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#### At the level of ontology, cartesian metaphysics paradigmatically informs the discussion of whether just governments ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike. Endemic to the Cartesian interpretation of the world is a divide between mind and matter, subject and object, as well as nature and culture. Workers are understood as rational and autonomous subjects that exerts mastery over the external natural order through the acquisition of material resources. A cultural cognitive and affective shift in our relationality to the earth is necessary to envision relationality to the earth and enable new bio social becomings.
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This being said, wide consensus exists among historians that the radical elevation of the human species over the nonhuman world by means of reflexive reason and scientific self-improvement is an idea of European origin (Leiss 1994). Moreover, there seems to be fair agreement that the idea of human mastery over nature has been progressively shaped by three influential cultural currents, the first of which is arguably the intellectual and artistic tradition of ancient Greece. In his broad historical account entitled The Beginnings of Western Science, David C. Lindberg (2007) illustrates that the emergence of pre-Socratic natural philosophy during the sixth century BC was marked by a distinct turn from a mythical worldview toward independent inquiry and generalised scepticism. **Nature came to be understood as an autonomous object which had to be comprehended through logical reasoning.** However, the gradual change that took place in Greece from the beginning of the sixth century BC was not simply a miraculous turn from mythos to logos that signalled the end of Greek mythology. Mythical thought can be found in every period of ancient Greece for which evidence exists ― to the end of antiquity and into the Middle Ages (Lloyd 1979). These influential mythical tropes certainly played their part in naturalising the ideology of human mastery within western cultural imaginaries. **Aristotelian, Platonic, and Stoic philosophy as well as the works of the Greek playwright Sophocles explicitly emphasised the divinity of the world, while simultaneously asserting ‘the godlike rationality and hence superiority of human beings, and the rightfulness of ruling over land, vegetable and animal life’** (Wybrow 1991: 129). **Western ideas of human mastery, in other words, never developed in a historical and scientific vacuum that was entirely free from mythical thought,** particularly if we turn our attention toward the second mythical tradition that played a decisive role in legitimising the human dominion over nature, the Judeo-Christian religious tradition. Decreed by divine providence, ‘Man’ was given dominium terrae, the cultural mandate to rule over God’s creation. Occasionally this mandate was interpreted in the sense of a paternalistic stewardship, while in other cases it was taken quite literally as a divine decree to subdue the earth and all living things.5 As a dominant cultural force and frame of reference for the interpretation of what I would call ‘second degree’ mythical thought (mythical thought that openly disavowed any intention to make a claim of absolute truth), **Christianity exerted a continuous influence throughout the entire early modern period — a period that witnessed the scientific revolution, the colonisation of the Americas, and the emergence of capitalism and the modern nation-state.** Reinforced by technological and scientific progress taking place at a hitherto unprecedented pace, **mythical themes of mastery ― that ‘man’ and spirit stand apart from nature and that human beings rightfully exercise authority over nature ― slowly blended with the modern scientific and capitalist worldview**. In the seventeenth century, iconic thinkers such as Francis Bacon and René Descartes set out to conquer nature by means of philosophy, science, and technology, driven by the desire to reconcile and transmute mythical, alchemical, and Christian influences under the aegis of a naturalistic and rationalistic worldview (Leiss 1994). **Particularly the Cartesian dualism between the extended physical world and the nonphysical world of thought was seen as the definitive completion of the pre-Socratic turn from mythos to logos, when myth finally became synonymous with the subjective and the irrational** (Scarborough 1994). From this point onward, myths could neither serve as cosmological narratives of the universe, nor as valid allegories of nature, for they were now fully associated with the inner realm of subjective experience and not with the outer realm of the objective physical world. In the same vein, myths had to be sharply distinguished from history as well, since history could from then on only refer to objective events. This Cartesian schism was further exacerbated by the spread of Enlightenment thought during the eighteenth century, which celebrated the power of reason and embraced a triumphalist scientism. Even though the Enlightenment was not a unified cultural expression with a single doctrine, it nevertheless gave rise to new forms of secular modernism which gradually reduced the influence of mythical and religious thinking as a dominant cultural frame of reference. **Simultaneously, the Enlightenment created its own utopian paradigm of the rational and autonomous individual who imposed upon nature as well as on herself or himself the orderly totality of a universal reason**. Nevertheless, the persistence of various mythical or spiritual imaginaries in our contemporary societies certainly illustrates that such a lasting demystification of life turned out to be a rather short-lived illusion. **If we consider contemporary discussions about the Anthropocene, we can easily see that the sediments of powerful mythical narratives advancing the idea of human mastery and distinguishing mind from matter, subject from object, and nature from culture can still be found in today’s political debates**. A number of scientists recently suggested that the Anthropocene should be seen as an opportunity and, ultimately, as a ‘good’ epoch in which human ingenuity and technology will provide the means to solve the critical environmental problems of our time (see, for example, Ellis 2011). These Promethean myths of ecomodernism, synthetic biology, and geoengineering are not only fallacies of control in the light of unprecedented changes which are currently occurring in the earth’s ecosystems. **They are also about to be woven into a new geopolitical master narrative that is on the verge of replacing the abstract totality of a single humanity with the abstract plurality of more-than-human entanglements**. Put differently, it is important to realise that more-than-human or posthuman accounts of the Anthropocene provide the discursive background for the mytho-politics of the newly proclaimed human epoch. From the contested metaphor of Gaia, popularised by James Lovelock as a synonym for earth system science (and recently reworked by the French philosopher and anthropologist Bruno Latour), to animistic and pantheistic currents in western environmental philosophy and non-western thought, there currently exists an intriguing interest in imagining other possible ways of relating to the world at large.6 **Decolonial scholars nevertheless argue that such attempts at conceptualising the relations between humans and more-than-human nature(s) must pay attention to the coloniality of power, knowledge, and being, while becoming more sensitive to the vital role that myth and mythology play in articulating alternatives to hegemonic western knowledge practices.** The idea of border thinking, in particular, alerts us to the limiting modes of relationality and representation that are inherent to the anthropocentric worldview, a worldview which perceives more-than-human nature primarily as an object (socially produced, biophysically constituted, or both). The gradual delinking from such a limiting perspective, and the simultaneous consideration of cosmologies which see nature as an active and ‘ensouled’ subject in its own right, so it seems, must therefore appear as one of the most radical projects imaginable vis-à-vis the epistemic hierarchy of westerncentric technoscience. Quite possibly, many scholars would fervently revolt against such a proposed bridging of established science/myth, rational/ primitive or fact/value divides ― particularly if such an attempt is performed without a certain ironic or subjective gesture ― for it conjures up vivid images of seemingly regressive elements that have been expelled from today’s dominant scholarly discourses: essence, spirit, esotericism, non-modernism, non-rationalism, romanticism, totalitarianism, and so on. And yet **it is evident that the predicaments of the Anthropocene, whether they are taken to be economic, spiritual, or sociopolitical in nature, will require a cultural-cognitive and affective shift in how (many) humans relate to the world they inhabit**. **While imagining the possibilities for new biosocial becomings, it is crucial to realise that contemporary societies are still influenced by older mythological substrata that carry with them the sediments of the ‘grand narratives’ of human mastery.** Such deep-seated sociocultural patterns must be taken very seriously in their capacity to shape the future outcomes of Anthropocene politics. After all, the ideology of human mastery might well survive without the much-critiqued nature/culture binary and become enshrouded in new Anthropocene myths. Advanced algorithmic or biopolitical control mechanisms and the capitalist-materialistic ethos of desire, production, and consumption are certainly well attuned to the Anthropocene rhetoric of biosocial complexity, indeterminacy, interconnectedness, and plurality (Pellizzoni 2015). By contrast, decolonial scholarship reminds us of the liberating potential and integrative function of myth and myth-making. The concept of mytho-politics, which I have outlined here, thus draws attention to the complex openness and suggestiveness of myth in the sense of an ideological ‘both/and.’ This means that, even if the role of mytho-politics in transforming imaginaries of biosocial relations is fully recognised, it is difficult to predict how the Anthropocene debate might develop in the near future. Will the discussion become more open to different views of knowing and being? Will it include marginalised perspectives which reject the objectification of nature and point toward the need for a decolonial politics of ‘delinking’ and ‘re-learning’? Or will the debate remain entrenched in western-centric and anthropocentric ideas of planetary stewardship, managerial control, and (bio-)technological fixes? Whatever the case may be, **it is clear that the discussion about the Anthropocene has already moved beyond questions of mere geological evidence. It has become a lively debate about the principles of thought, speech, and action which provide the seemingly ‘natural’ foundations for the idea of unlimited human mastery over the earth.**

#### Cartesian metaphysics perpetually reduces land to an unlimited resource that is retrofitted into a commodity for sustainable labor. Perpetual reduction of relationality to land to that of an external commodity entangled within a network of capitalist relations necessitates the anthropocentric deadening of being. Indigenous economies that centralize relationality to land become degraded components of primitive and arcane life that are not measurable within settler registers of materialism.

**Henderson 14** (Worlds on the Edge: The Politics of Settler Resentment on the Saugeen/Bruce Peninsula by Phil Henderson B.A., The University of Western Ontario, 2014 A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF ARTS in the Department of Political Science <https://dspace.library.uvic.ca/bitstream/handle/1828/7414/Henderson_Phil_MA_2016.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y> Page 69 – 72, RLA)

As Emma Lowman and Adam Barker assert, attempting to disentangle and isolate capitalist, racial, gender, or colonial oppressions from one another is misguided. Each of these 3 processes operate simultaneously, overlapping and reinforcing one another in a variety of nonschematic ways. Still, settler states such as Canada remain committed to ongoing colonization, and this is the background condition establishing and enabling - or, rather, disabling - what settlers perceive as the immutable ground or bedrock upon which all possible political projects must be built. Glen Coulthard observes that settler colonies mobilize “discursive and nondiscursive facets of economic, gendered, racial, and state power” to secure the continuance of hierarchical social orders predicated from their genesis on dispossessing indigenous peoples. 4 As such, **a decolonial account of dispossession begins by rejecting settlers’ claims to territorial sovereignty as a matter of course**. Moreover, this rejection must continue to contour how political and economic issues are understood within the context of settler colonialism. Narrating the dispossessive drive’s development begins with this rejection, and with a subsequent coming to terms, as Michael Asch says, with the fact that wherever **indigenous peoples and persons are in Turtle Island today**, whether on rural reserves or in urban centres, they live on land that remains under their sovereignty and jurisdiction; and that **we [settlers] ourselves live on ‘unceded land’…** rather than arguing over the point, we need to begin by determining the implications for us and accepting the reality of our status on Indigenous lands.5 Analyses of dispossession that attend to this fact by recognizing the ongoing decolonial struggle to disrupt the settler colony’s presumption of sovereignty and its highly destructive economy begin to accommodate the radical alterity of multiple subject positions. A decolonial critique underscores that the neoliberal regime, which many scholars portray as something radically new, 70 is only an extension of the dispossessive drives which were initiated by and continue to sustain the processes of settler colonization, and now also begin to operate against newly disposable populations of settlers. Neoliberalization does not emerge ex nihilo; rather, it maintains colonization, expanding and entrenching processes of dispossession while striving to open North America to deeper exploitation by the settler economy. For the purposes of this project it is sufficient to trace the initiation of this animating dispossessive drive only as far back as its origins in North America. Though a longer history exists, and is a project worthy of serious consideration, it is nevertheless both too broad and too deep to be contained in this work. 6 With notable and important exceptions, the earliest settlers primarily aimed to establish trade and military alliances between Europe and the various indigenous peoples of northeastern Turtle Island. As Europe’s economy transformed, however, the importance of these partnerships 7 declined precipitously in the reckoning of settlers. The rise of a regime of accumulation predicated on industrial capitalism saw European populations and markets undergo a massive expansion**. To the instrumentalized mentality of early industrial capitalists, the territories of indigenous peoples represented at once a nearly unlimited resource to be commodified and a site to which the “Malthusian excesses” of Europe could be conveniently relocated and used as labour in the extractive economy.** The presence of sovereign indigenous peoples, who may have 8 traded with Europeans but would object to the total exploitation and destruction of their territories by industry, became an impediment to the unbridled expansion of capitalist markets. Exemplified in the repeatedly violated treaties between the Saugeen Anishinaabek and the Crown, as discussed in chapter one, the settler state continually ignored both the letter and spirit 71 of these treaties, using subterfuge and coercion to advance an economy that necessitates the dispossession of their treaty-partners. It is tempting to assert that this is merely an example of cynical self-interest trumping treaties - and, to some degree, it no doubt is. I do not, however, think this explanation can fully account for the voraciousness and reflexivity with which settlers continue dispossessing indigenous peoples. **Settler colonialism relies, as all political regimes do, on the development of a political subject through discourses and social practices that naturalize the distribution of power.** Developed just prior to the initiation of settler colonization, John Locke’s “powerfully and influentially elaborated” labour theory of property provided settlers with a cogent narrative to support their sense of proprietorship. Asserting that all the world was a commons awaiting a 9 claim to private ownership via its transformation through human labour, Locke’s theory presented North America as radically open to the imposition of European possession. 10 In actual fact, and this should be so clear as to hardly require comment, the indigenous peoples of Turtle Island had been extensively labouring in their territories since time immemorial. The economies of indigenous peoples were, however, radically different from those of Europeans. Many of these economies were “based on the land and the free, unrestricted access of everyone to its resources.” Because many indigenous peoples did not engage in the 11 same sort of hierarchically structured and highly destructive economies as Europeans, settlers discounted indigenous labour as too ‘rudimentary’ to warrant acknowledgement. This enabled settlers to assert that North America was unassisted by human improvement and, therefore, that indigenous peoples’ territorial sovereignty need not be recognized. These abstractive discourses encouraged settlers to transplant into North America the material “preconditions underwriting 72 the capital relation” in Europe. Through the regimes of private property, which were codified 12 into laws and enforced by both the violence of the settler state and by vigilante mobs of settlers, indigenous peoples’ access to their territories was gradually eroded by settler enclosures. Enclosure of North America into a patchwork of private properties initiates what Karl Marx refers to as primitive [ursprünglich: original, initial] accumulation. Repeated wherever 13 capitalist relations instantiate themselves, this process represents the severance of a people from their direct access to the land, and the mediating of that access through hierarchical proprietary regimes. As such, in North America, the development of capitalist relations and the foundations of private property - of settlers’ sense possessing land - enacts the dispossession of indigenous peoples of their territories and the degradation of their original economies through processes of settler colonization. This is to say that while the development of capitalism may not necessitate colonialism - the case of England problematizes such a linear causality - in North America the emergence and maintenance of capitalism relies on ongoing processes of settler colonization. That said, **the initiation of the dispossessive drive in North America through the processes of settler colonization cannot be reduced solely, or even primarily, to a materialist account.** As Lowman and Barker note, **beginning the story of dispossession from a materialist standpoint presents the risk that our narrative will act as a conduit for smuggling settler “biases into Indigenous ways of being.”** Instead - as treaty-partners - we must struggle to do the 14 difficult work of learning from indigenous peoples’ ontologies, especially as indigenous peoples have long been required to learn our systems of knowledge in an effort to merely survive settler coloniality’s capriciousness. **of the indigenous peoples across Turtle Island their ontologies place the initial moment of sociality in a culture of relationality to the land, which offers up knowledge to guide the proper conduct of relationships with human and nonhuman others. This is radically different from the anthropocentric deadening of being that is foisted on all nonhuman subjects within the ontological orientations of settlers - who generally hold that the human is the subject of primary consequence.** Put differently, the settler is produced as a subject within a regime of power that 19 locates the human - and, even then, only some humans historically - as the site of ethical concern or relationality. **Settler regimes of proprietorship** - of possessiveness - imposed by colonization, **attempt the dispossession of more than mere materiality**. **It is also always already working to dispossess indigenous peoples of their ways of being in relation to the world, their grounded understandings of responsibility to all relations.** Aileen Moreton-Robinson asserts that the processes of settler coloniality function to “disavow and dispossess the Indigenous subject of an ontology that exists outside the logic of capital”. 20 **As a matter of course settler colonization attempts to eliminate indigenous peoples’ ontological alterity and subsequently to reground the colonized subject in the colonizers’ ontology.** Duncan Campbell Scott confessed to this very aim when he suggested that the Indian Act (1876) would “solve the Indian problem” by ensuring that “there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic.” All difference was to be flattened 21 into the homogeneity of the settler subject. Used throughout the anglophone settler colonies, Residential Schools are a particularly vicious example of the technologies employed in the effort to dispossess indigenous children of all ontological alterity. Designed to “obliterate young children’s connections to indigenous culture”, Residential Schools simultaneously imposed 75 settler ontologies onto indigenous children. The goal, as Stephanie McMullen notes, was to 22 reproduce indigenous children as “assimilated subjects”, imbued with the values of “selfsupporting Christian farmers”. The dispossessive drive that animates settler colonization in its 23 commodification and exploitation of the land operates at two levels simultaneously: attempting to strip indigenous peoples of both their material and ontological relationship to their territories. In a decolonial critique these processes of dispossession must not, as happens so often, be rendered as merely historic events which recede with the passage of time. Moreton-Robinson notes that overwhelmingly settler accounts of colonialism reduce dispossession to “a mere blemish on the historical record,” an event which no longer brings weight to bear on the present except as an historic grievance. Even Marx is ambivalent about the contemporary relevance of 24 the originary dispossessive movement. In the first volume of Capital he writes that primitive accumulation “is nothing else than the historical process of divorcing the producer from the means of production… it forms the pre-historic stage of capital”. Marx thus relegates the 25 material and ontological dispossessions that initiate enclosures to a discrete and historically finalized fact. Subsequent Marxist scholars have worked to temper this historicizing tendency somewhat. David Harvey notably asserts that the concept of ‘primitive’ accumulation is misleading as it suggests that the processes of enclosure occurred in the past. He proposes subsuming what Marx identifies as primitive accumulation within the phrase “accumulation by dispossession”, a process that he says is occurring “at a certain level” to this day. Despite 26 recognizing primitive accumulation as operating in the present, Harvey nevertheless subtly recapitulates Marx’s historicism, suggesting that dispossession through primitive accumulation 76 occurs through a series of discrete and foreclosed acts. He writes that primitive accumulation is a “necessary though ugly stage” in the developmental movement of economies. While Harvey 27 recovers primitive accumulation from the archaic past, his insistence on stadial development imparts a certain historicism to the process: suggesting that dispossession occurs as a series of singular events, the conclusion and political neutralization of which are determinable. Such an account ignores the always ongoing struggle involved in sustaining dispossession. As MoretonRobinson notes, it “takes a great deal of work” to maintain the processes dispossessing indigenous peoples in the face of their ongoing resistance. Settler possession of the colony is 28 thus never achieved with finality; rather it is a continuous reiteration of dispossessive acts.

#### The existence of an autonomous cartesian body also prefigures the very conditions for its exploitation and destruction. Conceptualizing laborers within biological/physiological categories enables domination of lacking black bodies as well as ongoing processes abstraction and appropriation worker’s bodies through exploitive modes of production.

**Burden-Stelly 15** (The Modern Capitalist State and the Black Challenge: Culturalism and the Elision of Political Economy By Charisse Burden-Stelly A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in African American Studies in the Graduate Division of the University of California, Berkeley **Cartesian Dualism** Page 25 – 27 2015 <https://escholarship.org/content/qt2gs4b7z3/qt2gs4b7z3_noSplash_3a3688cf56caa588e87ac34384a8ab66.pdf>,RLA)

**The reduction of laborers to “biological/physiological categories”15 was a technique of domination that had long been applied to the colonized generally, and the Black African particularly.** **Complete domination was rationalized through the reduction of the Black to the body as the condition for the denial of his capacity for intellect: “The plantation order which made it illegal for a slave to learn to read and become educated, which exhausted the black with relentless work, then produced empirical evidence of the Negro’s ‘lack of intellectual faculties.**’ The Negro then becomes the SYMBOLIC OBJECT OF THIS LACK.”16 It can be assumed that “relentless” work is simply a physiological activity that requires no thinking, innovation, or mastery. Work is completely devoid of thought. “As against capital, labor is merely the abstract form, the mere possibility of value-positing activity, which exists only as a capacity, as a resource in the bodiliness of the worker.”17 For the Black, this “**capacity” and “bodiliness” was directly related to the incapacity for reason and rationality. This reduction of labor to the body, and its complete bifurcation from “intellectual faculties” links the Black experience of abstraction of labor to the Cartesian mind/body split.** This is so because abstraction under conditions of freedom assumes the capacity for choice. Thus, it is located in the mind and leads to distortion and false consciousness. Based on conditions of unfreedom, choice was denied to the Black, hence the reduction of Black labor to the realm of the body. As Ramòn Grosfoguel explains, “Descartes claims that the mind is of a different substance from the body. This allows for the mind to be undetermined, unconditioned by the body…. Without ontological dualism, the mind would be located in a body, would be similar in substance to the body and, thus, conditioned by the body…”18 Lewis Gordon adds, “Descartes argued that the mind was distinct from the body because the latter was sensory, changing, and contingent but the former was linked to cogitation or thinking, which revealed essential or necessary invisible features of realitythat were not sensible but comprehensible. Further, parts of the body could be destroyed while thinking continued intact. In thinking, we are linked to God, who thinks reality in its clarity and distinctness.”19 **The potential for the destruction of the body is essential here. It follows that if labor belongs to the body, and if the body can be destroyed, then labor has an intrinsic relationship to violence and subjection to dismemberment as a negation of its existence**. The mind, in contradistinction, is a link to God, a safe haven that allowed the world to be apprehended and understood without the vulnerability of the body. As such the mind is representative of life and living, while the body is under the constant threat of death. Life, to use Hegel’s expression, ‘is a standing fight’ against the possibility of the dismemberment with which death threatens the unity of the living body. Life, in Marx’s analysis of capital, is similarly a ‘standing fight’ against the process of abstraction that is constitutive of the category ‘labor.’ It is as if the process of abstraction and ongoing appropriation of the worker’s body in the capitalist mode of production perpetually threatens to effect a dismemberment of the unit of the ‘living body.’20 Thus labor, the body, the slave, and the Black come together as “lack,” as vulnerability, and as proximity to violence. Thus, “the mind” is essential to Culturalist discourse, inasmuch as the mind can be understood as “spirit… ‘whatever substance is purely active, immaterial and always gains understanding through itself (i.e. directly), and acts from self-motion and with intention in regard to an end and goal of which it is conscious of itself.”21 Culturalism seeks to avoid the shame elicited by embodied labor, which represents the space devoid of education, intellect, literacy, and by extension, civilization. **The Cartesian mind became the trope that provided the means of overcoming the precariousness and lack of the (Black) body because it provided the self with certitude of existence through its immateriality (read superstructural situatedness), as Kwasi Wiredu points out: “[a]s far as he [Descartes] is concerned, the alleged fact that one can doubt all spatial existence and yet at the same time be absolutely certain of one’s existence under the dispensation of the Cogito implied ‘I’, the ego, exists as a spiritual, non-spatial, immaterial entity.”2**2 Black intellectuals sought to distance themselves from physical labor, which had come to be conflated with enslavement and abjection, and asserted their Black modern subjectivity through intellectual labor—especially aesthetic and cultural production—to assert their equality with whites. This is what Sylvia Wynter refers to as the “colonization of desire”: The most desired attribute was the ‘intellectual faculty.’ The sign that pointed to one’s possession of the attribute was whiteness of skin. This sign that pointed to its nonpossession was blackness of skin… The black exists as the Symbolic Object constituting the Lack, the Void of these qualities… That a man, or almost a man can exist, lacking these things, sets into play the terror that these attributes can be lost.23 The colonized desire is engendered by the threat of slipping into the realm of the nonintellectual, the realm of the slave/laborer. The “terror of lack”24 required the New Negro to assert himself on cultural grounds as an escape from the embodied figure of the Old Negro—“the symbol of the Negative Other, the very principle of Lack.”25 Cold War Culturalism was directly transferred from the civilization narrative of the New Negro that associated Black embodied labor with savagery. Both forms of Culturalism, predicated on the departure from the waiting room of history through culture, sought to release the Black from the savagery symbolized by Black skin. The accommodation of the antiradical pedagogy of the state by Black Cold War liberals rested upon this notion that “blackness of the skin” was the sign of nonpossession of intellect. Liberation was collapsed into the realm of culture as Black radical critique became a danger to the state. The inherent contradiction is that “the deliberate creation of lack [is] a function of the market economy.”26 It can only be resolved by a struggle that is waged at the level of the base. Otherwise, the materialities of dispossession—i.e. the exploitation of labor, the inequitable distribution of resources based on the extraction of surplus value, the entrenchment of poverty and the global axial division of labor—would remain uncontested. A focus on the relations of production threatened the order based on the “non-value of being black.”27 More importantly, any challenge to the “non-value of black being” threatened the hegemonic social order.

#### Thus; From the perspective of an Earth Centered Conscientization, I affirm Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike

#### An Earth Centered Conscientization constitutes continual relationality with Mother Earth for all beings. Collective histories and lived realities of Indigenous people all form a historical consciousness that activates sentiments of relationality and intimate stewardship. Giving voice to all our relations enables activists and organizers to dissolve colonial conceptions of a separate natural world and embark in a social web of human and non- human relations that protects the Earth.

**Klutz and Walter 18** (Jenalee Kluttz PhD Student, Education University of British Columbia Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada , Pierre Walter 17. THEORIZING ADULT EDUCATION, POWER AND SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE A Consideration of the Climate Justice Movement Page 195 – 198 INDIGENOUS FEMINISM, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND DECOLONIZING EDUCATION, RLA)

How then do notions of power, privilege and socio-environmental change play out in an Earth-centred positionality of place in environmental adult education? Since we as urbanized, colonized human beings have removed ourselves so thoroughly from being able to listen to and seek advice directly from the Earth (nor could we represent knowledge gained this way in textual form), we have no choice but to turn to human theorizing once more. Here, we look to Indigenous feminism, environmental justice, and decolonizing education for guidance. From theoretical work in Indigenous feminism, we understand that although Indigenous identities, societies and peoples are traditionally of Mother Earth, and have a history of working within an equitably differentiated gendered division of labor, and while both Indigenous men and women have been subject to genocidal colonial histories, dispossession of land and culture, White Supremacy and racism, Indigenous women also suffer additionally from systems of colonial-induced patriarchy cutting across indigeneity. That is, “**Indigenous women have endured a double erasure and (marginalization) – first, as indigenous peoples, and secondly, as women”** (Grande, 2004, p. 127). Thus, while maintaining an Earth-based positionality, Indigenous feminism seeks to identify and resist “the ways in which (Indigenous) women are subordinated to men and how women can be emancipated from this subordination” (Green, 2007, p. 21). Decolonizing education requires ,first, the historical study of human systems of oppression – settler colonialism, capitalism, patriarchy, systemic racism – which have destroyed Mother Earth and dispossessed Indigenous Peoples of their basic human rights to land, culture and livelihood. Second, it normally demands a recognition of direct personal complicity in these acts, not only by all present-day settler colonial peoples living on stolen lands (e.g. Canada, U.S. Japan, China, Australia, all of Latin America, Africa), but also by those residing in colonial states built upon these genocidal and environmentally catastrophic histories (England, Spain, France, Belgium, Italy, Netherlands, Portugal). **An ‘Earth-centred conscientization’ of adult learners continues through the histories and lived realities of Indigenous, poor, and racialized people bearing the costs of toxic waste, polluted water, and climate change; that is, of environmental racism, classism and oppression** (Irlbacher-Fox, 2014). Third, **decolonizing education recognizes that Indigenous Peoples have been defending the Earth and their very lands, lives, cultures, livelihood, human rights and identity against the violent onslaught of colonialism continuously for almost 600 years, continue to struggle today for the restoration of stolen ancestral lands, and are actively working to recover scared sites and cultural knowledge ripped away from them by non-Indigenous People** (Tuck & Yang, 2012). Finally, **with this historical consciousness in place, the question becomes how to re-establish a personal relationship with Mother Earth for all peoples (Plumwood, 2003), and for non-Indigenous people, how to develop a respectful and humble relationship with Indigenous Peoples, who are at once our teachers and ‘co-resisters’ as well as co-advocates for the return of stolen lands, the struggle against climate injustice, capitalism, racism and patriarchy, and the struggle for reconciliation and the healing of the Earth**. The Tsleil-Waututh Nation leading the movement against Trans Mountain are Sklilwkta or ‘People of the Inlet’: they are among the people most directly impacted by the pipeline construction and potential oil spills**. As people of the water, protection of the water is not simply a moral or ethical mandate, it is protection of self, of identity and existence, as well as a spiritual duty.** Yet all Tsleil-Waututh people do not experience their relationship to the water and the powers that threaten it in the same way: intersections of gender, “kinship, age, wealth, race, religion, political situation, and other characteristics affect and frame what one experiences as an indigenous person” (Whyte, 2014, p. 604), just like any other. **The positionality of Indigenous women within Tsleil-Waututh culture grants them particular understandings, identities, relations and responsibilities to water, similar to those they might have to children, elders or other family members**. Starting with water in the womb, water is thought of as life-giving and life-sustaining, and as such, women have a special duty to protect this relation. Of course, not all Indigenous women take up this responsibility, but elders acting as leaders of the movement often speak of this connection. When Indigenous women within the movement talk of their sacred duty to protect the water, they speak of it quite differently from non-Indigenous women or others who might see water as life-sustaining, but not as a living relation. **These different positionalities both embody and create different types of learning and knowledge generation and exchange within and from the movement. A non-Indigenous woman may resist the pipeline to protect the water as a social or moral responsibility, while an Indigenous woman struggles against colonial ideas that challenge her ability to do her spiritual or cultural duty to a relation (water**). Thus, for a non-Indigenous woman, protecting the water may bring about social or environmental consciousness, while for an Indigenous woman, it may support cultural learning and reconnection to spiritual practice. In the same sense, abuses of power, marginalization and oppression are not experienced by non-Indigenous women (or men) in quite the same way. However, by working side-by-side in the movements, these **adults co-enact a decolonizing education, learning from each other, questioning, revealing, undoing and replacing the hegemony of colonial truths with new knowledge of Indigenous history, epistemologies, colonialism, Earth-centered positionality and relations.** **Decolonizing education places human identity and social action into a web of both human and non-human relations - water, land, air, plants, animals - who cannot then be considered exploitable natural 'resources', and whom we are obligated to protect from harm** (Adams, 2003). Thus, 'water protector' becomes not only a name, but also an identity, a relation, a sacred duty, and a way of being. Centering Indigenous voices and leadership, activists and organizers are able to reflect on differences of oppression, identity, and ways of being, **as well as their roles within the movement and their own positioning as part of the collective we in relation to place.** Non-Indigenous climate justice activists in B.C. also have strong ties to land and water, sea, and sky, based on livelihood, life history, spirituality and identity. Some depend on agricultural production, fishing or coastal tourism to support themselves. **Many feel a deep spiritual connection to the immense beauty of B.C.'s landscapes and wild spaces**; others value the opportunities affored by the land and sea for hiking, kayaking, skiing, hunting, camping, boating or fishing. Some ties are shallow, some deep, some cultural, others spiritual or material. Some believe in rights to property and ownership; others see open, un-owned lands for all. However, in learning to see through a decolonizing lens, these and other adults in the movement begin to better understand the situated nature of power in relation to place and Indigenous peoples. **New knowledge uncovers our colonial mindset toward the Earth, where people's relations with nature are controlled by oil companies, governments, courts, rich white men, etc. working against, rather than with, nature** (Adams, 2003). Through a decolonizing lens, this knowledge is not limited to the present - where the fossil fuel industry is controlling relationships to land with implications for human and non-human futures - but also extends to the past teaching lessons of the reality of colonization that has controlled Indigenous communities' relationships to the land for hundreds of years. Positionality in relation to place is complex and varied among adults, in part depending on the extent to which their livelihood is place-based. For some, the Trans Mountain project is understood as both an immediate and future threat to ocean- and land-based livelihood because of oil spills, tanker traffic through marine ecosystems, and the effects of climate change, including sea level rise, acidification and warming. An understanding of environmental justice as integral to decolonizing education highlights these and other positionalities. Wealth, power and education may allow some to shift livelihood in the case of an oil spill or sea levels rise; poorer coastal fishing communities may not have the means to do so. A non-Indigenous organizer working in the coastal tourism industry may be more directly threatened by the pipeline than an Indigenous woman professional working in an urban office, and so on. The threat of the pipeline is experienced and learned differently - culturally, socially, spiritually and economically - depending on the intersects of social categories and positionality within the larger power structures in connection to place. Indigenous and non-Indigenous activists, for example, differ somewhat in their perspectives of the Earth’s role within the movement. Some colonial-settler activists, talking of protecting the non-human world (waterways, orcas, salmon, etc.), frame the Earth as a separate entity, and something to be guarded. **By contrast, Indigenous leaders not only speak of a responsibility to protect their relations, but also acknowledge the non-human world’s participation in the struggle. This is done in ways as simple as recognizing the presence of trees, birds, animals, and plants in the everyday events and activities of resistance**. It might mean drawing attention to eagles flying overhead who are watching over protest marches and rallies, or, before a protest action, acknowledging the history of a place; not only human histories, but also histories of other beings. In this way, **the non-human world is included in the movement rather than simply being a beneficiary of it, giving voice to ‘all our relations’, not just human voices. These recognitions and inclusions provide moments of learning where activists and organizers are encouraged to question colonial conceptions of a separate non-human world.** **Through learning from Indigenous leadership, the Earth and non-human relations are moved from the margins to “take their place as narrative subjects in a speaking and participating land, full of narratives and mythic voices” (Plumwood, 2003, p. 67). Inviting the Earth to be part of the conversation teaches an Earth-centred positionality, facilitated by Indigenous leaders and others who recognize the Earth’s agency and challenge a colonial ‘deafness’ to the non-human world** (Plumwood, 2003). In doing so, they begin a decolonizing dialogue in environmental adult education in which the Earth is an inseparable part of adult learning and education, culture, community, identity and human existence.

#### You’re an ethical facilitator and your role should be to prioritize an ethical consciousness formation.

#### Debate is a place of consciousness formation – all processes of observation and measurement endemic to their research model contribute to our understanding of a subject that stands as an outside of observer to an external physical world. Our intervention in the curriculum is necessary to recalibrate how we formulate and understand consciousness by situating it within the natural world instead of against it.

#### We must question the performative practices through which ideas and inquiry manifest. Practices of scholarship, knowing, and civic responsibility are bound to cartesian premises of observer as subject and an external world as object of study. Re modulating a conception of inquiry outside of Cartesian dogma necessitates integrating affect and cognition in processes that enable being, feeling, committing, and living in the natural world.

**Rosiek et al 20** (Jerry Lee Rosiek, Professor of Education Studies at the University of Oregon where he teaches courses on the cultural foundations of education, the racial politics of education practice and policy, and qualitative research methodology. His scholarship has experimented with the use of fiction and narrative modes of representations and is informed by revisionist pragmatism, new materialist philosophy, critical race theory, and Indigenous studies literature. His writing has appeared in journals such as Harvard Educational Review, Education Theory, Educational Research and Phi Delta Kapan and his recently published book, Resegregation as Curriculum (coauthored with Kathy Kinslow), won the American Association for Teaching and Curriculum 2016 Book of the Year Award. Jimmy Snyder is a PhD candidate in the Critical and Sociocultural Studies in Education program at the University of Oregon with interests in tribal critical theory and the use of narratives in the education of social studies teachers. He is a citizen of the Kickapoo Tribe in Kansas and has over 20 years of experience working in tribal communities including teaching high school social studies on Kickapoo and Navajo reservations and coaching football at Haskell University. Scott L. Pratt is Professor of Philosophy and Executive Vice Provost for Academic Affairs at the University of Oregon where he teaches graduate seminars in American philosophy, surveys of African American and Native American philosophy, and feminist pragmatism as well as courses on the work of John Dewey, William James, Josiah Royce, Jane Addams, C. S. Peirce, and W. E. B. Du Bois. He is the author of a number of books, including Native Pragmatism, Logic: Inquiry, Argument and Order, and American Philosophy From Wounded Knew to the Present (co-authored with Erin Mckenna). He is a past president of the Josiah Royce Society and the most recent PastPresident of the Society for the Advancement of American Philosophy. "The New Materialisms and Indigenous Theories of Non-Human Agency: Making the Case for Respectful Anti-Colonial Engagement" **2020, Vol. 26(3-4) 331–346 Agential Realism: Ambitious Interventions and Performative Challenges** Page 335 Final Paragraph on page is not included in text displayed in card <https://coe.uoregon.edu/rosiek/files/2020/01/Indigenous-Theories-and-the-New-Materialisms-hard-published-edition.pdf>, RLA)

One of the central challenges of applying agential realism to the practice of social science inquiry is working out its specific implications for methodological practice. The philosophies gathered under the banner of “new materialism” reconsider several foundational concepts central to social science as it has been traditionally understood—such as taken for granted notions of representation (MacLure, 2013), the idea of a single or stable object of inquiry (Barad, 2007; Mol, 2002), and the concept of “data” (Jackson & Mazzei, 2012). **Agent ontologies, however, put more than these individual concepts under reconsideration. They also question the performative practices through which we “have” ideas and the very idea of the “we” of inquiry itself. Barad’s agential realism is an effort to transform not just the ontology of our objects of study but also the ontology of subjects involved in inquiry, and the relation between objects and subjects.** More colloquially, it gestures toward a practice of inquiry that involves transformations not just of our ways of knowing but also of our ways of being, feeling, committing, and living in the world. We should not expect such a reorientation would be a smooth process even for those convinced of its necessity, that it would involve lurches, false starts, and backsliding of various forms. **The material-semiotic architecture that both enables and constrains our practices of scholarship, knowing, and civic responsibility in Western settler colonial societies is very old and runs deep. It is encoded into our language; our habits of perception, feeling, and desire, our identities, the social communities that sustain those identities and desires, the legal codes that bound and bind those communities, the material arrangements of property, land, food consumption, power grids, and much more.** We can critically question one part of this matrix, but the others remain as ballast that draw us back into past practices that are networked with other cultural and material aspects of the world. Consequently, as new materialist scholars invent ways to enact agentially realist inquiries, there is a significant risk that proposed innovations will be superficial and will be interpolated back into deeply ingrained practices of knowing and being. As Maggie MacLure (2017) observed in her 2016 Keynote to the International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, It is difficult to think outside of the Enlightenment structures of the Cartesian self, and the stories it tells itself about progress, reason and the advancement of knowledge. So although we have come a long way in formulating cartographies for new materialist research, we are necessarily some way from the anticipated ontological transformations to our field. . . I think we continue to underestimate the sheer difficulty of shedding the anthropocentrism that is built into our world-views and our language habits. (p. 55) One of the risks for the new materialisms involves framing the goal of inquiry as producing an improved description of our objects of inquiry, while leaving unchanged the construction of the inquirer as a spectator subject. This can be seen in the emerging literature that seeks to document the operation of self-organizing nonhuman phenomena. This includes research on algorithms, cognitive biology, and neuroscience (Dixon-Roman, 2016, 2017; Hayles, 2017) that identify the ways in which non-human systems engage in pattern recognition and response to changing environments. It can also be seen in research on self-organizing socio-material systems such as disease (Mol, 2002), political formations (Bennett, 2010), or institutionalized racism (Rosiek & Kinslow, 2016). Such scholarship provides informative accounts of the materially dynamic, evolving, nature of our objects of inquiry often through the use of the Deleuzian vocabulary of assemblage (e.g., Alaimo, 2016; Bennett, 2010; Fox & Alldred, 2015; Mazzei, 2017; Taguchi, 2018). However, the ontology of the knowing subject assumed in scholars’ representation of these dynamic objects of study remains largely unaltered (MacLure, 2017). This reinscription of the enlightenment spectator subject can also be seen in the turn to affect in some new materialist scholarship (e.g., Clough, 2009; Gregg & Seigworth, 2010; Massumi, 2002; Zembylas, 2014). **In an effort to get outside of a conception of inquiry based primarily on linguistic representation, cognition, and epistemology, many scholars are shifting their attention to the immediacy of affect. Scholars working in this vein offer that the influence of non-human agents on us may take the form of influence on our affect as much as our cognition.** However, **in an effort to explicate this expanded view of knowledge, scholars often resort to descriptions of the ways affect and cognition are integrated in some practices of knowing, as opposed to performing that integration.**

## AR Case OV

#### Affirming the resolution from the perspective of an Earth centered conscientization envisions the mind and network of thoughts as they are entangled with the spiritual, emotional, and physical through processes of ongoing intimate relationality. Mother Earth and the Human Consciousness are entangled and inseparable parts of a larger whole that transcends the liminal boundaries of Cartesian Metaphysics and Western Settler Materialism. A few implications to voting aff

#### Ethical Strikes - Strikes would no longer strive for material benefits, but new modes of relationality where all beings are connected to the earth and distinctions between employer and worker cease to matter. Decolonize Wallstreet exemplifies a strike premised on Earth Centered Conscientization.

#### Resolves the deadening of being - Cartesian Metaphysics reduces relations to land to that of a dialectical subject and object which naturalizes the slow deadening of Indigenous economies and spirituality that centralize land as subject and enshrine the natural world as sacred. Earth Centered Conscientization restores the modes of being that link the human consciousness and subject to the Earth.

#### Mitigates the exploitation of worker’s bodies and domination of black bodies – Burden-Stelly says that cartesian metaphysics informs conceptions of worker’s bodies as exploitable and black bodies as lacking and prone to domination by a western subject. Our method abolishes cartesian concepts of autonomy that enable these conditions of exploitation and anti- black domination.

## AR AT Disad

#### Case solves the Disad – their scenarios for conflict don’t make sense if we are all inter relational stewards of the land as opposed to autonomous actors competing for territories and land. Conscientization affectively compels us to protect the natural world because we recognize that the natural world consist of a complex social web of human and non- human relations that are collectively beneficial and interdependent

#### (?) Cartesian Metaphysics are the root cause of their impacts- colonial and imperial consciousness which created the foundations for international conflict, all presume autonomous subjects. As per the decree of Descartes, subjects and states had to emerge as autonomous actors that competed for control over an external and separate external world.

#### Western bio centrism taints their understanding of death through the imposition of a colonial world view that denies the entanglement of the spiritual, the emotional and the physical. Rather than conceptualizing death as an end to the body as an anatomical unit, death is the catalyst for the body’s return to mother earth and the spirit’s transcendence.

**Anderson and Woticky 18** (Michael Anderson, MD, MSc, FRCSC The Temmy Latner Centre for Palliative Care, Sinai Health System. University of Toronto. mike.anderson@utoronto.ca Gemma Woticky, BA (Hons.), MPH Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto. “The End of Life is an Auspicious Opportunity for Healing: Decolonizing Death and Dying for Urban Indigenous People” page 51 - 58 December 2018) RLA

Indigeneity in Urban Settlements The dramatic increase in the Indigenous population in Canada over the last decade largely results from ethnic mobility (the phenomenon by which individuals and families change their ethnic affiliation) and much of this growth has occurred in urban settlements (Peters & Andersen, 2013). The urban Indigenous community is highly diverse in their identity, lived experiences, and degree of connection to Indigenous culture (Peters & Andersen, 2013). Many urban Indigenous people are second and third generation city dwellers, thus their Indigeneity may not be primarily defined by connection to ancestral land (Peters & Andersen, 2013). Contemporary urban Indigenous people “choose from a variety of other resources to construct identities, including pan-Aboriginal cultures and activities in urban areas”(Peters & Andersen, 2013). Urban Indigenous communities are often arranged around cultural and health care organizations. Cultural engagement has been shown to be beneficial to the health and well-being of Indigenous people (Auger, Howell, & Gomes, 2016; Gone, 2011; Gone & Looking, 2011). However, government policies aimed at cultural extermination and assimilation have resulted in a tremendous loss of Indigenous knowledge, including end-of-life practices and ceremonies. Cultural disruption poses a real risk of permanently losing much of this knowledge given the oral nature of Indigenous knowledge. Rediscovering traditional death ceremonies, increasing access to cultural supports, enhancing death education, and improving relationships with health service providers are of great importance to urban Indigenous people (Anderson, Chalklin, Downey, Lee, & Rodin, 2017). Fortunately, **there are signs of Indigenous cultural and ceremonial revitalization in urban spaces and the end of life stage offers an auspicious healing opportunity.** Indigenous Concepts of Death and Dying **The absence of a word for death in most Indigenous languages underscores how differently the end-of-life experience is constructed by Indigenous people.** Despite being a very heterogeneous group, Indigenous people worldwide share elements of a common spirituality and worldview (Duggleby et al., 2015). **The colonial worldview frames death through a linear, biomedical, and physical lens. Indigenous people view themselves as a spirit having a human experience** (P. Keshane, personal communication, Jan 2017). **Birth and death are inextricably linked as a transition of the spirit through this world. Thus, the end-of-life is a transition of the spirit rather than solely the end of the body. The last stages of life are an auspicious opportunity for healing of the spirit - and spirit is healed through ceremony** (J. Longboat, personal communication, March 2016). The following is an excerpt from Basil Johnston’s (Johnston, 2010) book in which he recounts the Anishinaabe story of the Gift of the Stars (Annangoog Meegiwaewinan), the origins of children to the physical world. It is transcribed here in its entirety to honor the knowledge embedded in the story and to allow for a wholistic interpretation of its message. Johnston begins this story about a five year old, Southwind, and the teachings from his grandmother: "What are stars, grandmother?" he asked. "Babies," his grandmother answered. Southwind looked back up. The stars looked like sparks. But babies they must be. Had his grandmother not said so? So many babies. They filled the entire sky. A star fell. Southwind gasped. "Oh! Grandma! The baby is going to get hurt!" "Don't fret grandson. The baby won't get hurt. It will fall gently as a feather into someone's arms. Someone's going to receive a wonderful gift tonight. It will make them happy." Southwind's grandmother explained. "What kind of gift?". Some woman is going to get a baby that will make her happy,'' Southwind's grandmother said. Southwind looked back up into the sky. Not a word did he say. His mind was too small, too young to understand how stars and babies and gifts could be the same thing. To help Southwind understand, his grandmother told him, "One time you were a little star and you came down as a baby to your mother and to your father and to all of us. You made us all very happy. If ever a star falls near you, take it. Take it home! Look after it. It is a great gift that will make you happy." (Johnston, 2010, p. 19.) Southwind’s grandmother explained that boys don’t receive babies, but they do receive different gifts. “In that moment Southwind wanted a star to fall nearby so that he could take it up, bring it home and look after it. But none ever fell nearby. Always they fell far away. Always they were gifts for somebody else but not for him. For five years Southwind watched stars with his grandmother. Then he stopped going with his grandmother. Looking at stars was boring. Three more years went by. His grandmother fell ill. One night Southwind went out to the knoll where his grandmother used to watch the stars. Before Southwind got to the crest of the little hill, a star fell and it fell just the other side of the hill, where there was a pond. Southwind ran up the knoll and then down the other side to the edge of the pond. But there was nothing in the pond, nothing but white flowers that he'd never before seen. There was no gift. He turned to go back home. "Take me. Take me home. I am medicine. I will make your grandmother well!" a voice said. The little voice came from the middle of the pond. But there was no one there. Again and again the voice called, "Take me! Take me home with you." At last Southwind entered the water, waded out to the middle of the pond. In front of him was the white flower that called out. "Take me! Take me home! I am medicine. I am your gift." Southwind was about to yank the flower from its stalk when it screamed, "No! All of me! All of me!" But it was not an easy thing to lift the flower from its bed. To do this Southwind had to go underwater many times to dig the long root of the flower from its muddy bed. When he finally dug the flower out, Southwind took it home. With the flower Southwind's father made a medicine. They gave it to the old sick woman. The medicine made her better. Some months later Southwind and his grandmother were standing on the knoll studying the stars. He said to her, "No'okomiss, the flower gift that I received; it was really meant for you, wasn't it?. In a way it is. But it was meant for everybody. But that's the way all human gifts are." (Johnston, 2010.p, 20). The reader can interpret the various lessons within this story, but it is noteworthy that this is a children’s story, which educates about the cycle of life. This story addresses the entering of the spirit into this physical world, by the birth of a baby. **In** **death, the spirit is returning to the stars: departing the body as the physical body returns to the first mother, mother earth. In 2016, a diverse group of highly engaged key informants from community, clinical, policy, government, and educational perspectives gathered to consider First Nations, Inuit, and Metis (FNIM) palliative and end-of-life care issues** (Anderson et al., 2017). Numerous themes emerged from facilitated discussions and world cafes including: differing urban and remote community experiences, the need for death education, cultural barriers, challenging interactions with western medical personal, systemic racism, opportunities for healing, and the absence of spirit in the biomedical palliative care system (Anderson et al., 2017). The importance of this topic in the urban context has been affirmed by multiple sources including Indigenous Elders, the Toronto Indigenous Health Advisory Circle, and Anishnawbe Health Toronto. The Medicine Wheel The Medicine Wheel is a circular, wholistic, relational representation of the elements of life including the physical, emotional, mental, and spiritual aspects of self in addition to life stages, seasons, sacred medicines, and the four directions (Dapice, 2006). The Medicine Wheel is widely used for health and wellbeing including as a tool for healing from the imbalance caused by colonialism (Dapice, 2006). Its use is congruent with a theoretical framework for conceptualizing death and dying as it represents the cycle of life. Furthermore**, it opens the space to challenge the idea that the only death is physical and the possibility that death of all parts of self may not occur simultaneously. The explicit nature of spirit in the medicine wheel is critical at the end of life since the modern healthcare model rarely makes space for spirit.** Using examples to explore this concept, I will artificially divide the discussion into the four realms of self and subsequently demonstrate the impossibility of separating them – again consistent with the Indigenous worldview of interconnectedness and relational accountability. Kaswentha – The Two Row Wampum Based upon the Haudenosaunee principles of peace, respect, and friendship, the Two Row Wampum documents the relationship between Turtle Island’s Onkwehonweh (original people) and the first European explorers. Indigenous legal scholar Robert A. Williams Jr (1990). describes the Two Row Wampum: When the Haudenosaunee first came into contact with the European nations, treaties of peace and friendship were made. Each was symbolized by the Gus-Wen-Tah, or Two Row Wampum. There is a bed of white wampum which symbolizes the purity of the agreement. There are two rows of purple, and those two rows have the spirit of your ancestors and mine. There are three beads of wampum separating the two rows and they symbolize peace, friendship and respect. These two rows will symbolize two paths or two vessels, travelling down the same river together. One, a birch bark canoe, will be for the Indian people, their laws, their customs and their ways. The other, a ship, will be for the white people and theirs laws, their customs, and their ways. We shall each travel the river together, side by side, but in our own boat. Neither of us will try to steer the other's vessel. (p. 327) Thus, this belt of wampum reflects both the separation and interaction of First Nations people and the newcomers that continues to this day. This relationship applies to modern urban settlements with the same veracity as the original agreement in 1613. I propose that the modern urban Indigenous experience is rooted in the three white rows between the two purple rows – the space in between. This space in between the two rows seems congruous with post-colonial scholar Homi Bhabha’s concept of a ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 2004) and Willie Ermine’s ethical space (Ermine, 2004). This is a liminal space where two or more cultures interact. Ermine (2004) describes the ethical space as: “The in-between space, relative to cultures, [is] created by the recognition of the separate realities of histories, knowledge traditions, values, interests, and social, economic and political imperatives. The positioning of these two entities, divided by the void and flux of their cultural distance, and in a manner that they are poised to encounter each other, produces a significant and interesting notion that has relevance in research thought. The positioning of the two entities creates the urgent necessity for a neutral zone of dialogue.” (p. 20) In Haudenosaunee teachings this area is defined by peace, friendship, and respect. The urban Indigenous lived experience is often one of variable cultural connection; neither completely in the canoe or in the ship but in some third space between. Conceptualizing Urban Indigenous Death and Dying: The Medicine Wheel and Two Row Wampum Exist in Urban Settlements The Medicine Wheel and the Two Row Wampum offer a vision for restoring respect, balance, and spirit to the end-of-life journey. These two teachings can be used to navigate the unique challenges at the intersection of death, urbanity, and Indigeneity. Together they act as an Indigenous theoretical framework for end-of-life research, policy, and practice. Despite the plurality of cultures in urban settlements on Turtle Island, colonization informs and dominates most systems. Western, colonial worldviews are transactional, hierarchal, and extractive by design. This is the antithesis of relational, collectivist, and egalitarian Indigenous worldviews. Reconciliation for urban Indigenous communities involves negotiating this challenging paradox. However, rather than developing new strategies, I posit existing knowledge – the Medicine Wheel and the Two Row Wampum – can offer an attractive way forward. The Medicine Wheel does not frame aspects in isolation, opposition, or as separable. Intrinsic to the Medicine Wheel is a pathway for change, healing, and reconciliation. Urban Indigenous people do not have the option of living in isolation - although aspects of the colonial system continue to strive to achieve this. As a healing tool, the Medicine Wheel can help address imbalances caused by colonialism, including in relationships by (re)connecting with Indigenous culture. This is of great importance to Indigenous people at the end of life. The original tenets of the Two Row Wampum treaty offer a vision for weaving a relationship that is not dominated by the hegemonic culture. Approaches to this relationship that involve fitting the circular (Indigenous) into a hierarchy (western) have routinely failed Indigenous people. Trying to extract the “best” of both worlds inevitably results in the dominant culture deciding what qualifies as the “best”. While the Two Row Wampum explicitly prohibits steering each other’s vessels, it recognizes we travel the river together and provides a space for interaction. This space between the Indigenous canoe and the western ship is mediated by peace, friendship, and respect. For urban Indigenous people, existing in this liminal, ethical (third) space involves the praxis of building meaningful relationships with both the Indigenous and the non-Indigenous. Paolo Freire’s concept of praxis refers to the linking of theory, informed action, and critical reflection (Freire, 2000). Dialogue, the flow of meaning, is the principle mediator of praxis. I propose that dialogue, grounded in peace, friendship, and respect, and informed by the Medicine Wheel and Two Row Wampum teachings, can improve the end-of-life experience for urban Indigenous communities. Physical The last stages of life frequently involve challenges to one’s physical wellbeing. The western health care system focuses on the physical realm. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the approach to pain. Despite recognizing the concept of ‘total pain,’ (Mehta, 2008; Wein, 2010) in reality, pain is viewed almost exclusively in terms of physical pain as evidenced by the near ubiquitous use of opiates as a remedy (Middleton-Green, 2008; Montes-Sandoval, 1999). **An Indigenous approach would recognize the interconnectedness of the physical, emotional, spiritual, and mental aspects of pain in endeavoring to mitigate the total experience of pain** (Gone, 2009). What does this look like? Through ceremonies such as drumming and smudging which can be incorporated into institutional policies, pain management can take a more Indigenous perspective if combined with traditional Indigenous healing and/or healing circles. Reducing any aspect of pain reduces total pain. The physical structure and regulations of health care institutions are routinely hostile to Indigenous people. This is relevant in urban settlements because most of us will die in hospitals, despite our stated preferences to die at home (Kelly et al., 2009; McGrath, 2007; St Pierre-Hansen, Kelly, Linkewich, Cromarty, & Walker, 2010). Dying at home can be challenging given the high degree of mobility, precarious housing, and homelessness affecting urban Indigenous communities (King, Smith, & Gracey, 2009; Snyder & Wilson, 2015). Physical and policy limits on the number of people allowed in a room and failing to provide adequate space for family in many institutions precludes the role of the larger family, kin, and community networks that coalesce to support a dying individual. These barriers hinder the ability of a broad network of family and kin to empower the spirit for transition (Duggleby et al., 2015). Institutional policies in long term care homes, hospices, and health care facilities often prevent important ceremonies such as smudging or the pipe ceremony. The physical layout of hospitals is intended to hide death. People enter through brightly lit, well appointed, visible front doors but the deceased are removed through unseen service doors often located at the rear of the building. The deceased are rapidly cocooned in body bags, rendered invisible, and moved to places others cannot go or see. It is as if death is shameful and to be hidden. This isn’t surprising, given the illness-based, medical model’s perception of death as a failure. This **presents a barrier for Indigenous people who may wish to maintain a connection to their recently deceased loved one. Touching and bathing the body is an act of love and respect which can empower and release the spirit and support grieving.** Superimposed upon the hidden nature of death in institutions is the invisibility many Indigenous people already experience in the health care system. For Indigenous people, death in urban hospitals is another form of systemic racism that further marginalizes Indigenous ways of knowing. Mental There are many aspects of the mental realm which reflect the tensions between Indigenous and non-Indigenous ways of thinking. Families speak of the difficulty reconciling the health care system’s drive for expediency with Indigenous consensual approaches to decision-making. An example of this is seen in the determination of substitute decision makers (SDM). The colonial approach to defining a SDM is hierarchal and legally framed by way of a presumed series of relations based on blood and lineage. Even the term lineage is inconsistent with an Indigenous way of viewing the world. Indigenous decision-making is not rooted in hierarchical authority but instead in consensus building. I was recently told the story of an Indigenous man who was gravely injured in an accident. The healthcare team felt he was unlikely to recover and decisions regarding care were necessary. The medical team wanted an expedient decision from a SDM dictated by a non-Indigenous, hierarchal, legal protocol. The family, kin, and community gathered to take an Indigenous approach to decision-making. They sat in a circle and shared stories about this man’s life, with people stepping out of the circle after each round if they felt others knew him better. This continued until only three individuals remained. None fit the legal criteria for SDM but everyone agreed they had the deepest understanding of who he was as a human being and what his care decisions would have been. Thus, a community-based, consensual approach to decision-making was employed resulting in a less expedient but more appropriate decision. This is an example of how difficult conversations may require more time, but grounding decision-making in authentic relationships and Indigenous approaches to dialogue is essential to achieve outcomes acceptable to Indigenous communities. A final sad comment is necessary here though. Although the health care professionals were accepting of this decision-making strategy, and health care colleagues I have discussed this with find the approach appealing, the actual SDM transaction had to be carried out in a colonial, hierarchal manner. Emotional The sting of death can be lessened by family and community support or heightened if the circumstances of death are re-traumatizing. Intergenerational trauma expands unless addressed and this is particularly true for those grieving the loss of a loved one. Colonization (e.g., the Indian Act, residential school system, Sixties Scoop, forced relocation, child welfare system) is at the root of intergenerational trauma, and has resulted in many Indigenous people experiencing repeated and ongoing traumas from a wide variety of sources, including health care professionals and institutions (Barker, Goodman, & DeBeck, 2017; Howard, 2014; Kirmayer, Gone, & Moses, 2014; Myhra, 2011; Reeves & Stewart, 2017). Therefore, death and dying may retraumatize individuals and communities resulting in expanded intergenerational trauma unless affected people are afforded opportunities to address both past and ongoing traumas (Gone, 2013). The Medicine Wheel became unbalanced through colonial practices. Restoring balance to the Medicine Wheel through decolonization offers a path to heal. Dying well, within institutions, requires more than cultural safety – it requires empathy and dignity (Chochinov, 2013; Thompson & Chochinov, 2008). A health care system that is unable to deliver on these most basic human needs has failed. Sadly, Indigenous people encounter this failure routinely. In urban settings it is common to encounter stories of Indigenous people experiencing challenges accessing elders, traditional healers, or cultural supports as they are dying due to communication barriers with western healthcare institutions (Harrison J. personal communication, Jan 2017). Even when access to cultural support does occur, it frequently occurs late in their journey (Vautour, J. personal communication, Mar 2017). This limits the healing opportunities for individuals and families, particularly for people wishing to explore their identity and culture at the end of life. The benefits ascribed to early palliative care are not routinely afforded to Indigenous people. Improved relationships between the health care system and Indigenous organizations may enhance the opportunities for emotional support through connection to community and culture. Spiritual **Lastly, and most importantly, is the spiritual realm.** In western health care there is an aversion to all things spiritual. Health care professionals and institutions continue to erect physical as well as policy barriers which impede communal and spiritual activities at the end of life. As **Indigenous people, ‘we are a spirit having a human experience.’ It’s not surprising that one of the most sought out services at the end of life is receiving one’s spirit name. Creating space for spirit is both paramount and challenging at the end of life. The last stages of life are an auspicious opportunity for healing of the spirit. Spirit is healed through ceremony**. It is only very recently that Indigenous ceremonies are being permitted in some health care settings. That ceremonies (e.g., smudging, pipe ceremony) are still restricted in many institutional settings is particularly egregious given the history of legislated bans on Indigenous ceremony and culture. The Indian Act of 1876 outlawed Indigenous cultural and ceremonial practices in an effort to force assimilation (Joseph, 2018), the effects of which continue to be felt by many Indigenous people who are seeking to reclaim their cultural and spiritual practices. Although institutional policies regularly restrict Indigenous ceremonies, in my experience most health care workers are genuinely curious and accepting of Indigenous ceremonies. It is evident that there remains a disconnect between policy and practice that needs to be bridged. This too speaks to the need to construct meaningful relationships.

#### Consciousness occupies a terrain that cannot be falsified by the most scientific renditions of materialism. Neurophysiology can’t even falsify that physicality is true.

**Evans 05** (Charles Stephen Evans, University Professor of Philosophy and Humanities at Baylor University.[1] Evans was born on May 26, 1948, in Atlanta, Georgia. He holds a BA with high honors (philosophy) from Wheaton College, an MPhil (philosophy) from Yale University, and a PhD (philosophy) from Yale University. “Separable Souls: Dualism, Selfhood, and the Possibility of Life after Death” Page 1-2 <http://www.newdualism.org/papers/C.Evans/Evans-Separable%20Souls%20-%20Dualism%20Selfhood%20and%20the%20Possibility%20of%20Life%20after%20Death.pdf>, RLA)

What should Christians think about the constitution of the self? When the Heidelberg Catechism says "my only comfort in life and death is that I belong, body and soul, to my faithful Savior Jesus Christ," is this language to be taken as sober metaphysics or is it merely a poetic flourish? Recently a number of Christian philosophers, theologians, and scientists have argued that the traditional Christian view of the self, a dualistic account that sees human persons as having an immaterial soul as well as a physical body, should be rejected in favor of a monistic, physicalist view. There are various motivations for this move, some grounded in theology, others in philosophy, and others in science. A common argument of the theological type is that the monistic view of the self is the biblical one; dualism represents the deleterious influence of Greek philosophy on the Christian tradition. A common philosophical criticism is that a dualism of mind and body cannot account for interaction between the two entities. The third type of argument typically claims that dualism, while logically possible, is increasingly implausible in light of recent scientific findings, particularly with respect to neurophysiological research. In this paper I want to focus mainly on the third or scientific type of alleged difficulty for dualism, though I will very briefly indicate some reasons why I am less concerned about the first two types of arguments. In my view the claim that Scripture teaches a monistic materialism is mistaken; I believe that John Cooper has shown this in his book Body, Soul, and Life Everlasting: Biblical Anthropology and the Monism-Dualism Debate.1 Cooper sees three possible biblical views of life after death: (1) A gap theory: future resurrection with a period of non-existence between death and the resurrection. (2) Immediate resurrection upon death. (3) The traditional view: there is a future resurrection with continued existence ("the intermediate period") between death and that resurrection. There are some scriptural passages consistent with the "gap" theory and some others that are consistent with the immediate resurrection theory. However, each is contradicted by the passages consistent with the other view, and no passages plainly teach either of those views.2 The traditional view that the resurrection is a future event, but that the deceased believer enjoys communion with Christ between death and that resurrection, is the only view that is consistent with all of the scriptural evidence and that seems to be plainly taught in some passages. This third view plainly presupposes a dualistic ontology, since the person must be distinct from his or her body to exist between the biological death of that body and the resurrection. (It is also at least arguable that without a dualistic ontology, the resurrection is not possible. There are difficulties in seeing how the new resurrected body can be identical to the body that died; I believe that it is the soul that continuously exists that makes the resurrected body to be the body of the person that died.) Many of the alleged philosophical difficulties are problems that have been repeatedly answered. In any case, the most commonly cited problem, which is that a non-material reality cannot interact causally with a physical entity, is one that a Christian should not take seriously, since if such a principle held, God could neither create a physical world nor act within it. It is in any case odd, I think, for Christians to advocate a form of materialism on philosophical grounds, since a careful look at recent work on the mind-body problem clearly shows that materialism is in what could be called a state of crisis.3 **Although most philosophers today are materialists, many will acknowledge that materialism currently has no solution to two major problems with respect to the nature of mind.** First, **contemporary materialists do not know how to explain consciousness. The problem is so severe that one group of materialists, the so-called "new mysterians," has more or less given up, conceding that consciousness simply is a mystery that materialism will never explain**.4 The second difficult problem for materialists is explaining the nature of intentionality or "aboutness." **Many mental states of acts have meaning, and it is not clear how a physical entity or state can be meaningful without a mind to provide that meaning.** Given these difficulties, why are most philosophers materialists about human persons? The only answer that makes sense to me is that they are materialists about everything. **Philosophers who are metaphysical naturalists and who are committed to materialism believe that there must somehow be a true materialist account of the human self, even if they have no idea what that account may be.** Christians, however, surely should not share this assumption. In any case I believe it is the third type of problem that is most influential in pressing against dualism today. For example, Nancey Murphy, while admitting that scientific evidence does not prove that dualism is false, claims that "recent scientific advances do indeed provide scientific evidence for [physicalism]".5 After discussing some recent work in neurophysiology, Murphy claims that non-reductive physicalism is "not merely a philosophical thesis, but also the hard core of a scientific research program." She concludes that there is "ample scientific evidence" for the physicalism she espouses.6 Even William Hasker, who in the end espouses a type of dualism and rejects physicalism, sees contemporary scientific evidence as presenting problems for traditional dualistic views. He argues that there are two problems with traditional Cartesian dualism: "**The first is that it cannot plausibly account for the extensive and intimate dependence of mind on brain that we find to exist."7 While dualism is compatible with mind-body interaction, it does not seem to Hasker to fit comfortably with the detailed scientific findings about the way that the mind is dependent on the brain for its activity.** The second problem Hasker sees is that dualism cannot plausibly be incorporated into an evolutionary account of human origins. Of course some scientific creationists might say "so much the better for dualism" at this point, but Hasker wants a view of mind and body that is consistent with evolutionary theory. In what follows I shall argue for two claims: (1) **Recent advances in neurophysiology give us no evidence in favor of physicalism; the plausibility of at least some forms of dualism, rightly conceived, has not been diminished at all.** Scientific findings have given us reason to reject particular versions of dualism but not to reject all versions. There are some dualistic views that are plainly incompatible with scientific findings, but these findings have not affected the plausibility of other forms of dualism at all. (2) Recent forms of socalled non-reductive materialism or physicalism advocated by Christians may, when closely examined (depending on how some crucial interpretive questions are answered), turn out not to be materialistic views at all, but rather forms of dualism. Such views are at least close enough to dualism that a dualist may incorporate some of their features into a dualistic account. Both of my theses turn crucially on what is to count as "dualism," as well as what is to count as "materialism." Before turning to those issues, I need to make one important terminological note. In this paper I shall use the terms "mind" "soul," "person," and "self" more or less synonymously, to refer to whatever a person refers to when that person uses the term "I" to refer to himself or herself as a conscious agent. Of course this terminological practice does not determine whether or not that entity that is referred to in this way is a material thing, a non-material thing, or some combination of the two.

## AR AT Topicality

#### We meet – we defend an affirmation of the whole resolution. Our defense of earth centered conscientization only constitutes a defense of a method that would inform strikes. It’s no different than a soft left aff that has contention which justifies the research in the affirmative. We still have to defend the effects of affirming the resolution, and all of their disad links would apply.

#### Debate is a place of consciousness formation – rosiek and Schultz say that our preconceived notions of inquiry, what we are, and how we envision our consciousness in relation to the natural world are all influenced by what we read in debate. Their interpretation of the topic all presuppose laborers who operate and strike with the presumption that material resources are end goal.

#### As an ethical facilitator your role is to prioritize a consciousness formation model that places the human consciousness with the earth instead of against it. Currently, debates about this topic reproduce notions that we are autonomous workers entitled to the plunder of our external world – which recreates violent formations of consciousness that facilitate environmental exploitation and the disavowal of indigenous cultures and perspectives that center the land. It is try or die to break free of the grip Cartesian Metaphysics has on debate.

#### Counter Interpretation a Just Government is mother Earth, recognition is relationality to Earth, workers are the earth, and a strike is a call to restore entanglement between the human mind and earth.

#### All of their definition presuppose western materiality - Prioritizing materiality confines indigenous being to the western domain of physicality where being indigenous is always understood as being the irrational savage at an anatomical level – this legitimizes Indigenous erasure.

**Hokowhitu 09** (Brendan Hokowhitu, The University of Waikato Te Pua Wānanga ki te Ao, The Faculty of Māori & Indigenous StudiesHamilton, New Zealand Position Dean and Professor, The University of Waikato, Indigenous Existentialism and the Body Page 108 – 111, January 2009, RLA)

Exhuming ghosts: A genealogy of the Indigenous body Indigenous studies, as with feminist cultural studies, is best to position itself outside the Western, white masculine intellectual tradition of mind/body dualism: ‘an approach which refuses to privilege mind over body … and which assumes that the body cannot be transcended, is one which … emphasises contingency, locatedness, the irreducibility of difference, the passage of emotions and desire, and the worldliness of being’.13 Such a positioning is double-edged, however, as **the colonial project ‘limited the identity of the colonised to the materiality of their bodies’14 and thus the analysis must be at once deconstructory and existential.** Meaning, it is dangerous ground not to firstly problematise Indigenous theorisation stemming from the body, prior to foregrounding the body as a realm of study from where Indigenous existentialism can develop. Hence, this sub-section entitled ‘exhuming ghosts’. In part, white colonial patriarchy effected colonisation because it claimed to embody the power of reason and, consequently, universal interests. Key to enlightenment rationalism and its reliance on reason to know and to authenticate the objective world was its faith in the mind/body dichotomy orated by Plato and canonised by Descartes. In his 1871 book, The Descent of Man, 15 Charles Darwin emphasises the key differences in intellectual development (that is to say language, observation, curiosity, memory, imagination and reason) between primitive and civilised peoples.16 Darwin and other evolution theorists played an indirect but nonetheless highly significant role in the tainting of European accounts of Indigenous peoples. Indigenous cultures as unenlightened were, from an occipital logic, inherently more ‘physical’, ruled by their passions, and less intelligent than their civilised brethren**. The apparent lack of division between the indigene’s mind, body, spirit and the external world only served to augment the belief of European colonisers that they were indeed encountering savage races. Moreover, Enlightenment philosophers avoided questions of inconsistency in equality and autonomy arising from colonial subjugation by locating the Indigenous being in the realm of the physical and irrational, a site that denied full humanity itself.**17 **If savagery is understood from the perspective of Enlightenment rationalism, then it is apparent that it portends a state of unenlightenment, where reason is ruled by physical impulses and/or superstition.** What Foucault refers to as the invisible ‘breath’ that inhabits discontinuous discourses, even as they mutate,18 I conceive of as ‘physicality’ with reference to the colonised Indigenous savage. **As a sub-theme of the primitive/modern dialectic, physicality describes a complex of interconnecting discourses that enables unitary discursive knowledge to develop around the colonised Indigenous subject.** The thematic of Indigenous 108 VOLUME15 NUMBER2 SEP2009 physicality in the colonial state was ‘capable of linking, and animating a group of discourses, like an organism with its own needs, its own internal force and its own capacity for survival’.19 Darwin’s evolutionary theory, for instance, ‘directed research from afar’ acting as ‘a preposition rather than named, regrouped, and explained … a theme that always presupposed more than one was aware of … forcibly transformed into discursive knowledge’.20 Such discursive knowledge underpinned Indigenous ‘savagery’ and was transcribed into physical terms, onto the Indigenous body and about Indigenous bodily practices. For this essay, it is important to establish that the collision of supposedly embodied Indigenous epistemologies with disembodied Enlightenment rationalism left an inauthentic void that the Europeans, at least, desired to chart through authenticating disciplines such as anthropology and archaeology**. Enlightenment reason, as the determinant of truth and falsehood, was applied to the untranslatable—the epistemologies of other cultures.** The process involved, firstly, authenticating Indigenous knowledge by translating the untranslatable. That is, by encompassing and reconfiguring the incomprehensible into comprehensible forms. The authentication element in this equation is crucial because from the premise of the Enlightenment reason, knowledge was only authentic if it was known to the mind. That is, the embodied cultural concepts from ‘other’ epistemologies were only authentic if they were comprehensible to Western cognition**. The first principle of colonising the Indigenous body, then, was to bring the philosophical underpinnings of the savage under the logic of the coloniser, to authenticate the inauthentic.**21 In the universe of disembodied Enlightenment rationalism, it was assumed that reason (that is, European reason) could differentiate between truth and falsehood and, thus, the physical world was inherently translatable. The embodied practices of Indigenous epistemologies challenged that knowable world and, as a result, the reason of Enlightenment rationalism. The embodied holistic epistemologies of Indigenous societies determined the non-compartmentalisation of the ‘physical’. As opposed to the rational European subject, Indigenous subjectivity was not divorced from the body, nor the rationale from the passions, and so forth.22 **It is also important to recognise Indigenous subjectivities and their consequent bodily practices were often communally defined. Here the distinction can be made with the Western individual subject (who has prevailed in Western thought since the Enlightenment), whose person is comprised of a central and unique core, which determines their distinct identity.** The dissimilarity is important because, as opposed to a singular self, it indicates an Indigenous existentialism that incorporates multiple identities across time, including genealogical and spiritual associations, and communally defined bodily practices. The importance of the visible appearance of indigeneity and its genealogical tithing to moral deficiencies cannot be underestimated to the conception of the Indigenous body today. The Western conception of what it means to be Indigenous is in great part a visual BRENDAN HOKOWHITU—INDIGENOUS EXISTENTIALISM 109 phenomenon, ‘with all the political and ideological force that the seemingly naturalness of the body as the locus of difference can claim … [a] cultural training that quite literally teaches the eye not only how but what to see’.23 Allegorically, it is crucial to make the connection of the rationality of the European with the body of the colonised Other, underscored by: the eighteenth century resurrection of classical values of beauty and their similitude with the criteria of value in the classical economic tradition. Equilibrium and utility functioned in classical economic theory in ways analogous to proportion, symmetry, and refinement for classical aesthetics. Both sets of criteria determined an order of balance and harmony established on the basis of the geometric model ... By the late eighteenth century, beauty was established in terms of racial properties: fair skin, straight hair, organthous jaw, skull shape and size, well composed bodily proportions, and so on. To fail to possess these traits was considered a fault inheritance … Aesthetic value solidified into natural law, which in the eighteenth century was considered as compelling as the laws of nature, economics and morality precisely because they were all deemed to derive from the same rational basis.24 **The corporeal ‘reality’ of the asymmetrical Indigenous body undoubtedly naturalised colonial endeavour and Indigenous subjugation, allowing colonialist claims to moral superiority dependent upon what Robyn Wiegman refers to as ‘bodily fictions’ that ‘unproblematically reflect the natural meaning of flesh**’.25 Here, Bourdieu is useful as he conceives of the body metaphorically: ‘the bearer of symbolic meaning and values and a key site through which social differences are created, perpetuated and reinforced’.26 Bourdieu is also useful in thinking of the Indigenous body in terms of ‘physical capital’,27 especially in relation to mind/body duality in that symbolic meaning inscribed onto the Indigenous body determined inferior mental capacity and thus only contained capital in the inverse sense. The Indigenous body symbolised the physical realm and, thus, was employed for its physical labour, observed for its performativity, and humanised through the physical pursuits of sport.28 For many of the Indigenous parents of my generation, Bourdieu’s analysis becomes important because of its concern with the body in relation to the working class who, through bodily cognition as a necessary effect of a physically intensive life, developed different relations to their bodies than the white middle or dominant classes.29 Moreover, for Indigenous communities, sub-cultures developed throughout much of the twentieth century based on a relationship with a physically labouring body that, in turn, has come to symbolise traditional Indigenous cultures. For instance, the relationship between physical labour and sport with the Mäori male body has determined a traditional Mäori masculinity symbolically reified within the physical realm.30 As a consequence, many Indigenous communities remain predominantly working class. However, if we are to perceive of present day culture 110 VOLUME15 NUMBER2 SEP2009 as ‘postmodern’ then the relationship to the body with work and production becomes less important than an analysis of the fragmentation of the Indigenous body within late-capitalism.

## AT Essential Workers PIC

#### Perm do the counterplan – severance is justified because severance bad arguments presume rational cartesian subjects that are bound to strict lines of thought within a confined space.

#### Perm do both – Unconditional does not preclude exemptions for essential workers to go on strike, an unconditional right simply means that the right to strike can be unconditionally invoked given the limitations established.

#### Counterplan does not solve the aff – bracketing out essential workers recreates cartesian divides between the essential workers and the other workers who are deemed less essential and less productive.

#### Counterplan recreates cartesian capitalist hierarchies – workers who are able to go on strike are presumed to be more entitled to the earth than their counterparts that are branded as essential workers.

## AR AT CAP K

**Top Level**

#### Their deployment of collective institutionalist scholarship produces native erasure – natives are forced to choose between assimilating or being blamed for the movement’s failure. Ask yourself why the aff is the straw that breaks the camel’s back, and crushes their movement. You should view all of the links as a move towards holding native’s copable for institutional solidarity.

### Western Engagement DA

**Institutional engagement strategies that prioritize class and capitalism are paradoxically exclusionary for natives because they prioritize materialism and the division of land as a resource. Indigenous life and spirituality is alienated as a result**

**Mauro 11** (Salvatore Engel-Di Mauro, Associate professor of geography, State University of new york at new paltz, "Fighting for Socialism on Great Turtle Island— The Struggle Against Settler Colonialism," 2011 <http://www.oldandnewproject.net/Essays/Saed_Turtle%20Island.html>, RLA)

**The U.S. and Canada are settler colonial dictatorships.** This is hardly a revelation. Yet **most anti- capitalist leftist radicals seem unaware of or indifferent to this truth, a fact that is well illustrated by the paucity of concern expressed in socialist publications and other outlets with decolonization struggles on Great Turtle Island** (the name some Native Peoples give to what is often called"North America"). **This struggle should, however, be understood as fundamental to bringing about the demise of U.S. imperialism and building a post-capitalist alternative**. There has, of course, always been verbal acknowledgment of this and even a few efforts among socialists to recognize and act upon settler colonialism. Still, it has rarely figured prominently or centrally in any socialist platform in this part of the world, **nor have the contradictions inherent in a Eurocentric socialism** (in which I include anarchism) **been systematically confronted**—at least not without less than flattering results (see for example the book edited by Ward Churchill, number 7 on our list of readings below). It is disconcerting that most socialists, especially in the U.S., still cannot grasp what should be most obvious: The decolonization of Great Turtle Island would mean the end of U.S. imperialism everywhere—and with it a likely fatal weakening of all U.S.-supported institutions of repression worldwide. This is even more reason for considering the matter to be of some urgency. The recurring, intertwined social and environmental catastrophes generated through the capitalist mode of production are most clearly expressed in the genocides perpetrated against Indigenous Peoples. To put the matter succinctly, capitalist environmental degradation (not just global warming) is threatening or has already destroyed lives and livelihoods worldwide, with or without U.S. imperialism, and largely at the expense of the least powerful. Meanwhile, catastrophes are used to deflect attention away from capitalism as the root cause of those very same catastrophes. Indigenous Peoples have played and continue to play a pivotal role in the struggle against the capitalist mode of production and against any attempt to obscure the causes of worldwide environmental devastation.¶ We should, of course, acknowledge that **any expectation of a unified perspective and/or action developing among socialists and revolutionaries** (now a small, often marginalized if not persecuted political fraction of mainstream settler colonial society) **and all Indigenous Peoples of Great Turtle Island, or even of the Indigenous communities themselves, would be unrealistic**. Indigenous societies, for many reasons (some traceable to pre-invasion histories) are internally fractured, if not at times even mutually hostile. Some are even openly supportive of colonial governments. And socialists are similarly divided and politically diverse. But such **difficulties can be no excuse for the continuing indifference of most socialists towards the settler colonial dictatorships on which the modern industrial living standards** (shared, for the most part by these groups of radicals themselves) are based.¶ A counter-trend might be developing with recent collaboration and expressions of affinity among some Indigenous and socialist activists, especially in Canada (see works 1, 3, 11 and 14 on the list below). With **the tendency worldwide for Indigenous Peoples to play a central role in resisting further capitalist encroachments and ecological destruction,** such linkages could not be more opportune, as noted by Hugo Blanco (again see list of readings). **Indigenous Peoples on Great Turtle Island do not need socialists to carry on with their struggles.** Major capitalist assaults on livelihoods and ecosystems have been successfully repelled through alliances between Indigenous communities and parts of the rural working class in places like Wisconsin, to cite one example, while most socialists, especially Marxists, have largely missed the boat. Arguably, this is due to several assumptions that are both long-standing and foundational. Then let us add: completely **Eurocentric.** Such **assumptions must be shed once and for all—which will also, of course, mean major shifts in political organizing practices and programmatic objectives.** But if **an ecologically sensible socialist current** (or really any socialist current) **is to flourish and challenge the status-quo in Great Turtle Island such a paradigm shift is essential**. These **Eurocentric assumptions include** inter-related notions of 1) **stage-based social change, with one "mode of production" giving way logically and inevitably to another, socialism becoming possible only based on the productive forces generated by capitalism** (which Marx himself began rethinking, even if extremely late in his life, thanks to Vera Zasulich); 2) **the working class as the only revolutionary subject within capitalist society;** and 3) the state as the primary vehicle for revolutionary change. (See also, from this last point of view, reading 5 below.) The first assumption remains common to most left-wing groups which, among other things, persist in their belief that progress is tied to integrating masses of people into a single polity (with democratic central planning) and increasing the level of technology (now of an environmentally friendly variety). **If we start with these assumptions, the claims for land restitution raised by Indigenous Peoples, and their reticence to accept any assimilation, immediately become obstacles to "progress." Further, there is no room for Indigenous traditional life-ways in this worldview, because these stand in the way of resource extraction for the sake of the (not so) general good**. **The second assumption makes it necessary to explain away actual revolutionary subjects** that do not live up to Marxist preconceptions, such as peasants in the Russian, Mexican, and Chinese revolutions, and **Indigenous Peoples** who are **countering both settler colonialism (capitalist expansionism) and environmental devastation** simultaneously. For most socialists it remains too difficult to abandon these two foundational assumptions. But the third—the role of the state—probably raises the most tenacious resistance. And **yet if we continue to insist on statist strategies in a context where states have been imposed on often previously egalitarian societies, it is tantamount to partaking in a reinforcement of the settler colonial dictatorship and in the complete annihilation of such egalitarian societies once and for all**. This is not only a matter of subordinating questions related to Indigenous Peoples' sovereignty to other "more central" struggles. **In territories such as Great Turtle Island and northern Siberia, where states did not exist prior to colonizer invasions, projecting a centralized state as the key to creating a socialist society actively undermines Indigenous Peoples' anti-colonial struggles and thereby any prospect of establishing ecologically sustainable egalitarian** (i.e., ecosocialist) **societies.** But even anarchist currents are not immune to criticism. Why, for example, have anarchists only recently paid close attention to settler colonialism? This includes even some Indigenous activist currents. Eurocentric anti-statism, such as Proudhon's federalism or Landauer's structural renewal, is just as counterproductive as the traditional Marxist approach. There is even the occasional proposal for "a radical rehabilitation of the state" coming from Indigenous communities themselves—for example in Canada. These are reminiscent of the reformist concept of "democratizing" the state, and not therefore likely to be of use. This is because **the capitalist mode of production, which is inherently expansionistic, is based on the state as one of its main pillars. There is no confederacy or Indigenous- settler coexistence possible alongside a capitalist system of production, with its relentless pressure to ransack ecosystems everywhere for the endless accumulation of capital.** The mere everyday bustling of a capitalist society, with its incessant internal conflicts and violent repressions, necessitates ever-larger amounts of resources, often taken violently.

### Relationality DA

**Their pursuit of anti-capitalism absent a program of conscientization ensures the communities they create, socialist as they may be, will prosper off of the material kickbacks of imperial plunder, locking in global power relations of domination.**

**Peju 1960** [Marcel, one of the editors of *Temps Modernes*, “Mourir pour de Gaulle?,” in *Temps Modernes* No. 175-176, October-November. Found as a footnote on page 59 of *Wretched of the Earth*, Trans. Richard Philcox]

To make a radical distinction between the construction of socialism in Europe and “relations with the Third World” (as if any of our relations with it were external) is, knowingly or unknowingly, giving priority to restructuring the colonial heritage over the liberation of the underdeveloped countries, in other words constructing a de luxe type of socialism on the fruits of imperial plunder—as if a gang were to share out the loot more or less equitably even if it means giving a little to the poor by way of charity and forgetting they are giving back to the people they stole from.

### Root Cause

**Settler colonialism is foundational to class relations—extermination of indigenous populations enabled the techniques of managing surplus and capitalism can only be theorized as a spatial phenomenon**

**Lloyd and Wolfe 15**

[07 May 2015, David Lloyd and Patrick Wolfe, “Settler colonial logics and the neoliberal regime”, Settler Colonial Studies, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1035361]

It is highly significant that the distinctive characteristics of this emergent global regime have been locally prefigured in modes of repression **developed internally by settler colonial states**. As Israeli architect and specialist on urban warfare, Eyal Weizman, has argued, for instance, the West Bank can be seen as an extreme model – perhaps a laboratory – of a territorial and urban conflict that can take place in other places. Globalization takes the periphery straight to the center, the frontier between the First and Third worlds starts running through the middle of world cities.3 Weizmann's phrasing signals a genealogy for contemporary transformations in the longer history of colonialism as a repertoire of both tropes and practices of social control, brought together today in Israel's operations as a settler colonial state, anomalous only in that its project of expansion remains unfinished.4 The notable convergence of Israel and the USA (together with an ever-compliant Australia), expressed as much in their political solidarity as in their military and security collaborations, suggests to us a wider historical affinity between states that share a settler colonial history, one that continues to impress itself on both psychic and institutional formations. In this respect, to Weizmann's invocation of the first and third worlds, we should add the histories of dispossession and resistance through which Indigenous peoples of the ‘fourth world’ have shaped our understanding of the dynamics of settler colonialism and its lessons for the present. We suggest that the fundamental continuity between the historical development of European settler colonialism and the present-day development of the neoliberal world order **resides in the exigencies of managing surplus populations**. So far as settlers have been concerned, the salient surplus has, of course, been the Native population, whose refractory presence has prompted a range of techniques of elimination – from outright homicide to various forms of removal and/or confinement, and, once their numbers have been appropriately reduced in the post-frontier era, to Natives’ assimilation into settler society – techniques that have met with mixed success in the face of Native modes of resistance which have varied as creatively as the settlers’ own repertoire of strategies. In this overall historical process, the key shift is the ending of the frontier, which generally coincides with the consolidation of the settler state, and which is typically marked by intensified programs of Native assimilation, so many mopping-up exercises for civilization. Thus it is consistent that Israel, which remains bogged down in an incomplete expansion of its frontier, should rigorously eschew any semblance of Native assimilation, insisting instead on the sharpest of distinctions between Palestinians, who may or may not be citizen/residents of the Israeli state, and members of the so-called ‘Jewish nation’ wherever they may live. The exclusion of the Palestinian population is particularly apparent in the ease with which shifting economic and demographic circumstances – especially the large-scale immigration of Arab-Jews (Mizrahim) and Russians – have transformed what was once a reserve Palestinian labor force into a largely unemployed surplus. Bereft of potential productive utility, and with pauperization attenuating its value as a market, the Palestinian population has become subject to policies of removal and confinement that recall those adopted by other settler states while the expansion of their frontiers remained incomplete. Locally, therefore, Israel is straightforwardly settler colonial and bears comparison in important respects to the respective histories of settler societies such as Australia or the USA in the eras before these societies had completed the initial seizure of Native peoples’ land and inheritances. Globally, however, the twenty-first century context in which Israel is seeking to complete the seizure of what remains of Mandate Palestine differs crucially from the nineteenth-century context in which settlers in Australia and North America completed their seizure of the Native estate. Globally, the **dispossession of Indigenous peoples in Australia and North America took place in the context of (and formatively enabled) the titanic growth of industrial capitalism**. As Karl Polanyi observed, doing scant justice to Marx, an unprecedented feature of the emergence of industrial society was the sheer scale of the investment that was involved in factories. Not even shipbuilding had previously come close to the financial input required by the establishment of factories, with their heavy plant and infrastructure. Nor had any previous investment required maintenance for the length of time that it took factories to become profitable. To vouchsafe these investments, and to project factories’ viability forward through generations, required the total reorganization of society, complete with novel forms of surveillance, policing and war-making, that marked industrialization in the nineteenth century.5 This much is hardly novel. For our purposes, the crucial feature of the great nineteenth-century transformation is that it did not necessarily conduce to permanently superfluous populations. Rather, working populations grew dramatically. In addition to providing capital with its labor, the industrial proletariat provided a market for the fruits of its own alienated production. True, temporary labor surpluses were generated in the course of the periodic slumps and depressions that overtook the capitalist economy, especially after the 1870s, but this labor could be re-employed, even if only for warfare, once industrial demand was reinstated. Moreover, throughout this period, colonial settlement provided an outlet for the Malthusian excess, industrial society's surplus poor, who departed their Dickensian slums for Indigenous people's stolen homelands. The present situation is entirely different from the socially expansive context of nineteenth-century industrial capitalism. As many have noted, in the phenomenon of automation, capitalism has, as it were, over-succeeded, not only freeing itself from dependence on troublesome human labor but thereby simultaneously generating a population that, in contrast to waged labor, is not even much use as a market. As distinct from resistant Natives, this human surplus is produced within capitalism rather than external to it. In common with Natives, however, it obstructs rather than enables capitalist expansion. It is in relation to this community of redundancy, we believe, th**at settler colonialism's inventory of local strategies is becoming increasingly congenial to neoliberalism's emergent world orde**r. As we have noted elsewhere, in relation to Black people in the contemporary USA, the blatant racial zoning of large cities and the penal system suggests that, once colonized people outlive their utility, settler societies can fall back on the repertoire of strategies (in this case, spatial sequestration) **whereby they have also dealt with the Native surplus.**6 In this connection, we might view the phenomenon of warehousing, characterized by Klein, Jeff Halper and, above all, by Mike Davis,7 as **prefigured in the late-nineteenth-century Indian reservation**. The comparison may also serve to qualify the pessimism that consideration of this topic understandably engenders. Territorial concentration is both confining and enabling. From the settlers’ point of view, Indian reservations may have originated as holding pens for conquered peoples, but they also constitute unsurrendered, albeit diminished, repositories of Native sovereignty, focal points for survival and renewal. State strategies for **managing the warehoused surplus evince characteristics that are distinctly settler colonial in relation to other forms of colonialism**. In particular, the spatial **confinement of unwanted populations recapitulates the territorial adjacencies of settler colonialism**, which differs from blue-water colonialism in its spatial imbrication of metropolis and periphery.8 In expanding across continuous territory, settler colonialism seeks to **render the outside inside, a process that necessarily produces enemies within**. The intimacies of conquest militate against indiscriminate procedures, encouraging the spatial confinement of populations targeted for repression. In such ways, we believe, the ongoing history of settler colonialism **forms a crucial terrain through which to understand the systemic harmony between military occupation as a further version of colonial intervention and the formations and practices of the neoliberal state that have emerged to regulate and promote a new regime of capital accumulation**. We may be witnessing the consolidation of a new ‘nomos of the earth’, to use Carl Schmitt's term, but it is clear that the means and techniques of governance that maintain and police that nomos draw from longer histories of domination.9 As a Nazi, and an acutely reflexive one at that, Schmitt was singularly qualified to articulate the logic of oppression.10 He argued that every nomos or ordering of the world is instituted on the basis of a primary appropriation, Nahme or Landnahme, which establishes a bounding line, or enclosure, and stands as ‘a constitutive act of spatial ordering’.11 That initial act is **also ‘the original constitution, the concrete primal norm, the beginning of law and property’**.12 Locke's primal fiction that ‘In the beginning, all the world was America’ was for Schmitt a concrete historical fact. For him, the modern, Eurocentric world order, which in 1950 he already perceived as ‘foundering’, had a very specific origin in the conquest of the Americas, ‘the basic event in the history of European international law – the land-appropriation of the new world’.13 The nomos of the earth established by the European law of nations (later international law) dominated the globe up till the Second World War with the establishment of a quite literal line that ran through the Azores and Canary Islands and divided the sovereign, territorial states of Europe from what was now defined as ‘free land’, together with the no less ‘free sea’. ‘At this “line”, Europe ended and the “New World” began’.14 This ‘new world’ of ‘free land’ was open to appropriation; furthermore, This freedom meant that the line set aside an area where force could be used freely and ruthlessly. … Everything that occurred ‘beyond the line’ remained outside the legal, moral, and political values recognized on this [sic] side of the line.15 It is important to stress that this ‘line’, the bounding line of the modern, colonial-capitalist nomos, was a specific and recognized geographical marker, a longitude or meridian, that divided the world spatially. But is was also simultaneously a line that demarcated the world legally and morally between those subject to force and those subject to law, between the ‘subjects of transparency’ and the ‘subjects of affectability’, to use Denise da Silva's terms.16 This spatio-moral line has determined historically the distribution of law and civility to some, to others coercion and force. It represents, as Schmitt went on to show, not only the Hobbesian ‘abyss between freedom (the lawlessness of the state of nature) and an orderly “civil” mode of existence’, but also ‘a designated zone of free and empty space’ subject to a ‘state of exception’, that is, ‘a suspension of all law for a certain time and in a certain space’.17 Our analysis of settler colonialism prompts a crucial clarification of the temporality built into Schmitt's schema. In addition to the temporally bounded states of emergency that periodically legitimate the exception's application across society as a whole, **settler colonialism permanently schedules the refractory Native alternative for elimination**. Typically, this structural bifurcation has **a spatial correlate**. Zones set aside for the Native surplus, ‘beyond the Pale’ enclaves such as the Indian reservation, the Palestinian refugee camp, Gaza, or the Aboriginal fringe-camp, **constitute settler colonialism's permanent spaces of exception**. The bounding line that insulates these spaces must, therefore, be understood as simultaneously both spatial and juridical, determining the subjects of the law: the law and its abrogation are dialectical reflexes of each other.18 Thus a further revision to analytical temporalities is required. Settler colonialism is not some transitional phase that gives way to – or even provides a laboratory for – the emergent global order. **In both the originary and the continuing senses, it is foundational to that order**. It has often been assumed that, while both capitalism and the modern state originated in processes including primitive accumulation, imperialism, colonialism and conquest, modernization in both the political and economic spheres gradually leaves those stages behind, allowing for some form of cosmopolitan transnational globality to emerge. In particular, settler colonialism and primitive accumulation have been understood to belong to early stages of colonial-capitalist expansion and accordingly to be formations lodged in the past. Challenged initially by Rosa Luxemburg, as Sarita See shows in her essay below, Marx's understanding of primitive accumulation as an initial and by-passed stage of capitalism has more recently been critiqued by David Harvey, **who** proposes the term ‘accumulation by dispossession’ in its place, to designate a more rigorous understanding of the ongoing nature of the process. To this we would add that, just as ‘primitive accumulation’ continues and renews its forms, **neither settler colonialism nor military occupation can be consigned to the past**.19 Both continue to shape not only the states that locally originated in them but, increasingly, the emergent global order that settler colonialism underpins.

## AR AT Antiblackness

### Black Native DA

**Theorizing blackness as a monolith reproduces anti- black violence against black native women who embody a lived reality marked by their nativeness and blackness. Positionalities of black nativeness are branded as parasitic and inauthentic expressions of blackness – devaluing native black women.**

**Jordan-Zachery 16**(Julia Jordan-Zachery, Ph.D. Black Studies Program Public and Community Service Department Providence College, Director and Professor of Public and Community Service, Winter 2016 The Heritage Journal is a biannual newsletter for the Black Studies Program at Providence College. We invite our scholarly community—students, faculty, staff, alum and community members to contribute to Heritage. Pieces can take multiple forms such as art, poetry or prose; they can be reflective or analytical Page 7 – 9. The card starts with the second paragraph on page 7 and the last paragraph on page 8 extends to the beginning of page 9 2016 <http://www.providence.edu/black-studies/Documents/heritage-journal-vol1-issue1-winter2016.pdf>) RLA

i suppose you could say this is my humble¶ attempt at becoming whole, as my auntie (a tribal¶ elder) phrases it. **both communities i represent**¶ **have been embroiled in a constant struggle with the**¶ **white supremacist struggle for visibility since the**¶ **dawn of american history**. so to insist on being¶ whole, on coming together and on beginning, is¶ inherently political. **thus, the question i am charged**¶ **with is: how do i create space for me**?¶ i suppose the first step is to out myself¶ publicly. this is big. for almost the last decade, **i**¶ **would have died before i told you i’m black**¶ **pokanoket wampanoag—or, if we’re being totally**¶ **reductionist, black indian**. never mind the fact that¶ i was born and raised in providence, rhode island,¶ one of the first colonial settlements in america¶ where native american and black people have been¶ in community since the seventeenth century; that i¶ and my family are born of, and in constant¶ contention with, this history. so it’s ironic for me to write about visibility¶ because, as a new englander, **i’m coming from the**¶ **fringes of both indian country and black america,**¶ **the very intentionally invisible meridian between**¶ **the projects and the rez. white people have taken**¶ **great pains to whitewash new england, so blackamerica and indian country alike often call into**¶ **question the respective cultural legitimacies of**¶ **black and native people here**. in other words (as¶ i’ve heard and have been told), there aren’t “real”¶ black folks or “real” indians where i come from.¶ perhaps that is where the irony really lies because,¶ in the linear narrative of american history we tell¶ ourselves, it was in new england that the old and¶ new worlds first collided. **here they exploded in a**¶ **racially ambiguous, colored/brown/”what are you,**¶ **anyway?” supernova: the afterlife of colonization,**¶ **genocide, and chattel slavery in the all-consuming**¶ **contexts of white supremacy and anti-blackness.** **inhabiting this cultural and literal (physical)**¶ **space is as odd, surprising, and disconcerting as it**¶ **sounds**. **miraculously, though, i grew up with some**¶ **exposure to my indigenous heritage thanks to my**¶ **grandparents.** but **when they died within a year of**¶ **each other, the task of explaining myself and my**¶ **ontology became overwhelming. this was the end**¶ **of 2007.** i was fifteen and a sophomore at a snobby¶ private school in providence. in the days and weeks¶ after thanksgiving and into the new year, i pressed¶ the flowers from my grandparents’ funerals in my¶ bible; turned sixteen a week before the first¶ inauguration of barack obama, which i watched¶ starry -eyed and hopeful with the rest of black¶ america; and i decided once and for all i could no¶ longer be pokanoket wampanoag.¶ it’s a hell of a thing to be fifteen and¶ struggling to be acknowledged. it seemed that no¶ matter who i encountered, i was often mistaken for¶ biracial (as in, black and white), cape verdean, dominican, or puerto rican. **i was never “black**¶ **enough” in terms of my phenotype and my**¶ **mannerisms—and, of course, the dominant**¶ **narrative is that native americans don’t exist**¶ **anymore**. **at school, my white teachers and peers**¶ **policed my identity on a daily basis.** while my¶ classmates worried about prom dates and asking¶ their crush out to pizza after school, **i confronted**¶ **and struggled with the american obsession with**¶ **racial pigeonholing. every day, i was charged with**¶ **explaining the whole of my complex history—of**¶ **justifying my very being.** thus, i learned **that the thing about the black**¶ **indian thing is that it’s contentious at best.** my¶ heritage and my experience as a brown-skinned¶ new england girl implicates everyone—and i do¶ mean everyone—in this country. **regardless of**¶ **one’s positionality, the black indian identity**¶ **inevitably opens up questions of race vis-à-vis**¶ **blackness and native-ness** **(e.g., what does it mean**¶ **to be black? what does it mean to be native**?). **it is**¶ **a pandora’s box of our misconceptions about,** and¶ obsessions with, race, **the romanticizing of native**¶ **americans, blood quantum, the one-drop rule.**¶ ultimately, **its real controversy lies in that it**¶ **requires us to confront histories of oppression that**¶ **the white establishment has deemed inconvenient.** america has complicated the act of¶ existing for me which, where i came from, went¶ unquestioned and undiscussed. **in my family, there**¶ **were never any useless fractions or percentages**¶ **assigned to either ethnicity**, **nor** any **mythical, fullblooded**¶ **cherokee princesses floating around my**¶ **family tree. the very real people who do populate**¶ **my family tree are powwas and preachers, black**¶ **panthers and tribal elders,** activists in both¶ communities; schoolteachers, nurses, veterans,¶ catholics, red sox fans—my parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, and cousins. some of my family¶ “look” black, live their lives exclusively as black¶ people, and are very involved in the black¶ community; others “look” native, live their lives¶ exclusively as native people, and are very involved¶ in the tribe, native community of new england, and¶ indian country writ large. we didn’t necessarily¶ talk about our duality all the time, but we surely¶ lived it. so i **tried to assert both sides of my heritage**¶ **authentically. eventually**, though, **i just accepted**¶ **that anti-blackness (in the form of desiring to be**¶ **anything but black) is the lens through which most**¶ **people would perceive my pokanoket heritage.** i¶ **also didn’t like how in that paradigm,** **being native**¶ **does not exist as a viable and relevant cultural**¶ **identity, but it functions only as an object, and one**¶ **whose sole function is to abet anti-blackness**. for about the last eight years, i’ve been¶ constructing an exclusively black american identity. in¶ college, i soaked up every bit of black history,¶ literature and culture i came across. the more i¶ learned about black experiences in this country and¶ the world, **the more i critiqued and deconstructed**¶ **the idea of blackness as a monolith.** consequently,¶ **the once-potent accusation of not being “black**¶ **enough” lost its sting.** **i felt more than sufficiently**¶ **black, and proud of it. as i started to become more**¶ **radical in my thinking**, however, i felt convicted that¶ i had all but abandoned my wampanoag heritage.¶ how could i be a conscious person of color **if i was**¶ **consciously editing my history to exclude another**¶ **disempowered group?** the short answer: not very. **that’s how i got here, negotiating the**¶ **decidedly rebellious act of insisting on a black and**¶ **pokanoket duality**. in the last eight years, the¶ flowers from my grandparents’ funerals have all¶ but disintegrated in the thin pages of paul’s¶ epistles; **the myth of post-racial america has beenstained by the blood of trayvon martin, sara lee**¶ **circle bear, freddie gray, paul castaway, sandra**¶ **bland**, laquan mcdonald, and countless other **black**¶ **and native victims of systemic, racialized american**¶ **violence**. barack obama is leaving the white house¶ soon, and the whole of (non-white) america¶ watches anxiously to see which of the odd¶ assortment of candidates will be his predecessor.¶ most importantly, in the last eight years, i¶ graduated high school and went to college, where i¶ learned definitively that while i don’t have many of¶ the answers i want, i’d better start asking the right¶ questions. and **i realized it is impossible for me to**¶ **not be pokanoket.**

### Permutations

**The permutation is the superior method- alliances between Natives and Blacks have been successful at challenging white supremacy and ending slavery, but a method that seeks to destroy this alliance uses the same logic as Andrew Jackson when he passed laws to prevent “Savage” “Slave” relationships**

**Douglas 2015**

[Nick, the author of Finding Octave: The Untold Story of Two Creole Families and Slavery in Louisiana. September 28, 2015 "KNOW YOUR BLACK HISTORY: Slave Revolts Part 1", http://www.afropunk.com/profiles/blogs/know-your-black-history-slave-revolts-part-1-blacks-and-native]

This **alliance between Native Americans and slaves started long before Jamestown.** In the late 1500s slave traders like Sir Walter Raleigh marooned shiploads of slaves on the U.S. coast to pursue the more lucrative pirating of Spanish galleons carrying Latin American gold. Other slave ships were forced ashore by the slaves themselves, who then escaped into the interior of the U.S. These escaped slaves became known as maroons. It seems only natural that escaped slaves would gravitate to, and be accepted by Indian tribes. The first recorded slave revolt with the aid of Native Americans was in 1526 in a Spanish settlement in present-day South Carolina near the Pedee River. One hundred slaves revolted against 500 Spaniards after nearby Indians became hostile to the settlement. The slaves integrated into the Native American community after wiping out the Spaniards. There was slavery in the Americas before Europeans arrived. Native North Americans took captives during wars with other tribes and forced them into small-scale slave labor. Captives were often traded back to their tribes in captive exchanges. But large-scale slave labor and slaveholding was unknown to Native Americans before the Europeans arrived. European’s appearance in North America changed slavery for Native Americans. European’s need for labor, especially in the Southern colonies, broke down the previous system. Indian tribes began to make raids with the goal of selling captives as slaves to the Europeans. This affected the power balance between tribal nations and disrupted inter-tribal functioning. Enslaving Native Americans was a dangerous and tricky proposition for the early European settlers. Settlers relied on various Indian tribes for survival and protection: the French relied on the Choctaw: the British counted on the Chickasaw and Cherokee. And Native American slaves, unlike Africans uprooted from their ancestral homelands, were likely to escape and return to their tribes. To increase their slavery profits, some Europeans began selling Native Americans into slavery in the Caribbean. Between 1675 and 1715, thirty-to fifty-thousand Native American slaves (this is a conservative estimate) were sold from the southern colonies into slavery in the Caribbean. Due in part to this slave trade, the Yamasee Indians waged war in 1715 against British colonists. The Yamasee War forced most white colonists in South Carolina and the southeast to flee to Charlestown, North Carolina. The British colonists who took refuge in Charlestown were only saved by the Cherokees, who helped them survive the attack. As Native Americans had increasingly hostile encounters with ever, encroaching European settlers, they became natural allies of the arriving black slaves. Both groups fiercely resisted Europeans’ efforts to enslave them. Many tribes made the strategic calculation that aiding blacks revolting against slavery, was in their own best interest. White settlers and leaders fought furiously throughout U.S. history, even resorting to wholesale murder, to disrupt this powerful, centuries-old alliance. Colonists in South Carolina were so worried about slave and Indian alliances that they passed laws in 1725 and 1751 that prohibited holding slaves near Native Americans on the frontier. South Carolina Governor James Glen stated in 1758: “It has always been the policy of this government to create an aversion of the Indians to the Negroes.” During a 1739 outbreak of smallpox Europeans told the Cherokees the outbreak was brought by African slaves to create tension between them. (Of course, the disease was introduced to the Americas by Europeans.) American policy regarding blacks and Indians was to keep them “separated and mutually hostile.” Individual colonies encouraged this policy. Virginia offered Indians who caught escaped slaves 35 deerskins as a reward. North Carolina rewarded Indians with three blankets and a musket. The Natchez Uprising in 1729 was an Indian land dispute and slave revolt. The Natchez were upset with the French settler’s insistence on using a sacred burial ground as a farm. They plotted with black slaves, the Choctaw, Tunica, Yazoo and other Indian tribes to simultaneously attack French settlements throughout the Mississippi Valley. The Indians promised the slaves who participated that slavery would be abolished in the Mississippi Valley. Each tribe kept bundles of sticks in their lodges to count the days until the attack. A Natchez princess, who had a son with a Frenchman, got wind of the attack and warned the French. They ignored her. She slipped into the Natchez lodge and took out a few sticks from the bundle to sabotage the timing, so the many tribes would not attack in concert as planned. The Natchez and slaves attacked prematurely but still took over Ft. Rosalie in present day Mississippi, killing 250 French settlers. The French authority Etienne Perier realized that the Indians and slaves had planned this attack in advance and became extremely fearful of this new alliance. To drive a wedge between the Indians and slaves, and to prevent any future alliances, he ordered a group of slaves to murder a peaceful tribe called the Chaouachas. His plan worked. Indians in the area started referring to black slaves as “black white men” It took a year for the French to defeat and capture most of the remaining Natchez, due in large part to how well the slaves who allied with the Natchez fought. In 1776 the new U.S. government outlawed the enslavement of Indians. The government treaty negotiated with Indians included clauses that Indians should return escaped slaves. The Indians returned none. Andrew Jackson was one of the many people who actively sought to break the alliance between Native Americans and black slaves. Jackson had seen first-hand how successful the cooperation could be between these two groups. Choctaw and free people of color had successfully helped him defeat the British in the Battle of New Orleans in 1815. He distrusted the French-speaking free blacks known as Creoles and hated the Indians. As president he ordered the forced relocation of the Five Civilized Tribes (civilized tribes included: Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Seminole and Creek /Muscogee) to lands west of the Mississippi. It is no coincidence that Jackson began this relocation with the Choctaw in 1830. French Creoles and Choctaw Indians had a history of interdependency and cooperation that had endured for 100 years. A Choctaw chief was the first to call this forced relocation “a trail of tears and death,” possibly referring to the Choctaw tradition of ritual crying at the death of friends and relatives. After the 1830s black slave revolts continued unabated and intensified even through the Civil War. Because of President Jackson’s genocidal Indian policies, after 1830 black Americans could not count on large numbers of Native Americans in the fight against slavery. There was one exception: the Seminoles and the Black Seminoles. . The Seminoles were a loose confederation of the Creek, Miccosukee, other tribes and a large number of runaway slaves and their descendants. In 1740s the Spanish destabilized British colonial slavery in the area surrounding Florida by promising runaway-slaves freedom and land if they reached Spanish-controlled Florida. Many slaves escaped from Georgia and Alabama to freedom in Florida, where they joined this loose confederation of Indians. The First Seminole War erupted in 1817, when the U.S Army attempted to take the Miccosukee chief Neamaltha into custody. The Seminoles and Miccosukee had been conducting reprisals along the Georgia/Florida border in reaction to Georgia colonists stealing Native American livestock. Ironically, Andrew Jackson relied on a force of 2,000 Creek warriors to invade Northern Florida and take over the two largest Spanish settlements. The outcome of the invasion was the ceding of Florida to the Americans in 1819 and the Seminoles leaving Northern Florida. When Jackson tried to force the Seminoles to leave Florida under the Indian Relocation Act of 1830, the Seminoles refused. In December 1835 the Second Seminole War began. Up to 400 black slaves escaped plantations in Florida and joined the Seminoles. The escaped slaves became known as the Black Seminoles. The force of Black Seminoles and Seminole Indians succeeded in destroying 21 sugar plantations in Central Florida. After a number of embarrassing defeats the U.S. Army tried to split the Seminole force by offering the escaped slaves freedom if they would consent to be relocated west of the Mississippi. Few slaves accepted. After three years of fighting, the U.S Army—unable to defeat the Seminoles— offered Black Seminoles freedom in exchange for surrender. The Second Seminole War was the only successful emancipation of black rebels prior to the Civil War. Today Seminoles continue to inhabit their ancestral land in Florida. The Seminole Wars are rarely talked about because Southerners and the U.S. Army would never admit to being defeated by a group of black rebels and Indians. Black slaves and Native Americans shared common ground from the moment that the first black slaves set foot in the U.S. Their combined resistance to slavery was seen as such a powerful threat to the status quo that slaveholders used every method available to them from legislation, to wholesale murder, to forced relocation of Native Americans to break this powerful alliance. In the end black and Native American alliances were important in ending the evil institution of slavery. It is important to look at the history of Indian and black slave relationships in the context of current day. By censuring this amazing history we forget common ground that can be a powerful force for change.

**The 1AC’s analytic frame is necessary—slavery and anti-blackness are inadequate to understand and must be theorized in conjunction with settler colonialism as structuring modernity and constituting blackness**

**King 13**

[2013, Tiffany Jeannette King, “IN THE CLEARING: BLACK FEMALE BODIES, SPACE AND SETTLER COLONIAL LANDSCAPES”, PhD Dissertation]

We must consider that Settler colonialism shapes and constitutes Black life, **specifically slavery and its afterlife in America.** While slavery and anti-Black racism should be active and robust analytic frames that guide Black Studies and help us understand Black subjectivity in the Western Hemisphere, settler colonialism also structures Black life. The genocide of Native peoples, the perpetual making of Settler space and Settler subjectivity—as unfettered self actualization—do not immediately stop existing as forms of power when they run into Black bodies. The way that settler colonial power looks and manifests itself **just changes;** **it does not stop.** Settler colonialism, as a subjectless discourse, is a form of productive power that touches all that live in the US and Settler colonial nations.30 Though it touches and shapes everyone’s life it does so in very different ways. For the purposes of my own research I am arguing that settler colonialism’s normalizing power enacts genocide against Native peoples (disappears Native people) but it also shapes and structures antiBlack racism. The ontological positions that were created by slavery, specifically the Slave are still alive and well however, **settler colonial power intersects with, works through and structures the repressive and productive power that makes the Black captive fungible and socially dead**. Throughout, In the Clearing poses the question, in what ways does settler colonial power help structure slavery and anti-Black racism? This project ultimately argues that **slavery and anti-Black racism are not adequate to fully understand the material and discursive processes that create Blackness in all of its embodied genres in North America**. Slavery and anti-Black racism are also not the only repressive powers that make the Black body abject, fungible and situated at the outer limits of being-ness. Both **slavery and settler colonialism structure modernity and need to be fully conceptualized as forms of power that help constitute Blackness**. Conceptualizing the ways that settler colonialism and slavery co-constitute one another is an essential component of this dissertation.

### Dispossession DA

**Dispossession DA) Focusing on the black body and the centrality of the slave occludes the dispossession of indigenous populations that made slavery in the U.S. possible in the first place**

**Moreton-Robinson 8**

(Aileen, Queensland University Prof of Indigenous Studies, Transnational Whiteness Matters)kh

Morrison further suggests in " Black Matters" that the African American presence has also "shaped the body politic, the Constitution, and the entire history of the [USA] culture." Indigenous peoples are outside the scope of Morrison's analysis. Through the centering of the African American presence, Native American texts that have challenged, resisted and affected the American literary imagination, politics, history and the Constitution remain invisible. This silence is an interesting discursive move considering that the best-selling novels within the USA in the late eighteenth century were captivity narratives. And as Native American legal scholar Raymond Williams argues **it was** the positioning of Indians as incommensurable savages within the Declaration of Independence **that enabled** " ' **the Founders**' **vision of America's growth** and potentiality **as a new form of expansionary white racial dictatorship in the world**."ll The most valuable contribution of Morrison's work for my purposes is her thesis that "**blackness**," whether real or imagined, **services the social construction and application of whiteness in its myriad forms**. In this way **it is utilized as a white epistemological possession**. Her work opens up a space for considering how this possessiveness operates within the whiteness studies literature to displace Indigenous sovereignties and render them invisible. WHITE POSSESSIVENESS Most historians mark 1492 as the year when imperialism began to construct the old world order by taking possession of other people, their lands and resources. **The possessive nature of this enterprise informed the development of a racial stratification process on a global scale that became solidified during modernity. Taking possession of Indigenous** people's **lands was a quintessential act of colonization** and was tied to the transition from the Enlightenment to modernity, which precipitated the emergence of a new subject into history within Europe. Major social, legal, economic and political reforms had taken place changing the feudal nature of the relationship between persons and property in the 16th and 18th centuries. "These changes centered upon the rise of 'possessive individualism,' that is, upon an increasing consciousness of the distinctness of each self-owning human entity as the primary social and political value. "12 Private ownership of property both tangible and intangible operated through mechanisms of the new nation state in its regulation of the population and especially through the law. By the late 1700s people could legally enter into different kinds of contractual arrangements whereby they could own land, sell their labor and possess their identities all of which were formed through their relationship to capital and the state. **A new white property owning subject emerged into history and possessiveness became embedded in everyday discourse as** "**a firm belief that the best in life was the expansion of self through property and property began and ended with possession of one's body**."13 **Within the realm of intra-subjectivity possession can mean control over one's being**, ideas, one's **mind**, one's feelings **and** one's body or within inter-subjectivity it can mean the act or fact of possessing **something that is beyond the subject** and in other contexts it can refer to a state of being possessed by another. Within the law possession can refer to holding or occupying territory with or without actual ownership or a thing possessed such as property or wealth and it can also refer to territorial domination of a state. **At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one's will**-la-be **on the thing which is perceived to lack will**, thus it is open to being possessed. This enables the formally free subject to make the thing its own. Ascribing one's own subjective will onto the thing is required to make it one's property as " willful possession of what was previously a will-less thing constitutes our primary form of embodiment; it is invoked whenever we assert: this is minc."14 To be able to assert ' this is mine' requires a subject to internalize the idea that one has proprietary rights that are part of nonnative behavior, rules of interaction and social engagement. Thus possession that forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity is reinforced by its sociodiscursive functioning. WHITE WRITING A number of texts have been written historicizing the acquisition of white identity and the privileges conferred by its status through a trope of migration, which is based on the assumption that all those who came after the white people had taken possession are the immigrants. White possession of the nation works discursively within these texts to displace Native American sovereignties by disavowing that everyone else within the USA are immigrants whether they came in chains or by choice. The only displacement that is theorized is in relation to African Americans. Theodore Allen's work on how the Irish became white in America illustrates that the transformation of their former status as the blacks of Europe relied on their displacement by African Americans in the new country. IS David Roediger di scusses how the wages of whiteness operated to prevent class alliances between working class whites and African Americans. 16 Karen Brodkin 's excellent book on how Jews became white demonstrates that the lower status of African American workers enabled Jewish class mobility.17 Jacobsen illustrates that European migrants were able to become white through ideological and political means that operated to distinguish them from African American blackness.18 **The black/white binary permeates** these analyses enabling **tropes of** migration and **slavery to work covertly** in these texts **erasing the continuing history of colonization and the Native American sovereign presence**. **Blackness becomes an epistemological possession** that Allen, Roediger, Brodkin and Jacobsen **deploy[ed] in analyzing whiteness and race, which forecloses the possibility that the dispossession of Native Americans was tied to** migration and **the establishment of slavery driven by the logic of capital. Slaves were brought to America as the property of white people to work the land that was appropriated from Native America tribes**. Subsequently, migration became a means to enhance capitalist development within the USA. Migration, slavery and the dispossession of Native Americans were integral to the project of nation building. Thus **the question of how anyone came to be white or black in** the United States of **America is inextricably tied to the dispossession of the original owners and the assumption of white possession**. The various assumptions of sovereignty beginning with British 'settlers' the formation of individual states and subsequently the United States of America all came into existence through the blood-stained taking of Native American land. **The USA as a white nation state cannot exist without land and clearly defined borders**, it is the legally defined and asserted territorial sovereignty that provides the context for national identifications of whiteness. In this way I argue **Native American dispossession indelibly marks configurations of white national identity**. Ruth Frankenberg acknowledges in the introduction to her edited collection Displaying Whiteness that whiteness traveled culturally and physically, impacting on the formation of nationhood, class and empire sustained by imperialism and global capitalism. She wrote that notions of race were tied "to ideas about legitimate 'ownership' of the nation, with 'whiteness' and' Americanness' linked tightly together" and that this history was repressed. After making this statement she then moves on to discuss immigration and its effects. 19 Her acknowledgement did not progress into critical analysis that centered Native American dispossession, instead Frankenberg represses that which she acknowledges is repressed . Repression operates as a defense mechanism to protect one's perception of self and reality from an overwhelming trauma that may threaten in order to maintain one's self image. **Repressing the history of Native American dispossession works to protect the possessive white self from ontological disturbance. It is far easier to extricate oneself from the history of slavery if there were no direct family and material ties to its institution and reproduction.** However, **it is not as easy to distance one's self from a history of Indigenous dispossession when one benefits everyday from being tied to a nation that has and continues to constitute itself as a white possession**. Within the whiteness studies literature whiteness has been defined in multiple ways. It is usually perceived as unnamed, umnarked and invisible, and often as culturally empty operating only by appropriation and absence .20 It is a location of structural privilege, a subject position and cultural Praxis. Whiteness constitutes the norm operating within various institutions influencing decision making and defining itself by what it is not. 22 It is socially constructed and is a form of property that one possesses, invests in and profits from.2..1 Whiteness as a social identity works discursively becoming ubiquitous, fluid and dynamic24 operating invisibly through pedagogy.25 What these different definitions of whiteness expose is that it is something that can be possessed and it is tied to power and dominance despite being fluid, vacuous and invisible to white people. However, these different conceptualizations of whiteness, which use blackness as an epistemological possession to service what it is not, obscure the more complex way that white possession functions sociodiscursively through subjectivity and knowledge production. As something that can be possessed by subjects it must have ontological and epistemological anchors in order to function through power. As a means of controlling differently racialized populations enclosed within the borders of a given society, white subjects are disciplined, though to different degrees, to invest in the nation as a white possession that imbues them with a sense of belonging and ownership. This sense of belonging is derived from ownership as understood within the logic of capital and citizenship. In its self-legitimacy, white possession operates discursively through narratives of the home of the brave and the land of the free and through white male signifiers of the nation such as the Founding Fathers, the 'pioneer' and the 'war hero.' Against this stands the Indigenous sense of belonging, home and place in its sovereign incommensurable difference.

### White Black DA

**White/Black Binary DA) Their illusion to the White/Black binary assimilates and suppresses indigenous peoples leading to worse oppression against minority groups and constantly continues to reify colonialism**

**Alcoff ‘03**

[Linda Martin, Syracuse University Department of Philosophy, “Latino/AS, Asian Americans, and the Black-White Binary” The Journal of Ethics 7, 5.2.2003. <http://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023%2FA%3A1022870628484.pdf >//wyo-hdm]

The reality of race in the U.S. has always been more complicated than black/white. The initial exclusionary laws concerning testimony in court, as mentioned earlier, grouped “blacks, mulattoes, and Native Americans.” The Chinese laborers brought to the West in the 1800’s had speciﬁc rulings and ideological justiﬁcations used against them, restricting their right not only to vote or own property but even to marry other Chinese. This latter ruling outlasted slavery and was justiﬁed by invoking images of Asian overpopulation. To avoid reproduction, Chinese women were allowed to come as prostitutes but not as wives, a restriction no other group faced. The Mexicans defeated in the Mexican–American War were portrayed as cruel and cowardly barbarians, and although the Treaty of Guadalupe–Hidalgo ratiﬁed in 1848 guaranteed the Mexicans who stayed in the U.S. full rights of citizenship, like the treaties with Native Americans neither local governments nor the federal courts upheld the Mexicans right to vote or respected the land deeds they held before the Treaty.18 By the time of the Spanish– American War of 1898 the image of barbarism used against Mexicans was consistently attributed to a Latin-Catholic heritage and expanded for use throughout Latin American and the Caribbean, thus subsequently affecting the immigrant populations coming from these countries as well as justifying U.S. claims of hegemony in the region.19 The so-called Zoot Suit riots in Los Angeles in 1943 targeted Mexicans and their ethnically speciﬁc style of dress. The attempts made to geographically sequester and also to forcibly and totally assimilate Native American groups were not experienced by any other group, and had their own ideological justiﬁcations that combined contradictory images of the Great Chain of Being with the romanticized Noble Savage. Native peoples were **represented as vanquished, disappearing, and thus of no account**. The paradigm of an antiblack racism intertwined with slavery does not help to illuminate these and other speciﬁc experiences of other nonwhite groups, where ideologies often relied on charges of evil, religious backwardness, horde mentalities, being a disappearing people, and other projections not used in regard to African Americans. **The hegemony of the black/white paradigm has stymied the development of an adequate account of the diverse racial realities in the U.S**., and weakened the general theories of racism which attempt to be truly inclusive. This has had a negative effect on our ability to develop effective solutions to the various forms racism can take, to make common cause against ethnic and race based forms of oppression and to create lasting coalitions, and has recently played a signiﬁcant role in the demise of afﬁrmative action. I will support these claims further in what follows.

### Effacing DA

**Effacing violence DA) Starting with slavery effaces the violence committed against the Native Americans, allows the continuation of colonialist violence against them and makes sovereignty impossible- impact is case**

**Moreton-Robinson 8**

(Aileen, Queensland University Prof of Indigenous Studies, Transnational Whiteness Matters) KH

Despite the colonial history of the United States and racializing Native Americans in popular culture, as the embodiment of ' redness,' the whiteness literature makes a racial demarcation between African Americans and Native Americans. That is by making blackness synonymous with 'race' African Americans are placed in a reified position within the literature. This binary understanding of 'race' places the literature in one sense Qut of colonial history. That is the **theorizing about whiteness does not begin with nor center the appropriation of Indigenous peoples' lands** and the continuing sovereignty struggles with the US nation state. They are, but **they are marginalized within the theories of race and whiteness** offered by whiteness studies **despite its** political commitment to and **epistemological engagement with white race privilege** and power. **The conceptual links between the privileges** and benefits that flow from American citizenship to Native American dispossession remains invisible. Instead slavery, war and migration are the narratives by which the historically contingent positionality of whiteness unfolds. This reflects a failure to address the sociodiscursive way that white possession functions to produce racism. The racism attending the sociodiscursive nature of white possession informed the establishment of the Advisory Board of Race in 1997. President Clinton established this Board to counsel and inform him about race and racial reconciliation couching the terms of reference within a civil rights framework.44 No Native American representative was appointed to the Board even though they are the only racial group required to carry a blood quantum card as proof of tribal membership.45 This exclusion was the catalyst for numerous protests by different Native American groups. They stated that while Native Americans shared with other racial groups the need for improving their socioeconomic and legal conditions, there were other conditions not shared. They argued that their position within the USA was unique because of their sovereignties and treating with the Nation State. The racism that they experience is predicated on this relationship. Native American sovereignty is constantly under threat by the Nation State and its various mechanisms of governance such as the Plenary Powers of the United States Congress. Within their daily lives they experience the effects of broken treaties, loss of land and cultural rights, genocide and breaches of fiduciary duty. They are confronted by the constant battle with Congressmen and State Governors who wish to diminish their rights by framing "the economic and political empowerment of Indigenous tribes as evidence of a threatening tribal movement to transgress the temporal and spatial boundaries of colonial rule, consume American property and colonise the American political system."46 Resisting and diminishing Native American sovereignties also includes tactics such as positioning their claims outside racism which serves to protect and reinscribe possessive investments in the nation as a white possession. Some twelve months after its establishment, President Clinton was invited to discuss his Race Advisory Board with a panel of eight people on a PBS broadcast. One member of the panel was Native American Sherman Alexie. The panel discussed with Clinton a number of race issues including affirmative action. During the show Clinton did not address Native American sovereignty claims but tried to connect with Alexie by informing him that his grandmother was one-quarter Cherokee. Later in the program Alexie was asked if he was often engaged by others in discussions about race to which he replied that a dialogue often takes place when he is approached by people who "tell me they're Cherokee."41 In other words people do not talk about racism to Alexie unless they claim some form of Indigeneity. Alexie's comment serves to illustrate how Clinton tries to capitalize on a Native American ancestry by staking a possessive claim to a subject position that is not purely white in order to connect with his native brother while having excluded Native Americans from the Race Committee. Clinton can stake a possessive claim to Cherokee descent because there is no threat to his investment in his white identity, which carries a great deal of cultural capital enabling him to make the claim on biological grounds outside of Cherokee sovereignty. What Clinton was also signifying to the audience was that race does not matter: even a person of Cherokee descent can be President of the United States because this is the land of freedom, liberty and equality. A similar rhetorical strategy was also deployed in March 2008 by Barack Obama in his speech on race in Philadelphia, which was framed by the black/white binary operationalizing narratives of slavery and migration. **Obama declared that slavery was the original sin in the making of the nation and it is the African American experience that dominates his speech though he acknowledges Latinos, Hispanics and refers to Native Americans once**. His narrative on migration is reserved for white working and middle class people who he says feel they have not been privileged by their race, they have worked hard to build their dream but are now victims of globalization. **Obama stakes a possessive claim to whiteness throughout this speech by discursively operationalizing an American dream which is beyond race.** He stages this through an appeal to Christian principles, civil rights, patnotlsm, citizenship, liberty, freedom and equality noting that the Declaration of Independence was developed by men who "travelled across an ocean to escape tyranny and persecution."48 The tyranny and persecution inflicted upon Native Americans and slaves by white male possessors who framed the constitution is disavowed by Obama, who epitomizes them as the bearers of freedom and liberty. Clinton's executive and personal actions and **Obama's speech serve[s] to negate Native American claims that race and racism were operating, when Indigenous peoples were dispossessed**, and they continue to mark their everyday lives and sovereignty claims. The genealogy of racism toward Native Americans can be traced back to "Greek and Roman myths of warlike, barbarian tribes and biblical accounts of wild men cursed by God" which informed renaissance-era travel narratives describing them as the embodiment of primitive human savagery.49 Enlightenment theorists such as Locke and Hobbes developed their ideas of the state of nature utilizing the American Indian as the quintessential example of "humanity living in its pure, unadulterated savage state." These ideas operated discursively to inform theories about the rights of man within the context of the rise of democracy relegating Indigenous people to a state of nature without any sovereign rights. They continue to circulate preventing Indigenous sovereignties from gaining recognition as relevant and alternative visions of differently constituted modemities and global futures. **The exclusion of Native Americans** from the Race Committee **correlates with their invisibility within the whiteness literature. Native Americans are located outside 'racism' because United States' status as a former colony and its current mode of colonization is separated from its historical narrative** as being the land of liberty, freedom and equality. CONCLUSION I have shown that **white possession operates discursively within the whiteness literature shaping analyses about its social construction and morphology which are divorced from its colonial history and colonizing present. Tropes of migration and slavery become the dominant narratives that inform analyses**. The historical amnesia within the literature is tied to what white possession promises - migrants can become white and blacks can achieve racial equality. The selective historical amnesia mitigates the fear of opening oneself up epistemologically and onto logically to being a disoriented, displaced and diasporic racialized subject whose existence within the nation state is predicated on the continuing divestment of Indigenous people's sovereign rights. **Instead it is the black/white binary that becomes the parameter for the constitution of whiteness by operationalizing blackness as an epistemological possession**. Indigenous sovereignties within the USA are excluded from the whiteness literature because analyses of 'race' and ' whiteness' are sociodiscursively constituted by the racial contract and white possession which enable, constrain and discipline subjects in various ways within and outside the academy. White possession sets the limits of knowledge about the black/white binary disappearing beyond or behind the invention of this knowledge mediated through the racial contract. **These practices of knowledge production work to deny Indigenous sovereignties as they reinforce the power**, control **and authority of the nation as a white possession**. The work produced in the field of whiteness studies within the United States of America is written on and yet over the sovereign ground of Native Americans and Indigenous people from its other territories. While this literature does produce knowledge about whiteness and racism, there are powerful vested interests in not knowing Indigenous sovereignties and continuing to know Indigeneity in ways that confine it to a specialist domain of ethnographic expertise. **The failure of this literature to address the explicit colonial and continuing imperialism of the nation state results in the writing off of Indigenous sovereignties in the service of white possession. This servicing produces a particular way of being racialized within the United States of America and is fundamental both to its establishment and to its continued existence**.