**, with the goal of fostering international economic cooperation and raising economic prosperity worldwide. Today, 98% of global trade is among WTO members.

Affirming perpetuates the establishment of the United States through the WTO, a government who forcefully colonized the land it rests upon, as the existence of the WTO is one of the things that helps the US to defend global trade interests, as well as being a result of the US taking on the “white man’s burden”, believing that they had a responsibility to raise the world’s economic prosperity and cooperation.

**Impact**

**By legitimizing the United States and helping to perpetuate its existence, the affirmative perpetuates a world of settler-colonialism, which in term continues a legacy of oppression, erasure, and genocide.**

**Wolfe 06:**

Wolfe, Patrick.“Settler Colonialism and the elimination of the native.” Journal of Genocide Research, Dec 21 2006, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14623520601056240.

The logic of elimination not only refers to the summary liquidation of Indigenous people, though it includes that. In common with genocide as Raphaël Lemkin characterized it,[6](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14623520601056240) **settler colonialism** has both negative and positive dimensions. Negatively, it **strives for the dissolution of native societies**. Positively, **it erects a new colonial society on the expropriated land base**—as I put it, **settler colonizers come to stay: invasion is a structure not an event**.[7](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14623520601056240) In its positive aspect, **elimination is an organizing principal of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superseded) occurrence**. The positive **outcomes of** the logic of **elimination** can **include officially encouraged miscegenation, the breaking-down of native title into alienable individual freeholds, native citizenship, child abduction, religious conversion, resocialization in total institutions such as missions or boarding schools, and a whole range of cognate biocultural assimilations. All these strategies, including frontier homicide, are characteristic of settler colonialism.** Some of them are more controversial in genocide studies than others. **Settler colonialism destroys to replace.** As Theodor Herzl, founding father of Zionism, observed in his allegorical manifesto/novel, “If I wish to substitute a new building for an old one, I must demolish before I construct.”[8](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14623520601056240) In a kind of realization that took place half a century later, one-time deputy-mayor of West Jerusalem Meron Benvenisti recalled, “As a member of a pioneering youth movement, I myself ‘made the desert bloom’ by uprooting the ancient olive trees of al-Bassa to clear the ground for a banana grove, as required by the ‘planned farming’ principles of my kibbutz, Rosh Haniqra.”[9](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14623520601056240) Renaming is central to the cadastral effacement/replacement of the Palestinian Arab presence that Benvenisti poignantly recounts.[10](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14623520601056240) Comparably, though with reference to Australia, Tony Birch has charted the contradictory process whereby White residents sought to frustrate the (re-) renaming of Gariwerd back from the derivative “Grampians” that these hills had become in the wake of their original owners' forcible dispossession in the nineteenth century.[11](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14623520601056240) Ideologically, however, there is a major difference between the Australian and Israeli cases. The prospect of Israeli authorities changing the Hebrew place-names whose invention Benvenisti has described back to their Arabic counterparts is almost unimaginable. In Australia, by contrast (as in many other settler societies), the erasure of indigeneity conflicts with the assertion of settler nationalism. On the one hand, settler society required the practical elimination of the natives in order to establish itself on their territory. On the symbolic level, however, settler society subsequently sought to recuperate indigeneity in order to express its difference—and, accordingly, its independence—from the mother country. Hence it is not surprising that a progressive Australian state government should wish to attach an indigenous aura to a geographical feature that bore the second-hand name of a British mountain range. Australian public buildings and official symbolism, along with the national airlines, film industry, sports teams and the like, are distinguished by the ostentatious borrowing of Aboriginal motifs. For nationalist purposes, it is hard to see an alternative to this contradictory reappropriation of a foundationally disavowed Aboriginality. The ideological justification for the dispossession of Aborigines was that “we” could use the land better than they could, not that we had been on the land primordially and were merely returning home. One cannot imagine the Al-Quds/Jerusalem suburb of Kfar Sha'ul being renamed Deir Yasin. Despite this major ideological difference, however, Zionism still betrays a need to distance itself from its European origins that recalls the settler anxieties that characterize Australian national discourse. Yiddish, for instance, was decisively rejected in favour of Hebrew—a Hebrew inflected, what is more, with the accents of the otherwise derided Yemeni mizrachim. Analogously, as Mark LeVine has noted, though the Zionist modernization of the Arab city of Jaffa was intended to have a certain site specificity, “in fact Jaffa has had to be emptied of its Arab past and Arab inhabitants in order for architects to be able to reenvision the region as a ‘typical Middle Eastern city’.”

[...]

**The tide of history canonizes the fait accompli, harnessing the diplomatic niceties of the law of nations to the maverick rapine of the squatters' posse within a cohesive project that implicates individual and nation-state, official and unofficial alike**. Over the Green Line today, Ammana, the settler advance-guard of the fundamentalist Gush Emunim movement, hastens apace with the construction of its facts on the ground. In this regard, the settlers are maintaining a tried and tested Zionist strategy—Israel's 1949 campaign to seize the Negev before the impending armistice was codenamed Uvda, Hebrew for “fact.”29 As Bernard Avishai lamented of the country he had volunteered to defend, “settlements were made in the territories beyond the Green Line so effortlessly after 1967 because the Zionist institutions that built them and the laws that drove them … had all been going full throttle within the Green Line before 1967. To focus merely on West Bank settlers was always to beg the question.”30 In sum, then, **settler colonialism is an inclusive, land-centred project that coordinates a comprehensive range of agencies, from the metropolitan centre to the frontier encampment, with a view to eliminating Indigenous societies.** Its operations are not dependent on the presence or absence of formal state institutions or functionaries. Accordingly—to begin to move toward the issue of genocide—the occasions on or the extent to which settler colonialism conduces to genocide are not a matter of the presence or absence of the formal apparatus of the state.

**Alt**

**The alternative is decolonization, which allows us to reject prevailing narratives of settler colonialism.**

**Cox 17:**

Alicia Cox 26 July 2017. “Settler Colonialism.” *Oxford Bibliographies*, https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0029.xml.

**Decolonizing theories and narratives reject the notion of Western superiority. Decolonization remains an evolving concept that assumes we may transform current colonial conditions and work to build indigenous peoples’ futurity in the face of ongoing settler-colonial attempts to eliminate native peoples.** Haunani-Kay Trask ([Trask 1999](https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0029.xml#obo-9780190221911-0029-bibItem-0046)) and other scholars define **decolonization as the theory and practice of working to achieve indigenous peoples’ empowerment and justice**. Some scholars contend that the de- in decolonization falsely suggests that we can undo the processes of colonization and return to a pure, authentic precolonial way of being indigenous. This fantasy is a dangerous one not only because it is impossible but because it excludes indigenous people who don’t meet traditional standards of native identity. [Goodyear-Ka‘ōpua 2013](https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0029.xml#obo-9780190221911-0029-bibItem-0043) addresses the difficulties of putting decolonization theories into practice. [Arvin, et al. 2013](https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0029.xml#obo-9780190221911-0029-bibItem-0041) and [Smith 2012](https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0029.xml#obo-9780190221911-0029-bibItem-0045) argue that **decolonization involves indigenous peoples’ interventions in scholarship about native peoples and the creation of alliances to transform settler-colonial processes in the academy**. [Brooks 2008](https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0029.xml#obo-9780190221911-0029-bibItem-0042) and [Silva 2004](https://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780190221911/obo-9780190221911-0029.xml#obo-9780190221911-0029-bibItem-0044) highlight native peoples’ use of writing to provide revisionist histories of settler colonization.

**ROB/ROJ**

**The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best confronts the consequences of settler colonialism. This requires the neg’s approach of decolonization, since education of colonial ideologies is active decolonization. More ballots allow us to spread our advocacy, and this is inherently beneficial for education and the debate space. We seek to increase voices against structures such as the WTO that increase structural violence against native tribes.**

**T**

**Interpretation: The affirmative may not defend a subset of medicines**

**Violation: they do**

**Specific instances don’t affirm generics – past topics prove**

**Nebel 19** (Jake Nebel, assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs, “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution” August 12 2019, vbriefly,<https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14>) //triumph debate

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

**Standards –**

**1 – precision – debating the topic as written is key to precise engagement – anything else sets a norm of arbitrarily changing words and phrases in the res – this makes negating impossible because the neg has the burden of rejoined and the aff is a moving target. Kills fairness because the neg can never link offense into the aff –**

**2 – limits- kills neg ability to prep because there are infinite plans that can all no-link neg offense – topic  generics don’t solve because spec plans can no link them. kills fairness because under resourced debaters can’t keep up with thousands of tiny affs and kills education because we never get in depth engagement.**

**3 – ground – spec affs kill neg ground by taking away wholeres disads and counterplans – mooting neg generics sets a terrible norm that incentivizes affirmative debaters to write the tiniest, most unnegatable affs – kills fairness because aff always wins if there’s no neg lit base and kills education because the neg can’t debate the topic and is forced to read generics everyone’s already heard**

**TVA – read your aff as an advantage of a wholeres plan**

**Voters –**

**1 -- Fairness – you need fairness to evaluate debate rounds – the judge needs to vote for the better debater not the better cheater. Unfair advantages in debate rounds make decisions illegitimate and hurt our ability to access real world skills. If they try to go for “fairness bad” then just vote neg because it means you’re under no obligation to evaluate their arguments fairly.**

**2 – education – it’s a voter because it’s the reason schools fund debate and the only portable skills we gain from debate are a result of education – knowing how to discuss the merits of broad policy options has more real world implications than knowing how to go for an rvi or knowing how to defend policies that are so obscure they’d never be passed.**

**Paradigm issues –**

**1 – No RVIs**

**a] logic – you don’t get to win just for proving you’re topical**

**2 – competing interpretations over reasonability**

**a] arbitrariness – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention**

**b] brightlines mean competing interps – it becomes a debate of whose brightline is best which is the same thing as competing interps – you’re debating about whose model is best**

**3 – drop the debater**

**a] logic – drop the argument doesn’t make sense – the shell indics their entire advocacy**