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#### [Soldatic] Affirmations of disability hurts indigenous populations – it’s another signifier that allows the west to justify colonization and destroys decolonial potential.

**Soldatic ‘15:** Soldatic, Karen [PhD, Australian Research Council DECRA Fellow (2016-2019) who prior to joining the Institute, worked at UNSW] “Postcolonial Reproduction: Disability, Indigeneity and the Formation of the White Masculine Settler State of Australia” *Social Identities* *Vol, 21, No. 1, 53-58, TandFOnline,* 2015 AA

Further, emerging work in the area has identified the ways in which the category of disability for indigenous people within the white-settler colonial state resonates strongly with ongoing violence, oppression and stigmatization. So much so that, in fact, many indigenous people with disability do not want to claim disability, impairment or ill health as another marginalizing identity (Gilroy, 2009). Disability, with its parallel discourses of biological inferiority, can be a dangerous identifier for indigenous people struggling against white-settler colonial power (King, 2010). Many indigenous people seek to make invisible any additional bodily and mind differences that may amplify their ongoing experiences of violence and dispossession (Hollinsworth, 2013). Further, indigenous knowledges map the body and mind differently from those of western disability epistemologies and, therefore, what stands as disability for the settler is not positioned in this way for indigenous people (King, 2010). In many Aboriginal nations, disability, as constructed within the western frame, is an unknown (Ariotti, 1999). While disabled scholarship may wish to centre disability to enrich intersectional, complex, hybrid identities, the converging of other identities can undermine indigenous repertoires of decolonization. This is most clear when we consider the ways in which indigenous activism for indigenous nation-state formations radically de-centres one of the central tenets of postcolonial methodological assumptions – methodological nationalism. Critics have argued that the emphasis on nation, nation-state and nationalism inadvertently places boundaries around the possibilities of developing a cosmopolitanism/transnationalism with the emergence of globalization and is not reflective of the intensified integration of neoliberal nation-state economies (see Chernilo, 2006, for a full discussion). Leading postcolonial theorist Ato Quayson (2013) has acknowledged this claim, suggesting that the substantive methodological framework of the nation-state has not, as yet, adequately addressed its methodological critics – now a more urgent task with the onset of neoliberal global (often forced) mobilities.

#### [King et al] Their theory of power means settler never has to be accountable for the way the perpetuate colonialism – indignity is considered a disability.

**King et al ‘14:** King, Julie [Lecturer & Faculty of Health & Public Health and Social Work School at Queensland University of Technology, PhD, Master of Public Health] Brough, Mark [Professor & Faculty of Health & Public Health and Social Work School Queensland University of Technology, Doctor of Philosophy, Medical Anthropology] Knox M. [Public Health and Social Work, Queensland University of Technology] “Negotiating disability and colonisation: the lived experience of Indigenous Australians with a disability.” Disability & Society, *2014 Vol. 29, No. 5, 738–750, TandFOnline,* 2014 AA

It was remarked earlier, citing Meekosha (2011) and Hollinsworth (2013), that colonisation is disabling of itself, and this emerged from the ethnography in two related ways: the impact of colonisation on the Indigenous Australian way of life that led to disability; and the creation of a category called ‘disability’ where none had existed before. Some example excerpts from the ethnography are cited to emphasise that these themes emerged across the participants in very similar ways. … Auntie Lily thought this was because of what had happened when white men came. They brought alcohol and changed diets so they moved away from the traditional bush food and had more sugar and flour. She thinks this is why so many Indigenous people are overweight and why there is so much diabetes. She also wondered if this was why cancer was becoming more common in the Indigenous community. She said it was hard to afford a good diet and so a lot could not get food that was good for them and some just didn’t know what was good for them anyway. She thought that maybe a lot of Indigenous Australian people were disabled because of diabetes especially when they were obese and needed to have a leg amputated. (Diary entry, Auntie Lily) … she [Clara] couldn’t remember anyone being disabled when she was young but could see that there seemed to be more around today and she said that she thought it was because their lives were different now to what they were when she was young. (Diary entry, Group 4) But years ago we were very much aware that people with Down Syndrome particularly, we had a man who came here, and he came out of institutionalised care, and he was just delightful, and his mother had searched for him, and it’s typical of people being taken away. We’ve seen people who’ve got certificates that say ‘Been taken because …’ and I know someone else who got taken because he had a clubfoot, and our bloke was taken because of his Down Syndrome, and some of them just had certificates marked just ‘Taken because …’ and that’s why people used to say years ago ‘We are disabled because we’re a race of people that the government has disabled, well and truly’. (Transcribed from a recording with Emma, an Indigenous service provider) These accounts have coherence in strongly connecting current circumstances of health and disability with colonisation. This is paired with a continuing sense of non-Indigenous domination that maintains this disadvantage. Thus in many informal conversations about disability, the underlying source of discrimination regularly came back to racism rather than disablism. Experiences of prejudice were regularly shared by the Indigenous people receiving support at the Indigenous Respite Centre. Overwhelmingly these were not stories about their experience of societal oppression in relation to their disability, but rather they were stories about racism in response to their Indigeneity. Also clear from the participants was a strong stance that their identification as Indigenous Australians was superordinate, situated above other possible sources of identity and solidarity. Thus being a person ‘with a disability’ – whilst clearly a strong basis for the disability movement internationally – holds much less sway for a people with such intense and damaging experiences of colonisation coupled with a rich sense of their Indigenous Australian identity. Along with statements asserting ‘Indigenous first, disabled second’, it was clear that the capacity to be a part of their local community was a fundamentally important social ‘benchmark’ that lessened the resonance of predominantly non-Indigenous assumptions that drive the broader disability discourse. This was reflected, for example, in Auntie Amelia’s description of the period in her life when she began losing her mobility but immediately followed by the relief that ‘she could still go to Elders meetings because they would pick her up’ (diary entry, Auntie Amelia).

#### [King et al] The 1AC view of disability assumes a Western standpoint to be universally true.

**King et al ‘14:** King, Julie [Lecturer & Faculty of Health & Public Health and Social Work School at Queensland University of Technology, PhD, Master of Public Health] Brough, Mark [Professor & Faculty of Health & Public Health and Social Work School Queensland University of Technology, Doctor of Philosophy, Medical Anthropology] Knox M. [Public Health and Social Work, Queensland University of Technology] “Negotiating disability and colonisation: the lived experience of Indigenous Australians with a disability.” Disability & Society, *2014 Vol. 29, No. 5, 738–750, TandFOnline,* 2014 AA

As noted earlier in this paper, the literature on disability tends to lack self-consciousness in terms of cultural diversity (Stienstra 2002, 5). This reflects the standpoint of non-Indigenous, white hegemony in which the unstated but ever-present assumption is that a non-Indigenous experience is universal rather than culturally specific. Based on the qualitative findings presented in this paper it is very clear that Indigenous people living with disability experience their disability very much within the context of their Indigenous identity. The interplay between Indigeneity, disability and colonisation is complex and multifaceted, and is constantly evolving. Today Indigenous Australians share a strong sense of experience and history that could not have existed without colonisation. ‘Disability’ is a shifting and elusive term even in northern discourse, and among Indigenous Australians it is difficult to disentangle from the ability to participate in the life of one’s family, kinship group and community. Rather than disability being an added burden to the ongoing impact of colonisation, the sense of shared Indigenous experience is utilised to negotiate a lived experience of disability in which being Indigenous is a strength rather than a weakness. At the same time there is no intention to romanticise or essentialise Indigenous experience, and this research shows that this would not be appropriate anyway. The participants were well aware of disadvantage and discrimination, and showed a keen interest in political and other developments that devolved on the nexus between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australian worlds.

#### Independently, Settler colonialism mobilizes temporality itself in service of the consummation of white settler sovereignty – this operates through liberal narratives of progressivism that rely upon a vanishing endpoint of a “better world” achieved through the completion of the project of settler modernity. Normative debate is structured by the imperative of forward motion that locates the plan as a transformative break with colonial society that relegates the backwardness of indigeneity to the past and envisions a settler utopia in its place.

Strakosch and Macoun ’12 -- Elizabeth Strakosch is a senior lecturer in public policy and governance at the University of Queensland, and her work focuses on Indigenous policy, colonialism, political relationships, bureaucracy and new public management. Her research explores the connections between political relationships and policy systems in Australia and other settler contexts. contexts. Alissa Macoun is a Lecturer in the School of Justice at Queensland University of Technology. She is interested in the politics of race and contemporary colonialism. (Elizabeth Strakosch and Alissa Macoun, 8-14-2012, "The vanishing endpoint of settler https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/30618693/Arena\_Journal\_Vanishing\_Endpoint-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1641292909&Signature=ChuVXBZ8Rm1bur5JH2dQc5JWgaB7MbFAPs1cNeI35Eh1XzeGWPa2rtYC2dUiBrNmekVJBkim0VJNQ7YbXkuur3yBbhPhZix1z0n7k9n1JqxPcxK6tucFsuicP6kp9dPeEF23gClX26-9QbmukrpidEVgb6x4ysdi8c0JcSd1GQYnOTHpYngupZDn3NV-s1GCe5so8pVOrrOaPKVg5LXydJJkIb9tYKnZV1TGPophuk21rXLXZczrr6~GcwSYxIZw9uWVt8MNgCV6zh9H5edp~CWh-gA6cuCny-bACDvjQB~F7eluH5ooNGx-J7u4YPQsh3m-uIeMR8zhhZDQwxa81g\_\_&Key-Pair-Id=APKAJLOHF5GGSLRBV4ZA, accessed 1-4-2022)//nikki

Time, decolonization and colonial completion Critical geographers use Foucault’s insights to unsettle modern understandings of space as a fixed environment in which politics takes place. Instead, they show that political projects construct, naturalize and respond to particular spatial understandings.30 In relation to Indigenous policy, critical analysts are quick to identify these political deployments of space. SuvendriniPerera, for example, shows that policy-makers represent remote Indigenous communities as ‘set apart from the body of the nation, and as the locus of unspeakable violence and abjection’.31 As part of the discourse of the Northern Territory Intervention, the metaphor of the distant frontier — or vulnerable centre — is pervasive. Remote Aboriginal communities prescribed for Intervention are para - digmatically referred to in media reports as ‘remote Aboriginal societies’, ‘this other Australia’, ‘the remote world’ and as ‘a distinct domain’.32 Unsettling dominant understandings of time is equally important. In his work ‘The End of the Passing Past’, Walters aims to ‘think about change in ways that refuse the obligation to side with or against continuity… and resist the temptations of progressivism and reductionism’.33 He draws on Bruno Latour’s examination of the modern temporal imaginary, and his denat - uralizing of modern political timelines: We have never moved either forward or backward. We have always actively sorted out elements belonging to different times. We can still sort. It is the sorting that makes the times, not the times that make the sorting.34 This interrogation is especially useful in relation to understanding settler colonialism and Indigenous policy-making. Barry Hindess, Elizabeth Povinelli and N. Sheehan, for example, reflect on Western temporal constructions of Aboriginality and indicate how these relate to liberal political agendas. Barry Hindess argues that liberalism tends to locate different cultures in its own past, even when they coexist with liberal societies in the present.35 Indigenous groups, in particular, are located prior to the transformative moment of sovereign agreement, which in turn is read as an indication of their incapacity to enter into this superior, rational political future. Norm Sheehan maintains that settler colonialism in Australia is deeply invested in these kinds of temporal logics: In contrast to previous colonial contexts which tended to focus on constructing difference based on inherent racial traits the antipodean designation as primitive defines this specific other as non-other. The antipodean aborigine is by definition from the origin of (all) mankind which positions this primitive as an earlier and therefore lesser version of European self.36 Elizabeth Povinelli briefly makes a similar point in her analysis of recent Australian Indigenous policy: [E]ven as liberalism came to accept its fate as a culture among other cultures it differentiated the tense and orientation of its cultural difference from other cultures. The West as a general idea would claim the future and claim the potentiality of individuals and assign the past and the constraint of individuals to others — or, it would recognize that these were the values of non-liberal cultures.37 She refers to these patterns of political temporal positioning as ‘technologies of temporality’. Drawing together the work of Walters, Hindess, Sheehan and Povinelli, it becomes apparent that colonialism does not just take place in time. It constructs narratives of time, in ways that create particular political relationships in the present, and attempts to move itself through time to a certain political future. In the remainder of this section, we compare the temporalities of post-colonial and settler-colonial political formations, and argue that both anchor themselves to some sort of transformative ‘endpoint’. This radical political break separates a problematic past from a completed future and, in settler-colonial societies, involves a strange assemblage of ideas about decolonization, revolution, full colonization and sovereign exchange. The term post-colonial implies ‘the notion of a movement be - yond’;38 ‘the “post” in “post-colonial” suggests “after” the demise of colonialism, it is imbued, quite apart from its user’s intentions, with an ambiguous spatio-temporality’.39 In a number of former colonies (both extractive, such as India, and settler, such as Algeria), the formal colonial project has indeed ended. The term postcolonial captures something about the complex political realities of these nation-states today. A dramatic, and often violent, moment of structural decolonization separates these state’s colonial pasts from their post-colonial presents. However, even in relation to those nations which have undergone such institutional transformations, scholars contest the use of the term. Ella Shohat suggests that it erases the ongoing structural imperialisms that persist: ‘How then does one negotiate sameness and difference within the framework of a “post-colonial” whose “post” emphasizes rupture and deemphasizes sameness?’40 Some scholars use the term neocolonialism to indicate political continuity, and to contest the understanding that critical post-colonial work seeks to put out minor spot-fires of inequality left by ‘real’ colonialism.41 If the temporal narrative of post-colonialism is problematic in relation to former extractive colonies, it is altogether inaccurate when applied to ongoing settler colonies such as Australia. Yet post-colonial scholarship has dominated international academic [T]he lack of historical specificity in the ‘post’ leads to a collaps - ing of diverse chronologies … It equates early independence won by settler colonial states, in which Europeans formed their new nation-states in non-European territories at the expense of Indigenous populations, with that of nationstates whose indigenous populations struggled for inde - pendence against Europe.42 Australia has not, and most probably will not, undergo the kind of institutional transfer of control to the Indigenous population that could justify the application of the term post-colonial. And yet it is quite common to see Australia identified as a post-colonial or decolo nizing nation in cultural studies, literary theory and policy analysis.43 One of the greatest contributions of the emerging field of settler-colonial studies is the fact that it provides clear conceptual tools to articulate exactly why it is that nations like Australia and Canada should be understood differently. However, it is important not to overstate the uniqueness of settlercolonial studies in Australian scholarship. Critical Indigenous the - orists are carrying on their own conversation regarding Australian colonial conditions, and have long contested the relevance of the term post-colonial. Irene Watson, for example, argues: I understand the contemporary colonial project as one that has continued unabated from the time of the landing and invasion by the British in 1788 … the Australian state retains a vested interest in keeping the violence going, and the inequalities and iniquities that are maintained against Aboriginal peoples for the purpose of maintaining the life and continuity of the state. A question the Australian state is yet to resolve is its own illegitimate foundation and transformation into an edifice deemed lawful. Within this unanswered questionable structure the Australian state parades as one which has obliterated the ‘founding violence’ of its ‘illegitimate origins’ and ‘repressed them into a timeless past’.44 Aileen Moreton-Robinson instead uses the term post-colonizing, capturing the ambiguous and shifting temporal technologies deployed in settler-colonial Australia. These new conceptual models have grown productively out of the object of our study: the postcolonizing world we inhabit. Our respective geographical locations are framed by nation states such as the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand where colonization has not ceased to exist; it has only changed in form from that which our ancestors encountered.45 While settler-colonial studies proceeds from a conceptual distinction between extractive and settler colonialism, Indigenous scholarship is based in the lived experiences of ongoing colonization.46 Settlercolonial studies would benefit from connecting to this existing academic conversation that runs parallel to and intersects with its own ideas in important ways. In particular, it draws attention to ongoing Indigenous contestation of colonial projects, and counters the tendency towards totalizing, structural accounts of settler colonialism. As Watson observes: Today our voices are still talking while the colonial project remains entrenched and questions concerning identity politics, and the ‘authentic native’ are constructed and answered by those who have power.47 Up to this point, we have been drawing together points made by other scholars. Settler colonialism has an ongoing, structural temporality, which is generally unacknowledged and contrasts with the linear colonialism–decolonization–post-colonialism narrative. However, we suggest that the application of a unidirectional, progressive temporality to the settler-colonial context is not just an analytical mistake, but a ‘technology of temporality’. This conception is taken up within the settler-colonial project in ways that work towards the consummation of settler sovereignty. The borrowed notion of a ‘radical break’ is variously located in settler colonialism’s past, present or future. By harnessing the decolonizing resonances of this concept of colonial transforma - tion, the settler-colonial project obscures the very different political effects of its own ‘vanishing endpoint’.48 What is this vanishing endpoint, which seems to lurk in all of our imaginations, our policy projects and our political debates? Instead of the moment of decolonization, it is the moment of full colonization — or rather, it is both, because in this imagined moment colonial relationships will dissolve themselves and settler authority will be naturalized. This transformative event is both an impossible colonial dream, premised on the disappearance of Indigenous political difference, and a concrete political project that justifies all manner of tactics in the present. But what are the political con - sequences of such a preoccupation? And do Indigenous participants in the colonial relationship seek the same kind of resolution and dissolution? Significantly, the Western colonial narrative of transformational change maps onto another Western imaginary — the moment of sovereign transformation encapsulated in the social contract. This is the moment that a group of people transition from collective social ‘status’ into individualized freedom and contractual person - hood.49 It is also the movement out of a constraining ‘history’ into an atemporal, rational present. As Hindess argues, liberalism con - signs its Indigenous contemporaries to its own past, and imagines this location in the past to be ‘a kind of moral and intellectual failure’, revealing the incapacity and disinclination to enter into a social contract and join the present.50 Therefore, the movement through time, via a radical transformative moment, is also the developmental movement from incapacity to capacity. An unstable but productive dichotomy emerges between, on the one hand, Indigenous political difference-incapacity-status-injustice-lack of sovereignty, and on the other, colonial completion-capacitycontract-freedom-sovereign inclusion. These oppositions are separated by an image of a single, interchangeable and undefined threshold — the transformative event. This temporal narrative belongs to both progressive and conservative articulations of the settler-colonial future; the settler colonial endpoint is variously positioned as an inevitable global trend,51 a past achievement yet to be fully recognized,52 and a future goal for which Aboriginal people must prepare.53 As Povinelli notes, these conceptions are not only temporal, but also teleological: [T]hese tenses are in turn articulated to other discourses of time and event such as teleological discourses that apprehend events ‘as the realization of an already given end or telos and eschatological discourses that wait for ‘extreme’ or ‘ultimate’ moments and events which immediately precede or accompany ‘the end of history’ and ‘its reversal into eternity’.54 The transformative event is positioned as part of an inevitable and inescapable trajectory (although it may be consistently deferred or delayed). In this way, the eventual legitimacy and stability of the settler-colonial project is always-already assumed. Through this a priori assumption, settler colonialism is able to entrench and sustain itself on the basis of its eventual demise. The following section traces the appearance and temporal location of this settler-colonial end - point in recent Australian Indigenous policy phases.

#### Treating space as a problem that can be solved without considering its colonial history reifies settler colonialism

**Smiles 2020**: Smiles, Deondre. [Assistant Professor, Department of Geography, University of Victoria, in B.C., Canada] “The Settler Logics of (Outer) Space.” *Society and Space*, October 26, 2020. societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space CH

To most scholars, and certainly to the virtual majority of Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island, it is no secret that the country we call the United States of America was built upon the brutal subjugation of Indigenous people and Indigenous lands. Fueled by the American settler myths of terra nullius (no man’s land) and Manifest Destiny, the American settler state proceeded upon a project of cultural and physical genocide, with lasting effects that endure to the present day. The ‘settler myth’ permeates American culture. Words such as ‘pioneer’, the ‘West’, ‘Manifest Destiny’ grab the imagination as connected to the growth of the country in its early history. America sprang forth from a vast open ‘wilderness’. Of course, for Indigenous people, we know differently—these lands had complex cultural frameworks and political entities long before colonization. Words like ‘pioneer’ and ‘Manifest Destiny’, have deep meanings for us too, as they are indicative of the very real damage dealt against our cultures and nations, damage that we have had to work very hard to undo. Trump’s address raises key insights into the continuing logics of settler colonialism, as well as questions of its future trajectories. Trump’s invocation of ideas such as the ‘frontier’ and ‘taming the wilderness’ draws attention to the brutal violence that accompanied the building of the American state. Scholars such as Greg Grandin (2019) make the case that the frontier is part of what America is—whether it is the ‘Wild West’, or the U.S.-Mexican border, America is always contending with a frontier that must be defined. Language surrounding ‘frontier’ is troubling because it perpetuates the rationale of why the American settler state even exists—it could make better use of the land than Native people would, after all, they lived in wilderness. This myth tells us that what we know as the modern world was built through the hard work of European settlers; Indigenous people had nothing to offer or contribute. For someone like Mr. Trump, whose misgivings and hostility towards Native people have been historically documented, this myth fits well with his narrative as President—he is building a ‘new’ America, one that will return to its place of power and influence. The fact that similar language is being used around the potential of American power being extended to space could reasonably be expected, given the economic and military potential that comes from such a move. Space represents yet another ‘unknown’ to be conquered and bent to America’s will. However, such interplanetary conquest does not exist solely in outer space. I wish to situate the very real colonial legacies and violence associated with the desire to explore space, tracing the ways that they are perpetuated and reified through their destructive engagements with Indigenous peoples. I argue that a scientific venture such as space exploration does not exist in a vacuum, but instead draws from settler colonialism and feeds back into it through the prioritization of ‘science’ over Indigenous epistemologies. I begin by exploring the ways that space exploration by the American settler state is situated within questions of hegemony, imperialism, and terra nullius, including a brief synopsis of the controversy surrounding the planned construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea. I conclude by exploring Indigenous engagement with ‘space’ in both its Earthbound and beyond-earth forms as it relates to outer space, and what implications this might have for the ways we think about our engagement with space as the American settler state begins to turn its gaze skyward once again. I position this essay alongside a growing body of academic work, as well as journalistic endeavors (Haskins, 2020; Koren, 2020) that demands that the American settler colonial state exercise self-reflexivity as to why it engages with outer space, and who is advantaged and disadvantaged here on Earth as a result of this engagement. Settler Colonialism and ‘Space’ A brief exploration of what settler colonialism is, and its engagement with ‘space’ here on Earth is necessary to start. Settler colonialism is commonly understood to be a form of colonialism that is based upon the permanent presence of colonists upon land. This is a distinction from forms of colonialism based upon resource extraction (Wolfe, 2006; Veracini, 2013). What this means is that the settler colony is intimately tied with the space within which it exists—it cannot exist or sustain itself without settler control over land and space. This permanent presence upon land by ‘settlers’ is usually at the expense of the Indigenous, or original people, in a given space or territory. To reiterate: control over space is paramount. As Wolfe states, “Land is life—or at least, land is necessary for life. Thus, contests for land can be—indeed, often are—contests for life” (2006: 387). Without land, the settler state ‘dies’; conversely, deprivation of land from the indigenous population means that in settler logic, indigeneity dies (Povinelli, 2002; Wolfe, 2006.) The ultimate aims of settler colonialism is therefore the occupation and remaking of space. As Wolfe (2006) describes, the settler state seeks to make use of land and resources in order to continue on; whether that is through homesteading/residence, farming and agriculture, mining, or any number of activities that settler colonial logic deems necessary to its own survival. These activities are tied to a racist and hubristic logic that only settler society itself possesses the ability to make proper use of land and space (Wolfe, 2006). This is mated with a viewpoint of landscapes prior to European arrival as terra nullius, or empty land that was owned by no one, via European/Western conceptions of land ownership and tenure (Wolfe, 1994). Because of this overarching goal of space, there is an inherent anxiety in settler colonies about space, and how it can be occupied and subsequently rewritten to remove Indigenous presence. In Anglo settler colonies, this often takes place within a lens of conservation. Scholars such as Banivanua Mar (2010), Lannoy (2012), Wright (2014) and Tristan Ahtone (2019) have written extensively on the ways that settler reinscription of space can be extremely damaging to Indigenous people from a lens of ‘conservation’. However, dispossession of Indigenous space in favor of settler uses can also be tied to some of the most destructive forces of our time. For example, Aboriginal land in the Australian Outback was viewed as ‘empty’ land that was turned into weapons ranges where the British military tested nuclear weapons in the 1950s, which directly led to negative health effects upon Aboriginal communities downwind from the testing sites (Vincent, 2010). Indigenous nations in the United States have struggled with environmental damage related to military-industrial exploitation as well.

#### [ROB] The Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Better Resistance Strategy Against Colonialist Violence.

#### [Carlson] Any ethical commitment requires that the aff place themselves in the center of Native scholarship and demands.

Carlson ‘16: Carlson, Elizabeth [PhD, is an Aamitigoozhi, Wemistigosi, and Wasicu (settler Canadian and American), whose Swedish, Saami, German, Scots-Irish, and English ancestors have settled on lands of the Anishinaabe and Omaha Nations which were unethically obtained by the US government. Elizabeth lives on Treaty 1 territory, the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, Nehiyawak, Dakota, Nakota, and Red River Metis peoples currently occupied by the city of Winnipeg, the province of Manitoba, is an Aamitigoozhi, Wemistigosi, and Wasicu (settler Canadian and American), whose Swedish, Saami, German, Scots-Irish, and English ancestors have settled on lands of the Anishinaabe and Omaha Nations which were unethically obtained by the US government. Elizabeth lives on Treaty 1 territory, the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, Nehiyawak, Dakota, Nakota, and Red River Metis peoples currently occupied by the city of Winnipeg, the province of Manitoba,] “Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies, Settler Colonial Studies”, 2016 AA

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

#### [King et al] The alt is to affirm an indigenous view of health and disability which requires evaluating the community holistically instead of the individual – this is mutually exclusive with the social model and disability as ontology.

**King et al ‘14:** King, Julie [Lecturer & Faculty of Health & Public Health and Social Work School at Queensland University of Technology, PhD, Master of Public Health] Brough, Mark [Professor & Faculty of Health & Public Health and Social Work School Queensland University of Technology, Doctor of Philosophy, Medical Anthropology] Knox M. [Public Health and Social Work, Queensland University of Technology] “Negotiating disability and colonisation: the lived experience of Indigenous Australians with a disability.” Disability & Society, *2014 Vol. 29, No. 5, 738–750, TandFOnline,* 2014 AA

The picture of disability among a colonised people that comes from this research resonates to some extent with Hollinsworth’s (2013) analysis of the literature, although our starting points differ. Hollinsworth commences from a consideration of racism in relation to colonisation and notes how this has negatively affected Indigenous Australians. He then discusses disability among Indigenous Australians. His primary message is that colonisation is itself a disabling force, and that disability services need to be aware of this history and its ongoing effects. This research commenced as an investigation of the lived experience of disability among Indigenous Australians, explicitly taking into account the context of colonisation. The fact that this research is consistent with the research agenda recommended by Hollinsworth, even though it was planned and started several years ago, is fortuitous. For Hollinsworth, the ongoing impact of colonisation and its racist underpinnings mean that Indigeneity is an objective disadvantage in general, which adds further disadvantage on top of those already experienced as a consequence of having a disability. The accounts given by the participants showed that they were constantly aware of the fact and effects of colonisation, and their sense of themselves as Indigenous was a core feature in how they situated themselves in Australian society. However, by inquiring into their lived experience as Indigenous people with a disability, it became clear that the sense of being a person with a disability is not just an additional set of disadvantages on top of being Indigenous, but is actually an experience that is negotiated such that being Indigenous becomes a strength. The category ‘person with a disability’ was not taken up readily because of cultural constructions of health and functioning. ‘Disability’ itself appears yet again to be a non-Indigenous concept. While this has been identified before (for example, Ariotti 1997, 1999; Senior 2000; O’Neill, Kirov, and Thomson, 2004), the diversity of Indigenous kinship groups and languages always raises the possibility that such findings among delimited groups are not generalisable. The participants reflect a historical ‘melting pot’ in Queensland, where dozens of kinship groups from across the state were forcibly settled together on missions, run by a range of Christian groups that aimed to convert them and to educate them to undertake menial roles. These former missions still act as crucial nodes of social interaction, with the participants often visiting them to catch up with extended family. The fact that participants from this ‘melting pot’ provided the same evidence for a lack of an Indigenous construct for disability found in earlier but more geographically specific studies provides strong evidence for the generality of the finding. It is worth noting that there is a similar lack of a readily translatable Indigenous construct for ‘health’ (Go\_djalk and De Donatis 2008; Boddington and Raisanen 2009). In pursuing an alternative Indigenous concept that addresses the same outcomes as western concepts of health, a holistic approach has been advanced which is so broad that it encompasses all aspects of life (McLennan and Khavarpour 2004; Boddington and Raisanen 2009): Aboriginal health is not just the physical well being of an individual but is the social, emotional and cultural well being of the whole community in which each individual is able to achieve their full potential thereby bringing about the total well being of their community. It is a whole-of-life view and includes the cyclical concept of life-death-life. Health to Aboriginal peoples is a matter of determining all aspects of their life, including control over their physical environment, of dignity, of community self-esteem, and of justice. It is not merely a matter of the provision of doctors, hospitals, medicines or the absence of disease and incapacity. (National Aboriginal Health Strategy Working Party 1989, ix) This definition differs in one important respect from western constructs of ‘wellbeing’: rather than an individual experiencing ‘health’ by being able to participate in the community, their very role as a community member is validated by their ability to participate. One of the implications of this broad approach is that Indigenous health is related to the history of colonisation, issues of Indigenous identity, and the need for self-determination (Boddington and Raisanen 2009). That is, what ‘health’ means to an Indigenous person is intimately bound up in what it means to ‘be Indigenous’. Thompson and Gifford (2000), in a study of the lived experience of diabetes among Indigenous people in Melbourne, framed this as ‘embodiment of the collective in the individual’: remaining a part of the collective (family, kinship group, Indigenous community) is synonymous with health. An implication is that disability (defined in medical terms) is not experienced as something different if it does not affect continuing participation and support. When Auntie Amelia could still go to the Elders’ meeting, or the people on Mornington Island could be wheeled down to the beach to go fishing, they were participating and were therefore neither ‘unhealthy’ nor ‘disabled’. In this sense, Indigenous cultural constructions relevant to disability are negotiated in the context of participation with other Indigenous people. One of the effects of colonisation has been to bind Indigenous people together through shared disadvantage, and this is paradoxically a source of strength in dealing with impairments. Losing a leg through diabetes is a physical hindrance, but if interaction with family, kin and community continues there is no ‘disability’. In this way Indigenous people either actively decolonise (or resist colonisation of) disability through the negotiation of their lived experience. It is worth noting that there are resonances here with the social model of disability and the distinction made in the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (WHO 2001) between impairment, activity and participation. However, as pointed out by Solli and Barbosa Da Silva (2012), these elements of the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health are inconsistent with a holistic approach to health due to their ultimate basis in a materialist ontology.

#### We must actively reject western epistemologies and the erasure-based orientation that academic spaces have toward indigeneity. Thus, the role of the judge is to act as an anti-colonialist educator.

**Masta 2019** (Stephanie Masta, Challenging the Relationship Between Settler Colonial Ideology and Higher Education, Berkeley Review of Education, 2019, <https://escholarship.org/content/qt55p0c597/qt55p0c597.pdf?t=puwvdn>) //neth

Within this section, I discuss three different markers of settler colonial practices in postsecondary education. The first marker is the dominant belief in the value of western epistemologies at the expense of other forms of knowledge (e.g., Indigenous). The second marker is how research methods erase Indigenous perspectives. The third marker is how colleges and universities “erase to replace” (Patel, 2016, p. 38) non-western culture and knowledge through research training. Although the markers closely connect to teaching and research, each represents a different focus. The first marker focuses on the value of western knowledge over Indigenous knowledge. The second marker outlines how researchers value western-centered research practices when conducting research. The third marker illustrates how students are trained through western-centered research curricula, even if they want to perform Indigenous-based research. One of the most significant markers of settler colonialism in postsecondary education is the dominant belief in the value of western epistemologies (Smith, 2012). Students often enter higher education with very little understanding of how western knowledge systems are constructed to serve particular agendas, such as the settler colonial agenda (Apple, 2014; Ruck-Simmons, 2006). Western knowledge is often “presented as objective and universal, obscuring its own interestedness” (Howard, 2006, p. 50). Therefore, there is no acknowledgement that the settler colonial state determines the epistemic values in education. Because academia treats western knowledges as superior, the legitimacy of western knowledges is “internalized, both by the colonizer and the colonized. Indigenous knowledge, on the contrary has been classified as a folklore of rituals, beliefs, or myths, which according to western epistemology, is a non-knowledge” (Thésée, 2006, p. 34). The contrast between the value of western knowledges and Indigenous knowledges is important for several reasons: not only do the participants of this study identify as Indigenous, but—within the U.S.—the project of settler colonialism was based on erasing and replacing Indigenous communities (Patel, 2016; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). My participants’ presence in postsecondary education demonstrates that this erasure did not occur. However, Indigenous peoples still fight for the legitimacy of their knowledges within postsecondary institutions. The second marker of settler colonialism in postsecondary education is the different set of research practices found within colleges and universities, which serve to replace Indigenous perspectives (Deloria, 2004; Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). For example, the research process is often colonial in nature and is exacerbated “when the researcher conducts research among groups less powerful economically, politically, and socially than the researcher” (Hales, 2006, p. 244). The relationship between the researcher and researched can often resemble that of the oppressor and oppressed (Fine, 1994), or the colonizer and colonized (Memmi, 2003). Researchers often get to decide and/or define the landscapes in which they conduct research (e.g., science-based work on Indigenous lands that does not engage with Indigenous peoples or epistemologies), often with the assumed authority to produce knowledge that they determine is legitimate (Bhattacharya, 2015). Colleges and universities also serve as gatekeepers to particular types of knowledge, privileging certain work over others. Bhattacharya (2015) wrote, “Privileging work that is filtered through academic structures can re-inscribe colonization, especially when raw knowledge, street knowledge, and knowledge from other non-traditional sources are dismissed as ‘unscholarly’ in academia” (p. 317). All of this occurs under the guise that western knowledges are neutral and universal. The third marker of settler colonialism in postsecondary education is how colleges and universities “erase to replace” (Patel, 2016, p. 38) non-western culture and knowledge through research training. As Patel wrote, “the training of doctoral candidates is one of the sharpest junctures through which this logic of erasing to replace is expressed through higher education in the social sciences" (p. 38). A key element of this training occurs when students engage with different research epistemologies, which often involve positivistic and post-positivistic methods. These methods reflect western knowledge values of rationality and objectivity (Ruck-Simmons, 2006). Even critical approaches in research—often lauded as the most apt to address issues of structural power—cannot always address the pervasiveness of settler colonial ideologies in education. Often, these epistemologies—positivism, post-positivism, and critical approaches—are “racially biased ways of knowing” because they arise out of the social history of dominant white western culture and “are used and legitimated in educational research to the exclusion of the epistemologies of other racial and cultural groups” (Hales, 2006, p. 249). There is no escaping the effects of settler colonialism, no matter how critical the research. The entire research process is “inextricably bound up with the ongoing project of coloniality as well as the potential to interrupt it and other ways of knowing and learning” (Patel, 2016, p. 14). Bhattacharya (2015) stated, “colonizing and decolonizing discourses are always relational and interactional, for although they are oppositional, one cannot exist without the other” (p. 311). Even when educators and researchers attempt to disrupt the settler colonial project in education, they do so under the canopy of settler colonial ideology.

Case

#### Aff fails – nobody to administer

**Mirzaee 2017** (Siavash Mirzaee, “Outer Space and Common Heritage of Mankind: Challenges and Solutions,” RUDN Journal of Law – December 2017, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317121083_Outer_Space_and_Common_Heritage_of_Mankind_Challenges_and_Solutions> | DOI: 10.22363/2313-2337-2017-21-1-102-114) //neth

Given that common heritage of mankind resources belongs to the international community as a whole, the second common heritage of mankind element is an inter- national management regime incorporating “representatives from all nations”. Because developed states often have greater access to common heritage of mankind resources, international management is intended to provide developing states with a measure of control over exploitation [18. P. 231]. At the present time, there is no international entity to administer the legal status of outer space strongly or dispute settlements among States. Disagreement of developed countries' and inefficiency of current entities are the main reasons for this shortage in outer space.

#### Privatization is inevitable – 75% of space is already privatized

**Urrutia 2018** (Doris Elin Urrutia, October 12, 2018, “How Will Private Space Travel Transform NASA's Next 60 Years?” <https://www.space.com/42113-nasa-future-private-spaceflight.html>) //neth

First, people should understand that about 75 percent of the worldwide space enterprise is already commercial, said Scott Hubbard, an adjunct professor in the Department of Aeronautics and Astronautics at Stanford University. This includes the satellites belonging to DirecTV and Sirius XM radio. What's news is the extension of that into the human realm," said Hubbard, who also previously directed NASA's Ames Research Center in Silicon Valley. He served as the agency's "Mars czar," restructuring NASA's robotic Red Planet-exploration program after it suffered several failures in the 1990s. And if private companies can get the price of a suborbital flight down to about $50,000, "you get a lot of interest," Hubbard told Space.com. The highest-profile program currently in the works between NASA and the private sector is the agency's Commercial Crew Program, said Eric Stallmer, president of the nonprofit Commercial Spaceflight Federation. Commercial Crew is encouraging the development of U.S. spacecraft that will carry astronauts to and from the International Space Station (ISS). Toward this end, NASA has awarded multibillion-dollar contracts to both SpaceX and Boeing, which are building capsules called Crew Dragon and CST-100 Starliner, respectively. These craft are currently scheduled to start flying astronauts sometime next year. There's also the maturing commercial cargo program, which has given contracts to SpaceX and Northrop Grumman Corp. to fly robotic cargo missions to the ISS. Both of these companies have already completed numerous such flights. Both Hubbard and Stallmer said that NASA wins by relying on private industry to provide such services in low Earth orbit. Hubbard argued that this strategy allows the space agency to continue "exploring the fringe where there really is no business case."