## 1

#### Resist the urge to develop new institutions so that they fit neatly into an ethic mold that returns the power of development and engagement to the control of the people. It is the only way that we can confront the injustice of various neoliberal institutions.

Badiou ’11 (Alain, Prof. @ [European Graduate School](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Graduate_School), Former chair of [Philosophy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philosophy) @ [École Normale Supérieure](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/%C3%89cole_Normale_Sup%C3%A9rieure), “The Universal Reach of Popular Uprisings” the symptom, <http://www.lacan.com/thesymptom/?page_id=1031>)

The Wind of the East Carries Away the Wind of the West Until when will the idle and crepuscular West, the “international community” of those who still believe themselves to be the rulers of the world, continue to give lessons in good management and good behavior to the rest of the world? Is it not laughable to see well-paid and well-fed intellectuals, retreating soldiers of the capital-parliamentarism that serves us as a moth-eaten Paradise, offering their services to the awe-inspiring Tunisian and Egyptian people, in order to teach these savages the ABC of “democracy?” What pathetic persistence of colonial arrogance! In the situation of political misery that we’ve been living in for the last three decades, is it not evident to surmise that it is us who have everything to learn from the popular uprisings of the moment? Don’t we sense the urgency of giving a close look at everything, that, over there, made possible, by collective action the overthrow of oligarchic and corrupt governments, who — or maybe especially — stood in a humiliating position of servitude to the Western world? Yes, we should be the students of these movements, and not their ~~stupid~~ professors. For they give life, with the genius of their own inventions, to those same political principles that for some time now the dominant powers tried to convince us were obsolete. And in particular the principle that Marat never stopped recalling: when it is a matter of liberty, equality, emancipation, we all have to join the popular upheavals. We Are Right To Revolt Just as in politics, our states and those that benefit from them (political parties, unions and complaisant intellectuals) prefer management to revolt, they prefer peaceful demands and “orderly transition” to the breach of law. What the Egyptian and Tunisian people remind us is that the only action appropriate to the sentiment of scandalous takeover by state power is the mass uprising. In this case, the only rallying cry capable of linking together the disparate aspirations of those making a crowd is: “you there, go away!” The exceptional significance of the revolt, namely its critical power, lies in the fact that its rallying cry, which is repeated by millions of beings, gives the measure of what will be, undoubtedly, irreversibly, its first victory: the flight of the designated ~~man~~. And whatever happens next, this triumph, illegal by nature, of popular action, will be forever victorious. Now, that a revolt against the power of the state can be absolutely successful is an example of universal reach. This victory points out the horizon over which any collective action, unencumbered by the authority of the law, itself outlines: what Marx called “the deterioration of the state.” The knowledge that someday the people, freely associated and resorting to their creative power, will be able to throw away the funereal coercion of the state. That’s the reason why this idea arouses boundless enthusiasm in the entire world and will trigger the revolution that ultimately will overthrow the authority in residence. A Spark Can Set The Plain on Fire… It began with the suicide, a self-immolation by fire, of a man who had been downgraded to unemployment, and to whom was forbidden the miserable commerce that allowed him to survive; and because a female police officer slapped him in the face for not understanding what in this world is real. In a few days this gesture becomes wider and in a few weeks millions of people scream their joy on a distant square, and this entails the beginning of the catastrophe for the powerful potentates. What is at the root of this fabulous expansion? Are we dealing with a new sort of epidemic of freedom? No. As Jean-Marie Gleize poetically said: “The dissemination of a revolutionary movement is not carried by contamination. But by resonance. Something that surfaces here resounds with the shock wave emitted by something that happened over there.” Let’s name this resonance “event.” The event is the sudden creation, not of a new reality, but of a myriad of new possibilities. None of them is the repetition of what is already known. This is the reason why it’s obscurantist to say “this movement claims democracy” (implying the one that we enjoy in the West), or that “this movement pursues social improvement” (implying the average prosperity for the petit bourgeois de chez nous). Starting with almost nothing, resonating everywhere, the popular uprising creates unknown possibilities for the entire world. The word “democracy” is hardly uttered in Egypt. There is talk about “a new Egypt,” about the “true Egyptian people,” about a constituent assembly, about complete changes in everyday life, of unheard-of and previously unknown possibilities. There is a new plain that will come after that which no longer exists, the one that was set on fire by the spark of the uprising. This plain to be stands between the declaration of an alteration in the balance of forces and the grasping of new tasks. Between the shout of a young Tunisian: “We, children of workers and of peasants, are stronger than the criminals;” and what a young Egyptian said: “As from today, January 25, I take in my own hands the matters of my country.” The People, Only the People, Are the Creators of Universal History It’s amazing that in our West, the governments and the media consider that the insurgents in a Cairo square are “the Egyptian people.” How can that be? Aren’t the people for them, the only reasonable and legal people, the one usually reduced to the majority of a poll, or the majority of an election? How did it happen that suddenly, hundreds of rebels are representative of a population of eighty million? It’s a lesson that should not be forgotten, and that we will not forget. After a certain threshold of determination, of stubbornness and of courage, the people, in fact, can concentrate their existence in a square, an avenue, some factories or a university… The whole world will witness the courage, and especially the wondrous creations that go with it. These creations prove that there, there is a People. As an Egyptian rebel strongly put it: “before I watched television, now television is watching me.” In the stride of an event, the People is made of those who know how to solve the problems brought about by the event. Thus, in the takeover of a square: food, sleeping arrangements, watchmen, banners, prayers, defensive actions, so that the place where it all happens, the place that is the symbol, is kept and safeguarded for the people, at any price. Problems that, at the level of the hundreds of thousands of risen people mobilized from everywhere, seemed insoluble, all the more that in this place the state has virtually disappeared. To solve insoluble problems without the assistance of the state becomes the destiny of an event. And this is what makes a People, suddenly, and for an indeterminate time, exist where they have decided to assemble themselves.

#### Our perception of a linear “real time” is non-existent, as temporalization is structured by retention and protention. The concept of time is relative. Thus the analysis of outer space must start with measures of time. Space has different relative measures of time and even the way we perceive the world is relative, but their absolute understanding of space and debate is flawed.

#### Elements of the past return in a different manner and in a different context where only versions of what is interpretated in the past is dead. In order to solve the root cause of their impacts we need to challenge the underlying spectral antagonism that makes the ghosts run. The ghost of the cold war haunt your 1AC.

#### Their framing of private entities serves as a distraction from the spatial accumulation and violence produced by the neoliberal state --- the 1AC doesn’t prevent expansion it just solidifies control.

**Fredriksson and Arvanitakis 17**[Martin Fredriksson Linköping University James Arvanitakis Western Sydney University “Property, Place and Piracy” November 2017 Publisher: RoutledgeISBN: 9781138745131 Projects: Piracy UnboundCommons and Commodities]/ISEE /recut mlk-jo

So, the Orphans rebellion might be closer to Disney’s Jack Sparrow than to ‘Calico Jack’ Rackham and figures like Tumlinson describe the invocation of piracy as tongue in cheek. Nontheless historical figure of the pirate remains a useful heuristic for approaching contemporary space mining. The pirate, as frontier libertarian of the colonial seas, was both anathema to and fundamentally constitutive of the international legal order that began to emerge alongside the ‘juridification of the oceanic commons’ (Policante, 2015, p. xii). A violent appropriator exploiting the ‘free’ spaces outside the sphere of state power, the pirate of the pre-modern world was hostis humani generis – the enemy of all humanity (see Chapter 6 in this volume for a detailed analysis). But, paradoxically, efforts to eradicate piracy solidified the role of European colonial powers as protectors of the oceanic commons and global commerce, simultaneously strengthening the state’s monopoly on legitimate violence on the frontier (Heller-Roazen, 2009; Policante, 2015, p. xii).Although the pirate’s capacity for unrestricted violence in plundering treasure from rival vessels may not resonate with space mining, this section considers whether extraterrestrial resource exploitation can be construed as an act of theft that similarly involves this state/ pirate dialectic. Central to the commingling of piratical lawlessness and the extension of state power onto the frontier is a transformation in the pirate’s legal standing that occurred between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. During the European Wars of Religion, a ‘state of exception’ (Agamben, 2005) became solidified in customary law and treaty agreements beginning with the 1559 Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis. ‘Amity lines’ were drawn to separate the emergent ‘law of nations’ between continental powers and an anomic space ‘beyond the line’,10 where ‘treaties, peace and friendship applied only to Europe, to the Old World, to the area on this side of the line’ (Schmitt, 2006, p. 92). It is within this 130 M. Johnson anomic space where the pirate became employed by the state: those who held a lettre des marques et de représailles (letter of marque and reprisal) were authorised to plunder enemy vessels and treasure without any limit on hostility. The pirate was transformed from lawless freebooter to state-sanctioned privateer: resources appropriated beyond the line were shared between privateers and state coffers, and the privateer became fundamental to European state-building (Policante, 2015, pp. 61–67). Might the frontier beyond the atmosphere comprise a similar state of exception, where the physical distance from the ‘concrete order’ (Schmitt 2006, p. 65) of terrestrial legal and political norms results in an extra-legal or anomic space, free for plunder? Despite the largely pre-emptive juridification of the space frontier via the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 (OST), the legal status of outer space retains a degree of ambiguity. The OST was drafted at the height of Cold War geopolitical tension and subsequently focused more on the militarisation of outer space and undesirability of territorial claims on celestial bodies, as opposed to clarifying the role of non-state actors or providing a framework for commercial activity (Pop, 2000). The treaty established that outer space was res communis: a commons and ‘the province of all mankind’. Article 2 stated that ‘Outer space, including the Moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.’ Crucially, the treaty has not explicitly forbidden private appropriation of celestial bodies. The clause ‘by any other means’ is possibly enough to prohibit appropriation by non-government actors (Pop, 2000). To more ardent supporters of space mining, however, the emphasis on national appropriation presents a loophole for private enterprise (Kfir, 2016; White, 1998), that ‘an individual acting on his own behalf or on behalf of another individual or a private association or an international organization could lawfully appropriate any part of outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies’ (Gorove, 1969, p. 351). The US Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act of 2015 (CSLCA) appears to take the latter interpretation, whereby the sovereign power of the US legislature endorses private enterprises to ‘act on their own behalf’. Title IV of the Act states: A United States citizen engaged in commercial recovery of an asteroid resource or a space resource … shall be entitled to any asteroid resource or space resource obtained, including to possess, own, transport, use, and sell the asteroid resource or space resource obtained in accordance with applicable law, including the international obligations of the United States. (US CSLCA, 2015, §402) These ‘international obligations’ are clearly in relation to the OST, and the CSLCA also includes the ‘Extraterritorial Sovereignty Disclaimer’: ‘the United States does not thereby assert sovereignty or sovereign or exclusive rights or jurisdiction over, or the ownership of, any celestial body’ (US CSLCA, 2015, Privateering on the cosmic frontier? 131 §403). The ‘applicable law’ of the act only includes, but it is not limited to, international law: while the precise details regarding enforcement of any space property claims are unclear, such claims could also be protected under US law and competing claims arbitrated in US courts. While the CLSCA would not entail the American flag being planted on the surface of an asteroid, the US is tacitly claiming some level of jurisdiction via acts of corporate appropriation. And, if ‘international obligations’ represent more than just the OST’s nonappropriation principle, the general absence of recognition and endorsement from the international community means that the CSCLA is a largely unilateral assertion.11 The CSLCA effectively positions the US in opposition to other nations – spacefaring or otherwise – seeming to contradict the res communis nature of the OST. It imposes a res nullius legal interpretation of outer space resources by assuming that celestial bodies are free for exploitation, provided no direct territorial claims are made. The United States recognises and enforces its citizens’ resource claims on the space frontier in the name of ‘[developing] in the United States … economically viable, safe and stable’ space resource industries (US CSLCA, 2015, p. 44). This exploitation of the frontier as ‘state of exception’ is an act of economic competition, and the CSLCA then starts to resemble the letter of marque. Resources claimed in outer space will generate tax revenue and further political prerogatives of economic growth (jobs, infrastructure and so on), akin to the role of privateering in European state-building or the granting of royal charters to joint-stock companies like the East India Company. Outer space becomes the province of the United States economy rather than ‘all mankind’ a commercial vanguard enables an indirect form of ‘accumulation by dispossession’ (Harvey, 2004; Dickens & Ormrod 2007, p. 59), pre-emptively stealing resources owned by all. As far as NewSpace’s yearnings for pirate space utopias are concerned, this fundamental reliance on the state’s legislative apparatus implies that the notion of a stateless space frontier is indeed a fantasy. As privateers and patriots, ‘[extending] our free-market values into space’ (Kerber, cited in Space Frontier Foundation, 2015), NewSpace mining firms effectively extend state influence onto the anomic frontier under the guise of entrepreneurial commerce.

#### The way that policies are framed deeply implicates how they are carried out.

The Frameworks Institute 03, (“The FrameWorks Perspective: Strategic Frame Analysis”, http://www.frameworksinstitute.org/strategicanalysis/perspective.shtml)

By framing, we mean how messages are encoded with meaning so that they can be efficiently interpreted in relationship to existing beliefs or ideas. Frames trigger meaning. The questions we ask, in applying the concept of frames to the arena of social policy, are as follows: How does the public think about a particular social or political issue? What is the public discourse on the issue? And how is this discourse influenced by the way media frames that issue? How do these public and private frames affect public choices? How can an issue be reframed to evoke a different way of thinking, one that illuminates a broader range of alternative policy choices? This approach is strategic in that it not only deconstructs the dominant frames of reference that drive reasoning on public issues, but it also identifies those alternative frames most likely to stimulate public reconsideration and enumerates their elements (reframing). We use the term reframe to mean changing "the context of the message exchange" so that different interpretations and probable outcomes become visible to the public (Dearing & Rogers, 1994: 98). Strategic frame analysis offers policy advocates a way to work systematically through the challenges that are likely to confront the introduction of new legislation or social policies, to anticipate attitudinal barriers to support, and to develop research-based strategies to overcome public misunderstanding. What Is Communications and Why Does It Matter? The domain of communications has not changed markedly since 1948 when Harold Lasswell formulated his famous equation: who says what to whom through what channel with what effect? But what many social policy practitioners have overlooked in their quests to formulate effective strategies for social change is that communications merits their attention because it is an inextricable part of the agenda-setting function in this country. Communications plays a vital role in determining which issues the public prioritizes for policy resolution, which issues will move from the private realm to the public, which issues will become pressure points for policymakers, and which issues will win or lose in the competition for scarce resources. No organization can approach such tasks as issue advocacy, constituency-building, or promoting best practices without taking into account the critical role that mass media has to play in shaping the way Americans think about social issues. As William Gamson and his colleagues at the Media Research and Action Project like to say, media is "an arena of contest in its own right, and part of a larger strategy of social change." One source of our confusion over communications comes in not recognizing that each new push for public understanding and acceptance happens against a backdrop of long-term media coverage, of perceptions formed over time, of scripts we have learned since childhood to help us make sense of our world, and folk beliefs we use to interpret new information. As we go about making sense of our world, mass media serves an important function as the mediator of meaning — telling us what to think about (agenda-setting) and how to think about it (media effects) by organizing the information in such a way (framing) that it comes to us fully conflated with directives (cues) about who is responsible for the social problem in the first place and who gets to fix it (responsibility). It is often the case that nonprofit organizations want communications to be easy. Ironically, they want soundbite answers to the same social problems whose complexity they understand all too well. While policy research and formulation are given their due as tough, demanding areas of an organization's workplan, communications is seen as "soft." While program development and practice are seen as requiring expertise and the thoughtful consideration of best practices, communications is an "anyone can do it if you have to" task. It is time to retire this thinking. Doing communications strategically requires the same investment of intellect and study that these other areas of nonprofit practice have been accorded. A Simple Explanation of Frame Analysis In his seminal book Public Opinion (1921:16), Walter Lippmann was perhaps the first to connect mass communications to public attitudes and policy preferences by recognizing that the "the way in which the world is imagined determines at any particular moment what men will do." The modern extension of Lippmann's observation is based on the concept of "frames." People use mental shortcuts to make sense of the world. Since most people are looking to process incoming information quickly and efficiently, they rely upon cues within that new information to signal to them how to connect it with their stored images of the world. The "pictures in our heads," as Lippmann called them, might better be thought of as vividly labeled storage boxes - filled with pictures, images, and stories from our past encounters with the world and labeled youth, marriage, poverty, fairness, etc. The incoming information provides cues about which is the right container for that idea or experience. And the efficient thinker makes the connection, a process called "indexing," and moves on. Put another way, how an issue is framed is a trigger to these shared and durable cultural models that help us make sense of our world.

#### The 1AC spectacles of catastrophe comes from a confidence in colonial power that continues to haunt the present and future, seeking to assimilate and obliterate all that is different while attempting to turn a profit.

#### Space exploration becomes an outlet for expanding capitalist grip – infinite wars will be fought over new resources – also their advantages are made up and/or inevitable in capitalism.

**Dickens 9 – \***Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex(Peter, “The Cosmos as Capitalism’s Outside,” The Sociological Review, 57: 66–82, dml)

The imminent conquest of outer space raises the question of ‘outside’ and ‘inside’ yet again. Capitalism now has the cosmos in its sights, an outside which can be privately or publicly owned, made into a commodity, an entity for which nations and private companies can compete. As such the cosmos is a possible site of armed hostilities. This means, contra Hardt and Negri, that there is an outside after all, one into which the competitive market can now expand indefinitely. A new kind of imperialism is therefore underway, albeit not one attempting to conquer and exploit people ‘outside’ since there are no consumers or labour power to exploit in other parts of the solar system. Ferrying wealthy tourists into the cosmos is a first and perhaps most spectacular part of this process of capital's cosmic expansion. Especially important in the longer term is making outer space into a source of resources and materials. These will in due course be incorporated into production-processes, most of which will be still firmly lodged on earth. Access to outer space is, potentially at least, access to an infinite outside array of resources. These apparently have the distinct advantage of not being owned or used by any pre-existing society and not requiring military force by an imperializing power gaining access to these resources. Bringing this outside zone into capitalism may at first seem beneficial to everyone. But this scenario is almost certainly not so trouble-free as may at first seem. On the one hand, the investment of capital into outer space would be a huge diversion from the investments needed to address many urgent inequalities and crises on Earth**.**On the other hand, this same access is in practice likely to be conducted by a range of competing imperial powers. Hardt and Negri (2000) tell us that the history of imperializing wars is over. This may or may not be the case as regards imperialism on earth. But old-style imperialist, more particularly inter-imperialist, wars seem more likely than ever, as growing and competing power-blocs (the USA and China are currently amongst the most likely protagonists) compete for resources on earth and outer space**.** Such, in rather general terms, is the prospect for a future, galactic, imperialism between competing powers. But what are the relations, processes and mechanisms underlying this new phenomenon? How should we understand the regional rivalries and ideologies involved and the likely implications of competing empires attempting to incorporate not only their share of resources on earth but on global society's ‘outside’? Social crises, outer spatial fixes and galactic imperialism Explanatory primacy is given here to economic mechanisms driving this humanization of the universe. In the same way that they have driven imperializing societies in the past to expand their economic bases into their ‘outsides’, **the**social relations of capitalism and the processes of capital-accumulation are driving the new kind of outer space imperialisms. Such is the starting-point of this paper (See alsoDickens and Ormrod, 2007). It is a position based on the work of the contemporary Marxist geographer David Harvey (2003) and his notion of ‘spatial fixes’. Capitalism continually constructs what he calls ‘outer transformations.’ In the context of the over-accumulation of capital in the primary circuit of industrial capital, fresh geographic zones are constantly sought out which have not yet been fully invested in or, in the case of outer space, not yet been invested in at all. ‘Outer spatial fixes’ are investments in outer space intended to solve capitalism's many crises. At one level they may be simply described as crises of economic profitability. But ‘economic’ can cover a wide array of issues such as crises of resource-availability and potential social and political upheavals resulting from resource-shortages. Furthermore, there is certainly no guarantee that these investments will actually ‘fix’ these underlyingeconomic, political and social crises. The ‘fix’ may well be of a temporary, sticking-plaster, variety.

#### Geopolitical hegemony becomes utilized through ideologies of imaginative geographies that includes outer space. The geographical distinction between us and them feeds on cartographies of fear that need to be conquered. EXLORATION IS INHERENTLY COLONIAL

**Smiles 20** Written By Deondre Smiles, October 26 2020 "The Settler Logics of (Outer) Space, https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space

In reaffirming our heritage as a free nation, we must always remember that America has always been a frontier nation. Now we must embrace the next frontier. America’s Manifest Destiny in the stars…The American nation was carved out of the vast frontier by the toughest, strongest, fiercest and most determined men and women ever to walk on the face of the Earth…Our ancestors braved the unknown, tamed the wilderness, settled the Wild West…This is our glorious and magnificent inheritance. We are Americans. We are pioneers. We are the pathfinders. We settled the New World. We built the modern world.” -President Donald J. Trump, 2020 State of the Union address. 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. But, what does this all look like in regard to outer space? In order to really understand the potential (settler) colonial logics of space exploration, we must go back and explore the ways in which space exploration became inextricably tied with questions of state hegemony and geopolitics during the Cold War. US and Soviet space programs were born partially out of military utility, and propaganda value—the ability to send a nuclear warhead across a great distance to strike the enemy via a ICBM and the accompanying geopolitical respect that came with such a capability was something that greatly appealed to the superpowers, and when the Soviets took an early lead in the ‘Space Race’ with Sputnik and their Luna probes, the United States poured money and resources into making up ground (Werth, 2004). The fear of not only falling behind the Soviets militarily as well as a perceived loss of prestige in the court of world opinion spurred the US onto a course of space exploration that led to the Apollo moon landings in the late 1960s and the early 70s (Werth, 2004; Cornish, 2019). I argue that this fits neatly into the American settler creation myth referenced by Trump—after ‘conquering’ a continent and bringing it under American dominion, why would the United States stop solely at ‘space’ on Earth? To return to Grandin (2019), space represented yet another frontier to be conquered and known by the settler colonial state; if not explicitly for the possibility of further settlement, then for the preservation of its existing spatial extent on Earth. However, scholars such as Alan Marshall (1995) have cautioned that newer logics of space exploration such as potential resource extraction tie in with existing military logics in a way that creates a new way of thinking about the ‘openness’ of outer space to the logics of empire, in what Marshall calls res nullius (1995: 51)[i]. But we cannot forget the concept of terra nullius and how our exploration of the stars has real effects on Indigenous landscapes here on Earth. We also cannot forget about forms of space exploration that may not be explicitly tied to military means. Doing so deprives us of another lens through which to view the tensions between settler and Indigenous views of space and to which end is useful. Indeed, even reinscribing of Indigenous space towards ‘peaceful’ settler space exploration have very real consequences for Indigenous sovereignty and Indigenous spaces. Perhaps the most prominent example of the fractures between settler space exploration and Indigenous peoples is the on-going controversy surrounding the construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea, on the island of Hawaii. While an extremely detailed description of the processes of construction on the TMT and the opposition presented to it by Native Hawai’ians and their allies is beyond the scope of this essay, and in fact is already expertly done by a number of scholars[ii], the controversy surrounding TMT is a prime example of the logics presented towards ‘space’ in both Earth-bound and beyond-Earth contexts by the settler colonial state as well as the violence that these logics place upon Indigenous spaces, such as Mauna Kea, which in particular already plays host to a number of telescopes and observatories (Witze, 2020). In particular, astronomers such as Chanda Prescod-Weinstein, Lucianne Walkowicz, and others have taken decisive action to push back against the idea that settler scientific advancement via space exploration should take precedence over Indigenous sovereignty in Earth-space. Prescod-Weinstein and Walkowicz, alongside Sarah Tuttle, Brian Nord and Hilding Neilson (2020) make clear that settler scientific pursuits such as building the TMT are simply new footnotes in a long history of colonial disrespect of Indigenous people and Indigenous spaces in the name of science, and that astronomy is not innocent of this disrespect. In fact, Native Hawai’ian scholars such as Iokepa Casumbal-Salazar strike at the heart of the professed neutrality of sciences like astronomy: One scientist told me that astronomy is a “benign science” because it is based on observation, and that it is universally beneficial because it offers “basic human knowledge” that everyone should know “like human anatomy.” Such a statement underscores the cultural bias within conventional notions of what constitutes the “human” and “knowledge.” In the absence of a critical self-reflection on this inherent ethnocentrism, the tacit claim to universal truth reproduces the cultural supremacy of Western science as self-evident. Here, the needs of astronomers for tall peaks in remote locations supplant the needs of Indigenous communities on whose ancestral territories these observatories are built (2017: 8) As Casumbal-Salazar and other scholars who have written about the TMT and the violence that has been done to Native Hawai’ians (such as police actions designed to dislodge blockades that prevented construction) as well as the potential violence to come such as the construction of the telescope have skillfully said, when it comes to the infringement upon Indigenous space by settler scientific endeavors tied to space exploration, there is no neutrality to be had—dispossession and violence are dispossession and violence, no matter the potential ‘good for humanity’ that might come about through these things. Such contestations over outer space and ethical engagement with previously unknown spaces will continue to happen. Outer space is not the first ‘final frontier’ (apologies to Gene Roddenberry) that has been discussed in settler logics and academic spaces. In terms of settler colonialism, scholars have written about how Antarctica was initially thought of as the ‘perfect’ settler colony—land that could be had without the messy business of pushing Indigenous people off of it (see Howkins 2010). Of course, we know now that engagement with Antarctica should be constrained by ecological concern—who is to say that these concerns will be heeded in ‘unpopulated’ space? What can be done to push back against these settler logics? Indigenous Engagement with ‘Space I want to now turn our attention towards the possibilities that exist regarding Indigenous engagement with outer space.  After all, the timing could not be more urgent to do so—we are now at a point where after generations and generations of building the myth that America was built out of nothing, we are now ready to resume the project of extending the reach of American military and economic might in space. To be fair, there are plenty of advances that can be made scientifically with a renewed focus on space exploration. However, history shows us that space exploration has been historically tied to military hegemony, and there is nothing in Mr. Trump’s temperament or attitude towards a re-engagement with space that suggest that his push toward the stars will be anything different. A sustained conversation needs to be had—will this exploration be ethical and beneficial to all Americans? One potential avenue of Indigenous involvement comes through the active involvement of Indigenous peoples and Indigenous perspectives in space exploration, of course. This involvement can be possible through viewing outer space through a ‘decolonial’ lens, for instance. Astronomers such as Prescod-Weinstein and Walkowicz have spoken about the need to avoid replicating colonial frameworks of occupation and use of space when exploring places such as Mars, for example (Mandelbaum, 2018). The rise of logics of resource extraction in outer-space bodies have led to engagements by other academics such as Alice Gorman on the agency and personhood of the Moon. Collaborations between Indigenous people and space agencies such as NASA help provide the Indigenous perspective inside space exploration and the information that is gleaned from it, with implications both in space and on a Earth that is dealing with climate crisis (Bean, 2018; Bartels, 2019). Another potential avenue of engagement with Indigenous methodologies and epistemologies related to space comes with engaging with Indigenous thinkers who are already deeply immersed into explorations of Indigenous ‘space’ here on Earth—the recent works of Indigenous thinkers such as Waziyatawin (2008) Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2017), Natchee Blu Barnd (2018) and others provide a unique viewpoint into the ways that Indigenous peoples make and remake space—perhaps this can provide another blueprint for how we might engage with space beyond Earth. And that is just the work that exists within the academic canon. Indigenous people have always been engaged with the worlds beyond the Earth, in ways that often stood counter to accepted ‘settler’ conventions of space exploration (Young, 1987). In one example, when asked about the Moon landings, several Inuit said, "We didn't know this was the first time you white people had been to the moon. Our shamans have been going for years. They go all the time...We do go to visit the moon and moon people all the time. The issue is not whether we go to visit our relatives, but how we treat them and their homeland when we go (Young, 1987: 272).” In another example, turning to my own people, the Ojibwe, we have long standing cultural connections to the stars that influence storytelling, governance, and religious tenets (CHIN, 2003). This engagement continues through to the present day, and points to a promising future. A new generation of Indigenous artists, filmmakers, and writers are beginning to create works that place the Indigenous individual themselves into narratives of space travel and futurity, unsettling existing settler notions of what our future in space might look like. As Leo Cornum (2015) writes, “Outer space, perhaps because of its appeal to our sense of endless possibility, has become the imaginative site for re-envisioning how black, indigenous and other oppressed people can relate to each other outside of and despite the colonial gaze.” These previous examples should serve as a reminder that the historical underpinnings of our great national myth are built upon shaky intellectual ground—we need to be honest about this. America did not just spring forth out of nothing; it came from the brutal occupation and control of Native lands. Despite the best efforts of the settler state, Native people are still here, we still exist and make vital contributions to both our tribal communities and science. We cannot expect Donald Trump to turn his back on the national myth of what made the United States the United States—in his mind, this is the glorious history of what made America great in the past. And it should serve as no surprise that Trump and others wish to extend this history into outer space. Even when Trump’s days in the White House are over, the settler colonial logics that underpin our engagement with land on Earth will still loom large over the ways that we may potentially engage with outer space. But for those of us who do work in Indigenous geographies and Indigenous studies, it becomes even more vital that we heed the calls of Indigenous thinkers inside and outside formal academic structures, validate Indigenous histories, and push to deconstruct the American settler myth and to provide a new way of looking at the stars, especially at a crucial moment where the settler state turns its gaze towards the same.

#### The 1AC appropriation of outer space uses escapist logics that run away from the problems of earth – we are the root cause meaning we should focus on space as way to move beyond retrenches a transcendental understanding of outer space as a place to overcome limits with society. Thus we are a critique of spatiality - Space is constantly utilized to rummage for rare materials, as a place of colonization, or even war.

Kriss 17 [Sam Kriss, Atlantic Writer and Journalist, The Atlantic, Science Section, “Think Twice About Escaping Earth to an Exoplanet,” March 8th 2017, [https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/03/space-travel-wont-save-you-from-capitalism/518853/]/lm](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/03/space-travel-wont-save-you-from-capitalism/518853/%5d/lm) (0:23)

Exploring the galaxy will only give our problems more room to expand.Outer space was once the domain of myth and metaphors; the sun’s stern circuit around the sky told the stories of living and dying gods, the stars were immortalized heroes. These myths changed, as they always do: In the science-fiction mythology our galaxy would be a great adventure; we’d go out in search of green-skinned alien babes or make war against angry humanoids with weird foreheads. That’s gone now. Human beings look up at the night sky, through all its senseless intricacies, and don’t see anything else looking back. Instead, the entire infinite universe has become nothing more than a life raft.What’s not explained is how we’re expected to avoid bringing the crop blight with us, or why agriculture would be more viable on a desert world than one that still has some harried remnants of life. Listen to these narratives for long enough and you start to think that the problem is our Earth itself, that there’s something evil buried deep below the soil, that it’s one giant haunted house to be fled. As if whatever ghosts swarm around this place were here before we created them. All these visions of humanity’s destiny in the stars, whether they’re brought on by curiosity or desperation, imagine that we could turn lifeless planets into gardens. But all that’s happened in living memory is the precise opposite. Wastelands are already growing on this earth, steadily drying out farmlands into scrub or burning forests into lifeless ashy mud. What will happen to an earth that’s wasteland already? Fleeing into outer space isn’t a solution to any of our problems; it’s not even running away from them. Exploring the galaxy just means giving the problem more room in which to expand.Capitalism, as David Harvey once remarked, never solves its contradictions, it only moves them around. If it becomes impossible to make profits in Europe, you set up plantations in the New World, where you can work people to death for free. If you’re worried about socialist uprisings in your own country, you can move the production process to south-east Asia, where client states can brutalize their populations without the people that matter ever having to care about it. For centuries the capitalist mode of production has chased itself in tightening circles around a planet that’s starting to wear away under the strain, thinning out the biosphere, removing the conditions necessary for biological life out from under its own frantic legs. It’s run out of room; there are fewer and fewer places in which to lodge the permanent crisis. The only direction left is up and out. And so the idea starts to take hold that human destiny is to conquer the stars, that the darkness beyond our planet isn’t the home of gods or aliens, but infinite lifeless space. An empire waiting to be founded. And if we don’t create it soon, the empire we have now will kill us all.But things won’t be different on those distant planets. They’ll be exactly the same, just worse, always worse. The logic of this model of space colonization assumes a society that expands constantly, pushing itself into every empty space it can find, because if it stops for even a moment, it’ll die. It’s a society that needs to spread itself infinitely, not for any articulable reason, but simply because that’s what it needs to do. And it’s a society that is always under threat of breaking under the weight of its own contradictions and always at war with the livability of life. In other words, the exact conditions we’re all living and dying under now. It’s capitalism; it could only ever be capitalism, turning itself into all the monsters it could once only imagine. Purified from any residual traces of the soil from which it rose, liberated from its parasitic dependence on Earth and its human labor by a glut of new planets, space capitalism could transform itself into something truly monstrous: a black and segmented carapace, vast beyond thought; nested jaws gnashing through the galaxies in a lifeless, merciless greed. If you’re worried that reactionary leaders, climate change, and nuclear weapons have the power to destroy everything on this planet, the solution isn’t to conjure up a future in which they could destroy everything on all the other planets too. Our problems have to be solved, not fed, before we risk spreading the blight to rot away the entire sky. As things stand, going to TRAPPIST-1e will not save you from your fear of Donald Trump or anything else. That tourist poster needs updating; already, there should be a big gleaming gold skyscraper jutting out between the untouched hills, because he’s going with you, clinging to the hull of your spaceship as it crosses those 40 light years of black nothing, his hair finally freed from gravity and fanning into a predator’s frill.

#### Hauntology, as a rhetorical and epistemic method, is necessary to challenge the aura of certainty that distorts military intervention. Prior to considering instrumental approaches to the resolution, pedagogy must prioritize encounters with spectral moments. The impact to the K is the recreation of ghosts of colonialism and capitalism that will lead to eventual extinction. **Hauntology displaces blame and instability internally by turning the masses against one-another - Punishing those who don’t ‘succeed’ with incarceration, and blaming them for capitalism’s failings where** natives are appropriated into the Sovereign’s culture nativity is erased AND capitalism results in a never-ending war on the poor and inter-state competition

#### The alternative is to haunt the political imaginary of the 1AC with the specter of Marx – the project of the 1AC is dead, but the fundamental tensions that give it weight are not; by preserving the possibility of proletarian revolution as a specter, we keep its radical and unforeseen potential alive

Hitchcock, ‘13 [Peter Hitchcock, Professor, Baruch College, English, CUNY; “from ( ) of Ghosts” in The Spectralities Reader, Maria del Pilar Blanco and Esther Peeren, eds., London: Bloomsbury, 2013]

But the last word of ghosts is not just philosophical, despite these incarnations. What the ghost (revenant) always also comes back to is the status of science. Here Marxism has strengths that oscillation does not. Oscillation is a concept for materialism, but Marxism does not devolve, ultimately, into its constituent concepts. Yet here one faces a sharp dilemma that even “whither’s” palimpsest cannot significantly displace. If, as Deleuze and Guattari propose, “A scientific notion is defined not by concepts but by functions or propositions” (117), then can one separate the wheat of Marxist propositions from the chaff of its concepts? Historically, there have been moments where this has appeared more possible (the Second International remains a crucial example), but if one accepts the conjunctural reading of Marxist theoretical formations, the process if not the actuality of those differences may now be more difficult to discern. This does not mean that such attempts are idealist or illusionist. On the contrary, work like Roy Bhaskar’s identifies how materialist principles themselves can become mired in “epistemic fallacies” (the reduction of ontology to epistemology) that only a sustained critical (and in Bhaskar’s terminology, realist) investigation can disarticulate as a science in the social.26 But the ghost is neither a simple categorical error nor the reincarnation of some Hegelian absolute spirit (although, given the predilections of French philosophy, the “appearance” would be understandable). The ghost remains for science, just as a ghost of science haunts the Marxist dialectic. Here is not the place to adjudicate the truth claims of Marxism as science; I do, however, wish to counter the impression that any focus on Marx’s deployment of spectral metaphors is to abjure the rational kernel for its mystical shell. If history has taught us anything in recent years, it is that the de facto rejection of the spectral in Marxism is partly what allowed utopia to congeal, then disappear, in dogma. On the one hand, Deleuze and Guattari claim that science “slows down” variability by the use of constants or limits. A measure, or a principle of measurement, can pull reality from chaos and “suspend,” however briefly, the process of the infinite. The examples they provide (the speed of light, absolute zero, the quantum of action, the Big Bang) all attempt to coordinate, to provide a scale, to provide a reference for what must always exceed them. And, not surprisingly, the sheer variability of constants produces a determinate disciplinary fear: “science is haunted not by its own unity but by the plane of reference constituted by all the limits or borders through which it confronts chaos” (119). Philosophy, on the other hand, is less troubled by the infinite as long as it can be thought consistently (philosophy, they claim, gives “the virtual a consistency specific to it” [118]). In this, science and philosophy can be linked to art: they all “cast planes over the chaos” (202). But this, of course, is an intellectual, political, and social challenge. Artists, philosophers, and scientists confront chaos not just to impose an order on it (for this alone would amount to hubris), but because a certain affinity with chaos is necessary for the crises we call change. Again, the image of this confrontation is striking: “The philosopher, the scientist, and the artist seem to return from the land of the dead” (202). And which one of these ghosts is the real Marxist? Marxism is a science to the extent that it has developed forms of measurement (laws of motion) for the infinite chaos of socialization (in this respect, the charge of “totalization” is often a nonscientist’s reaction to scientificity). These measurements (ideology, class, value, commodity, etc.) are not fictions to the degree that they have often elaborated the real contradictions that stand within and between the social and forms of socialization. But philosophy (and indeed art) is not to blame for the distortion of these measurements, at least according to Deleuze and Guattari’s interpretation: it is a function of the plethora of methodologies vis-à-vis chaos. Chaosophy, as Deleuze and Guattari call it, is not for me only because I still tend to think in terms of the collective rather than the nomads who wander off into the infinite. I do believe, however, that it provides a strong antidote to knee-jerk reactions about the status of science and philosophy for Marxism at a time when “post-ality” is all too quick to dig a grave for it. Ghosts do not make history, people do, but not under conditions of their own choosing (a point where Marx and the Shakespeare of Hamlet most assuredly agree). This little history of ghosts is not about the agency of the specter, but about materialism’s accountability to and for specters. Derrida’s bold declaration that there will be “no future without Marx” (“Pas sans Marx, pas d’avenir sans Marx” [SDM 36]) only makes sense within a spectral economy of materialism, a materialism that is not beholden to monologic causality but one that seeks an understanding of a material reality caught between the calculable and the incalculable, the undecidability of “determinate oscillations.” Marx is dead; only the spectral can critically explain how Marxism comes back from the future. Not content with the naming of an undecidable, I have sought to interpellate Marx within his own Gespenstergeschichte: that is, to trace the function of the ghost, and thinking the ghost, for his materialist methodology. Millennial materialism must use this heritage not to reincarnate Marx (in the manner of a quaint religious observance) but to resist an inclination to resolve conceptual aporias merely by dogmatic statements to the contrary. The science of materialism includes its respect for the criteria of judgment, not the assumption of a universal truth in the judgment. The vacillations of class and class struggle in Marx’s formulations are examples of determinate instability within the concepts and their application. What spectrality does is keep this instability “alive” at a moment when “actual existence” cannot possibly confirm or deny it. In 1883 Engels stood by Marx’s grave and predicted that “the gap that has been left by this mighty spirit will soon enough make itself felt” (an absence as agency indeed!). Yet barely a hundred years later Hobsbawm could opine that “the shadow of Karl Marx presides over a third of the human race.”27 The shade of Marx is still here, but not in the form that either Engels or Hobsbawm suggests. It exists now as a condition of possibility in a sense of the world radically different from the specters of the past, however answerable it must be to them. The ambivalence of the specter is not its virtue, only its dependence on concrete determination. And that is why the experience of freedom before us is also the space of ghosts.

## 2

#### We endorse the 1AC except for the concept of scenario-planning and the prioritization of big-stick impacts. Extinction is a settler fantasy. The aff’s spectacularized claims of extinction are an act of settler futurity that hide the ongoing violence of settler colonialism

**Dalley 16** Hamish Dalley (2016): The deaths of settler colonialism: extinction as a metaphor of decolonization in contemporary settler literature, Settler Colonial Studies, DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1238160

**Settlers love to contemplate the possibility of their own extinction; to read many contemporary literary representations of settler colonialism is to find settlers strangely satisfied in dreaming of ends that never come.** This tendency is widely prevalent in English-language representations of settler colonialism produced since the 1980s: the possibility of an ending – the likelihood that the settler race will one day die out – is a common theme in literary and pop culture considerations of colonialism’s future. Yet it has barely been remarked how surprising it is that this theme is so present. **For settlers, of all people, to obsessively ruminate on their own finitude is counterintuitive, for few modern social formations have been more resistant to change than settler colonialism.** With a few exceptions (French Algeria being the largest), the settler societies established in the last 300 years in the Americas, Australasia, and Southern Africa have all retained the basic features that define them as settler states – **namely, the structural privileging of settlers at the expense of indigenous peoples, and the normalization of whiteness as the marker of political agency and rights – and they have done so notwithstanding the sustained resistance that has been mounted whenever such an order has been built. Settlers think all the time that they might one day end, even though (perhaps because) that ending seems unlikely ever to happen.** The significance of this paradox for settler-colonial literature is the subject of this article. **Considering the problem of futurity offers a useful foil to traditional analyses of settlercolonial narrative, which typically examine settlers’ attitudes towards history in order to highlight a constitutive anxiety about the past – about origins. Settler colonialism, the argument goes, has a problem with historical narration that arises from a contradiction in its founding mythology.** In Stephen Turner’s formulation, the settler subject is by definition one who comes from elsewhere but who strives to make this place home. The settlement narrative must explain how this gap – which is at once geographical, historical, and existential – has been bridged, and the settler transformed from outsider into indigene. **Yet the transformation must remain constitutively incomplete, because the desire to be at home necessarily invokes the spectre of the native, whose existence (which cannot be disavowed completely because it is needed to define the settler’s difference, superiority, and hence claim to the land) inscribes the settler’s foreignness, thus reinstating the gap between settler and colony that the narrative was meant to efface.**1 Settler-colonial narrative is thus shaped around its need to erase and evoke the native, to make the indigene both invisible and present in a contradictory pattern that prevents settlers from ever moving on from the moment of colonization.2 **As evidence of this constitutive contradiction, critics have identified in settler-colonial discourse symptoms of psychic distress such as disavowal, inversion, and repression**.3 Indeed, **the frozen temporality of settler-colonial narrative, fixated on the moment of the frontier, recalls nothing so much as Freud’s description of the ‘repetition compulsion’ attending trauma**.4 As Lorenzo Veracini puts it, because: **‘settler society’ can thus be seen as a fantasy where a perception of a constant struggle is juxtaposed against an ideal of ‘peace’ that can never be reached, settler projects embrace and reject violence at the same time**. The settler colonial situation is thus a circumstance where the tension between contradictory impulses produces long-lasting psychic conflicts and a number of associated psychopathologies.5 Current scholarship has thus focused primarily on settler-colonial narrative’s view of the past, asking how such a contradictory and troubled relationship to history might affect present-day ideological formations. Critics have rarely considered what such narratological tensions might produce when the settler gaze is turned to the future. Few social formations are more stubbornly resistant to change than settlement, suggesting that a future beyond settler colonialism might be simply unthinkable. Veracini, indeed, suggests that settler-colonial narrative can never contemplate an ending: that settler decolonization is inconceivable because settlers lack the metaphorical tools to imagine their own demise.6 This article outlines why I partly disagree with that view. I argue that **the narratological paradox that defines settler-colonial narrative does make the future a problematic object of contemplation. But that does not make settler decolonization unthinkable per se; as I will show, settlers do often try to imagine their demise – but they do so in a way that reasserts the paradoxes of their founding ideology, with the result that the radical potentiality of decolonization is undone even as it is invoked.** I argue that, notwithstanding Veracini’s analysis, **there is a metaphor via which the end of settler colonialism unspools – the quasi-biological concept of extinction, which, when deployed as a narrative trope, offers settlers a chance to consider and disavow their demise, just as they consider and then disavow the violence of their origins.** This article traces the importance of the trope of extinction for contemporary settler-colonial literature, with a focus on South Africa, Canada, and Australia. It explores variations in how the death of settler colonialism is conceptualized, drawing a distinction between historio-civilizational narratives of the rise and fall of empires, and a species-oriented notion of extinction that draws force from public anxiety about climate change – an invocation that adds another level of ambivalence by drawing on ‘rational’ fears for the future (because climate change may well render the planet uninhabitable to humans) in order to narrativize a form of social death that, strictly speaking, belongs to a different order of knowledge altogether. As such, my analysis is intended to draw the attention of settler colonial studies toward futurity and the ambivalence of settler paranoia, while highlighting a potential point of cross-fertilization between settler-colonial and eco-critical approaches to contemporary literature. That ‘extinction’ should be a key word in the settler-colonial lexicon is no surprise. In Patrick Wolfe’s phrase,7 settler colonialism is predicated on a ‘logic of elimination’ that tends towards the extermination – by one means or another – of indigenous peoples.8 This logic is apparent in archetypal settler narratives like James Fenimore Cooper’s The Last of the Mohicans (1826), a historical novel whose very title blends the melancholia and triumph that demarcate settlers’ affective responses to the supposed inevitability of indigenous extinction. Concepts like ‘stadial development’ – by which societies progress through stages, progressively eliminating earlier social forms – and ‘fatal impact’ – which names the biological inevitability of strong peoples supplanting weak – all contribute to the notion that settler colonialism is a kind of ‘ecological process’ 9 that necessitates the extinction of inferior races. What is surprising, though, is how often the trope of extinction also appears with reference to settlers themselves; it makes sense for settlers to narrate how their presence entails others’ destruction, but it is less clear why their attempts to imagine futures should presume extinction to be their own logical end as well. The idea appears repeatedly in English-language literary treatments of settler colonialism. Consider, for instance, the following rumination on the future of South African settler society, from Olive Schreiner’s 1883 Story of an African Farm: It was one of them, one of those wild old Bushmen, that painted those pictures there. He did not know why he painted but he wanted to make something, so he made these. […] Now the Boers have shot them all, so that we never see a yellow face peeping out among the stones. […] And the wild bucks have gone, and those days, and we are here. But we will be gone soon, and only the stones will lie on, looking at everything like they look now.10

## Case

**Double bind: either the impacts are true then the root cause lies with the K or There will be no “space war” – nobody wants space to go nuclear – stop securitizing threats that just won’t happen.**

Bowen 18 (https://www.europeanleadershipnetwork.org/commentary/the-art-of-space-deterrence/)

Fourth, the ubiquity of space infrastructure and the fragility of the space environment may create a degree of existential deterrence. As space is so useful to modern economies and military forces, a large-scale disruption of space infrastructure may be so intuitively escalatory to decision-makers that there may be a natural caution against a wholesale assault on a state’s entire space capabilities because the consequences of doing so approach the mentalities of total war, or nuclear responses if a society begins tearing itself apart because of the collapse of optimised energy grids and just-in-time supply chains. In addition, the problem of space debris and the [political-legal hurdles to conducting debris clean-up](https://doi.org/10.1080/14777622.2014.890489) operations mean that even a handful of explosive events in space can render a region of Earth orbit unusable for everyone. This could caution a country like China from excessive kinetic intercept missions because its own military and economy is increasingly reliant on outer space, but perhaps not a country like North Korea which does not rely on space. The usefulness, sensitivity, and fragility of space may have some existential deterrent effect. [China’s catastrophic anti-satellite weapons test in 2007](https://defenceindepth.co/2017/01/11/chinas-space-weapons-test-ten-years-on-behemoth-pulls-the-peasants-plough/) is a valuable lesson for all on the potentially devastating effect of kinetic warfare in orbit.

#### Reformism is a naïve strategy- if the reform is actually worthwhile, it will never be fully actualized- it can only serve to stabilize capitalism

Herod 07, James Herod, Graduate of Columbia University, “Getting Free”, Pg. 133-134, TCT

**The picture here**, then, **is one of masses of people organized** into special-purpose organizations and single-issue campaigns who network on a global scale, and **thus supposedly acquire the power to impose changes on the existing ruling-class institutions.** "The movement's unifying goal," the authors claim, "is to bring about sufficient democratic control over states, markets, and corporations to permit people and the planet to survive and begin to shape a viable future." They argue that "the principal strategy of the movement for globalization from below has been to identify the violation of generally held norms, demand that power actors conform to those norms, and threaten the bases of consent on which they depend if they fail to do so." **It is foolish to think that the State Department, General Electric, or the World Bank can be democratized. What is not part of this picture is any thought of dismantling states, markets, or corporations and replacing them with authentically democratic social arrangements**. (Thankfully, dismantling states, markets, and corporations is, however, in the picture for a significant minority of today's protesters against corporate globalization, although this doesn't seem to have been noticed by these authors.) This is a startlingly reformist book, and as with most **reformism, is deeply naive**. **The authors do not fully perceive or understand the true nature of the enemy we face. Having failed to take into consideration the imperatives of a system based on profit taking, they fail to realize that many of the reforms they seek to impose are incompatible with that system**, or that in its current phase, **the system is incapable of accommodating these reforms** without self‑destructing, and consequently, **contemporary capitalists will fanatically fight these reforms because it is a matter of survival for them**. These theorists of globalization from below, however, do not perceive this. **They think these reforms can be imposed**, through protests and the withdrawal of consent. **This is where their use of mainstream sociological categories has gotten in the way.** Although they use the term global capital occasionally, **they are not really aware of capitalism as a historical system, but are rather merely talking abstractly about "established institutions" and "the power of the powerful."** They claim that such power "is based on the active cooperation of some people and the consent and/or acquiescence of others." They believe that this power can be challenged by the withdrawal of consent. "Social movements can be understood as the collective withdrawal of consent to established institutions." This may be true on an abstract level and in the long run (although apartheid in South Africa survived for half a century after the vast majority hated it). But in the here and now, **since they lack any concrete knowledge of what the actual imperatives of contemporary capitalists are** (for their continued survival as capitalists), **our theorists are led to make wildly romantic demands.**

#### Distancing DA – the affs ethical orientation to the state means they deflect accountability for technocratic violence. Turns violence into catharsis and conditions us into a psychological doubling.