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#### Settler colonialism is a structure of technologies, not an event, a patterning of social relations that renders indigenous land and life infinitely fungible.

**paperson 17** [La, also K. Wayne Yang, an associate professor of ethnic studies at the University of California, San Diego. “A Third University Is Possible” June 2017]

Land is the prime concern of settler colonialism, contexts in which the colonizer comes to a “new” place not only to seize and exploit but to stay, making that “new” place his permanent home. Settler colonialism thus complicates the center–periphery model that was classically used to describe colonialism, wherein an imperial center, the “metropole,” dominates distant colonies, the “periphery.” Typically, one thinks of European colonization of Africa, India, the Caribbean, the Pacific Islands, in terms of external colonialism, also called exploitation colonialism, where land and human beings are recast as natural resources for primitive accumulation: coltan, petroleum, diamonds, water, salt, seeds, genetic material, chattel. Theories named as “settler colonial studies” had a resurgence beginning around 2006.[2] However, the analysis of settler colonialism is actually not new, only often ignored within Western critiques of empire.[3] The critical literatures of the colonized have long positioned the violence of settlement as a prime feature in colonial life as well as in global arrangements of power. We can see this in Franz Fanon’s foundational critiques of colonialism. Whereas Fanon’s work is often generalized for its diagnoses of anti/colonial violence and the racialized psychoses of colonization upon colonized and colonizer, Fanon is also talking about settlement as the particular feature of French colonization in Algeria. For Fanon, the violence of French colonization in Algeria arises from settlement as a spatial immediacy of empire: the geospatial collapse of metropole and colony into the same time and place. On the “selfsame land” are spatialized white immunity and racialized violation, non-Native desires for freedom, Black life, and Indigenous relations.[4] Settler colonialism is too often thought of as “what happened” to Indigenous people. This kind of thinking confines the experiences of Indigenous people, their critiques of settler colonialism, their decolonial imaginations, to an unwarranted historicizing parochialism, as if settler colonialism were a past event that “happened to” Native peoples and not generalizable to non-Natives. Actually, settler colonialism is something that “happened for” settlers. Indeed, it is happening for them/us right now. Wa Thiong’o’s question of how instead of why directs us to think of land tenancy laws, debt, and the privatization of land as settler colonial technologies that enable the “eventful” history of plunder and disappearance. Property law is a settler colonial technology. The weapons that enforce it, the knowledge institutions that legitimize it, the financial institutions that operationalize it, are also technologies. Like all technologies, they evolve and spread. Recasting land as property means severing Indigenous peoples from land. This separation, what Hortense Spillers describes as “the loss of Indigenous name/land” for Africans-turned-chattel, recasts Black Indigenous people as black bodies for biopolitical disposal: who will be moved where, who will be murdered how, who will be machinery for what, and who will be made property for whom.[5] In the alienation of land from life, alienable rights are produced: the right to own (property), the right to law (protection through legitimated violence), the right to govern (supremacist sovereignty), the right to have rights (humanity). In a word, what is produced is whiteness. Moreover, it is not just human beings who are refigured in the schism. Land and nonhumans become alienable properties, a move that first alienates land from its own sovereign life. Thus we can speak of the various technologies required to create and maintain these separations, these alienations: Black from Indigenous, human from nonhuman, land from life.[6] “How?” is a question you ask if you are concerned with the mechanisms, not just the motives, of colonization. Instead of settler colonialism as an ideology, or as a history, you might consider settler colonialism as a set of technologies —a frame that could help you to forecast colonial next operations and to plot decolonial directions. This chapter proceeds with the following insights. (1) The settler–native– slave triad does not describe identities. The triad—an analytic mainstay of settler colonial studies—digs a pitfall of identity that not only chills collaborations but also implies that the racial will be the solution. (2) Technologies are trafficked. Technologies generate patterns of social relations to land. Technologies mutate, and so do these relationships. Colonial technologies travel. In tracing technologies’ past and future trajectories, we can connect how settler colonial and antiblack technologies circulate in transnational arenas. (3) Land—not just people—is the biopolitical target.[7] The examples are many: fracking, biopiracy, damming of rivers and flooding of valleys, the carcasses of pigs that die from the feed additive ractopamine and are allowable for harvest by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The subjugation of land and nonhuman life to deathlike states in order to support “human” life is a “biopolitics” well beyond the Foucauldian conception of biopolitical as governmentality or the neoliberal disciplining of modern, bourgeois, “human” subject. (4) (Y)our task is to theorize in the break, that is, to refuse the master narrative that technology is loyal to the master, that (y)our theory has a Eurocentric origin. Black studies, Indigenous studies, and Othered studies have already made their breaks with Foucault (over biopolitics), with Deleuze and Guatarri (over assemblages and machines), and with Marx (over life and primitive accumulation). (5) Even when they are dangerous, understanding technologies provides us some pathways for decolonizing work. We can identify projects of collaboration on decolonial technologies. Colonizing mechanisms are evolving into new forms, and they might be subverted toward decolonizing operations. The Settler–Native–Slave Triad Does Not Describe Identities One of the main interventions of settler colonial studies has been to insist that the patterning of social relations is shaped by colonialism’s thirst for land and thus is shaped to fit modes of empire. Because colonialism is a perverted affair, our relationships are also warped into complicitous arrangements of violation, trespass, and collusion with its mechanisms. For Fanon, the psychosis of colonialism arises from the patterning of violence into the binary relationship between the immune humanity of the white settler and the impugned humanity of the native. For Fanon, the supremacist “right” to create settler space that is immune from violence, and the “right” to abuse the body of the Native to maintain white immunity, this is the spatial and fleshy immediacy of settler colonialism. Furthermore, the “humanity” of the settler is constructed upon his agency over the land and nature. As Maldonado- Torres explains, “I think, therefore I am” is actually an articulation of “I conquer, therefore I am,” a sense of identity posited upon the harnessing of nature and its “natural” people. Indeed, for Fanon, it is the perverse ontology of settler becomings—becoming landowner or becoming property, becoming killable or becoming a killer—and the mutual implication of tortured and torturer that mark the psychosis of colonialism. This problem of modernity and colonial psychosis is echoed in Jack Forbes’s writings: Columbus was a wétiko. He was mentally ill or insane, the carrier of a terribly contagious psychological disease, the wétiko psychosis. . . . The wétiko psychosis, and the problems it creates, have inspired many resistance movements and efforts at reform or revolution. Unfortunately, most of these efforts have failed because they have never diagnosed the wétiko. Under Western modernity, becoming “free” means becoming a colonizer, and because of this, “the central contradiction of modernity is freedom.” Critiques of settler colonialism, therefore, do not offer just another “type” of colonialism to add to the literature but a mode of analysis that has repercussions for any diagnosis of coloniality and for understanding the modern conditions of freedom. By modern conditions of freedom, I mean that Western freedom is a product of colonial modernity, and I mean that such freedom comes with conditions, with strings attached, most manifest as terms of unfreedom for nonhumans. As Cindi Mayweather says, “your freedom’s in a bind.”

#### The destruction of relationships to land constitutes ontological violence – only a theoretical frame that can theorize land can understand the intricacies of the settler colonial situation.

**Tuck and Yang 12** – associate professor of critical race and indigenous studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto and director of ethnic studies at UC San Diego

Eve Tuck and K Wayne Yang, “Decolonization is not a Metaphor”, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, <http://clas.osu.edu/sites/clas.osu.edu/files/Tuck%20and%20Yang%202012%20Decolonization%20is%20not%20a%20metaphor.pdf> // sam

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 anew "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.6The 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 desires. 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.re

#### The 1ac is a form of settler colonial emplacement that renders outer space as only a cite of militarization and exploittation upon which the settler can infinitely project colonial fantasies of the final frontier – that enables unsustainable approaches to space exploration – they say all space exploration is bad but indigenous space relations and explorations is key

**Mitchell et al 20** – Bawaka Country including A. Mitchell S. Wright S. Suchet-Pearson K. Lloyd L. Burarrwanga R. Ganambarr M. Ganambarr-Stubbs B. Ganambarr D. Maymuru R. Maymuru (this is a lot of authors; you can find qualifications on your own lol)

Mitchell, Audra et. Al. “Dukarr lakarama: Listening to Guwak, talking back to space colonization” Political Geography, Volume 81, August 2020 // sam

We started talking about space colonization because the ways it interferes with Sky Country and our relationships with it. The term space colonization can be used to refer not only to plans for the long-term settlement of planets other than earth, but also to space exploration and exploitation. These plans include the exploitation of resources from asteroids, the moon and other space bodies, and the annexation of Indigenous lands and displacement of Indigenous peoples for installations that promote space exploration (including observatories and launch sites). To address these plans, we need to extend our conversations into discussions of space colonization, its processes and imaginaries, and the economic and legal architecture developing around it. Critical engagement with the relationality of space is an important point of focus by Indigenous communities, scholars and their supporters (Burarrwanga et al., 2013; Bawaka Country incl et al. 2019; Bhathal, 2006; Johnston, 2010; Cornum, 2015; Hunt 2018; Fuller et al., 2014; Watts, 2013; Todd, 2016), as well as within geography and the social sciences more broadly (Beery, 2012, 2016; Dickens & Ormrod, 2007, 2016; Johnston, 2010; MacDonald, 2007, 2008). Work in Indigenous futurisms for example, powerfully critiques ideas and practices of ‘outer space’ (and indeed futurity in many forms and expressions) that continue to perpetuate conditions of Indigenous invisibility, and extend settler-colonial narratives and fantasies both into space and into the future (Byrd, 2011; Hunt 2018). Many Indigenous people continue to struggle against the devastating impact of space exploration and colonization in their Countries, including at Woomera on Kokatha and Pitjantjatjara Country in Australia and against the proposed telescope at Mauna Kea in Hawai’i, as they seek to protect and nurture their relations with earth and sky, and to assert their rights and sovereignties (Gorman, 2005; Peryer, 2019). These are critiques that we take inspiration from and aim to engage with, from our own place and experience, particularly as we acknowledge the co-becoming of diverse times, the ways that the future is the past, is the present, and the ways these emerge together with and as place and time (Bawaka Country incl et al., 2016, 2019). These scholars point out that space should not be understood as detached, or distant, from everyday life. Rather, whether through everyday technological realities such as the use of satellite navigation and communications networks, through the proliferation of stakeholders in space - including New Space actors – or through the ways that realities and imaginings of sky-worlds inform realities and imaginings on earth, ‘outer space’ continues to play a crucial and increasingly central place in life on, as, and beyond, earth. Despite regular media reports of technological developments such as the successful testing of reusable rockets (Sheetz, 2017), space colonization, tends to be treated as a fantasy or science fiction plot by global publics (Dickens & Ormrod, 2007). Recent developments in both the private and nationalized space industries, and indeed new collaborations between the two, are rapidly changing this scenario. Since the 1980s, for example, a group of primarily US-based entrepreneurs, advocates and space scientists, collectively referred to as ‘NewSpace’, have been competing to be the first to exploit outer space for resources. Although the NewSpace community embraces diverse perspectives and subjectivities (Oman-Reagan, 2015), its dominant figures share an understanding of the unbounded resources of the universe and the right of humans to dominate it (Valentine, 2012). The dominant actors in NewSpace enterprises are white, male, Euro-Americans who are amongst the world’s wealthiest individuals, including PayPal and Tesla entrepreneur Elon Musk, founder of Space Exploration Technologies Corporation (SpaceX); entrepreneur Peter Diamandis, who is a principle in mining company Planetary Resources; and Amazon owner Jeff Bezos, who founded spaceflight company Blue Origin. These companies pursue various goals, including the development of reusable, cost-effective launch systems (SpaceX, Blue Horizon) and off-Earth mining equipment and techniques (Deep Space Industries, Planetary Resources).2 Although the drive to mine and possibly settle space is fuelled largely by private actors, several states, including the US, China and Qatar, offer increasing support for this industry, including funding infrastructure, research and development (Beery, 2012). Jason Beery (2012) points out that although major space agencies such as NASA have been contracting with private companies for decades, governments increasingly regard commercial projects, such as space ports, as part of their core efforts to promote economic growth, stability and the reproduction of the political-economic system (Beery, 2012:25). In some cases, states are working actively to create legal frameworks to enable or even incentivize the exploitation of space. Notably, although not the only example, in late 2015, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship (SPACE) Act passed by the US Congress granted the exclusive right to US companies to exploit minerals, water and other resources (excluding biological life) found in space on a first-come, first-serve basis. The SPACE Act grants private property rights to US-based companies on the presumption that space has no owners or inhabitants. For many advocates of space exploration and exploitation, extending resource markets into space is a means of gaining exclusive legal control over territory and resources, and, in this context, the term ’colonization’ is used in aspirational tones. For example, one early proponent of commercial space colonization envisions a future in which the “global expansion of European technology and civilization brought about by the terrestrial age of exploration is but a pale foreshadowing” (Lewis, 1996:5). Indeed, many space entrepreneurs and boosters do not flinch at the term ’colonization’ – they actively embrace it, as a beneficial project undertaken for, and in the name of, humanity (UNOOSA 1999). Of course, significant ground-work is required to frame colonization in aspirational terms given the deep violences that have occurred in its name, and so we turn now to four central attitudes deployed by many would-be space colonizers and advocates to highlight some of the foundations of these claims. While relationships with space are in no way monolithic, and indeed dominant Western accounts have their own diverse pre-Enlightenment engagements with the cosmos, as well as complex contemporary relationships, the tropes that we discuss here are strong and pervasive. These tropes act to empower and propel imaginaries and realties, both on earth and in the sky, that enact colonizing pasts/presents/futures and negate the active agencies, legal orders and sovereignties of First Nations people and of Sky Country, in all its diverse manifestations. First, many proponents of space colonization speak of space as a terra nullius: an uninhabited wilderness awaiting exploitation. This proposition underpins claims that there are no Indigenous people in space, and no people Indigenous to space. NASA, for example, claims that their goal is to “build new land, not steal it from the natives [sic]” (NASA, 2014). Even scholars who are overtly critical of mainstream space programs and their effects on Indigenous peoples tend to cede this point. For instance, astrobiologist David Grinspoon (2004) argues that, “Mars has no people to be displaced … we may have the opportunity to explore lands that are truly unoccupied, giving outlet to our need to explore without trampling on others.” Space archaeologist Alice Gorman (2005:88) has written extensively on the links between Australia’s space programme and its consolidation as a settler colonial state (Gorman, 2005). Yet, even in her critique of this colonial project, Gorman contends that …of all landscapes, perhaps space alone can claim to be a true ‘wilderness’. Before 1957, there were no material traces of human activity. And while there may yet be life in the solar system, there has been no human life; no autochthons, no Indigenous inhabitants. Interplanetary space was a real terra nullius. Terra nullius, a legal fiction which provided a foundation for the invasion and colonization of Australia and other First Nations territories globally, is not defined as a place with no people, rather it is a place that is deemed to have no Law/lore, no protocols and no constitutive relationships (Langton, 2001). To speak of Sky Country in this way, then, is an erasure of Indigenous Law, and of many, diverse legal orders, relationships and systems that extend to, and include, space. The image of space as an empty wilderness makes it possible for would-be space colonizers to present their plans as victim-free or ethically unproblematic.3 It also creates the impression that space is lawless and ungoverned, which opens it up to almost unregulated exploitation untrammeled by ethical concerns. As one international space law scholar argues, there are assumed to be “no known natives to outer space … [so] there seems to be nothing inherently immoral about a right of first grab” (Reinstein, 1999:79). During the Cold War, fears that a rush to grab control of space for commercial or military purposes would result in inter-state conflict prompted its designation as a res communes: a global commons owned by humanity and regulated by international organizations. The Outer Space Treaty (United Nations, 1966) (still the most fundamental piece of international space law) designates space as “the province of all mankind” and argues that its exploration and use “shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries” (United Nations, 1966:13). On this basis, the OST prohibits “national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means” (United Nations, 1966:13). This norm was subsequently developed in the 1999 Vienna Declaration on Space and Human Development (United Nations, 1999), which argues that the use of space is crucial to addressing the rising demand for resources, changes in sea level and deforestation, and fostering international cooperation, amongst other goals. Legal frameworks based on the principle of res communes may appear to be oriented towards protecting space. But they violate Sky Country in a different way: they annex it as the property of the nebulous category of ’humanity’, defined in large part by the UN, and rooted in Western liberal values and modes of governance (Mitchell, 2014). The act of claiming Sky Country as the property of “mankind” follows the same logic as the creation of national parks through the displacement of Indigenous peoples and their forms of governance (Adams, 2004; Brockington & Igoe, 2006). Indeed, some scholars of international space law have proposed a ‘planetary park’ model, in which whole planets would be designated as wilderness reserves (Bruhns & Haqq-Misra, 2016). This strategy is intended to preserve the environment of space in the face of intense competition for resources. Both of these approaches – understanding space as an uninhabited wasteland, or as the “province of all mankind”– repeat familiar colonial tropes. The former reproduces the logic of terra nullius, while the latter erases the particular forms of inhabitation, care and co-creation carried out by many Indigenous peoples. A second proposition that underpins dominant framings of space and that acts to validate its exploitation is that space is inanimate or lifeless. Without supporting life, this apparently empty wilderness can be treated as a massive store of “off-earth resources” (Virgin Galactic, 2014, italics ours), which are assumed to be nearly infinite in comparison to those available on earth. For instance, Planetary Resources states that a single platinum-rich 500 m wide asteroid contains approximately 174 times the annual output of platinum, and 1.5 times the known world-reserves of platinum-group metals (ruthenium, rhodium, palladium, osmium, iridium and platinum) (Planetary Resources, 2014). These resources are intended to meet increasing resource demands made by a rising population on Earth, but also to fuel projects of colonization beyond the solar system (Deep Space Industries, 2014). Treating space as a lifeless, uninhabited, un-governed wilderness and store of resources also allows proponents of space colonization to envision it as a dumping ground for pollution and ecologically-harmful activity, a move that echoes the racialized undertones of environmental injustices on earth, whereby harmful activities are concentrated around vulnerable people and places (Schlosberg, 2009). Some proponents of space mining argue not only that the extraction of minerals in Sky Country is ethically defensible, but also that it can occur with little regulation or concern for ecological damage. Whilst other scholars and activists argue that space is an environment that requires careful ecological management (Bruhns & Haqq-Misra, 2016; Olson, 2012), these arguments appear to have had little impact on major NewSpace entrepreneurs, whose plans hinge on the ability to export the damage of extraction to the weakly regulated realm of space. Indeed, some Newspace proponents claim that space extraction will have the positive effect of reducing ecological harms on earth. For instance, space resource company Planetary Resources argues that its aim is to externalize dangerous and polluting extraction activities “safely outside of our delicate biosphere” (Planetary Resources, 2014). Similarly, Space Adventures principal Chris Anderson asks rhetorically: Wouldn’t it be great if one day, all of the heavy industries of the Earth—mining and energy production and manufacturing—were done somewhere else, and the Earth could be used for living, keeping it as it should be, which is a bright-blue planet with lots of green? (quoted in Fallows, 2013) Anderson’s rhetorical question seeks to justify ongoing extractive practices, both on and off earth, by displacing the harms they cause outside of the scope of mainstream ethics (see Mitchell, 2016). In framing space as lifeless and inanimate, the knowledges, Laws and agencies of the beings and becomings of space, and the ongoing relationships that many cultures have with space, are nullified. This, then, allows for a seemingly unproblematized move of settler-colonial emplacement, one in which the active agencies of asteroids, planets, metals and gases, may be ignored and made invisible, and within which Laws, sovereignties and relationships of Indigenous people are negated (Hunt, 2018). Constructions of space as lifeless and inanimate also rely on the assumption that it is separate and distinct from earth. This idea is encapsulated through the Western imaginary of earth as a sealed vessel disconnected from space and in an image of the enclosed globe that has come to be understood as co-terminous with earth. This motif of Western cosmology is epitomized by early images of earth from space, including the iconic Earthrise photograph from the 1968 Apollo mission, and the equally famous Blue Marble photograph from the 1972 Apollo 17 mission (see Oliver, 2015; Lazier, 2011; Cosgrove, 1994, 2001) and, more recently, Google Earth imagery (Helmreich, 2011). Throughout these transformations, the globe has been framed as an enclosed structure whose function is to shelter humans from a cold, dead, and threatening external universe (Sloterdijk, 2014). As Nigel Clark (2005) argues, these images of a perfectly round, self-enclosed space have eclipsed the idea of earth as part of a cosmic ecosystem engaged in lively exchanges (see also Beery, 2016; Collis, 2017; Mendenhall, 2018; Ormrod, 2014). Taken together, these tropes – of space as lifeless and inanimate, of it being a terra nullius, of space as separate and discontinuous from earth – suggest that there are no ethical challenges associated with these ways of relating to space. Guwak teaches otherwise. We now turn to her to learn about order and negotiation, the agency of Sky Country, how earth, sea and sky co-become, and the ethical relationships and responsibilities these entail.

#### “In the future, we would be singing about the moon that existed before” – colonial expansion into space inevitably destroys indigenous spiritual connections to Sky Country – theoretical frames that understand the earth and sky as fundamentally separate ignore the intimate connections between bodies that govern space. The alternative is a rejection of the 1ac’s relationships to place and space in favor of a relational approach that recognizes our infinite obligation to never take without giving back and to respect the nonhuman as we do ourselves – that’s mutually exclusive with their detached, utilitarian analysis of space.

**Mitchell et al 20** – Bawaka Country including A. Mitchell S. Wright S. Suchet-Pearson K. Lloyd L. Burarrwanga R. Ganambarr M. Ganambarr-Stubbs B. Ganambarr D. Maymuru R. Maymuru (this is a lot of authors; you can find qualifications on your own lol)

Mitchell, Audra et. Al. “Dukarr lakarama: Listening to Guwak, talking back to space colonization” Political Geography, Volume 81, August 2020 // sam

“There already are spirits up there, a spiritual story”, Rrawun says, “Guwak, the bird, it is someone’s spirit when someone passes away … When we talk about space, there are people already there”. The songspiral tells us that when Guwak flies with the spirit of a deceased person to Sky Country, that person joins ancestors and kin who dwell there and care for it. Rrawun explains further: “already a person who is related to us lives there for me, my burrku, is given to me as my identity and my authority … I will go there my place of belonging, the place of spirits to again join with my ancestors”. One’s identity and kinship, in other words, are linked not only to relations on earth but also to the relatives dwelling in Sky Country. The inhabitation of Sky Country by ancestors and other kin is common sense within the Guwak songspiral and the broader cosmology it sits within. Yolŋu people are not alone in this knowledge. For example, on Stradbroke Island, Queensland, a man called Mirabooka was placed in the sky by the ‘good spirit’ Biami in order to look after the people of the Earth, and he remains spread across the sky in the form of a constellation (Bhathal, 2006). Kamilaroi people have a communicative relationship with a giant emu whose body is composed of stars and the dark space between them that travels across the sky (Fuller et al., 2014). The Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee peoples of Turtle Island are both descended from Ancestors who came to earth from sky worlds. In fact, the name ‘Anishinaabe’ refers to the fall of the first human from the sky to earth; while the Haudenosaunee descended from Sky Woman, the progenitor of all humans, who fell from a hole in the sky, pregnant with the first humans, and co-created earth with the animals (Johnston, 2010; Watts, 2013). All of these communities recognize and maintain kinship relations with beings (human and nonhuman) who dwell in what Yolŋu recognize as Sky Country (see Krupp, 1999). Activities that alter Sky Country damage the dwelling places of kin and disrupt their relations with people and other beings on earth. Disruptions such as these have had intensely unjust legal implications – for example for Indigenous people in Australia and Canada who have to prove continuity of inhabitation as understood by colonial law, in order to make native title claims (Borrows, 2010; Moreton-Robinson, 2015). Sky Country is, and always has been, continuously inhabited. The way the songspiral is sung confirms kinship structures and shared responsibility to care for Sky Country (Gaw’wu Group of Women et al., 2019). As Rrawun explains, he is responsible for part of the song as it maps onto specific places, but the duty of singing it is shared by others: My song in reality, in Yolŋu will stop at Jaraku, … that is where the song stops, the other clan will take over the story. In Yolŋu way we always share, we don’t own things, nature owns us. We don’t say to a particular animal we own you … Similar to when we sing, the exchanging of the song, half way they will swap over and show the other clan’s song, it’s about sharing, respect, deep understanding of the land, the skies and the universe. Rrawun’s words make clear that Yolŋu people and their kin co-create Sky Country. This does not translate into Western ideas of ownership – least of all those that suggest exclusive control over access, such as the SPACE Act. Instead, Sky Country is governed through plural, overlapping (perhaps sometimes conflictual) layers of responsibility and care undertaken by multiple more-than-human communities. Singing the songspiral is a crucial part of maintaining the negotiations between these communities. Waŋanydja ŋayi yurru dhawalnha ŋupan wanhaka wa€ŋa, yurru ŋayinydja Guwakdja ŋathili yana marŋgi nhalili € ŋayi yurru butthun. Guwak speaks and her echoes reach the lands and the sea of Muŋurru, and from there go up to the skies; she already knows to where she will fly. When Guwak speaks, her cries are heard, not only on earth but also across Sky Country. As Rrawun offers, “The Guwak calls when you arrive at your destination in the River of Stars. It is heard in the stars and the echo is heard in the sea of stars”. In this way, the songspiral tells us that Guwak, and Sky Country communicate and are heard by one another. They have sentience and agency, actively co-constitute one another and communicate through ceremony, song and journeys. Sky Country and the beings that inhabit it are kin. For instance, Djawundil and Ritjilili explain that ŋalindi (the moon) has a moiety – “it has a family, is kin … everyone is related to the moon” (see Burarrwanga et al., 2013). In other words, the more-than-human beings that co-constitute Sky Country are entwined in kinship structures and are part of the web of responsibilities and obligations that shape these structures. This is at odds with the understanding of those NewSpace entrepreneurs who argue that outer space has no ethical standing. Guwak has strong and intimate relationships with Sky Country, having made this journey through and as time/space innumerable times (Bawaka Country incl et al., 2016). Guwak recognizes these places and calls out to them, and they return the call. But what if Guwak cries out and the echoes do not reach the rivers or the seas? What if that Country is no longer there, or if it is damaged beyond recognition? Indeed, the destruction or transformation of Sky Country by space colonization could have detrimental effects on the songspiral, and on the relations it (re)makes. Banbapuy states that these actions would damage the songspirals themselves, and violate the Rom they embody. It might also fundamentally alter the relationships between Yolŋu people and their kin in Sky Country. As Banbapuy tells us, “songlines are there forever. Songlines remain. But in future [after space colonization, we] would be singing about the moon that existed before, but there is nothing there”. Djawundil worries about what would happen to the songspirals if the beings they connect to – the moon, stars, sun, Milky way and so on – were destroyed or tampered with. “I think it would mean danger,” she says, “singing about something that existed before but now it is gone”. The disruption of Sky Country and the songspirals that sing it into being, may not destroy the songspirals entirely – they have always been, and will always be – but the results would be unpredictable. The fact that songspirals are eternal does not justify activities that might damage them, particularly as the results are unknowable. As Sarah observes, this would be akin to arguing that, because a deceased loved one can live on in your heart, it is acceptable to murder that person. In short, permanence of the songspirals does not justify or excuse colonial violence. Bala ŋayi Guwakthu dhakay ŋakulana € watana guyŋarrnha. Guwak feels the cold wind, the south wind, Madirriny. Bala ŋarra yurru ŋurrungunydja marrtji ŋunha wata ŋupan watamirri rirrakay dupthurruna ŋathili € Milŋiyalili, ga Muŋurrulili. From here I will first go to the place from where the cold wind blows, to the stony Country, and speak where my voice will reach space, the River of Stars, Milŋiyawuy, and the sea of Muŋurru. Many advocates of space exploitation argue that their projects would help to protect earth by externalizing dirty industries such as mineral mining to space. But Banbapuy tells us that “there is no difference between the land and the sky. If they mine the land, they are mining the sky”. The reverse is also true: they are all part of Country. In Yolŋu cosmology, there is no clear separation between earth and Sky Country – they are continuous, threaded together by the songspirals that sing them into being. As Banbapuy reminds us, songspirals go all the way deep into the earth, to the depths of the ocean, and out beyond the realm that Western sciences designate as space. What Western thinkers define as Bawaka Country including climate and weather are as much a part of Sky Country as are the stars. Because they are continuous and entwined – literally co-respondent to one another – what happens in Sky Country affects earth, and vice versa. We can see this profound connection as the wind blows from earth all the way to milŋiyawuy, the Milky Way, and the River of Stars and back to the Muŋurru, the sea of stars. Importantly, the flow of continuity is reciprocal – as Ritjilili and Djawundil say, just as the songspirals extend from the center of the earth beyond the sky, “the stars and light shine down to light the rivers here on earth”. Banbapuy describes how the call of Guwak is heard simultaneously between Sea, Earth and Sky Country. “The sound goes up to the River [of Stars] and the echoes are heard in the sea, it bounces from the river to the sea. The echoes get heard by people still living”. Fuller and his colleagues write of resonant knowledge shared by Kamilaroi collaborators, for whom “everything up in the sky was once down on Earth, and the sky and the Earth reversed” (Fuller et al., 2014:23). Within that cosmology, constellations and star formations, including the Milky Way and Southern Cross, not only correspond to places on Earth but are entangled with them, such that what happens in either sphere affects the other – that is, “what’s up there is down here” (Fuller et al., 2014:23). A story shared by Banbapuy, describes the islands of Nalkuma, Murrmurrnga, Wakuwala, Gaywndji, to which the deceased travel, as existing simultaneously in Sky and Sea Country. As Banbapuy explains, “when you are alive you can paddle to the island [in the ocean], when you die you go to [the island in] Sky Country. Before Dad died he went to the island Nalkuma – he lay there – when he was sick – we took him there by helicopter, then he went back home and passed away”. Since these islands exist simultaneously in Sea and Sky Country, to visit one is to visit the other. So, not only is there constant communication and interchange between Sea and Sky Country, but they are connected, inseparably sensitive to each other. Just as the preceding verses of the songspiral tell us that the colonization and exploitation of Sky Country might rupture profound, co-constitutive relationships, this verse shows that the disruption of Sky Country would be reflected in the places on earth to which it corresponds. Reflecting on his grandfather’s maps (see above), Rrawun explains how the stars can be used to find one’s way around Country: When they are lost somewhere they will follow the stars. They will follow stars and also they will follow the wind; if you are lost somewhere in the bush if you see a tree or leaves blowing from the east you will know that I am in this area and that my family is this way and I will follow this in the day time. That’s why ancestors gave everything for our survival technique, so we can survive through that. It is only because of the co-respondence between earth, stars, wind and other beings that people with the right knowledge are able to interpret their connections, intimately know and be intimately known by Country. The model of a separate earth and space erases these relationships and may compromise their continuity by underwriting the disruption of Sky Country. The damage that occurs through the breaking of protocols and the damaging of relationships occurs in ways both known/knowable and unknown/unknowable. There is the clearing of sites on earth, the ’space junk’ orbiting earth (Gorman, 2005), the mis-communications and changing seasonal messages that come when the sky speaks differently, and the deep, lingering ramifications that occur from Law not followed. There is also damage done to the protocols and Laws of more-than-humans, many of which live beyond human understanding. And the ways that futurities/pasts/presents predicated on Indigenous absence, on possession and accumulation, and on the disrespect of protocols will always continue to re-create wrongs. Rrawun also expresses concern over the disruption of the links between Sky Country and Sea and Land Country if they are traversed by those who do not have sufficient knowledge. He asks what might happen if substances from Sky Country were brought back to Country on earth and sea: Say if you travelled 1 million miles up there and then you come back, bring back all the toxic and all the radiation back here on earth, and then go back to space. And could be taking dangerous toxic air waves and spread like viruses. Guwak knows how to travel to Sky Country and back without disrupting or displacing. But would-be space colonizers may not, and may inadvertently bring about cascades of destruction through their ignorance. This is another reason why it is so important to understand how deeply connected Sky Country is with Country on earth. Ŋunhili yukurrana nhina miyalk Nyapililŋu. There lives a sprit woman, Nyapililŋu. Guwak waŋana dhuwala ŋarra yurru marr ganana Dhithi, Gunbalka Rakila. I will leave this place, the essence of my people, with the seep name Dhithi, leave the stony Country, Gunbalka Rakila, from where the string came. Ŋunha ŋupan guyaŋirri watamirri Wurrtjinmirri Dharrpayina. I will chase and remember and fly towards to the Country from where the wind blows, to where it directs me to Maŋgalili Country, nation of Wurrtjinmirri, Dharrpayina, deep clan names for Maŋgalili. Bala butthurrunana warryurrunana burrkundja. I take and pull the string and together we will fly; entwined, we will start the journey, guided, directed by the Milky Way, we fly the universe After the string is finished, after the identification is finished, Guwak will cry to claim that body’s spirit. It’s time to put that body’s spirit into the string. Entwining5 the spirit into the string and flying together where the wind blows from. Starting to journey to the universe. (Banbapuy) As the echoes heard in the songspiral are echoes of Guwak, they are heard for the first time and every time. Guwak has been there all the time – and Guwak has been travelling through Sky Country forever – just as the songspiral has always been sung. But there is also an ethical requirement, an obligation and responsibility to keep singing it, to make sure that it is sung forever. The process of sharing Guwak is a process of intergenerational learning through which Rrawun (and hopefully others) will continue to learn and share the songspiral and carry out this responsibility. To gain permission to share Guwak with us for this paper and our new book, Rrawun spoke to old man Balaka Maymuru, his other eldest brother from an elder brother. Balaka said, “Do it. Because if I pass away, there will be no one else to share the Guwak”. Rrawun is worried that Balaka is getting sick, so he needs all his sons and daughters to wake up and learn the songspirals – “to ensure that our stories are not taken away”. By sharing the songspiral, Rrawun is carrying on the work of his grandfather, one of the first men in the community to open up an art gallery and invite ŋapaki € to participate in ceremonies in the 1970s. This was part of his grandfather’s vision of sharing knowledge through the generations. It is crucial that young men also sing Guwak, keeping it alive in contemporary song. Indeed, Rrawun wrote a song about Guwak and Milngiyawuy, the River of Stars, with his rock band, East Journey. This process of spiraling in, through and as time blurs any neat separations between then and now, between this moment and the eternity of the songspiral, and across generations. Rrawun sees this as part of the work of ensuring continuity: It is the same thing, we are using the same pathway in a different context. Like right now, we are discussing about how great the universe is. We are learning together. We are trying to discover, while we are alive, we are saying, what is going to happen when we pass away. We are all doing that. We are getting the songs, putting the songs in our souls and we will journey with that until later on, the time when we pass away, we will journey, begin the songs and stories, following the songs and stories until we get there, we will know ahh, this is what we were doing. Same thing, I know that song, I am going to put it into contemporary to show what the song talks about. Same thing with life. I know this story, this song, I am going to exercise and maintain it to reach the spiritual world, in a right path. This ethical obligation to make sure that Guwak is sung forever is an important way of taking care of the cosmos, and the kin who dwell throughout it. As Rrawun explains: Guwak is someone’s spirit when someone passes away. The spirit waits until Guwak calls out. It’s like opening the gates to the heavens, to the universe, for the spirit who is carrying the string. It is another way to tell people to look after the universe. When we talk about space, there are people already there. Already. You don’t see but if you believe, it gets passed on. Each time the ceremony is carried out, the songs are sung, the dances danced and Guwak’s flight repeated, Sky Country is remade. Indeed, Sky Country needs to be sung, danced and journeyed into becoming; it is coconstituted by these acts. The songs and ceremonies that re-create Sky Country will, as Rrawun says, continue to exist as long as Yolŋu sing songspirals. In sharing Guwak with you, we hope to learn and remind ourselves and others of our obligations to Sky Country, and how plans to disrupt it might break these bonds.

#### Refusal is not just a no but rather a generative process that intervenes into bad research projects and generates alternative politics that allow us to live more ethically in the world.

**Tuck and Yang 14** – associate professor of critical race and indigenous studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto and director of ethnic studies at UC San Diego

Eve Tuck and Wayne C Yang, “R-Words: Refusing Research,” Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities, vol 223 pp 239 – 243 [https://townsendgroups.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/tuckandyangrwords\_refusingresearch.pdf //](https://townsendgroups.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/tuckandyangrwords_refusingresearch.pdf%20//) sam

For the purposes of our discussion, the most important insight to draw from Simpson’s article is her emphasis that refusals are not subtractive, but are theoretically generative (p. 78), expansive. Refusal is not just a “no,” but a redirection to ideas otherwise unacknowledged or unquestioned. Unlike a settler colonial configuration of knowledge that is petulantly exasperated and resentful of limits, a methodology of refusal regards limits on knowledge as productive, as indeed a good thing. To explore how refusal and the installation of limits on settler colonial knowledge might be productive, we make a brief detour to the Erased Lynching series (2002–2011) by Los Angeles–based artist Ken Gonzales-Day (see Figure 12.1). Gonzales-Day researched lynching in California and the Southwest and found that the majority of lynch victims were Latinos, American Indians, and Asians. Like lynchings in the South, lynchings in California were events of public spectacle, often attended by hundreds, sometimes thousands of festive onlookers. At the lynchings, professional photographers took hours to set up portable studios similar to those used at carnivals; they sold their images frequently as postcards, mementos of public torture and execution to be circulated by U.S. post through- out the nation and the world. Lynching, we must be reminded, was extralegal, yet nearly always required the complicity of law enforcement—either by marshals or sheriffs in the act itself, or by judges and courts in not bothering to prosecute the lynch mob afterward. The photographs immortalize the murder beyond the time and place of the lynching, and in their proliferation, expand a single murder to the general murderability of the non-White body. In this respect, the image of the hanged, mutilated body itself serves a critical function in the maintenance of White supremacy and the spread of racial terror beyond the lynching. The spectacle of the lynching is the medium of terror. Gonzales-Day’s Erased Lynching series reintroduces the photographs of lynching to a contemporary audience, with one critical intervention: The ropes and the lynch victim have been removed from the images. Per Gonzales-Day’s website (n.d.), the series enacted a conceptual gesture intended to direct the viewer’s attention, not upon the lifeless body of the lynch victim, but upon the mechanisms of lynching themselves: the crowd, the spectacle, the photographer, and even consider the impact of flash photography upon this dismal past. The perpetrators, if present, remain fully visible, jeering, laughing, or pulling at the air in a deadly pantomime. As such, this series strives to make the invisible visible. The Erased Lynching series yields another context in which we might consider what a social scientist’s refusal stance might comprise. Though indeed centering on the erasure of the former object, refusal need not be thought of as a subtractive methodology. Refusal prompts analysis of the festive spectators regularly backgrounded in favor of wounded bodies, strange fruit, interesting scars. Refusal shifts the gaze from the violated body to the violating instruments—in this case, the lynch mob, which does not disappear when the lynching is over, but continues to live, accumulating land and wealth through the extermination and subordination of the Other. Thus, refusal helps move us from thinking of violence as an event and toward an analysis of it as a structure. Gonzales-Day might have decided to reproduce and redistribute the images as postcards, which, by way of showing up in mundane spaces, might have effectively inspired reflection on the spectacle of violence and media of terror. However, in removing the body and the ropes, he installed limits on what the audience can access, and redirected our gaze to the bodies of those who were there to see a murder take place, and to the empty space beneath the branches. Gonzales-Day introduced a new representational territory, one that refuses to play by the rules of the settler colonial gaze, and one that refuses to satisfy the morbid curiosity derived from settler colonialism’s preoccupation with pain. Refusals are needed for narratives and images arising in social science research that rehumiliate when circulated, but also when, in Simpson’s words, “the representation would bite all of us and compromise the representational territory that we have gained for ourselves in the past 100 years” (p. 78). As researcher-narrator, Simpson tells us, “I reached my own limit when the data would not contribute to our sovereignty or complicate the deeply simplified, atrophied representations of Iroquois and other Indigenous peoples that they have been mired within anthropologically” (p. 78). Here Simpson makes clear the ways in which research is not the intervention that is needed—that is, the interventions of furthering sovereignty or countering misrepresentations of Native people as anthropological objects. Considering Erased Lynchings dialogically with On Ethnographic Refusal, we can see how refusal is not a prohibition but a generative form. First, refusal turns the gaze back upon power, specifically the colonial modalities of knowing persons as bodies to be differentially counted, violated, saved, and put to work. It makes transparent the metanarrative of knowledge production—its spectatorship for pain and its preoccupation for documenting and ruling over racial difference. Thus, refusal to be made meaningful first and foremost is grounded in a critique of settler colonialism, its construction of Whiteness, and its regimes of representation. Second, refusal generates, expands, champions representational territories that colonial knowledge endeavors to settle, enclose, domesticate. Simpson complicates the portrayals of Iroquois, without resorting to portrayals of anthropo- logical Indians. Gonzales-Day portrays the violations without reportraying the victimizations. Third, refusal is a critical intervention into research and its circular self-defining ethics. The ethical justification for research is defensive and self-encircling—its apparent self-criticism serves to expand its own rights to know, and to defend its violations in the name of “good science.” Refusal challenges the individualizing discourse of IRB consent and “good science” by high- lighting the problems of collective harm, of representational harm, and of knowledge colonization. Fourth, refusal itself could be developed into both method and theory. Simpson presents refusal on the part of the researcher as a type of calculus ethnography. Gonzales-Day deploys refusal as a mode of representation. Simpson theorizes refusal by the Kahnawake Nation as anticolonial, and rooted in the desire for possibilities outside of colonial logics, not as a reactive stance. This final point about refusal connects our conversation back to desire as a counterlogic to settler colonial knowledge.

### 1nc – Framework

#### Our interpretation is that the 1ac is an epistemological project – before you evaluate the consequences of the plan text you should weigh its ideological underpinnings.

#### The role of the ballot should be to embrace an ethic of incommensurability that steps away from the endless “what abouts” of the settler and unconditionally commit to decolonization instead of moves towards settler innocence.

**Tuck and Yang 12** (Eve Tuck is a professor at SUNY New Paltz. Wayne K Yang is a professor at the University of California San Diego) “Decolonization is not a metaphor” Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, July 17, 2017 // sam

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.

#### Accountability DA – “weigh the aff” is a settler ruse to ensure a lack of accountability for anti-native representations – only our model of debate ensures we can challenge violent representations which internal link turns fairness because it makes debate unsafe for black, brown, and native debaters. Psychological violence outweighs – your role as an educator is to prioritize a model of debate that makes debate safer for students.

#### All of our 1nc K proper evidence justifies why thinking through land and relationships to land is imperative –if we win that is true than we win framework because only an interpretation that understands land as central to our epistemology can create a good politics.

## 3

#### Reject 1AR theory – a) 1ar theory means it’s game over for the 2nr because of the 2ar collapse – the negative will inevitably undercover something, b) I can respond to 1ar only once which both kills resolvability and kills reciprocity since they can respond to 1nc shells twice.

#### Reasonability on 1ar theory – 7 minutes of the 1nc means they will always find there’s something abusive we did – reasonability’s key to incentivizing in-depth discussion rather than a 2ar collapse on theory.

#### Drop the arg on 1ar theory – 1ar theory is incentivized to restart the debate and avoid the 1n. Drop the arg solves because if one position the 1nc was abusive, then ignoring it in the 2ar allows evaluation of substance.

#### RVIs on 1ar theory – anything thing else puts me in a double bind because I’ll either overcover substance and undercover theory or vice versa which makes negating impossible – RVIs solve by creating another route to the ballot to compensate.

# Case

#### On Durrani, 19 – stopping any sort of exploration into space is definetly bad bc it renders space only as a space of militarization – doesn’t solve for things like satelites

On the rotb – militarization is too narrow, prefer our rotb

#### Collision is unlikely – all countries receive collision warnings THREE days ahead AND their evidence doesn’t assume new technology.

**Mosher** **’19** [Dave; September 3rd; Journalist with more than a decade of experience reporting and writing stories about space, science, and technology; Business Insider, “Satellite collisions may trigger a space-junk disaster that could end human access to orbit. Here’s How,” <https://www.usafa.edu/app/uploads/Space_and_Defense_2_3.pdf>; GR]//ww pbj

The Kessler syndrome plays center-stage in the movie "Gravity," in which an accidental space collision endangers a crew aboard a large space station. But Gossner said that type of a runaway space-junk catastrophe is unlikely. "Right now I don't think we're close to that," he said. "I'm not saying we couldn't get there, and I'm not saying we don't need to be smart and manage the problem. But I don't see it ever becoming, anytime soon, an unmanageable problem." There is no current system to remove old satellites or sweep up bits of debris in order to prevent a Kessler event. Instead, space debris is monitored from Earth, and new rules require satellites in low-Earth orbit be deorbited after 25 years so they don't wind up adding more space junk. "Our current plan is to manage the problem and not let it get that far," Gossner said. "I don't think that we're even close to needing to actively remove stuff. There's lots of research being done on that, and maybe some day that will happen, but I think that — at this point, and in my humble opinion — an unnecessary expense." A major part of the effort to prevent a Kessler event is the Space Surveillance Network (SSN). The project, led by the US military, uses 30 different systems around the world to identify, track, and share information about objects in space. Many objects are tracked day and night via a networkof radar observatories around the globe. Optical telescopes on the ground also keep an eye out, but they aren't always run by the government. "The commercial sector is actually putting up lots and lots of telescopes," Gossner said. The government pays for their debris-tracking services. Gossner said one major debris-tracking company is called Exoanalytic. It uses about 150 small telescopes set up around the globe to detect, track, and report space debris to the SSN. Telescopes in space track debris, too. Far less is known about them because they're likely top-secret military satellites. Objects detected by the government and companies get added to a catalog of space debris and checked against the orbits of other known bits of space junk. New orbits are calculated with supercomputers to see if there's a chance of any collisions. Diana McKissock, a flight lead with the US Air Force's 18th Space Control Squadron, helps track space debris for the SSN. She said the surveillance network issues warnings to NASA, satellite companies, and other groups with spacecraft, based on two levels of emergency: basic and advanced. The SSN issues a basic emergency report to the public three days ahead of a 1-in-10,000 chance of a collision. It then provides multiple updates per day until the risk of a collision passes. To qualify for such reporting, a rogue object must come within a certain distance of another object. In low-Earth orbit, that distance must be less than 1 kilometer (0.62 mile); farther out in deep space, where the precision of orbits is less reliable, the distance is less than 5 kilometers (3.1 miles). Advanced emergency reports help satellite providers see possible collisions much more than three days ahead. "In 2017, we provided data for 308,984 events, of which only 655 were emergency-reportable," McKissock told Business Insider in an email. Of those, 579 events were in low-Earth orbit (where it's relatively crowded with satellites).

#### No debris impact at every layer of space

Fange 17 (Daniel von Fange. Web Application Engineer. “Kessler Syndrome is Over Hyped,” *Braino*, 5/21/17, <http://braino.org/essays/kessler_syndrome_is_over_hyped/>) dwc 19)//ww pbj

Kessler Syndrome is overhyped. A chorus of online commenters great any news of upcoming low earth orbit satellites with worry that humanity will to lose access to space. I now think they are wrong. //// What is Kessler Syndrome? Here’s the popular view on Kessler Syndrome. Every once in a while, a piece of junk in space hits a satellite. This single impact destroys the satellite, and breaks off several thousand additional pieces. These new pieces now fly around space looking for other satellites to hit, and so exponentially multiply themselves over time, like a nuclear reaction, until a sphere of man-made debris surrounds the earth, and humanity no longer has access to space nor the benefits of satellites.//// It is a dark picture.//// Is Kessler Syndrome likely to happen? I had to stop everything and spend an afternoon doing back-of-the-napkin math to know how big the threat is. To estimate, we need to know where the stuff in space is, how much mass is there, and how long it would take to deorbit. //// The orbital area around earth can be broken down into four regions. //// Low LEO - Up to about 400km. Things that orbit here burn up in the earth’s atmosphere quickly - between a few months to two years. The space station operates at the high end of this range. It loses about a kilometer of altitude a month and if not pushed higher every few months, would soon burn up. For all practical purposes, Low LEO doesn’t matter for Kessler Syndrome. If Low LEO was ever full of space junk, we’d just wait a year and a half, and the problem would be over.///// High LEO - 400km to 2000km. This where most heavy satellites and most space junk orbits. The air is thin enough here that satellites only go down slowly, and they have a much farther distance to fall. It can take 50 years for stuff here to get down. This is where Kessler Syndrome could be an issue. /// Mid Orbit - GPS satellites and other navigation satellites travel here in lonely, long lives. The volume of space is so huge, and the number of satellites so few, that we don’t need to worry about Kessler here. //// GEO - If you put a satellite far enough out from earth, the speed that the satellite travels around the earth will match the speed of the surface of the earth rotating under it. From the ground, the satellite will appear to hang motionless. Usually the geostationary orbit is used by big weather satellites and big TV broadcasting satellites. (This apparent motionlessness is why satellite TV dishes can be mounted pointing in a fixed direction. You can find approximate south just by looking around at the dishes in your northern hemisphere neighborhood.) For Kessler purposes, GEO orbit is roughly a ring 384,400 km around. However, all the satellites here are moving the same direction at the same speed - debris doesn’t get free velocity from the speed of the satellites. Also, it’s quite expensive to get a satellite here, and so there aren’t many, only about one satellite per 1000km of the ring. Kessler is not a problem here. //// How bad could Kessler Syndrome in High LEO be? Let’s imagine a worst case scenario. //// An evil alien intelligence chops up everything in High LEO, turning it into 1cm cubes of death orbiting at 1000km, spread as evenly across the surface of this sphere as orbital mechanics would allow. Is humanity cut off from space? //// I’m guessing the world has launched about 10,000 tons of satellites total. For guessing purposes, I’ll assume 2,500 tons of satellites and junk currently in High LEO. If satellites are made of aluminum, with a density of 2.70 g/cm3, then that’s 839,985,870 1cm cubes. A sphere for an orbit of 1,000km has a surface area of 682,752,000 square KM. So there would be one cube of junk per .81 square KM. If a rocket traveled through that, its odds of hitting that cube are tiny - less than 1 in 10,000. ////// So even in the worst case, we don’t lose access to space. // Now though you can travel through the debris, you couldn’t keep a satellite alive for long in this orbit of death. Kessler Syndrome at its worst just prevents us from putting satellites in certain orbits. //// In real life, there’s a lot of factors that make Kessler syndrome even less of a problem than our worst case though experiment.//// Debris would be spread over a volume of space, not a single orbital surface, making collisions orders of magnitudes less likely.//// Most impact debris will have a slower orbital velocity than either of its original pieces - this makes it deorbit much sooner.//// Any collision will create large and small objects. Small objects are much more affected by atmospheric drag and deorbit faster, even in a few months from high LEO. Larger objects can be tracked by earth based radar and avoided.//// The planned big new constellations are not in High LEO, but in Low LEO for faster communications with the earth. They aren’t an issue for Kessler.//// Most importantly, all new satellite launches since the 1990’s are required to include a plan to get rid of the satellite at the end of its useful life (usually by deorbiting)//// So the realistic worst case is that insurance premiums on satellites go up a bit. Given the current trend toward much smaller, cheaper micro satellites, this wouldn’t even have a huge effect.

#### Alternative measures solve misclac from satellite takeout

Lambakis 01 (Steven Lambakis is a senior defense analyst at the National Institute for Public Policy and the author of On the Edge of Earth: The Future of American Space Power (University Press of Kentucky, 2001). “Space Weapons: Refuting the Critics” <http://www.hoover.org/publications/policy-review/article/6612>, Donnie)//ww pbj

In other words, it is not at all self-evident that a sudden loss of a communications satellite, for example, would precipitate a wider-scale war or make warfare termination impossible. In the context of U.S.-Russian relations, communications systems to command authorities and forces are redundant. Urgent communications may be routed through land lines or the airwaves. Other means are also available to perform special reconnaissance missions for monitoring a crisis or compliance with an armistice. While improvements are needed, our ability to know what transpires in space is growing — so we are not always in the dark.

#### Kessler’s Syndrome wrong and super long timeframe

Kurt 15 – JD-William & Mary Joseph Kurt, JD- William & Mary School of Law, BA-Marquette University, NOTE: TRIUMPH OF THE SPACE COMMONS: ADDRESSING THE IMPENDING SPACE DEBRIS CRISIS WITHOUT AN INTERNATIONAL TREATY, 40 Wm. & Mary Envtl. L. & Pol'y Rev. 305 (2015)//ww pbj

A. Practical Considerations: Feasible Solutions to the Space Debris Problem Are on Their Way One key question in assessing whether an international treaty is a requisite for solving the space debris problem is just how difficult it will be to fashion a remedy. The more complex and costly are feasible solutions, the more likely it is that a comprehensive regime is necessary to bind the various actors together. 93Link to the text of the note A good place to begin is to determine just how imminent is the onset of the cascade of exponentially more frequent debris-creating collisions, known as the Kessler Syndrome. 94Link to the text of the note To be certain, no one can be sure--this phenomenon being subject to highly complex probabilities. 95Link to the text of the note Indeed, experts' estimates of when such a cascade will become irreversible vary [\*316] widely. 96Link to the text of the note The National Research Council produced a report in 2011 that suggested that "space might be just 10 or 20 years away from severe problems." 97Link to the text of the note In fact, the cascading effect has already begun, albeit at a modest pace. 98Link to the text of the note However, Donald Kessler, who first described the eponymous effect in 1978, has significantly recalibrated his own outlook over the years. 99Link to the text of the note Originally, Kessler predicted that catastrophe would result by the year 2000. 100Link to the text of the note That date long passed, Kessler now speaks of a century-long process that "we have time to deal with." 101Link to the text of the note