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## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative should only defend the hypothetical implementation of the resolution

#### Resolved means a legislative policy

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition. “Resolved”. 1964. ED

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Unjust means unlawful.

Waters 98, [H. FRANKLIN WATERS, Senior District Judge. Colonia Ins. Co. v. City Nat. Bank, 13 F. Supp. 2d 891 - Dist. Court, WD Arkansas 1998] Sachin

Arkansas law is clear on the issue that in the realm of unjust enrichment, the word "unjust" means "unlawful." "One is not unjustly enriched by receipt of that to which he is legally entitled. \* \* \* No recovery of money received can be based upon unjust enrichment when the recipient can show a legal or equitable ground for keeping it." Halvorson v. Trout, 258 Ark. 397, 403, 527 S.W.2d 573, 577 (1975) (quoting Whitley v. Irwin, 250 Ark. 543, 550-51, 465 S.W.2d 906, 910-11 (1971)). See also, Jackson County Grain Drying Coop. v. Newport Wholesale Electric, Inc., 9 Ark.App. 41, 46, 652 S.W.2d 638, 640 (1983) (no one shall be allowed to unjustly enrich himself at the expense of another; the word "unjustly" means "unlawfully").

#### In the context of space, “Appropriation” means to take as property

Leon 18 (Amanda M., Associate, Caplin & Drysdale, JD UVA Law) "Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources." Virginia Law Review, vol. 104, no. 3, May 2018, p. 497-547. HeinOnline.

Appropriation. The term "appropriation" also remains ambiguous. Webster's defines the verb "appropriate" as "to take to oneself in exclusion of others; to claim or use as by an exclusive or pre-eminent right; as, let no man appropriate a common benefit."16 5 Similarly, Black's Law Dictionary describes "appropriate" as an act "[t]o make a thing one's own; to make a thing the subject of property; to exercise dominion over an object to the extent, and for the purpose, of making it subserve one's own proper use or pleasure."166 Oftentimes, appropriation refers to the setting aside of government funds, the taking of land for public purposes, or a tort of wrongfully taking another's property as one's own. The term appropriation is often used not only with respect to real property but also with water. According to U.S. case law, a person completes an appropriation of water by diversion of the water and an application of the water to beneficial use.167 This common use of the term "appropriation" with respect to water illustrates two key points: (1) the term applies to natural resources-e.g., water or minerals-not just real property, and (2) mining space resources and putting them to beneficial use-e.g., selling or manufacturing the mined resources could reasonably be interpreted as an "appropriation" of outer space. While the ordinary meaning of "appropriation" reasonably includes the taking of natural resources as well as land, whether the drafters and parties to the OST envisioned such a broad meaning of the term remains difficult to determine with any certainty. The prohibition against appropriation "by any other means" supports such a reading, though, by expanding the prohibition to other types not explicitly described.168

#### Private entity = majority nonstate

Warners 20 (Bill, JD Candidate, May 2021, at UIC John Marshall Law School) "Patents 254 Miles up: Jurisdictional Issues Onboard the International Space Station." UIC Review of Intellectual Property Law, vol. 19, no. 4, 2020, p. 365-380. HeinOnline.

To satisfy these three necessary requirements for a new patent regime, the ISS IGA must add an additional clause ("Clause 7") in Article 21 specifically establishing a patent regime for private nonstate third parties onboard the ISS. First, Clause 7 would define the term "private entity" as an individual, organization, or business which is primarily privately owned and/or managed by nonstate affiliates. Specifically defining the term "private entity" prevents confusion as to what entities qualify under the agreement and the difference between "public" and "private."99 This definition would also support the connection of Clause 1 in Article 21 to "Article 2 of the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization." 100 A succinct definition also alleviates international concerns that the changes to the ISS IGA pushes out Partner State influence. 101 Some in the international community may still point out that Clause 7 still pushes towards a trend of outer space privatization. However, this argument fails to consider that private entities in outer space have operated in space almost as comprehensively as national organizations. 102

#### They violate—they gain offense from Endorsing a method of transpacific reimagining

#### Standards:

#### 1] Competitive equity – 3 warrants:

#### A] Ground: they get to pick the topic ex post facto which incentivizes vague argumentation that’s not grounded in a consistent, stable mechanism – caselists are concessionary, unpredictable, beaten by perms, and don’t justify their model.

#### B] Limits: their model has no resolutional bound and creates the possibility for literally an infinite number of 1ACs. Not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months. Cutting negs to every possible aff is a commitment even large squads can’t handle, let alone small schools like us.

#### C] Causality: debating the resolution forces the affirmative to defend a cause and effect relationship, the state doing x results in y. Non topical affs establish their own barometer “I think x is good for me” that aren’t negatable which kill clash

#### D] Fairness is an impact – [1] it’s an intrinsic good – some level of competitive equity is necessary – if it didn’t exist, there wouldn’t be value to the game since judges could vote whatever way they wanted [2] probability – your ballot can’t solve their impacts but it can solve mine – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but can rectify skews [3] comes before substance –– any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them, since it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it. 3

#### 2] Switch-side debate –

#### Second is switch side and idea-testing --- only a limited topic that leaves a role for the negative allows contestation and second-order testing that overcomes polarization. Switching sides forces them to scrutinize their own beliefs, which is valuable for developing and defending their own convictions more robustly.

#### B] TVA – here’s a method to deconstruct the securitization of China through the res – also proves that critiques of Chinese policy are relevant and necessary

Büscher and Fletcher 16 Bram Büscher, Robert Fletcher, 4-06-2016, “Destructive creation: capital accumulation and the structural violence of tourism,” Journal of Sustainable Tourism, Vol. 25, 2017, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09669582.2016.1159214

Consequently, strategic branding decisions must simultaneously be “true” and do violence to the realities they aim to promote. This can lead to poignant contradictions that embody the violence of distinct forms of structural inequalities in relation to race, ideology, gender and income. One example is the “the commoditization in Cuba's revitalized tourism industry during the post-Soviet Special Period vis-a-vis the revolution's Marxist–Leninist ideology” (Kaifa Roland, [2010](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09669582.2016.1159214), p. 3). Another is the ironic Chinese “self-orientalism” to create a tourist representation that signifies “a modern China subjugated to Western understanding and authority over modernity” (Yan & Almeida Santos, [2009](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09669582.2016.1159214), p. 295). A final issue is that branding itself obviously makes strategic decisions to play into existing social-economic inequalities in that certain places brand themselves exclusively for certain classes or segments of society. Hence, certain experiences are “meant” to be exclusively for the super-rich, which in turn enables them to further distinguish them as a class (one example here being “space tourism”; see [http://www.virgingalactic.com](http://www.virgingalactic.com/)).

Importantly, these various issues do not represent an exhaustive attempt to categorize the links between inequality and tourism. Moreover, and equally importantly, they also intersect in manifold ways. Hence, contemporary forms of uneven geographical development link to distinction-generating tourism practices in manifold and sometimes unexpected and extreme ways. One example relates to contemporary and deeply violent dynamics in terms of structural inequalities happening in Greece. As Greece is forced to adjust (more) to neoliberal forms of governance, debates on how it may use its tourism image to alleviate its debts may take extreme forms as occurred several years ago already when commentators suggested that Greece must just “sell some islands” to cover its debt. As one article explained, “There's little that shouts ‘seriously rich’ as much as a little island in the sun to call your own.. .Now Greece is making it easier for the rich and famous to fulfill their dreams by preparing to sell, or offering long-term leases on, some of its 6,000 sunkissed islands in a desperate attempt to repay its mountainous debts” (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/jun/24/greece-islands-sale-save-economy>). Another, very different, example is “James Bond” tourism where tourists aim to revisit James Bond movie sets and scenes and so contribute to and re-enact, according to Reijnders ([2010](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09669582.2016.1159214), p. 369), unequal “patriarchal notions of masculinity”.

The broader point here is that the dialectic between tourism and uneven geographical capitalist development allows each element of this dialectic to feed off the other, resulting in intensified stimulation of violent structural inequality as capital accumulation via tourism both profits from and exacerbates the uneven development of which it is part and parcel. It is in this sense that tourism can be truly seen as “world-making” (Hollinshead et al., [2009](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09669582.2016.1159214)).

#### C] Vote negative – A] this procedurally evaluates whether their model is good, which is a prior question B] they can’t get offense: we don’t exclude them, only persuade you that our methodology is best. Every debate requires a winner and loser, so voting negative doesn’t reject them from debate, it just says they should make a better argument next time.

## 2

#### Settler colonialism is the ontological permeating structure of the nation-state which requires the elimination of indigenous life and land via the occupation of settlers. The appropriation of land turns Natives into ghosts and chattel slaves into excess labor. Their method begins and ends with mental “orientations” or epistemologies” – when they reference “the decolonial … work that Asian American rhetoric can and must do,” they make decolonization a metaphor which turns the aff.

Tuck and Yang 12

(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

Our intention in this descriptive exercise is not be exhaustive, or even inarguable; instead, we wish to emphasize that (a) decolonization will take a different shape in each of these contexts - though they can overlap - and that (b) neither external nor internal colonialism adequately describe the form of colonialism which operates in the United States or other nation-states in which the colonizer comes to stay. Settler colonialism operates through internal/external colonial modes simultaneously because there is no spatial separation between metropole and colony. For example, in the United States, many Indigenous peoples have been forcibly removed from their homelands onto reservations, indentured, and abducted into state custody, signaling the form of colonization as simultaneously internal (via boarding schools and other biopolitical modes of control) and external (via uranium mining on Indigenous land in the US Southwest and oil extraction on Indigenous land in Alaska) with a frontier (the US military still nicknames all enemy territory “Indian Country”). The horizons of the settler colonial nation-state are total and require a mode of total appropriation of Indigenous life and land, rather than the selective expropriation of profit-producing fragments. Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain. Thus, relying solely on postcolonial literatures or theories of coloniality that ignore settler colonialism will not help to envision the shape that decolonization must take in settler colonial contexts. Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article.) Land is what is most valuable, contested, required. This is both because the settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence. This violence is not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is reasserted each day of occupation. This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that settler colonialism is a structure and not an event. In the process of settler colonialism, land is remade into property and human relationships to land are restricted to the relationship of the owner to his property. Epistemological, ontological, and cosmological relationships to land are interred, indeed made pre-modern and backward. Made savage. In order for the settlers to make a place their home, they must destroy and disappear the Indigenous peoples that live there. Indigenous peoples are those who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they came to be in a particular place - indeed how we/they came to be a place. Our/their relationships to land comprise our/their epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies. For the settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and over time and through law and policy, Indigenous peoples’ claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource. Indigenous peoples must be erased, must be made into ghosts (Tuck and Ree, forthcoming). At the same time, settler colonialism involves the subjugation and forced labor of chattel slaves, whose bodies and lives become the property, and who are kept landless. Slavery in settler colonial contexts is distinct from other forms of indenture whereby excess labor is extracted from persons. First, chattels are commodities of labor and therefore it is the slave’s person that is the excess. Second, unlike workers who may aspire to own land, the slave’s very presence on the land is already an excess that must be dis-located. Thus, the slave is a desirable commodity but the person underneath is imprisonable, punishable, and murderable. The violence of keeping/killing the chattel slave makes them deathlike monsters in the settler imagination; they are reconfigured/disfigured as the threat, the razor’s edge of safety and terror. The settler, if known by his actions and how he justifies them, sees himself as holding dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as the anthropocentric normal, and as more developed, more human, more deserving than other groups or species. The settler is making a new "home" and that home is rooted in a homesteading worldview where the wild land and wild people were made for his benefit. He can only make his identity as a settler by making the land produce, and produce excessively, because "civilization" is defined as production in excess of the "natural" world (i.e. in excess of the sustainable production already present in the Indigenous world). In order for excess production, he needs excess labor, which he cannot provide himself. The chattel slave serves as that excess labor, labor that can never be paid because payment would have to be in the form of property (land). The settler's wealth is land, or a fungible version of it, and so payment for labor is impossible.6 The settler positions himself as both superior and normal; the settler is natural, whereas the Indigenous inhabitant and the chattel slave are unnatural, even supernatural. Settlers are not immigrants. Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies. Therefore, settler nations are not immigrant nations (See also A.J. Barker, 2009). Not unique, the United States, as a settler colonial nation-state, also operates as an empire - utilizing external forms and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the settler colonial project. This means, and this is perplexing to some, that dispossessed people are brought onto seized Indigenous land through other colonial projects. Other colonial projects include enslavement, as discussed, but also military recruitment, low-wage and high-wage labor recruitment (such as agricultural workers and overseas-trained engineers), and displacement/migration (such as the coerced immigration from nations torn by U.S. wars or devastated by U.S. economic policy). In this set of settler colonial relations, colonial subjects who are displaced by external colonialism, as well as racialized and minoritized by internal colonialism, still occupy and settle stolen Indigenous land. Settlers are diverse, not just of white European descent, and include people of color, even from other colonial contexts. This tightly wound set of conditions and racialized, globalized relations exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization, and by solidarity, against settler colonial forces. Decolonization in exploitative colonial situations could involve the seizing of imperial wealth by the postcolonial subject. In settler colonial situations, seizing imperial wealth is inextricably tied to settlement and re-invasion. Likewise, the promise of integration and civil rights is predicated on securing a share of a settler-appropriated wealth (as well as expropriated ‘third-world’ wealth). Decolonization in a settler context is fraught because empire, settlement, and internal colony have no spatial separation. Each of these features of settler colonialism in the US context - empire, settlement, and internal colony - make it a site of contradictory decolonial desires7. Decolonization as metaphor allows people to equivocate these contradictory decolonial desires because it turns decolonization into an empty signifier to be filled by any track towards liberation. In reality, the tracks walk all over land/people in settler contexts. Though the details are not fixed or agreed upon, in our view, decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonization is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity. “Decolonization never takes place unnoticed” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). Settler colonialism and its decolonization implicates and unsettles everyone.

#### Cards from the 1AC that are particularly nauseating:

#### 1) Their 1AC Wan & Young evidence claim’s that the nation state

perform its own violence in contexts such as relations with Native Hawaiians, indigenous nations, or other racialized communities in the United States.

#### proves that the aff’s attempt to explain indigenous oppression through racialization and tossing in of indigenous people that one that assimilates Natives into the broader ethos of liberal democracy ignoring it’s not a race but a subject position

#### 2) The 1AC Park evidence represents a tossing in and stirring of indigenous populations who are completely unrelated to the idea of Asian technoorentalism, but are instead used as a token to preempt settlerism. Their claim that the

#### European “discovery” of the Americas resulted in the loss of 95% of the indigenous population

#### also proves that you ought to prioritize our impacts first because they controlled the RC and created the conditions for hegemonic domination

**Techno-orientalism is reliant and constitutive of settler colonialism – turns case because the aff serves to reproduce itself**

**Arvin 18** [Maile Arvin Dr. Maile Arvin is an assistant professor of History and Gender Studies at the University of Utah. She is a Native Hawaiian feminist scholar who works on issues of race, gender, science and colonialism in Hawai‘i and the broader Pacific. At the University of Utah, she is part of the leadership of the Pacific Islands Studies Initiative, which was awarded a Mellon Foundation grant to support ongoing efforts to develop Pacific Islands Studies curriculum, programming and student recruitment and support. “Polynesia Is a Project, Not a Place : Polynesian Proximities to Whiteness in Cloud Atlas and Beyond” 2018 <https://laulima.hawaii.edu/access/content/user/kfrench/sociology/Family_Text/SOC%20214/Beyond%20Ethnicity%20Hawaii/Chapter_1_Polynesia%20is%20a%20Project%2C%20not%20a%20place.pdf> ] // aaditg

SETTLER COLONIALISM MEETS TECHNO-ORIENTALISM ON THE PACIFIC RIM In addition to those about Polynesians transcending race (in my analysis, being possessed by Whiteness), another troubling narrative in Cloud Atlas is the story of Sonmi, a female cyborg-slave played by Korean actress Doona Bae in a fastfood restaurant in Neo-Seoul. Her political awakening and escape, aided by an underground revolutionary network, leads her to become a prophetess and martyr for the cause of cyborg abolition. Although not set directly in the Pacific Islands, a key subplot links the stories: namely, Sonmi becomes a goddess that future Pacific Islanders worship. Thus, the Sonmi narrative’s inclusion in Cloud Atlas is suggestive of some of the ways that Orientalism and settler colonialism are embedded in each other and mutually constitutive. Considering the Asia Pacific pivot military strategy of the United States, the so-called Pacific Rim and the often-overlooked Pacific Islands are tightly enmeshed. At work in the Sonmi narrative is a familiar form of Orientalism often found in science fiction, what David Morley and Kevin Robins have termed technoOrientalism. 59 In their formulation, techno-Orientalism ties older forms of Orientalism, in which the East is an exotic and excluded Other from the West, to fears about Asia’s seeming technological, and increasingly economic, superiority. 60 Where Morley and Robins relate techno-Orientalism to the rise of Japan in the 1980s and the overwhelming postmodern and decentered metropolis of Tokyo in movies such as Blade Runner, other scholars, including Aimee Bahng, have shown how techno-Orientalism continues to move and reemerge in places like Singapore, which markets itself as a future hub of finance, biotechnology, and engineering. 61 Cloud Atlas locates the Sonmi story in a future South Korea but differs little from these other articulations of techno-Orientalism. In all articulations, the “future is technological,” and thus the future is Asian, “a future that seems to be transcending and displacing western modernity.” Morley and Robins note that “The association of technology and Japaneseness now serves to reinforce the image of a culture that is cold, impersonal and machine-like, an authoritarian culture lacking emotional connection to the rest of the **world.”** 62 In line with such techno-Orientalism, Cloud Atlas places Sonmi as a nearly indistinguishable cog in a cold, machine-filled, authoritarian Orient. Sonmi’s realization of her true humanity—that she has emotions and deserves to live outside the indignities and sexual exploitation of the restaurant she is trapped in—leads her to become the figurehead and martyr of the cyborg and allied human revolution. This narrative then operates as a cautionary tale about the consequences of allying with a rising, authoritarian Asia instead of the original capitalists, the West, who are equally rapacious but, this story seems to indicate, fundamentally more caring and more human. Neo-Seoul is presented as a doomed enterprise that will never eliminate the true human spirit, which audiences will recognize as a uniquely individualistic American spirit. Though Sonmi is represented as a Korean cyborg, her femininity and the love story interwoven with her escape and martyrdom make her an appropriate sexual object of Western audiences, and her belief in democracy and freedom bestows upon her a kind of honorary Whiteness. The reemergence of Sonmi in the Pacific Islander story of Zachry uses the narrative of Western freedom as always triumphant over Oriental authoritarianism to further instruct audiences to view the Pacific as naturally aligned with the West rather than the East.Revealing a towering statue of Sonmi at the summit of a volcano on Zachry’s island, the movie suggests that Pacific Islanders were tricked into superstitiously believing that Sonmi was a goddess when she was really just a cyborg. When Halle Barry’s character Meronym explains this to Zachry, one possible implication is that his Pacific Islander people are mistaken for believing in an Oriental future, rather than a Western one. Sonmi’s true spirit, after all, was a Western one, which modern people may admire but do not worship in such a Native or Oriental fashion. In any case, Meronym highlights that the admiration for Sonmi among Zachry’s people should be for her Western traits of a strong belief in freedom and democracy. Considering the juxtaposition of Neo-Seoul against the future Big Island of Zachry’s narrative, we can also see the Pacific Islands as operating directly as an antidote to the overwhelming, post-apocalyptical metropolis of Asian countries. The Big Island is visually portrayed as empty of any markers of modern life, inhabited primarily by goat herders who live in shacks and the roaming savages who prey on the goat herders. Here again, the two types of Polynesian noted by Louis Sullivan, as discussed earlier, emerge to represent rustic but innocent Whiteness on the one hand, and barbaric savagery that must be eradicated in the name of that innocence on the other hand. Where Neo-Seoul is overwhelmingly disorienting, the Big Island is still pristine, even in the distant future when the rest of the world is destroyed. The Pacific is the place where the West survives the East; it is a safer, experimental Orient that reorients the hegemony of the West. In this story, settler colonialism is the salve of a failed imperial contest, as the successful settlement of the Pacific Islands will allow the West to rise again and last beyond the boom and busts of Asia. Thus, we must recognize that stories that are techno-Orientalist also often depend on naturalizing settler colonialism in the Pacific and present occupation of the welcoming feminine Pacific as a solution to threats from the technological advances of the Asian metropolis. More specifically, the presence of Sonmi as a Pacific Islander goddess also naturalizes the presence of Asians in the Pacific, rather than situating that presence as historical and political. Asian settler colonialism, a field of scholarship that has grown in recent years**,** attempts to reframe such naturalized Asian and Asian American relationships to land in Hawai‘i. Although Asian settler colonialism has existed as a concept since at least the 1990s, stemming from Haunani-Kay Trask’s insistence that Asian Americans in Hawai‘i are settlers rather than immigrants, the project has more recently coalesced with the 2008 publication of the volume Asian Settler Colonialism, 63 The contributors to the volume identify themselves as Asian settler scholars who are committed to respectfully confronting the ways that Asian Americans living in Hawai‘i have long erased Native Hawaiian claims to land and sovereignty. In contrast to histories that laud the first generations of Japanese and Chinese plantation workers as the foundation for the contemporary Asian American middle class in Hawai‘i, these scholars seek to reposition themselves and their communities outside U.S. national frames and within a squarely settler colonial one. 64 Although criticism of the term “Asian settler” has denounced the potential for lumping Asians and Asian Americans along with White settlers into a category starkly opposed to Native Hawaiians, the Asian settler scholars of the volume repeatedly position their critiques as ones that do not seek to reproach Asian Americans in Hawai‘i for their presence there but rather to challenge Asian affiliations with the American nation-state. In other words, Asian settler colonialism reminds everyone (to recall Edouard Glissant and Dean Saranillio’s words) that America is a project, not a place, not only in Hawai‘i but also in Alaska, the continent, and other outposts of American empire. What does recognizing America “as a project, not a place” mean for intervening into settler colonialism and possessive forms of Whiteness in the Pacific? For Asian settler colonialism, it means asking for Asian settlers to disavow the project, not the place, and for the place to be recognized as Hawai‘i nei, not America, and not a U.S. state. Here, I understand the discourse of Asian settler colonialism as one that dovetails with Victor Bascara’s theorizing of model minority imperialism. Bascara reminds us that critiques of the Asian American model minority stereotype are also critiques of U.S. imperialism. Rather than an effort to name and divide populations into settlers and indigenes, Asian settler colonialism is a critique of, as Bascara says, the use of “the success stories of Asian Americans” to erase both the conditions of empire that involved Asians in the racial-capitalist project of America and to mask the “new terms of empire” **under the more recent names of multiculturalism and globalization.** 65 To be sure, Asian settler scholars are not interested in dishonoring “the struggles of their grandparents and greatgrandparents, the early Asian settler laborers who demonstrated tremendous courage and resourcefulness,” only in reclaiming their stories within narratives Fojas, C., Guevarra, R. P., & Sharma, N. T. (Eds.). (2018). Beyond ethnicity : New politics of race in hawai'i. Retrieved from http://ebookcentral.proquest.com Created from wcc-ebooks on 2019-10-08 20:28:20. Copyright © 2018. University of Hawaii Press. All rights reserved. that do not valorize the settler colonial project of America. 66 In a similar vein, Asian American writer Dennis Kawaharada writes about the need for all residents of Hawai‘i to educate themselves about Hawaiian language and culture, rather than assume that the plantation experience and pidgin language that developed on the plantations reflects everyone’s experience. He points to the work of Native Hawaiian poet Dana Naone Hall to remind his readers that, for many Native Hawaiians, “identity is rooted not in the plantation experience, but in the mythic world of nature and ancestral gods,” where “K nehekili / flashes in the sky / and Moanonuikalehua changes / from a beautiful woman / into a lehua tree / at the sound of the pahu.” Kawaharada further points out that resistance on the part of Asian American residents of Hawai‘i to learning more about Hawaiian culture and history often stems from “the hurt and rejection they feel when they discover they cannot become Hawaiian by moving here or living here, which they believe is their right as Americans, based on the cultural myth that a person is free to be anything he or she wants to be.” 67 Kawaharada’s work points out though both Asians and Native Hawaiians were crucially part of the material to be “melted” in the American melting pot image of Hawai‘i, both would assimilate and effectively disappear into Whiteness. Rather than transferring the privileges and property of Whiteness to Asians and Native Hawaiians, this logic simply strengthened the structure of Whiteness and White supremacy, allowing White American settlers to be understood as the natural leaders and owners of Hawai‘i. Asian American proximity to Whiteness thus notably works similarly to Native Hawaiian proximity to Whiteness. The model minority myth, Bascara writes, trotted Asian Americans out as, in the language of Aiiieeee!, “miracle synthetic white people.” 68 Not being able to assume that synthetic Whiteness in any secure, consistent way, however, puts Asian Americans in a similar if incommensurable position to Native Hawaiians in respect to Whiteness: each is engaged in the project of America by being possessed through Whiteness, but is not extended the possession of Whiteness.

#### Vote negative for a politics of decolonization – refuse settler futurity, refuse the 1AC, and refuse to flinch from an ethic of incommensurability. Solves the aff – creates an open space for future work to resist imperial and hegemonic domination

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)

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework. We want to say, first, that decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions - decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity. Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics - moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone - these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability.*when you take away the punctuation he says of lines lifted from the documents about military-occupied land its acreage and location you take away its finality opening the possibility of other futures* -Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012)

Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.

## Case

### T/L

#### Vote neg on presumption –

#### A) Nothing spills over – there’s no connection between the ballot and chancing people’s attitudes. You encourage more teams to read framework which turns your offense and prevents the alteration of mindsets. Pacific politics is not the issue making debate inaccessible. Issues such as microaggressions, discrimination, the model minority myth, and other forms of racism are making debate inaccessible and the aff does not solve. This turns case because the AC takes action on the wrong issue, makes us thing we solve and takes resources and energy.

#### B) No warrant for a ballot – the competitive nature of debate coopts any ethical value of advocating the aff – winning rounds only makes it look like they just want to win which proves framework and means advocating by losing is more effective.

#### C) Debate – none of their evidence is specific to it – sets a high threshold for solvency and ignores how communicative norms operate.

#### D) Voting aff doesn’t access social change, but voting neg resolves our procedural impacts.

Ritter ‘13 (JD from U Texas Law (Michael J., “Overcoming The Fiction of “Social Change Through Debate”: What’s To Learn from 2pac’s Changes?,” National Journal of Speech and Debate, Vol. 2, Issue 1)

The structure of competitive interscholastic debate renders any message communicated in a debate round virtually incapable of creating any social change, either in the debate community or in general society. And to the extent that the fiction of social change through debate can be proven or disproven through empirical studies or surveys, academics instead have analyzed debate with nonapplicable rhetorical theory that fails to account for the unique aspects of competitive interscholastic debate. Rather, the current debate relating to activism and competitive interscholastic debate concerns the following: “What is the best model to promote social change?” But a more fundamental question that must be addressed first is: **“Can debate cause social change?”** Despite over two decades of opportunity to conduct and publish empirical studies or surveys, academic proponents of the fiction that debate can create social change have chosen not to prove this fundamental assumption, which—as this article argues—is merely a fiction that is harmful in most, if not all, respects. The position that competitive interscholastic debate can create social change is more properly characterized as a **fiction** than an argument. A fiction is an invented or fabricated idea purporting to be factual but is not provable by any human senses or rational thinking capability or is unproven by valid statistical studies. An argument, most basically, consists of a claim and some support for why the claim is true. If the support for the claim is false or its relation to the claim is illogical, then we can deduce that the particular argument does not help in ascertaining whether the claim is true. Interscholastic competitive debate is premised upon the assumption that debate is argumentation. Because fictions are necessarily not true or cannot be proven true by any means of argumentation, the competitive interscholastic debate community should be **incredibly critical** of those fictions and adopt them only if they promote the activity and its purposes.

#### ROB/ROJ is to vote for the better debater---only non-arbitrary form of decision making and anything else is leads to endless clarification that is a slippery slope to always concluding affirmative.

#### E] Allies DA – if the aff has a ballot key warrant, then their resistance project relies on the approval and activism of white judges who vote for them – if those judges are constitutively anti asian as per their theory, that dooms their project

### K Proper

#### 1) Reading Technoorientalism against an Asian debater is a double turn with their method & results in psychological violence –1AC ev indicates that the technoorientalist discourse encompasses Indians – we read Green

1AC Roh et al 15. \*David S. Roh is associate professor of English and director of the Digital Matters Lab at the University of Utah, where he specializes in digital humanities and Asian American literature. \*\*Betsy Huang is an associate professor of English and former inaugural Chief Officer of Diversity and Inclusion at Clark University. \*\*\*Greta A. Niu writes about Asian stuff and tech [“Techno-Orientalism,” 2015, *Imagining Asia in Speculative*]//vikas

Throughout the twentieth century, variations of that premodern-hypermodern dynamic in speculative visions of Asia and Asians have been recycled numerous times. 2 Exemplars include the villainous Khan Noonien Singh in Gene Roddenberry’s Star Trek universe, the leader of a group of superhumans who attempt to take control of the Starship Enterprise; the Chinese scientist Dr. X in Neal Stephenson’s novel, The Diamond Age (1995),a counterfeiter using “a gallimaufry of contraband technology” (73) to steal Western innovations; and most recently The Mandarin in Iron Man 3 (2013), a clear revival of Dr. Fu Manchu played cleverly by Ben Kingsley in a tongue-in-cheek fashion. 3 But **Western speculations of an Asianized future are not always consolidated in a singular fictional figure** as in Fu Manchu, Dr. X, or The Mandarin. **The yellow peril anxiety of an earlier, industrial-age era** embodied by Fu Manchu **found new forms across cultures and hemispheres as Asian economies become more visible competitors in the age of globalization and rapid technological innovations**. One needs to witness only the speculative fictional worlds of Maureen McHugh’s novel China Mountain Zhang (1992), Joss Whedon’s television series Firefly (2002), and Gary Shteyngart’s novel Super Sad True Love Story (2010) to trace persisting anxieties over the past three decades of a China dominated future. All of **these worlds feature Western protagonists struggling to navigate a sociopolitical landscape in which China is the dominant global empire with a superior technological edge**. Beyond the focus on China, paradigmatic works such as William Gibson’s Japan-based oeuvre (including Neuromancer), Ridley Scott’s Blade Runner, and the Wachowskis’ The Matrix films have also burnished in the Western consciousness Asian-influenced visions of the future underpinned by a familiar yet estranged mixture of Orientalist sensibilities.

**These** examples **perfectly illustrate** our definition of techno-Orientalism: the phenomenon of imagining Asia and Asians in hypo- or hypertechnological terms in cultural productions and political discourse.4 Techno-Orientalist imaginations are infused with the languages and codes of the technological and the futuristic. These developed alongside industrial advances in the West and have become part of the West’s project of securing dominance as architects of the future, a project that requires configurations of the East as the very technology with which to shape it. Techno-Orientalist speculations of an Asianized future have become ever more prevalent in the wake of neoliberal trade policies that enabled greater flow of information and capital **between the East and the West**. Substantial criticism of techno-Orientalism emerged in the mid-1990s when cultural theorists began to trace its manifestations and theorize its causes and implications. Kevin Morley and David Robins, Toshiya Ueno, and Kumiko Sato, principal trailblazers of the field, laid much of the valuable groundwork. Morley and Robins’s Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes, and Cultural Boundaries (Routledge, 1995), in which a definition of “techno-Orientalism” first saw print, remains the most cited in critical assessments of technological and Orientalist discourses; however, Ueno has probably written most extensively about techno-Orientalism as a discursive cultural phenomenon in the era of what he identifies as the “post-Fordist social environment of globalization” (223). “The basis of Orientalism and xenophobia is the subordination of Others through a sort of ‘mirror of cultural conceit,’” Ueno explains. “**The Orient exists in so far as the West needs it**, **because it brings the project of the West into focus**” (223).

Whereas Orientalism, as a strategy of representational containment, arrests Asia in traditional, and often premodern imagery, **techno-Orientalism presents a broader, dynamic, and often** contradictory spectrum **of images**, constructed by the East and West alike, **of an “Orient” undergoing rapid economic and cultural transformations**. **Techno-Orientalism**, like Orientalism, **places great emphasis on the project of modernity**—cultures privilege modernity and fear losing their perceived “edge” over others. Stretching beyond Orientalism’s premise of a hegemonic West’s representational authority over the East, **techno-Orientalism’s scope is** much more expansive and bidirectional, its discourses mutually constituted by the flow of trade and capital across the hemispheres. As Ueno observes, techno-Orientalism is first and foremost an effect of globalism. “If the Orient was invented by the West,” he writes, “then **the Techno-Orient was also invented by the world of information capitalism**” (228). **Technological developments**, driven by the imperial aspirations and the appetites of consumerist societies on both sides of the Pacific, **propel the engines of invention and production**. In its wake, **Western nations** vying for cultural and economic dominance with Asian nations **find in techno-Orientalism an** expressive vehicle for their aspirations and fears. Our volume, Techno-Orientalism: Imagining Asia in Speculative Fiction, History, and Media, documents past and current constructions of the role of Asia in a technologized future and critically examines this proliferating phenomenon.

Dr. Fu Manchu illustrates just one way in which techno-Orientalist imagery pervades Western cultural productions in the early twentieth century. The principal locales of techno-Orientalist projects as they developed in the late twentieth century have primarily been Japan and China. Ueno, whose influential analyses of “Japanimation” in the mid-1990s seeded the field of techno-Orientalist studies, observes, “In Techno-Orientalism, Japan is not only located geographically, but is also projected chronologically. Jean Baudrillard once called Japan a satellite in orbit. Now Japan has been located in the future of technology” (228). Morley and Robins put a finer point on the temporal dimension of the spatial construction: “If the future is technological, and if technology has become ‘Japanised,’ then the syllogism would suggest that the future is now Japanese, too. The postmodern era will be the Pacific era. Japan is the future, and it is a future that seems to be transcending and displacing Western modernity” (168).

Whereas Japan’s dubious honor as the original techno-Orient was bestowed in the eighties with the help of the cyberpunk movement, the techno-Orientalizing of China occurred roughly a decade later. 5 China was not yet a competitor in the global economy in the1980s, when the West focused its wary gaze on what it saw as an invasion of Japanese capital investments and imports into Western economies. When China was recognized as a newly industrialized country (NIC) in the 1990s and its influence in the global economy increased, it, too, became once again a target of techno-Orientalist fashioning. The discourse on China’s “rise” in the U.S. context, consistent with techno-Orientalist contradictions, has focused on constructing its people as a vast, subaltern-like labor force and as a giant consumer market whose appetite for Western cultural products, if nurtured, could secure U.S. global cultural and economic dominance. This dual image of China as both developing-world producers and first world consumers presents a representational challenge for the West: Is China a human factory? Or is it a consumerist society, like the United States, whose enormous purchasing power dictates the future of technological innovations and economies?

**Japan and China are** thus **signified** differently in the techno-Orientalist vocabulary. Both are constructed **as competitors and therefore** threats **to the U.S. economy**; but **while Japan competes with the United States for dominance in technological innovation**, **China competes with the United States in labor and production**. To put it in starker terms, Japan creates technology, but China is the technology. In the eyes of the West, **both are crucial engines of the future**: **Japan innovates and China manufactures**. And as Asia, writ large, becomes a greater consumerist force than the West,6 its threat/value dualism commensurately increases. These differences in the technological signification of **Japan and China manifest themselves in the fictive forecasts of the Asian-tinged future**. If **Japan is a screen on which the West has** projected its technological fantasies, then **China is a screen on which the West projects its** fears of being colonized, mechanized, and instrumentalized in **its own pursuit of technological dominance**.

India, another NIC, has also found itself under the techno-Orientalist gaze as a consequence of U.S. outsourcing practices. Asa much maligned business strategy, outsourcing has provoked extremely negative public sentiments in the United States. These opinions find expression in a particular strand of techno-Orientalist discourse that consolidates China and India as the chief threats to the U.S. service and labor sectors. These Asian nations serve as the scapegoats for corporate decisions to move service and manufacturing jobs abroad and bear the brunt of the resulting xenophobic antipathies. Chinese and Indian workers, for instance, are routinely portrayed in techno-Orientalist and technophobic vocabularies; call center employees in India adopt Western Christian names and mimic the linguistic and idiomatic style of Americans, a practice so ubiquitous as to be parodied cinematically in romantic comedies such as Outsourced (2006), conjuring images of Dickian androids (or Blade Runner’s “replicants”) **who simulate human behavior and** threaten the distinction between “real” and “fake” Americans. Glossy spreads of endless rows of Chinese workers in corporate factories and towns in mainstream magazines such as Time and Wired seal the visual vocabulary of Asians as the cogs of hyperproduction. In the NIC contexts, **techno-Orientalist discourse constructs Asians as** mere simulacra **and maintains a** prevailing sense of the inhumanity of Asian labor—**the** very antithesis of **Western liberal** humanism**.**

#### 2) Homogenizing and essentializing all of Asians recreates psychological violence and turns the case – Japanese and Chinese wars, India and Pakistan tensions, etc. all prove that geography =/= agreement – proven by how no one says “I’m Asian” but instead “I’m Indian” or “I’m Chinese.” Homogenization of Asianness is unproductive, ahistoric, and flattens meaningful difference that has been advocated for by various groups of Asian people. Rao 18

Sonia Rao, 2018, Washington Post, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/lifestyle/style/the-term-asian-american-was-meant-to-create-a-collective-identity-is-it-necessary-in-2018/2018/07/27/c30e7eb0-8e90-11e8-b769-e3fff17f0689_story.html>

Rain pools in the seats of folding chairs arranged haphazardly near an outdoor stage. Parents, huddling under umbrellas, had pushed the chairs aside, determined to get photographs of their children performing a traditional Filipino dance against the backdrop of the U.S. Capitol. An announcer thanks the families for spending their Saturday afternoon this way, despite the inclement weather.

“Anyway, for Asians, this is a blessing,” she says of the rain.

Such sweeping statements are true to the nature of Fiesta Asia, an annual festival held in Washington that aims to broadly celebrate Asian heritage in the United States — essentially, commemorating the “Asian American” experience.

That term — Asian American — encompasses dozens of distinct ethnic identities, which, in our labels-obsessed era, has splintered the community’s attitudes toward it. Some appreciate being lumped into the collective, while others question its utility.

Uncertainty remains: What does it actually mean to identify as Asian American in 2018?

Melissa dela Cuesta stands under one of the many tents at Fiesta Asia, dressed in a purple dress with puffy sleeves. She wears a sash across her torso denoting her place as second runner-up in a Miss Teen Philippines pageant and looks surprised when asked how she would identify herself. Isn’t the answer obvious?

“I am Filipino American,” declares the 17-year-old. The explanation gushes out: She is “in love” with her culture and feels as though it influences every aspect of her being. She doesn’t understand why anyone would reject their ethnic identity, especially with their skin color as evidence. She proudly calls herself “morena,” a Spanish word used in the Philippines to describe women with darker skin and hair.

This isn’t uncommon among first-generation Americans, according to sociologist Dina Okamoto. If someone were to ask them the dreaded “But where are you really from?” question, the answer would most likely be the country their parents came from, not the continent. About two-thirds of Asian Americans identify primarily with their specific ethnicity, according to the research organization AAPI Data.

They “reject the [broader] label because they view it as homogenizing,

and they don’t believe it really captures who they are,” says Okamoto, 47, author of “Redefining Race.”

In the past, it was targeted discrimination that motivated the strong connections to their family’s country of origin. When Japanese Americans were incarcerated during World War II, for example, some Chinese Americans wore buttons or carried signs that stated their ethnicity so they wouldn’t meet the same fate. A pan-ethnic identifier would have made little sense to them.

#### 3) The 1AR’s inevitable argument that appropriation of space excludes Asian countries is nonsensical because the Asian continent definitively has some of the most expansive space industries thing about Japan, SoKo, China. India – so they don’t solve

#### 4) Park implicates that none of their offense applies because it is theoretical, about film and fiction, and NASA’s documentations – we read blue

#### 1AC Park, 16

[Kelly Jiyoon Park is a medical student and science fiction enthusiast based in Los Angeles. She is passionate about reproductive rights, mental health literacy in immigrant communities, and not actively contributing to the medical industrial complex. In her free time, she enjoys choral singing and having strong feelings about social justice, books, and the internet. “A People’s History of Outer Space,” 22 July 2016, <https://freerads.org/2016/07/22/a-peoples-history-of-outer-space/>] Cgilbert

Until the mid-20th century, however, characterizations of outer space remained mostly theoretical. This changed with the advent of modern physics and engineering; suddenly, the stars were quite literally in our grasp. The time between the first aerial circumnavigation and the first orbit of Earth from space was less than 40 years. The Cold War’s Space Race and real-life Star Wars (more officially known as the Strategic Defense Initiative) were fought between U.S. and Communist powers to establish dominance over the skies. For the first time, the battle over space surpassed ideology and entered physical reality. **The Space Race undoubtedly yielded important scientific discoveries, but this was secondary to political and military agendas concerning missiles and nuclear armament**. And although the conversation around international space programs has evolved to include talks of peace, collaboration, and friendly science, billions of dollars are still spent every year by the United States government on military space initiatives. Now that human space exploration seems destined to occur in our lifetime, it is more important than ever that we remain vigilant about its potential costs. Despite the aspirational nature of outer space – exemplified in the deployment of space communicators such as Bill Nye and Neil DeGrasse Tyson into STEM classrooms – it’s hard not to notice the imperialist undertones lurking within the seemingly benign discourse of curiosity. On July 22, the most recent installment in the Star Trek franchise premiered with the following familiar words: “Space: the final frontier. These are the voyages of the starship Enterprise. Its five-year mission: to explore strange new worlds, to seek out new life and new civilizations, to boldly go where no man has gone before.” As a Trek devotee myself, I have been known to tear up at these words, to lose myself in their cheap sentimentality, to dream one day of traveling outer space for myself. But on closer examination, they construct space as a territory to be penetrated, explored, and possibly conquered. **The concept of the “final frontier” is not new: Manifest Destiny**, for example, was a narrative that encouraged and **legitimized 19th-century American expansionism**. But the frontier has traditionally been an inhospitable, bloody place for people of color. The phrases “to boldly go” and “explore strange new worlds,” while perhaps intended to captivate the imagination, belong to a broader rhetoric of imperialism and exploitation. After all, the European “discovery” of the Americas resulted in the loss of 95% of the indigenous population and the subsequent establishment of the Trans-Atlantic slave trade. Although the original Star Trek creatives (to their credit) likely developed the Prime Directive as a critique of U.S. foreign policy in Southeast Asia, contemporary works of **science fiction** are **replete with narratives of settler colonialism**. **The short-lived TV show Firefly (2002),** in which humans terraform planets for colonization, borrows heavily from colonial/pioneer imagery in an ode to westerns (and from techno-Orientalismas well, but that’s another story). While scientists like to nitpick the technical verisimilitude in these depictions, they are also deeply committed to the possible colonization of Mars, as outlined in a 36-page NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration) document titled Journey to Mars: Pioneering Next Steps in Space Exploration. We seem not to have much choice in the matter, however. The ever-present fear of alien enemy combatants invading Earth not only fuels TV and movie franchises but also ensures that society look to authoritarian institutions (such as the military) with gratitude and relief **instead of suspicion**. Even the more domestic threat of resource scarcity and environmental collapse looms over any attempt

#### 5) Watson is almost entirely about AUSTRALIA – all their empirical examples and personal travels that informed their method happened in Australia, their only reference to the US is about student demographics at NYU’s campus IN AUSTRALIA – that’s not sufficient to make broad claims about the US writ large or to establish any kind of solvency for “transpacific reimagining”

#### 6) Wan and Young – don’t allow for any pre-fiat performative offense – the NC and NR are also instances of Asian performance and identity within the debate space and there’s no pre and post-fiat distinction either way. If they win that their reading of the 1AC spills up then the act of us reading the DA or K clearly spills up as well. If we prove that the act of getting private corporations out of space is bad then that means their performative act of rejecting it is unethical and bad so you should vote NEG