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## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must not defend the creation of a binding international agreement that treats space as a global commons subject to regulatory delimiting and global liability.

#### “is” is – Merriam Webster ND:

Webster ND Definition of IS," Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is> IS

is Definition of is (Entry 1 of 4) present tense third-person singular of BE dialectal present tense first-person and third-person singular of BE dialectal present tense plural of BE

#### Dialectical present tense means logical coherence which implies no implementation

Your Dictionary ND, , "Dialectical Meaning," No Publication, <https://www.yourdictionary.com/dialectical> Cho

The definition of dialectical is a discussion that includes logical reasoning and dialogue, or something having the sounds, vocabulary and grammar of a specific way of speaking. An example of something dialectical is a Lincoln Douglass style of debate, where both parties argue a point in a logical order. Of, or pertaining to dialectic; logically reasoned through the exchange of opposing ideas.

#### “BE” is a linking verb, not an action verb so implementation is incoherent

Grammar Monster ND "Linking Verbs," Grammar Monster, <https://www.grammar-monster.com/glossary/linking_verbs.htm> CHO

What Are Linking Verbs? (with Examples) A linking verb is used to re-identify or to describe its subject. A linking verb is called a linking verb because it links the subject to a subject complement (see graphic below). Infographic Explaining Linking Verb A linking verb tells us what the subject is, not what the subject is doing. Easy Examples of Linking Verbs In each example, the linking verb is highlighted and the subject is bold. Alan is a vampire. (Here, the subject is re-identified as a vampire.) Alan is thirsty. (Here, the subject is described as thirsty.)
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#### Violation: They do

#### 1] Limits – they explode them – they are super Extra T and justify an infinite possible number of affirmatives and different actors – none of which are part of the resolution which means there is no prediction ground. Multiple Impacts – A] Stable Ground – they deck neg preparation ability and impose an infinitely reciprocal research burden on the negative to have to guess the infinite policy options and possible permutations and to cut specific disads to those - B] Predictability – no actor or action means its impossible to have a way to predict affs on this topic which decks quality engagement and education – C] Infinite Abuse – being non-topical justifies picking a trivially true aff which means they always win

#### 2] Ground – their hyperspecific actor resolves all the reasons private space is bad decking neg ground – I can’t read stuff about disorganization, exploitation by companies, inequality created by access to space, and tons more

#### 3] TVA – implement OST

#### Vote of fairness a] debate is a game that needs rules b] skews substance

#### Competing interps over reasonability a] intervention b] collapses

#### Drop the debater – a] its T b] deter future abuse

#### No RVIs a] logic b] baiting c] chilling

## 2

#### The 1AC’s model of debate and discourse is structured on the erasure of indigenous bodies and epistemologies. Settler colonialism is a structure not an event that infiltrates the status quo on every level. Every move we, as settlers, take on indigenous land for “well-being” is really just to hide the project of ongoing colonialism in attempt to forget the past, justifying settler moves to innocence that require slightly “recognizing” indigenous communities to mask our guilt. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best methodology that actively resists the project of settler colonialism. Only through the resistance of settler colonialism can we achieve the goodness they will talk about – its form over content – Shaw 20:

Shaw, Devin Z., [Devin Zane Shaw teaches philosophy at Douglas College, British Columbia. He is author of several books, including Philosophy of Antifascism: Punching Nazis and Fighting White Supremacy (Rowman and Littlefield International, 2020).] “The Politics of the Blockade” (February, 2020). // LHP PS

**We settlers face a choice: decolonization or white suprem-acy.** **The status quo is settler colonialism: a project of white supremacy, capital accumulation, resource extraction, and Indigenous dispossession. We, settlers, have made excuses for too long.** **For too long we have repeated our homilies as settler moves to innocence: "strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or respon-sibility without giving up land or power or privilege, with-out having to change much at all.**"4 **In Canada, we celebrate Reconciliation because Reconciliation ensconces colonial-ism in the distant past.** When **Indigenous peoples reoccupy Parliament Hill during Canada's sesquicentennial, we say that we gave them the former U.S. embassy for a cultural centre.** **When Indigenous peoples demand the recognition of Indigenous title, we deliver land acknowledgements**. **When Gerald Stanley is acquitted for the death of Coulton Boushie, we say that there are concrete flaws in the judicial system, but due process is fundamentally sound.** When **the RCMP invades unceded Wet'suwet'en territory** now, **we say** that **all peoples must recognize** **the** rule of **law**. **But Wet'suwet'en claims to title were legally recognized in Delgamuukw v. British Columbia in 1997 (the precedent, in fact, of the Tsilhqot'in decision of 2014) though without the adjudication of their specific land or territorial claim**. **Every time Indigenous peoples are given to wait, for justice will come, only the RCMP shows up.** **We settlers cannot place the burden of decolonization on Indigenous peoples alone, though we must also recognize that decolonization demands that we uproot long-standing structures of our world,** **that we must struggle against our own self-interests and our identities, for we have come to recognize ourselves in the institutions of settler-colonialism and in the prospects of settler futurity.** Such a struggle will be fraught with numerous failures. But g**iven the status quo, our choices are either decolonization or white supremacy.** Perhaps I have cast the choice as too stark a dilemma. I would suggest, however, that **we begin** from this dilemma **to measure our responsibility for the status quo.** **Black and Indigenous voices demand this of us.** But **our own intellectual traditions do, too**. I **think** here **of Jean-Paul Sartre's existen**-**talism**, which emphasized the freedom, agency, and respon-sibility of every human being. In Being and Nothingness, **Sartre** also **asserts** that **our individual freedom and the choices we make only make sense in our given historical and social situation.** Given that he was writing in the early 1940s, **Sartre characterizes human freedom and responsibility in the con-text of the Second World War and the Occupation of France.** He writes: the situation is mine because it is the image of my free choice of myself, and everything which it presents to me is mine in that this represents me and symbolizes me.…Thus there are no accidents in a life; a community event which suddenly bursts forth and involves me in it does not come from the outside. If I am mobilized in a war, this is my war; it is in my image and I deserve it.5 Philosophers often discuss this account of freedom and responsibility as if they were making choices in Sartre's cir-cumstances, as if we could readily transplant those circum- stances to our present situation. We consider the responsi-bilities attendant on joining the military to fight Germany, becoming an accomplice of Occupation, or ignoring the war because it would not affect us. We consider how each choice impinges on us due to circumstances that are not of our choos-ing. But the choices are easy, for we will never be forced to choose in those precise historical circumstances. **However, if we take Sartre's concept of responsibility seriously, we ought to consider our own situation before its possibilities have been decided. We ought to consider moral choices that implicate our actions and our responsibility.** **North America as we know it is premised on centuries of set-tler colonialism, but the future of settler colonialism has yet to be decided. We settlers have for too long made excuses. We have buried colonization in our past**, but as Patrick **Wolfe argues, settler colonialism is a structure (with legal, cultural, and social ramifications) and not an event (a moment in the past, now over).** That is, **settler colonialism is an ongoing project, and thus it is a situation that demands that we make a choice. For too long, we've evoked the politics of civility and tone-policing to silence the legitimate anger and indignation of Indigenous peoples. For too long, we've evoked the rule of law, as if it weren't already the law of the settler-colonizer. For too long, we've pointed toward historical progress and social justice, as if it will arrive inevitably, regardless of our actions and choices, but not now.** **For too long, we've chosen the status quo because we have refused to imagine an alter-native -or imagine, pitifully, all the alternatives to be worse. And for our pusillanimity, we bear responsibility for the ongo-ing project of settler colonialism, white supremacy, capital accumulation, and Indigenous dispossession. These choices have led us to our present, which prioritizes yet another pipe-line over the rights of the Wet'suwet'en, or, writ large, white settler futurity over Indigenous futurity. It does not have to be that way. Now we settlers must choose our future.** The ques-tion is: where do you stand?

#### Don’t be fooled by the aff’s claims to anti-capitalism—all they do is trade globalist capitalist exploitation for mercantilist capitalist exploitation. Private entities don’t need to appropriate themselves if they can rely on the colonial state to do it for them; the aff only dooms us to replicate the logic of the railroad, where the colonial state did the appropriating of indigenous lands to hand them over for financialization as a way to reinforce whiteness. Gal 21

The Interstellar Railroad, or Speculation and Shareholder Whiteness in the Space Economy Réka Patrícia Gál April 14, 2021

Indeed, **Musk has** carefully **positioned his company as a space transportation company, and has explicitly compared the SpaceX project to building the Union-Pacific Railroad — for space** (Robertson 2016). The colonial comparison is not surprising (Cowen 2020). **Proponents of space colonization have long drawn parallels to the colonization of the Americas, enthusiastically representing frontier pioneering and imperialist expansionism as imperative to US American national identity** (Billings 2007). The explicit comparison to North American railroad construction hints at a specific trend of space colonization advocacy that is focused on stimulating commercial space operations. **The industrialist argument is that just as the construction of the transcontinental railroad was best undertaken by private entrepreneurs who were incentivized by the government with land grants and subsidies, the US American government should similarly aid private entrepreneurs** **in the establishment of the New Space industry** (Mazlish 1965, Launius 2014, McCurdy 2019a). In fact, from the founding of SpaceX up to 2012, the additional government funding provided to SpaceX raised returns on investment by more than two percent--this is approximately the same return that a nineteenth century investor might have expected to gain if the railroad company they invested in received federal land grant subsidies (McCurdy 2019b, 48). **Looking at the transcontinental railroad and current space colonial initiatives in parallel can therefore provide a helpful analytic for understanding, and struggling against, such a colonial expansion.** What questions and conceptual understandings can thinking of commercial space travel alongside the transcontinental railroad generate? I am particularly interested in thinking this analogy through some of the concepts advanced by Manu Karuka in his recent monograph Empire’s Tracks (2019). Karuka argues that **the construction of the transcontinental railroad was foundational to the development of the modern US colonial state, which grew in tandem with finance capitalism and the modern corporation.** Karuka’s systematic analysis unveils two central concepts that are useful for understanding the outer spatial analogies. First, that the financial speculation accompanying the gold rush was foundational to the establishment of the settler society’s extractive social order. And second, that the logic of corporate shareholding has served, and continues to serve, as the core vehicle upholding the white supremacist social order. While SpaceX stocks are not publicly available yet, numerous venture capital firms have invested in the aerospace company, with some key investors being Peter Thiel’s Founders Fund, Google, and the Bank of America (McCurdy 2019a). **A landscape of speculation enfolds over the lonesome weightlessness of outer space as these powerful companies are investing towards capitalizing on future shareholding profits.** A future, which has been called into question by numerous people, because, as Shannon Stirone has put it simply: “Mars is a hellhole. [...] Mars will kill you.” Stirone explains that Mars has a very thin atmosphere and no magnetic field, which means that it has extremely high radiation, and no breathable air. All the while, the surface of the planet is −63 °C, and dust storms are extremely common. These concerns, however, continue to be ignored in favor of high-risk investment. The corporate expansion into outer space is coated in a language of equality – of providing equal access to the wonders of outer space for all. An example of this is the recent private mission into space entitled Inspiration4, which developed in cooperation with the online payments startup Shift4Payments, and is currently raffling a seat to a random winner. The lottery acts as aspirational evidence of equal opportunity: Musk claims that these private missions are necessary to eventually make it possible for “everyone” to go to space (Chang, 2021). But **Musk’s vision of making space travel affordable through economies of scale can only be made possible by creating initial demand through aspirational marketing. Just as railroad companies, aided by government grants and loosened regulations, facilitated the westward expansion of European colonists over Indigenous lands, so ought the colonization of Mars create a pastoral utopia in which inspiration and creativity for all abound.** Exactly how a trip to a Martian colony could be paid by anyone was revealed in recent Tweets by Musk in which he has reinvented indentured servitude for extraplanetary colonization (McKay 2020). **Territorial expansion, based on financial speculation, facilitated by corporations and using unfree imported laborers is exactly what Karuka unveils about the logics of railroad colonialism**. He explains, As investors became increasingly disconnected from the sources of their revenue, financial profits seemed to arise through agreements between individuals, seemingly separated from, even independent of, the sweat of specific bodies in specific places. With the maturation of the modern corporation in the wake of emancipation, investors imagined financial accumulation as autonomous from labor, whiteness as autonomous from blackness and indigeneity. (2019, 150) Here I want to hone in on Karuka’s key concept of shareholder whiteness. Karuka explains that slaveholders maintained their economic advantages after the emancipation of slaves by excluding Black people, the Chinese workers who constructed the railroad, and the Indigeous peoples whose lands they occupied, from corporate ownership. According to Karuka, “**Racism is an effect, not a cause, of imperialism**. [...] Whiteness is fiction, not a biological reality, [...] Finance capital and whiteness ripened through a historical elaboration of relationships between imperial corporations and colonial states, forging and sustaining continental imperialism” (Karuka 2019, 150). The extension into the cosmos has already been theorized by scholars as a way to allow for the unfettered continuation of capitalist accumulation, and the New Space companies of the last decade have repeatedly claimed humanity’s extension into the cosmos as an inevitable consequence of “progress” (Dickens 2007; Valentine 2012; Klinger 2017). **With little left on Earth to be financialized, companies are turning outer space itself into an asset. I could hardly think of a better example of fictitious capital that would produce such profound alien-ation from the act of production**. Whether we are thinking of asteroid mining, space settlements, or simply private space voyages, the shareholders are, and will continue to be, removed from production on our planet, but will in the event of space colonization also be separated from it by several atmospheric layers, hatches, pressurized rooms, and spacesuits. Karuka writes, **“the future of the corporation presupposes the future of the colonial state, and the law of the corporation colonizes the future”** (2019, 153), and his analysis of the role of the modern corporation in the establishment of the US colonial state proves to be an entirely-too fitting prediction of a future neoliberal space dystopia**. The particular colonial expansion perpetrated through the railroad was achieved through “blending the economic and military functions of the state”** (Karuka 2019, xiv). The policing of racial and territorial borders was at the heart of imperial expansion as the colonizing states guarded reservation borders as sites of containment. **It also allowed the states to enforce the rules of colonial market relations on occupied Indigenous lands. To this day, the militaries of the US naval empire serve the vital functions of presenting their interests at sea. This produces another apt analogy when we consider the same mercantilist logic is being extended into space with the recent development of the United States Space Force, a new branch of the Armed Forces that is meant to facilitate, and ultimately guard, the supremacy of the United States in outer space.** **Rather than produce a new world or a vastly different future, interstellar-railroad-colonialism seems to aim, at best, to re-entrench and, at worst, to** exacerbate **the ongoing inequalities that exist on Earth**. This is especially true for conditions produced in and through colonial relations. Space exploration is explicitly settler-colonial**.** It projects the same logic of terra nullius into outer space that was used as a justification for the appropriation and colonization of the North American lands that were inhabited by various Indigenous nations, while also reproducing existing colonial relations on Earth through the expansion of space colonization infrastructure. For example, the observatories, telescopes, and other space exploration related buildings continue to be erected on Indigenous lands all over Earth, from Hawaiʻi, through French Guiana all the way to Aolepān Aorōkin Ṃajeḷ (Marshall Islands) (Smiles 2020; Prescod-Weinstein et al. 2020; Durrani 2019). As his Tweet about indentured servitude in space shows, Musk is already counting on the extension of the (likely racialized) material exploitative practices from Earth to outer space. But this is also the one major difference between railroad colonialism and space colonization: while the colonial expansion in North America was articulated as the colonizing European’s ongoing fight against the sovereignty of the Indigenous peoples of Turtle Island**, the fight over territory in outer space might not be fought against extraterrestrial natives. Instead, it will likely continue to be fought against the sovereignty of Indigenous peoples on Earth, and in space, against other spacefaring nations, such as China and India.** As such, what remains open for me is to what extent shareholder whiteness remains the same, or transforms with this move of the corporation into outer space. Will whiteness remain the currency of the future, or will the shareholder privilege of the future turn towards something else, something new yet equally insidious? How does shareholder whiteness function under a global economy? And more importantly, what tools for resistance can we learn from those who struggled against colonial expansion and specifically, the transcontinental railroad? Can we break with the logics of finance capital, empire, and whiteness in interstellar space, and speculate towards a better future?

#### The alternative is to make space for indigenous futurist reimagining of the relationship between the NDN and the state. It’s a prerequisite to any reconceptualization of land ownership and requires the capability to appropriate space making it mutually exclusive to the aff. The aff reinforces the settler view of relation to land with their flattened understanding of appropriation. Cornum 15.

https://thenewinquiry.com/the-space-ndns-star-map/

**For indigenous futurism**, technology is inextricable from the social. **Human societies are part of a network of wider relationships with objects**, animals, geological formations and so on. **To grasp our relationship with the non-human world here on Earth, we must also extend our understanding of how Earth relates to the entirety of the cosmos.** We live on just one among millions of planets, each an intricate and delicate system within a larger, increasing complex structure. For the indigenous futurist endeavor, striving to understand the ever-multiplying connections linking us to the beginning of the universe and its constant expansion also entails unraveling the intricate relations that make up our Earthly existence. Zainab Amadahy, who identifies as a person of mixed black, Cherokee and European ancestry, grounds her writing practice in illuminating and understanding networks of relationships: “I aspire to write in a way that views possible alternatives through the lens of a relationship framework, where I can demonstrate our connectivity to and interdependence with each other and the rest of our Relations.” **Her** 1992 novel ***The Moons of Palmares*** examines the relationships, both harmful and collaborative, between indigenous peoples and descendants of slaves in an outer space setting that merges histories of the Black Atlantic with the colonial frontier. In a provocative bit of plotting, she casts an indigenous character, Major Eaglefeather, as an oppressive foreign force in the lives of an outer space labor population that has shaped its society in remembrance of black slave resistance in North/South America and the Caribbean. The story **follows Major Eaglefeather’s decision to reject his ties to the corporate state and support a rebel group of laborers**. The name Palmares is taken from a real-world settlement founded by escaped slaves in 17th-century Brazil, which is also known to have incorporated indigenous peoples and some poor, disenfranchised whites. In a chronicle written in the late 17th century, these *quilombos* are described as networks of settlements that lived off the land and were supplemented by raids on the slave plantations where the inhabitants were formerly held**. It is said that in Palmares the king was called Gangasuma, a hybrid term meaning “great lord” composed of the Angolan or Bandu word *ganga* and the Tupi word *assu*. The word succinctly captures the mixture of cultures that banded together in Palmares to live together on the margins of a colonialist, slave-holding society. While Palmares was eventually destroyed in a military campaign, it lives on as a legend of slave rebellion and utopian possibility that Amadahy finds well suited for her outer space story about collaborative resistance to state power and harmful resource extraction processes. Outer space, perhaps because of its appeal to our sense of endless possibility, has become the imaginative site for re-envisioning how black, indigenous and other oppressed people can relate to each other outside of and despite the colonial gaze.** Amadahy’s work is crucial for a critical understanding of the space NDN. **The space NDN cannot allow him or herself to fall into the patterns of domination and kyriarchy that have for too long prevailed here on Earth as well as speculative narratives of outer space. Afrofuturists have looked to space as the site for black separatism and liberation. If the space NDN is truly committed to being responsible to all our relations, it is imperative for our futurist vision to be in solidarity with and service to our fellow Afrofuturist space travelers. Our collective refusal of colonial progress (namely, our destruction) means we must chart other ways to the future that lead us and other oppressed peoples to the worlds we deserve.** *The Moons of Palmares* works toward this end by revealing the strong connections between indigenous and black histories, narratives and ways of living. **Indigenous futurism is indebted to Afrofuturism: Both forms of futurism explore spaces and times outside the control of colonial powers and white supremacy.** These alternative conceptions of time reject the notion that all tradition is regressive by narrating futures intimately connected to the past. SF and specifically the site of outer space give writers and thinkers the imaginative room to envision political and cultural relationships and the future decolonizing movements they might nourish. This focus on relationship, especially as posited by Amadahy, also accounts for those forms of indigeneity that persist among peoples either stolen from their lands or whose lands have been stolen from them. As the writer Sydette Harry recently posted on Twitter, “Black people are displaced indigenous people.” However, because of the processes of forced relocation and slavery and continuing anti-black racism, black people are often denied claims to indigeneity. There is also a pernicious erasure of black NDNs in America and Canada. **In exploring outer space, black authors are also able to assert their own relationship to land both on Earth and in the cosmos.** The Black Land Project (BLP), while not an explicitly futurist organization, fosters the kind of relationships to land on Earth that futurist authors and thinkers envision in outer space. In a recent podcast, *Blacktracking through Afrofuturism*, BLP founder and director Mistinguette Smith discusses how walking over the routes of the Underground Railroad brought forth alternate dimensions and understandings of time outside the settler paradigm of ownership. These are aspects of relating to land that the Afrofuturist and the space NDN (identities which can exist in the same person) bring with them on their travels. This focus on relationship rather than a strict idea of location speaks to the way in which the space NDN can remain secure in their indigenous identity even while rocketing through dark skies far from their origins**.** This is not to demean the work of land protectors and defenders who risk serious repercussions for resisting corporate and state encroachment on indigenous territories. **The space NDN supports those who are able and choose to remain on the land, while also hoping to broaden understandings of indigeneity outside simple location**. **Locations of course are never simple. It is the settler who wishes to flatten the relation between place and people by claiming land through ownership. Projecting themselves forward into faraway lands and times, the space NDN reveals the myriad ways of relating to land beyond property.**

## Case

### OV

#### International law’s origins are based on the racist refusal to acknowledge Native sovereignty. Treaty authority is predicated on the nonexistence of indigenous governance and seeks to reconcile Native indifference through genocidal means. Scott 18,

(Xavier Scott, Department of Philosophy, York University, Repairing Broken Relations by Repairing Broken Treaties: Theorizing Post-Colonial States in Settler Colonies, Studies in Social Justice, Volume 12, Issue 2, 388-405, 2018, JKS)

The divisibility of sovereignty in the case of non-Europeans allowed colonial states to grant them partial recognition in the form of quasi-sovereignty, thereby enabling the local people to enter into treaties that they could be punished for violating (through just war doctrine) but which could be unilaterally broken by the colonial power once they were no longer politically expedient. Since all the nations of the world are part of a single international community, no country has the right to invade any other. Yet that community was not founded on universal principles, but was based on a European consensus. Since recognition was the basis for membership in the “international community” and the original members of the jus gentium were all European (in practice, if not in theory), the Westphalian system would seem to promote conquest and colonialism abroad, even as it promoted mutual recognition within Europe. The legacy of the Westphalian peace has been a system that simultaneously maintains the historical legality of colonialism, while rejecting it as a principle of justice. The origins of international law were inherently unjust and based on a racist refusal to acknowledge Indigenous sovereignty in its entirety. However, in recognizing the moral and legal chicanery that was required to deny Indigenous sovereignty, we can lay the groundwork for understanding the sovereign violence that European powers committed and how that was then tied to the numerous forms of injustice committed afterwards. Not only did Indigenous peoples have political societies, but European sovereigns and jurists regularly recognized their sovereignty by signing over 800 treaties with different Indigenous communities (Kickingbird, 1995). Siegfried Wiessner (1995) divides the treaty-making conventions between the United States and Indigenous communities into two time periods – prior to and following the end of the War of 1812. Prior to this date, treaties were concluded on a relatively equal basis. They fully recognized the Indigenous governance structures and were ratified by the U.S. Senate using the language of international law. Once the threat of other colonial powers was over, treaties became increasingly used “to regularize and channel the removal of Indians from their traditional vast hunting and fishing grounds to ever smaller, ever more barren areas of land” (Wiessner, 1995, p. 577). The War of 1812 marks a switch from the nation-to-nation relationships that characterized earlier agreements, to a new species of treaty which deprived Indigenous communities of nationhood. I call the means by which colonial states appropriated Indigenous sovereignty “theft,” since it deprived Indigenous peoples of their right to selfdetermination and full use of their traditional territories. Moreover, the quasisovereignty that was granted to Indigenous peoples made the destruction of their communities a requirement to establish the legitimacy of the colonial power’s occupation. Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel argue that contemporary settlers are no longer trying to eradicate Indigenous peoples as bodies, but rather “as peoples through the erasure of the histories and geographies that provide the foundation for Indigenous cultural identities and sense of self” (2005, p. 598; emphasis in original). This is both a continuation of the desire to appropriate Indigenous land and an attempt to foreclose the possibility that land that has already been annexed by colonists be returned. Indigenous sovereignty in its current form in the British colonial states continues to act as a form of “quasi-sovereignty” the goal and legacy of which are the assimilation and destruction of Indigenous peoples. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015) has outlined the crimes the Canadian government committed against Indigenous peoples. While the summary of their findings focuses on the cultural genocide the Canadian state engaged in through residential schools, it acknowledges the physical and biological genocides engaged in by the state as well. It states: Canada asserted control over Aboriginal land. In some locations, Canada negotiated Treaties with First Nations; in others, the land was simply occupied or seized. The negotiation of Treaties, while seemingly honourable and legal, was often marked by fraud and coercion, and Canada was, and remains, slow to implement their provisions and intent. (Truth & Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015, p. 1) Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd (2008) issued an apology for the “Stolen Generation,” which took Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families. The U.S. issued its apology to Indigenous peoples, hidden in section 8113 of a 2010 Defense Appropriations Act. It acknowledges “that there have been years of official depredations, illconceived policies, and the breaking of covenants by the Federal Government regarding Indian tribes” and also “many instances of violence, maltreatment, and neglect inflicted on Native Peoples by citizens of the United States” (111th Congress, 2009, s.8113). All three of these apologies profess a desire to “remove a stain from its past” (Truth & Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015, p. 237), for “the nation to turn a new page” (Rudd, 2008), and look towards a future “where all the people of this land live reconciled as brothers and sisters” (111th Congress, 2009, s.8113). Yet the Australian apology made no reference to reparations, the American apology contains a disclaimer that nothing in it is meant to “serve as any settlement against the United States” (111th Congress, 2009, s.8113), and while Canada has attached its apology to court mandated reparations payments, it has failed to reform its relationship with Indigenous peoples by (for example) reforming the 1876 Indian Act. The existence of sovereignty in a colonial context is predicated on the nonsovereignty of Indigenous peoples. At best, they are granted a form of “quasisovereignty” that is not taken seriously by the international state system and is generally considered to be a temporary stage in the integration of Indigenous peoples into the colonial state.5 The quasi-status of their sovereignty is not a step on the path towards full sovereignty, but towards destruction and the seamless transfer of sovereignty from them to the colonial state. In their critique of the literature on post-colonial theory and antiracist work, Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua ask, “what does it mean to look at Canada as colonized space?” (2005, p. 123). Because settler states are founded on policies that combine extermination and assimilation, the continued existence of Indigenous peoples as peoples depends on the full recognition of their inherent sovereignty. For this reason: To speak of Indigenous nationhood is to speak of land as Indigenous, in ways that are neither rhetorical nor metaphorical. Neither Canada, nor the United States – or the settler states of “Latin” America for that matter – which claim sovereignty over the territory they occupy, have a legitimate basis to anchor their absorption of huge portions of that territory. (Lawrence & Dua, 2005, p. 124) To claim respect for Indigenous sovereignty, therefore, is to deny the legal legitimacy of Settler colonies. This is because of the territoriality and legal supremacy claims of sovereign states. While the development of international law has served to strip Indigenous peoples of their traditional lands, it also contains a number of mechanisms that have been used in other contexts of occupation, violence, and genocide. First, the principle of pacta sunt servanda is the cornerstone of international law (Uribe, 2010; Wiessner 1995) – states are required to abide by their word. The fact that colonial powers broke their treaties with Indigenous governments ought not to mean that it is thereby nullified, but rather that “there may be legal consequences” (Kickingbird, 1995, p. 603). Furthermore, the principle of sovereignty contains a right to reassert authority when territory is unjustly annexed. When a state’s sovereignty is violated, international law calls for its restoration. Following Kirke Kickingbird, I believe that “treaties form the backdrop of the past, confirm rights in the present and provide the basic definition for the evolving future” (1995, p. 605). Only by respecting the traditional rights of Indigenous peoples – including rights to their territories – can colonial states repair the sovereign wrong done in the abrogation of their duty to stand by their treaties.

### Mining

#### Mining fails – gravity, power, and economics, Fickling 20:

David Fickling, [David Fickling is a Bloomberg Opinion columnist covering commodities, as well as industrial and consumer companies. He has been a reporter for Bloomberg News, Dow Jones, the Wall Street Journal, the Financial Times and the Guardian.] “We earthlings are never going to mine asteroids for minerals,” December 22, 2020, <https://www.livemint.com/opinion/columns/we-earthlings-are-never-going-to-mine-asteroids-for-minerals-11608650916882.html> //LHP AV

**One factor rules out most space mining** at the outset: **gravity**. On one hand, **it guarantees that most** of the solar system’s **best mineral resources are** to be found **under** **our** **feet**. Earth is the largest rocky planet orbiting the sun. As a result, **the cornucopia of minerals the globe attracted as it coalesced is as rich as will be found this side of Alpha Centauri**. **Gravity poses a technical problem, too**. **Escaping Earth’s gravitational field makes transporting the volumes of material needed in a mining operation hugely expensive**. **On Falcon** Heavy, the large rocket being developed by Elon Musk’s SpaceX, transporting a **payload** to the orbit of Mars comes to as little **as $5,357 per kilogram**, a drastic reduction in normal launch costs. Still, **at those prices just lofting a single half-tonne drilling rig to the asteroid belt would use up the annual exploration budget** of a small mining firm. **Power is another issue**. The international space station, with 35,000 sq ft of solar arrays, generates up to 120 kilowatts of electricity. **That drill would need a similar-sized power plant**. **Power demands rise sharply once you move from exploration drilling to mining and processing**. **Bringing material back** to Earth **would raise the costs even more**. Japan’s Hayabusa2 satellite spent six years and 16.4 billion yen ($157 million) recovering a single gram of material from the asteroid Ryugu. What might you want to mine from space? Water is an essential component of most earth-bound mining operations and a potential raw material for hydrogen-oxygen fuel that could be used in space. The discovery in October of ice molecules in craters on the Moon was taken as a major breakthrough. Still, the concentrations of 100 to 412 parts per million are extraordinarily low by terrestrial standards. Copper, which typically costs about $4,500 per metric tonne (ppm) to refine, has an average ore grade of about 6,000 ppm. The more promising commodities are platinum, palladium, gold and a handful of rare related metals. Because of their affinity for iron, these so-called siderophile elements mostly sunk toward the metallic core of our planet early in its formation, and are relatively scarce in the Earth’s crust. Estimates of their abundance on some asteroids, such as the enigmatic Psyche 16 beyond the orbit of Mars, suggest concentrations several times higher than can be found in terrestrial mines. **If** such platinum-group **metals are going to justify the literally astronomical costs** of space mining, **they will need to count on sustained high prices** for the decade or so that would be needed to get such an operation up and running—and that sort of situation is all but **unheard-of** **in the materials industry**. **When prices** of an essential commodity **get** excessively **high**, chemists get extraordinarily good at finding ways to avoid using it, scrap merchants improve their recycling rates, and miners discover new deposits that wouldn’t have been viable at lower prices. That eventually pushes supply up and **demand down, so that prices rebalance**—a dynamic we’ve seen play out in the markets for rare earths, lithium and cobalt in recent years. The world mines about three times more platinum than it did in the early 1970s, but prices have barely changed once adjusted for inflation.

#### Public sector mining thumps, NASA 19:

NASA 19 [“NASA Invests in Tech Concepts Aimed at Exploring Lunar Craters, Mining Asteroids,” NASA, June 11, 2019, <https://www.nasa.gov/press-release/nasa-invests-in-tech-concepts-aimed-at-exploring-lunar-craters-mining-asteroids>] TDI

NASA Invests in Tech Concepts Aimed at Exploring Lunar Craters, Mining Asteroids Robotically surveying lunar craters in record time and mining resources in space could help NASA establish a sustained human presence at the Moon – part of the agency’s broader [Moon to Mars exploration](https://www.nasa.gov/specials/moon2mars/) approach. Two mission concepts to explore these capabilities have been selected as the first-ever Phase III studies within the [NASA Innovative Advanced Concepts](https://www.nasa.gov/niac) (NIAC) program. “We are pursuing new technologies across our development portfolio that could help make deep space exploration more Earth-independent by utilizing resources on the Moon and beyond,” said Jim Reuter, associate administrator of NASA’s Space Technology Mission Directorate. “These NIAC Phase III selections are a component of that forward-looking research and we hope new insights will help us achieve more firsts in space.” The Phase III proposals outline an aerospace architecture, including a mission concept, that is innovative and could change what’s possible in space. Each selection will receive as much as $2 million. Over the course of two years, researchers will refine the concept design and explore aspects of implementing the new technology. The inaugural Phase III selections are: Robotic Technologies Enabling the Exploration of Lunar Pits William Whittaker, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh This mission concept, called Skylight, proposes technologies to rapidly survey and model lunar craters. This mission would use high-resolution images to create 3D model of craters. The data would be used to determine whether a crater can be explored by human or robotic missions. The information could also be used to characterize ice on the Moon, a crucial capability for the sustained surface operations of NASA’s Artemis program. On Earth, the technology could be used to autonomously monitor mines and quarries. [Mini Bee Prototype to Demonstrate the Apis Mission Architecture and Optical Mining Technology](https://www.nasa.gov/directorates/spacetech/niac/2019_Phase_I_Phase_II/Mini_Bee_Prototype) Joel Sercel, TransAstra Corporation, Lake View Terrace, California This flight demonstration mission concept proposes a method of asteroid resource harvesting called optical mining. Optical mining is an approach for excavating an asteroid and extracting water and other volatiles into an inflatable bag. Called Mini Bee, the mission concept aims to prove optical mining, in conjunction with other innovative spacecraft systems, can be used to obtain propellant in space. The proposed architecture includes resource prospecting, extraction and delivery.

### Colonialism

#### The aff is a fantasy with the naïve belief in limiting private property being equivalent to counteracting private ideology. The true ideology underlying the public/private distinction is not simply about the state but rather about the nature of the position from which you reason. Presuming the state escapes the private and using it to limit that private fails and replicates the exclusion society is predicated on. ZIZEK.

Zizek, Slavoj. [Slavoj Zizek is a Slovenian philosopher and cultural critic. He is a professor at the European Graduate School, International Director of the Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities, Birkbeck College, University of London, and a senior researcher at the Institute of Sociology, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. His books include Living in the End Times, First as Tragedy, Then as Farce, In Defense of Lost Causes, four volumes of the Essential Zizek, and many more. Slavoj Žižek, the maverick philosopher, author of over 30 books, acclaimed as the “Elvis of cultural theory”, and today’s most controversial public intellectual. His work traverses the fields of philosophy, psychoanalysis, theology, history and political theory, taking in film, popular culture, literature and jokes—all to provide acute analyses of the complexities of contemporary ideology as well as a serious and sophisticated philosophy. His recent films The Pervert’s Guide to the Cinema and Žižek! reveal a theorist at the peak of his powers and a skilled communicator. Now Verso is making his classic titles, each of which stand as a core of his ever-expanding life’s work, available as new editions. Each is beautifully re-packaged, including new introductions from Žižek himself. Simply put, they are the essential texts for understanding Žižek’s thought and thus cornerstones of contemporary philosophy.] In defense of lost causes. Verso Books, 2009.

A further qualification should be added here: the solution is not to limit the market and private property by direct interventions of the state and state ownership. **The domain of the state itself is also in its own way "private": private in the precise Kantian sense of the "private use of Reason" in state administrative and ideological apparatuses: The public use of one's reason must always be free, and it alone can bring about enlightenment among men**. **The private use of one's reason, on the other hand, may often be very n a r r o w l y restricted without particularly hindering the progress of enlightenment. By public use of one's reason I understand the use w h i c h a person makes of it a s a scholar before the r e a d i n g public**. **Private use I call that w h i ch one may make of it in a particular civil post or office w h i c h is entrusted to him.** **What one should add here, moving beyond Kant, is that there is a privileged social group which, on account of its lack of a determinate place in the "private" order of the social hierarchy, in other words, as a "part of no-part" of the social body, d i r e c t l y stands for universality: it is only the reference to those Excluded, to those who dwell in the blanks of the space of the state, that enables true universality.** **There is nothing more " private" than a state community which perceives the Excluded as a threat and worries how to k e e p the Excluded at a proper distance.** In other words, as w e have a l r e a d y seen, in the series of the four antagonisms, the one between the Included and the Excluded is the crucial one, the point of reference for the others; without it, all others lose their subversive edge: ecology turns into a "problem of sustainable development," intellectual p r o p e r t y into a "complex legal c h a l l e n g e , " biogenetics into an "ethical" issue. **One can sincerely fight for ecology, defend a broader notion of intellectual property, oppose the copyrighting of genes, while not questioning the antagonism between the Included and the Excluded—what is more, one can even formulate some of these struggles in terms of the Included threatened by the polluting Excluded. In this way, we get no true universality, only "private " concerns in the Kantian sense of the term.** **Corporations such as Whole Foods and Starbucks continue to enjoy favor among liberals even though they both engage in anti-union activities; the trick is that they sell products that claim to be p o l i t i c a l ly progressive acts in and of themselves.** One buys coffee made w i t h beans bought from the growers at fair prices, one drives a hybrid vehicle, one buys from companies that provide good benefits for their employees (according to the corporation's own standards), and so on. **Political action and consumption become fully merged. In short, without the antagonism between the Included and the Excluded, we may well find ourselves in a world in which Bill Gates is the greatest humanitarian fighting against poverty and diseases, a n d Rupert Murdoch the greatest environmentalist mobilizing hundreds of millions through his media • 9 empire.** **And, one should be clear at this point, the political expression of this radical antagonism, the w a y the pressure of the Excluded is experienced within the established political space, always has a flavor of terror**. The lesson is thus the one rendered long ago b y Athena towards the end of Aeschylus's Euinenides: As for terror, don't banish it completely from the city. What mortal man is t r u l y righteous without being afraid? Those who sense the fear UNBEHAGEN IN DER NATUR revere vi'hat's right. With citizens hke these y o u r country and y o u r city will be safe, stronger than anything possessed by men.'" How are w e to read these famous Unes? Do they r e a l l y point towards the manipulation of the politics of fear we know t o d a y ? " The first obstacle to such a reading is the obvious fact that Athena does not evoke the fear of an external enemy whose threat justifies the disc i p l i n e d u n i t y and possible "defensive m e a s u r e s " of the city-state: **the fear is here the fear of divine J u s t i c e itself, of its b l i n d i n g authority; from the perspective of modern subjectivity (which is our perspective h e r e ) , the object of this fear is the abyss of subjectivity itself, its t e r r i f y i n g power of self-relating negativity; it is the terrifying encount e r of this t r a u m a t i c core** that H e i d e g g e r h a d in mind when he claimed that terror {Schrecken) was necessary if "modern man" was to be awakened from his metaphysico-technological slumber into a new beginning; we must p r i n c i p a l l y concern ourselves w i t h preparing for man the v e ry basis and dimension upon which and within which something like a mystery of his Deuteln could once a g a i n be encountered. We should not be at all s u r p r i s e d if the contemporary man in the street feels disturbed or perhaps sometimes d a z e d and clutches all the more stubbornly at his idols when confronted with this challenge a n d w i t h the effort required to approach this mystery. It would be a mistake to expect anything else. We must first call for someone capable of instilling terror into our Ucuem a g a i n . Heidegger thus opposes wonder as the basic disposition of the first (Greek) beginning to terror as the basic disposition of the second new beginning: "In wonder, the basic disposition of the first beginning, beings first come to stand in their form. Terror, the basic disposition of the other beginning, reveals behind all progress and all domination over beings a d a r k emptiness of irrelevance." (The thing to note here is that Heidegger uses the word "terror" and not " a n x i e t y . ") Hegel said something similar in his a n a l y s i s of the master and servant (bondage), when he emphasized that, since the bondsman is also a selfconsciousness. 431 IN DEFENSE OF LOST CAUSES 432 the master is t a k e n to be the essential r e a l i ty for the state of bondage; hence, for it, the truth is the independent consciousness existing for itself, although this t r u th is not taken y e t as inherent in bondage itself Still, it does in fact contain within itself this truth of pure negativity and self-existence, because it has experienced this reality' w i t h i n it. **For this consciousness w a s not in peril a n d fear for this element or that, nor for this or that moment of time, it w a s afraid for its entire being; it felt the fear of death, the sovereign master.** It has been in that experience melted to its inmost soul, has trembled throughout its e v e r y fibre, and all that was fixed and steadfast has quaked within it**. This complete perturbation of its entire substance, this absolute dissolution of all its s t a b i l i ty into fluent continuity, is, however, the simple, ultimate nature of self-consciousness, absolute negativity, pure self-referrent existence, which consequently is involved in this type of consciousness.** This moment of p u r e self-existence is moreover a fact for it; for in the master it finds this as its object. Further, this bondsman's consciousness is not only this total dissolution in a general w a y ; in serving and toiling the bondsman a c t u a l l y c a r r i e s t h i s out**. B y serving he cancels in e v e r y p a r t i c u l a r aspect his dependence on and attachment to natural existence,** and by his w o r k removes this existence away.''\* The servant is t h u s in-himself a l r e a d y free, his freedom being embodied outside himself in his master. It is in this sense that Christ is our master and simultaneously the source of our freedom. Christ's sacrifice set us free —how? Neither as the payment for our sins nor as legalistic ransom, but as w h e n w e are afraid of something (and fear of death is the ultimate fear that makes u s slaves), a n d a t r u e friend says: "Don't be afraid, look, I will do it. W h a t are y o u so a l r a i d of? I w i l l do it, not because I h a v e to but out of my love for y o u . I am not afraid! " He does it a n d in this w a y sets us free, demonstrating in acta that it can he done, that w e too can do it, that we are not slaves . . . Recall, from Ayn Rand's Tl^e Fountainhead, the description of the momentary impact Howard Roark makes on the members of the audience in the courtroom where he is standing trial: Roark stood before them as each man stands in the innocence of his own mind. But Roark stood like that before a hostile crowd —and they knew suddenly that no hatred w a s possible to him. For the flash of an instant, they grasped the manner of his consciousness. Each asked himself: do I need anyone's a p p r o v a l ? —does it matter? —am I t i e d ? — UNBEHAGEN IN DER NATUR And for that instant, each man was free —free enough to feel benevolence for every other man in the room. It w a s only a moment; the moment of silence when Roark w a s about to speak.''^ This i s t he w a y Christ brings freedom: when confronting him, w e become aware of our own freedom. And does not, mutatis mutandis , the same hold for Che Guevara? The photos showing him under arrest in Bolivia, surrounded by government soldiers, have a w e i r d Christological a u r a , as if w e see a t i r ed but defiant Christ on his w a y to crucifixion — no wonder that, when, moments prior to his death, the executioner's pistol a l r e a dy aimed at him, the hand holding it trembling, Guevara looked at h im and said: "Aim well. You are about to kill a man" —his version of ecce homo . . . And, Indeed, is the basic message of Guevara not p r e c i s e l y this: the message of how, in a n d through all his failures, he persisted, he went on? One can imagine h im thinking in the desperate last d a y s in Bolivia a version of the last words of Samuel Beckett's The VnnameahU: "in the silence y o u don't know, y o u must go on, I can't go on, I'll go on."'^ **In an unsurpassable irony of history, after the triumph of the Cuban revolution, everything he did was a failure** ^—the dismal failure of his economic policies as the Cuban minister of economy (after a y e a r , food had to be rationed. . . ) , t h e failure of his Congo adventure, the failure of his last mission in Bolivia; **however, all these "human, all too human" failures somehow fade into the -background, the backdrop against which the contours of his properly over-human (or, why not, inhuman) figure appear**, confirming Badiou's motto that the only w a y to be t r u l y human is to exceed ordinary humanity, tending towards the