## Frwk

#### The aff should be topical.

#### “Resolved:” refers to a legislative debate.

Louisiana State Legislature 16, “Glossary of Legislative Terms,” http://www.legis.state.la.us/glossary2.htm

Resolution: A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. (Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11, 13.1, 6.8, and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### Private company is defined as

Chen, 21, Learn about Private Companies, https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/privatecompany.asp, Investopedia,

A private company is a firm held under private ownership. Private companies may issue stock and have shareholders, but their shares do not trade on public exchanges and are not issued through an [initial public offering](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/i/ipo.asp) (IPO). As a result, private firms do not need to meet the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC) strict filing requirements for [public companies](https://www.investopedia.com/terms/p/publiccompany.asp). In general, the shares of these businesses are less liquid, and their [valuations](https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/09/how-to-value-shares-in-private-company.asp) are more difficult to determine.

#### Meriam webster defines outer space

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/outer%20space>

: space immediately outside the earth's atmospherebroadly : interplanetary or interstellar space

#### [1] Competitive equity—any alternative wrecks it—it’s impossible to negate alternative frameworks with the ground allocated to us by the parameters of the resolution—all 1AR defense to this claim will rely on concessionary ground which isn’t a stable basis for a year of debate.

#### They don’t get to weigh the aff – it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### [2] Switch Side Debate – read your stuff on the neg which non-uniques your offense and is net better since a Kritik on the neg has to be tailored to the aff– otherwise your discussion starts and ends at the 1AC.

#### [3] Refinement – a well-defined resolution is critical to allow the neg to refute the aff in an in-depth fashion. This process of negation produces iterative testing and improvement. Only a resolution with ground on both sides allows for the most clash which controls the internal link to education. Committees outweigh because they discuss the best topic for a stasis point – even if some resolutions are bad it is net better for a group to create a topic rather than an individual.

#### [4] TVA – talk about taking away power,

#### [5] Truth testing—they moot the role of the negative which is to force the aff to defend their core assumptions—allowing affs to reframe the debate around their terms makes engagement impossible—outweighs and turns the aff because clash is the only way to translate anything debate gives us outside of the activity.

#### T isn’t violent – A] I don’t have the power to impose a norm – only to convince you my side is better. T doesn’t ban you from the activity – the whole point is that norms should be contestable – I just say make a better arg next time. B] Exclusion is inevitable – every role of the ballot e

#### xcludes some arguments and even saying T bad excludes it – that means we should delineate ground along reciprocal lines, not abandon division altogether. Reading T isn’t psychic violence – that was above, but especially if we’re not going for it since reading T can be used to prevent aff shiftiness and make substance a viable option.

#### No silencing DA - T is just like a disad or critique we’ve said a certain practice the aff took was bad and it would’ve been better had they done it differently not that they are bad debaters – just like the cap k says the aff engaged in some practice that reinforced capitalism and it would’ve been better if they had emphasized Marxism – impositions in some form are inevitable because the negative has the burden of rejoinder and needs link arguments – every disad link says the aff did something wrong and theres an implicit version of the aff that wouldn’t have linked

#### Theory before the K – A] Prior question. My theory argument calls into question the ability to run the argument in the first place. They can’t say the same even if they criticize theory because theory makes rules of the game not just normative statements about what debaters should say. B] Fair testing. Judge their arguments knowing I wasn’t given a fair shot to answer them. Prefer theory takes out K because they could answer my arguments, but I couldn’t answer theirs. Without testing their args, we don’t know if they’re valid, so you prefer fairness impacts on strength of link. Impact turns any critical education since a marketplace of ideas where we innovate, and test ideas presumes equal access.

#### Fairness- consittutive of comp activites, args presume

#### No RVI’s- illogical, baiting

# Case

#### Vote neg on presumption – they don’t even claim to solve

#### Perf con – you defend giving the state more power,

#### Alliance DA - using debate as a mode of advocacy ensures the failure of their radical project – competition means debaters ally themselves with individuals who vote for them and alienate those who are positioned with the burden of rejoinder and forced to negate – at worst you vote affirmative on presumption because they don’t use debate as a stepping stone for their advocacy outside the space and don’t have a net benefit to negating.

#### 3] Framing settler colonialism through a totalizing lens of absolute decolonization makes indigenous liberation impossible by setting the terms of victory as all-or-nothing—pessimism actively reifies settler dominance

Busbridge 18’ - Research Fellow at the Centre for Dialogue, La Trobe University (Rachel, “Israel-Palestine and the Settler Colonial ‘Turn’: From Interpretation to Decolonization,” Theory, Culture & Society Vol 35, Issue 1, 2018, dml)

The prescription for decolonisation—that is, a normative project committed to the liberation of the colonised and the overturning of colonial relationships of power (Kohn & McBride, 2011: 3)—is indeed one of the most counterhegemonic implications **of the settler colonial paradigm** as applied to IsraelPalestine, **potentially shifting it from a diagnostic frame to a prognostic one which offers a ‘proposed solution to the problem, or at least a plan of attack’** (Benford & Snow, 2000: 616). **What**, however, **does the settler colonial paradigm offer by way of** envisioning decolonisation? As Veracini (2007) notes, while settler colonial studies scholars have sought to address the lack of attention paid to the experiences of Indigenous peoples in conventional historiographical accounts of decolonisation (which have mostly focused on settler independence and the loosening of ties to the ‘motherland’), **there is** nevertheless **a** ‘narrative deficit’ **when it comes to** imagining settler decolonisation. While Veracini (2007) relates this deficit to a matter of conceptualisation, it is apparent that **the** structural perspective **of the paradigm** in many ways closes down possibilities **of** imagining the type of social **and** political transformation **to which the** notion of decolonisation aspires. In this regard, there is a worrying tendency (**if not** tautological discrepancy) **in settler colonial studies**, **where the** only solution to settler colonialism is decolonisation—**which a faithful adherence to the paradigm** renders largely unachievable, **if not** impossible. To understand why this is the case, it is necessary to return to Wolfe’s (2013a: 257) account of settler colonialism as guided by a ‘zero-sum logic whereby settler societies, for all their internal complexities, uniformly require the elimination of Native alternatives’. The **structuralism** of this account **has** immense power **as a means of mapping forms of injustice and indignity as well as strategies of resistance and refusal**, and Wolfe is careful to show how transmutations of the logic of elimination are complex, variable, discontinuous and uneven. **Yet, in seeking to** elucidate the logic of elimination **as the** overarching historical force **guiding settler-native relations there is an** operational weakness **in the theory, whereby such a logic is** simply there, omnipresent **and** manifest **even when (and perhaps especially when) it** appears not to be; **the settler colonial studies scholar need only** read it into a situation **or** context. **It** thus hurtles from the past **to the** present **into the** future, **never to be fully extinguished until the native is, or until history itself ends. There is thus a** powerful ontological (if not metaphysical) dimension to Wolfe’s account, **where there is such thing as a ‘**settler will’ **that** inherently desires the elimination of the native **and the distinction between the settler and native** can only ever be categorical**, founded as it is on the ‘primal binarism of the frontier’** (2013a: 258). It is here that the differences between earlier settler colonial scholarship on Israel-Palestine and the recent settler colonial turn come into clearest view. While Jamal Hilal’s (1976) Marxist account of the conflict, for instance, engaged Palestinians and Jewish Israelis in terms of their relations to the means of production, Wolfe’s account brings its own ontology: the bourgeoisie/proletariat distinction becomes that of settler/native, and the class struggle the struggle between **settler**, who **seeks to** destroy **and** replace the native**, and native**, who can only ever push back. Indeed, **if the settler colonial paradigm views history in similar teleological terms** to the Marxist framework, **it** does not offer **the same hopeful vision of a liberated future**. After all, **settler colonialism has** only one story to tell—‘**either** total victory **or** total failure’ (Veracini, 2007). Veracini’s attempt to disaggregate different forms of settler decolonisation is revealing of the difficulties that come along with this zero-sum perspective. It is significant to note that beyond settler evacuation (which may decolonise territory, he cautions, but not necessarily relationships) the picture he paints is a relatively bleak one. For Veracini (2011: 5), claims for decolonisation from Indigenous peoples in settler societies can take two broad forms: an ‘anticolonial rhetoric expressing a demand for indigenous sovereign independence and self-determination… and an “ultra”-colonial one that seeks a reconstituted partnership with the [settler state] and advocates a return to a relatively more respectful middle ground and “treaty” conditions’. While both, he suggests, are tempting strategies in the struggle for change, though ‘ultimately ineffective against settler colonial structures of domination’ (2011: 5), it is the latter strategy that invites Veracini’s most scathing assessment. As he writes, under settler colonial conditions the independent polity is the settler polity and sanctioning the equal rights of indigenous peoples has historically been used as a powerful weapon in the denial of indigenous entitlement and in the enactment of various forms of coercive assimilation. This decolonisation actually enhances the subjection of indigenous peoples… it is at best irrelevant and at worst detrimental to indigenous peoples in settler societies (2011: 6-7). **The ‘primal binarism of the frontier’ plays a particularly ambivalent role in Veracini’s (2011: 6) formulation, where the** categorical distinction **between settler and native** obstructs **the ‘possibility of a genuinely decolonised relationship’ (by virtue of its lopsidedness) yet is a** necessary political strategy **to** guard against the absorption **of Indigenous people into the settler fold, which would** represent settler colonialism’s final victory**. The battle here is between a ‘settler colonialism [that] is designed to produce a fundamental discontinuity as its “logic of elimination” runs its course until it actually extinguishes the settler colonial relation’ and an anti-colonial struggle that** ‘must aim to keep the settler-indigenous relationship going’ (2011: 7). In other words, **the categorical distinction** **produced by the frontier** must be maintained in order to struggle against its effects. Given the lack of options presented to Indigenous peoples by Veracini (2014: 315), his conclusion that settler decolonisation demands a ‘radical, post-settler colonial passage’ is perhaps not surprising – although he has ‘no suggestion as to how this may be achieved and [is] pessimistic about its feasibility’. Scholars have long reckoned with the ambivalence of the settler colonial situation, which is simultaneously colonial and postcolonial, colonising and decolonising (Curthoys, 1999: 288). **Given the generally dreadful** Fourth World **circumstances facing many Indigenous peoples** in settler societies, **it** could be argued **that there is good reason for** such pessimism. The settler colonial paradigm, in this sense, offers an important caution against celebratory narratives of progress. Wolfe (1994), it must be recalled, wrote the original articulation of his thesis precisely against the idea of ‘historical rupture’ that dominated in Australia post-Mabo, and was thus as much a scholarly intervention as it was a political challenge to the idea of Australia having broken with its colonial past. Nonetheless, **the** fatalism **of the settler colonial paradigm**—whereby decolonisation is by and large put beyond the realms of possibility—**has** seen it **come under** considerable critique **for** reifying settler colonialism **as a transhistorical meta-structure where colonial relations of domination are** inevitable (Macoun & Strakosch, 2013: 435; Snelgrove et al., 2014: 9). **Not only does** Wolfe’s **ontology** erase contingency, heterogeneity **and (crucially)** agency (Merlan, 1997; Rowse, 2014), **but its polarised framework effectively ‘**puts politics to death’ (Svirsky, 2014: 327). In response to such critiques, Wolfe (2013a: 213) suggests that ‘the repudiation of binarism’ may just represent a ‘settler perspective’. However, as Elizabeth Povinelli (1997: 22) has astutely shown, it is in this regard that the totalising logic of Wolfe’s structure of invasion rests on a disciplinary gesture where ‘any discussion which does not insist on the polarity of the [settler] colonial project’ is assimilationist, worse still, genocidal in effect if not intent. Any attempt **to ‘explore the** dialogical **or** hybrid nature **of colonial subjectivity’—which would entail** working beyond the bounds of absolute polarity—is disciplined as complicit **in the settler colonial project itself, leaving ‘the** only nonassimilationist position **one that** adheres strictly **and** solely **to** **a** critique **of [settler] state discourse’. This gesture not only** disallows the possibility of counter-publics and strategic alliances **(even limited ones), but also** comes dangerously close to ‘resistance as acquiescence’ **insofar as the settler colonial studies scholar may** malign the structures set in play **by settler colonialism, but** only from a safe distance unsullied by the messiness **of ambivalences and contradictions of settler and Native subjectivities and relations.** Opposition **is thus left as our** only option, **but**, as we know from critical anti-colonial and postcolonial scholarship, opposition in itself is not decolonisation.

#### Decol is white double bind – the world is structed by colonialism which makes universal decol swapping settlers. Think about the Nepal highway that pushed out the madheshi, Filipino Christians erasing moro people, the Russian circassian genocide, the ENTIRETY of south America. Either they just swap settlers or they are a monolithic approach where settlerism only matters in the US which abstracts away from other violence.

#### Evacuation DA – a settler is someone who migrates to an area and establishes permanent residence there – “Natives” came to the Americas and established permanent residences there- which is why they had wars about each other’s territory- all of your claims on settlers also apply to “Native” Americans.

#### Vote aff on presumption – demands for rematriation and material land return generate interpassivity within debate rounds where we think talking the talk is sufficient – turns settler colonialism because we demand recognition from settler spaces like debate that occurs on stolen land – aff is non-inherent cuz squo grassroots efforts at rematriation already solve

Brough 17 (Taylor, BA from University of Vermont and 2016 CEDA Nationals Champion, Open letter to non-Black Native people in debate, <https://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/> //shree)

What is most disturbing to me about this ongoing history is that we have yet to tie virtually any debate round to actual, material land repatriation, sovereign gains, or the upholding of treaty rights. These material gains involve labor from Native people organizing at the grassroots level, not an academic labor from Settlers. Debate arguments do not facilitate sovereign benefits for Native peoples. Further, the struggle for sovereignty itself does not overcome or solve genocide. The removal of the Hunkpapa Lakota Oyate and their relatives at the Oceti Sakowin camp at Standing Rock should be proof enough of this—sovereignty as a politic is often met with, rather than resolving, genocidal violence. Non-Black Native people in debate have performed a similar land-based politic. Native debate has become so associated with words like “land,” “sovereignty,” “space,” “place,” “treaty rights,” and others, that it is almost impossible to theorize Native debate absent sovereignty as a grammar that marks our existence. So both non-Native debaters (who claim to advocate for Native peoples’ sovereignty) and Native debaters (who claim to advocate for something that usually falls into the grammar of sovereignty) are talking in essentially the same register, with incredibly limited slippage towards genocide as a vector of violence. And, for Native people, like non-Natives, debate arguments do not and cannot facilitate the material elements of decolonization that these land-based arguments frequently rely upon.[3] Sovereign gains don’t happen in debate rounds, but for some reason the (mis)recognition of Native enunciation as sovereignty persists, in that the word “land” harkens to Native debate in almost every instance, that almost every debate involving Native people reading perceptibly “Native” arguments includes a discussion of “treaties” or “sovereignty” or “land-based pedagogy” or “spatiality.” What other reason could this be than a structure of desire around recognition from the Settler/Master? If we really follow the history of how “Nativeness” has been misrepresented in debate by Settlers, it becomes clear that much of contemporary Native debate, strangely (or as I argue, not so strangely), mimics these misrepresentations.

#### Logistical concerns are good they pushes off problems’ settlers need to be culpable of

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)

We observe that **a**nother **component** **of a desire to play Indian is a settler desire to be made innocent,** to find some mercy or relief in face of the relentlessness of settler guilt and haunting (see Tuck and Ree, forthcoming, on mercy and haunting). Directly and indirectly **benefitting from the erasure and assimilation of Indigenous peoples is a difficult reality for settlers to accept**.  The weight of this reality is uncomfortable; the misery of guilt makes one hurry toward any reprieve. In her 1998 Master’s thesis, Janet Mawhinney analyzed the ways in which **white people maintain**ed **and (re)produce**d white **privilege in self-defined anti-racist** **settings** and organizations.8 She examined the role of storytelling and self-confession - which serves to equate stories of personal exclusion with stories of structural racism and exclusion - and what she terms ‘**moves to innocence**,’ or “strategies to **remove involvement in and culpability for systems of domination**” (p. 17). Mawhinney builds upon Mary Louise Fellows and Sherene Razack’s (1998) conceptualization of, ‘the race to innocence’, “the process through which a woman comes to believe her own claim of subordination is the most urgent, and that she is unimplicated in the subordination of other women” (p. 335).   Mawhinney’s thesis theorizes the self-positioning of white people as simultaneously the oppressed and never an oppressor, and as having an absence of experience of oppressive power relations (p. 100). **This** simultaneous self-**positioning** afforded white people **in various purportedly anti-racist settings** to **say** to people of color, “**I don’t experience the problems you do, so I don’t think about it,” and “tell me what to do, you’re the experts here**” (p. 103).  “**The commonsense appeal** of such statements,” Malwhinney observes, **enables white speakers** to “utter them sanguine in [their] appearance of equanimity, **is rooted in the normalization of a liberal analysis of power relations**” (ibid.).