### **1**

#### **Dualist understanding of outer space presupposes a spirit/matter distinction that grants humanity a privileged position as the authority figure that can harness outer space as a system of resources. Such a presupposition of spirit and material denies the entanglement of the natural world.**

**Mitchell 11** (JAMES MITCHELL MADDOX B.A., The University of Virginia, 2004 A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree MASTER OF ARTS ATHENS, GEORGIA 2011, <https://getd.libs.uga.edu/pdfs/maddox_james_m_201108_ma.pdf>) matt

Galileo‘s optical affirmation of a mathematical discovery is a fitting, if symbolic, beginning of the Scientific Revolution, which gave us a new vocabulary for describing our world. It may be obvious why the church had an interest in maintaining the divine order of cosmos. It gave them a privileged position, a connection to the ―heavens,‖ which, as Donne wrote, were high above us in the perfect order of the firmament—God‘s realm. As we see in his verse, that cosmic order was an integral part of the poet‘s existence—a way to describe the world physically and figuratively. We use the word ―metaphysical‖ to describe Donne‘s poetry because of his skill at drawing long comparisons, or conceits, between our lives and the world around us. It was a way of understanding who we are in the cosmos, not so distant from the cosmos in which the ancients placed themselves. Though the cosmos at this point was essentially Catholic real estate, our position within it gave us meaning, just as our position in our current model of the universe gives us meaning today. The poetry of Donne‘s day, as Francis Bacon believed, ―[expresses] the spiritual condition of humanity, for presenting a ‗more perfect order‘ than one could find in nature ‗since the fall.‘‖ (Craige 17). Today no academic would aver such a claim, though that physical-metaphysical duality persists. **The belief that there is a soul that is somehow separate from the world, a ―spirit/matter dualism that itself can be traced back to Plato,‖ is intimately tied to our representations of the cosmos and where we fit into the cosmic order** (Craig 15). **Christian cosmology, especially in the hands of authority figures, has reinforced that duality and continues to reinforce it**.9 **In this story, that duality is the conflict between the discourses and how we handle outer space and we fit in it.** Today we now know that every atom in our bodies was manufactured in a star at some point during the history of the universe. We learn in school about the ―origin of species,‖ the origins of stars, and the role of DNA in shaping our physical and psychological characteristics. Only a fanatic would argue that Earth is the center of the universe. But we still find that occasionally the scientific narrative falls short. Many of us feel we must be more than ―star stuff,‖ as Carl Sagan once said (Cosmos, episode 9). And indeed, alongside all the great astronomical discoveries, from Galileo, Kepler, and Newton, to William Herschel, to Einstein and Hubble, poets have attempted to satisfy our desire to fill in the gaps that science has left us in our cosmological model. **The vestige of dualist metaphysics still exists in our popular understanding, even if it was parceled out from the church‘s holdings long ago, and even if the academic and artistic discourse communities have completely disassembled it.** Ideas don‘t change overnight. The pervasiveness of that duality in our thinking is the backbone of this comparison between scientific and poetic ontologies, which have evolved together as two stars in a binary system. One of Galileo‘s attackers, Jesuit mathematics professor Orazio Grassi, wrote, ―Even with his telescope, the lynx-eyed astrologer [Galileo] cannot look into the inner thoughts of the mind‖ (Reston 181). His use of the word ―astrologer‖ is a slight that implies that astronomy, a science, is the domain of the church and that Galileo‘s business is not serious work. We know who we side with today. Even the Church would disagree with Grassi today. But did Grassi have a point? The lexical and ontological distance between astronomical discourse and the language of poetry seems at first to support his snub against Galileo, at least objectively, but Catholicdoctrine is not the answer. Nor is poetry. These are ontological salves which work similarly in that they construct a discourse community and a sense of meaning. Science provides, for me at any rate, a more agreeable, secular vocabulary for describing the world, but we cannot explain all our experiences with science. Science even has a word for the experiences that are neurologically elusive: qualia. But even when science creates new vocabulary to signify ever more obscure phenomena, its ontology, as constructed by its discourse, is infinite (like that of any given academic discipline). Science uses the word ―qualia‖ to describe phenomena that are not otherwise quantifiable or otherwise communicable as phenomena in the conscious experience of humans, just as medicine uses the term ―idiopathic‖ to describe medical phenomena that have not yet been worked out by researchers, and just as astronomy uses the term ―dark matter‖ to describe material in the universe whose presence is known but whose physical makeup is unknown. We find all the time that we got something wrong and have to revise. One might think that art, like poetry, is an attempt to fill in those gaps, but it turns out that art too cannot be seen as value-free. So Grassi was right in one thing: **no single discourse can satisfy all our questions about who and what we are. This paper is even a testament to the fact that we‘re still working it out. But the goal for me, like the holistic thinkers whose work has inspired my research, is to work out a narrative that reduces the power relationships between global citizens, and not simply within discourse communities whose discourses might be used to take advantage of those who are not in the know.**

#### **Reducing relationality to land to that of an external commodity necessitates the anthropocentric deadening of being.**

**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) matt

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, ovepping 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.

#### **Western biocentrism taints the affirmative understanding of death through the imposition of a colonial worldview 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) matt

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.

#### **Reject the 1AC as a continuation of an Earth Centered Conscientization that reestablishes a personal relationship 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.**

**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) matt

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, Nethends, 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.

### **2**

**Framing**

#### **Interpretation – The affirmative must justify the ethicality of their representations. If we prove that the discourse they use to convey their research normalizes orientalist violence you can conclude that their representations are immoral. Prefer our Framework:**

#### **Ethicality: Representations have an immediate effect on how we understand oriental and indigenous cultures. If we see China as an irrational monster, that view remains anchored to us once we leave debate.**

#### **Sequencing: Evaluating ethicality of representations is a prerequisite to determining if the policy outcome is good. The way we discuss the plan determines if we can make it happen.**

#### **Policy Failure: The plan never happens after one debate but discussing policy from an orientalist perspective materializes hostile policies such as proxy wars, sanctions, blockades, and first strikes.**

#### **Fairness: How we represent our research with discourse is a part of affirming the resolution, making a critique of reps predictable.**

**Reality is constructed by our discursively-shaped understandings and continues to be influenced by it.**

**Chia 2K** (Robert Chia, University of Essex, UK, 2000, accessed on 2-24-2022, "Discourse Analysis as Organizational Analysis", Robert Chia is Research Professor of Management at the University of Glasgow Adam Smith Business School. PhD in Organization Studies, MA in Organizational Analysis, Diploma in Training and Development Management, Diploma in Mechanical Engineering <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.457.2745&rep=rep1&type=pdf>) matt

The question of discourse, and the manner in which it shapes our epistemology and understanding of organization, are central to an expanded realm of organizational analysis. It is one which recognizes that the modern world we live in and the social artefacts we rely upon to successfully negotiate our way through life, are always already institutionalized effects of primary organizational impulses. Social objects and phenomena such as **‘the organization’, ‘the economy’, ‘the market’ or even ‘stakeholders’ or ‘the weather’, do not have a straightforward and unproblematic existence independent of our discursively-shaped understandings.** Instead, they have to be forcibly carved out of the undifferentiated flux of raw experience and conceptually fixed and labelled so that they can become the common currency for communicational exchanges. Modern social reality, with its all-too-familiar features, has to be continually constructed and sustained through such aggregative discursive acts of reality-construction. The idea that reality, as we know it, is socially constructed, has become an accepted truth. What is less commonly understood is how this reality gets constructed in the first place and what sustains it. For the philosopher William James, our social reality is always already an abstraction. Our lifeworld is an undifferentiated flux of fleeting sense-impressions and it is out of this brute aboriginal flux of lived experience that attention carves out and conception names: . . . in the sky ‘constellations’, on earth ‘beach’, ‘sea’, ‘cliff’, ‘bushes’, ‘grass’. Out of time we cut ‘days’ and ‘nights’, ‘summers’ and ‘winters’. We say what each part of the sensible continuum is, and all these abstract whats are concepts. (James, 1948: 50, emphasis original) It is through this process of differentiating, fixing, naming, labelling, classifying and relating—all intrinsic processes of discursive organization—that social reality is systematically constructed. Discourse, as multitudinal and heterogeneous forms of material inscriptions or verbal utterances occurring in space–time, is what aggregatively produces a particular version of social reality to the exclusion of other possible worlds. It is therefore inappropriate to think of ‘organizational discourse’, for **instance, as discourse about some pre-existing, thing-like social object called ‘the organization’. To do so is to commit what the mathematician-turned-philosopher Alfred North Whitehead (1926/1985) called the ‘Fallacy of Misplaced Concreteness’ (p. 64) whereby our socially constructed conceptions of reality** are unreflexively mistaken for reality itself. It is this fallacy which has led to either the rejection of the study of discourse as being inappropriate to organizational analysis, or the more popular formulation of ‘Organizational Discourse’ as discourse about organizations or about what goes on within organizations. Both claims miss the true significance of discourse analysis as a central feature of organizational analysis. Such formulations miss the essential point that discourse acts at a far more constitutive level to form social objects such as ‘organizations’ by circumscribing selected parts of the flux of phenomenal experiences and fixing their identity so that it becomes possible to talk about them as if they were naturally existing social entities. This ‘entitative’ form of thinking, which is widespread in organizational theorizing, conveniently forgets the fact that organizational action is first and foremost an ontological activity. Viewed from this perspective, the apparent solidity of social phenomena such as ‘the organization’ derives from the stabilizing effects of generic discursive processes rather than from the presence of independently existing concrete entities. In other words, phrases such as ‘the organization’ do not refer to an extra-linguistic reality. Instead they are conceptualized abstractions to which it has become habitual for us to refer as independently existing ‘things’. ‘Organizational Discourse’, therefore, must be understood, not in the narrow sense previously discussed, but in its wider ontological sense as the bringing into existence of an ‘organized’ or stabilized state. **Discourse works to create some sense of stability, order and predictability and to thereby produce a sustainable, functioning and liveable world from what would otherwise be an amorphous, fluxing and undifferentiated reality indifferent to our causes**. This it does through the material inscriptions and utterances that form the basis of language and representation. Through the regularizing and routinization of social exchanges, the formation and institutionalization of codes of behaviour, rules, procedures and practices and so on, the organizational world that we have come to inhabit acquires its apparent externality, objectivity and structure. The study of organizational discourse, and the way it shapes our habits of thought, by legitimizing particular objects of knowledge and influencing our epistemological preferences, is crucial for a deeper appreciation of the underlying motivational forces shaping the decisional priorities of both organizational theorists and practitioners alike. For, by organizing our preferred modes of thought, organizational discourse works as a relatively unconscious force to restrict vision and to thereby inhibit the exploration of genuinely alternative modes of conception and action. But since language itself, as a form of discourse, is quintessentially a modern method for organizing thought, we can only begin to fully appreciate the fundamental character of organization by first examining the workings of language itself. Thus, the formation of discursive modalities, the legitimating of objects of knowledge and the shaping of meanings and their attachment to social objects all form part of that wider organizational concern which we call ‘discourse analysis’, and which we argue here is a legitimate form of organizational analysis in the wider sense defined earlier. Since language is that prevailing means for codifying and hence rendering ‘articulable’ that realm of sense-experience which actively resists codification and representation, it must logically be our first port of call in our search for a deeper understanding of the meaning and effect of discourse as organization. But this poses a problem since we can only use language to express our understanding of the organizational character of language itself. As such, the study of discourse as organization needs to be approached elliptically rather than in the traditional direct and assertive manner. We need to begin by referral to that ‘pristine experience, unwarped by the sophistication of theory’ (Whitehead, 1929: 240) in order to rediscover the meaning and effect of organizational action. This, in turn, demands that we start off with a strategy of analysis which acknowledges the primacy of vagueness or undifferentiatedness as the aboriginal ‘stuff’ of reality. The long-held Aristotelian belief that language in general and linguistic categories in particular are fully adequate to the task of describing reality as it is in itself must be set aside if we are to begin to fully appreciate the workings of discourse as organization. By way of a kind of metaphorical explanation, Hans Holbein the Younger’s The Ambassadors, which was painted in 1533, provides a convenient leitmotif for the kind of oblique strategy required for approaching this ontological issue of organizational discourse. The painting depicts two finely clad gentlemen in traditional ambassadorial attire standing on either side of a display shelf containing books, scrolls, the globe, geometrical instruments, musical instruments and so forth. The two figures appear frozen, stiffened in their magnificent adornment. In front, cutting diagonally across the painting, as if put there as an afterthought, is a strange, oblique and unidentifiable object which interrupts and distracts our attention from the main contents of the painting. This painting has aroused endless controversies regarding its meaning and significance. One explanation which has been offered (Lacan, 1979: 92) and which suits our illustrative purpose here is that the ‘ambassadors’ are not ambassadors in the ordinary sense. Instead, the artefacts displayed suggests that the artist intended them to represent the triumph and vanity of formal, scientific knowledge. These are ambassadors of the Enlightenment. There is, however, the odd-shaped figure in the front which interrupts our visual field. The interesting thing about this particular unidentifiable object is that it can only be seen obliquely by positioning oneself at an angle of about twenty seven degrees from the surface of the painting. At this position, the object becomes immediately recognizable as a human skull. It is what, in art, is called an anamorphic figure. It cannot be seen frontally, but only from a side glance. The significance of the anamorphic skull cutting across the triumphal achievements of order, rationality and progress is a reminder that beneath all these achievements lie the murky depths of the unknown, the uncertain and the unpredictable. There is an intrinsic and essential vagueness which haunts our every achievement and which refuses to go away. This is the undifferentiated flux of our pre-linguistic experience. And it is out of this undifferentiated potentiality that discourse acts to produce the pattern of regularities that constitutes what we call organization. The claim that discourse is essentially performative is indisputable. We need discourse to order our world and to make it more predictable and hence more liveable. Yet, beneath this appearance of organizational orderliness lie material resistances which we have to constantly find ways of temporarily overcoming. These are areas of our pure experiences which language and discourse are not able to reach. It is this vague awareness which circumscribes our every attempt at organization.

### **Case**

#### **Their depiction of China as a sophisticated and sinister entity that is prone to violence reinforces a paradigmatic discourse of techno orientalism. Asian States and Economies are presumed inhuman due to a lack of modern values endemic to Western States.**

**Bergsten 20** (Lisa Bergsten, Thesis, 30 ECTS (hp) Political Science with a focus on Crisis Management and Security Master’s Programme in Politics and War, Swedish Defence University Autumn 2020 Supervisor: Ronnie Hjorth"Evil Monsters and Machines A Techno-Orientalist Perspective on Threat Perception in the United Kingdom," \*\*\* Text cut from Pages 3 to 4 in Article https://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1525320/FULLTEXT01.pdf) MC

On the 14th of July 2020, the United Kingdom banned telecom-companies in the country from using Huawei’s 5G technology, with the motivation that this particular technology should be considered a security risk to the national infrastructure (Kelion 2020). In 2020 the British Foreign Policy Group concluded in a research project that 83% of the United Kingdom’s population regard China with distrust – with only Iran and North Korea being more distrusted than China (Gaston 2020). These findings raise some questions – why are the Chinese so distrusted? Why, in particular, is a Chinese company singled out on grounds of national security? How does this fit into the United Kingdom’s current security discourse about China? **What perceptions and prejudices influence and frame the way Western states interpret China as a security threat? This thesis will look at if the Western discourse of China as a security threat is influenced by techno-Orientalism.** **Techno-Orientalism can be defined as “the phenomenon of imagining Asia and Asians in hypo- or hypertechnological terms in cultural productions and political discourse”** (Huang, Niu, and Roh 2015, 2). Another definition comes from Ueno (1999) who defines techno-Orientalism in connection to Orientalism: **Just as the discourse of Orientalism has functioned to build up the identity of the West, techno-orientalism is set up for the West to preserve its identity in its imagination of the future.** It can be defined as the Orientalism of cybersociety and the information age, aimed at maintaining stable identity in a technological environment (Ueno 1999, 95) **Techno-Orientalism is a theoretical perspective which looks at how the West constructs itself by how it constructs what it regards as others, with a specific focus on Asia. It shows how “visions of the purportedly technologically sophisticated economies and people of East Asia [acts] as foils for Western anxieties about the digital or information age**” (Yeats 2015, 126). From a techno-Orientalist perspective, **China is viewed as a treacherous, sinister character, whose main aim is to dominate the world through both the facilitation and the control of technology. This will then lead to an oppressive future for the West** (Huang, Niu, and Roh 2015, 14). This thesis intends to study if and how this perspective is contributing to the construction of China as a security threat in the West. This view of a destructive, evil future is closely tied to ideas about modernity and technology. In the theoretical perspective of techno-Orientalism modernity is not only tied to advanced technology, but also to the West’s liberal values. Thus, **the West’s conceptualisation of China through techno-Orientalism construct China as something other and inhuman due to China’s lack of ‘modern’ values** (Morley and Robins 1995; Huang, Niu, and Roh 2015). I argue that techno-Orientalism as a theoretical perspective will help with our comprehension of the West’s reaction to China, and of how the West perceives China. To be clear, this thesis is not focused on the question if China should be seen as a security threat or not to the West. Rather, it is focused on how the idea of China as a security threat is constructed through techno-orientalist ideas in the West. The scope of this thesis will look at the United Kingdom, which is a Western country that historically has been tied to the creation of an Orientalist discourse to justify colonisation (Said 2003). Orientalism was first theorised specifically in relation to the United Kingdom (UK) and France, and as I do not understand nor speak French, the UK is the natural choice as the basis of analysis for a study about Orientalism. I have also lived in the UK and have a basic understanding of their political system. Thus, this thesis aims to increase our understanding of how China is perceived through techno-Orientalism specifically in the UK – but of course, according to the theoretical perspective used, similar ideas should be found in the Western context when China is being discussed, particularly when it is discussed in connection to technology. A secondary aim is to open up for conversations and ideas about how techno-Orientalism affects the West’s view of China and to bring that perspective into studies of political science and security, and decision-making processes. **I argue that it is important for both researchers and political decision-makers to be aware of their own prejudices, and that this study can shed some light on how this works in a political context regarding China.** Therefore, this thesis focuses on how the British Parliament builds its view of China on techno-orientalist beliefs. I will look at the debates in the parliament which concern China that has taken place between January 2010 – September 2020 and do a discourse analysis to see if there are elements of techno-Orientalism in these discussions. Furthermore, technoOrientalism has primarily been used in connection to technology; I want to see if there are elements or traces of it even in other discussions about security. Based on this the research question this thesis focus on concerns the understanding of why China is seen as a particularly threatening force in the Western, British, imagination. How is the British discourse of China as a security threat influenced by techno-Orientalism?

#### **Orientalism normalizes military violence as an intrinsically therapeutic cure to ‘the Orient’ and ‘the Middle East’ as spaces of disease.**

**Gregory 13** (Derek Gregory Ph.D. FBA, FRSC is a British academic and world-renowned geographer who is currently Peter Wall Distinguished Professor and Professor of Geography at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver , “Dis/Ordering the Orient Scopic Regimes and Modern War**” Orientalism and War Tarak Barkawi and Ketih Stanski** 2013https://oxford-universitypressscholarship-com.libproxy2.usc.edu/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199327782.001.0001/acprof-9780199327782-chapter-8) MC

In many ways the separations of the exhibitionary order—the world as exhibition now mutated into the world as target—have been compromised by visual technologies that both propel and make possible the intimacy of contemporary counterinsurgency. But even as those separations are dissolved they are reinstated; the screen morphs into the sovereign map, ‘our space’ is partitioned from ‘their’ space, and event-ontology reverts to object-ontology. These transformations are reinforced by a metaphoric that reactivates the performances of orientalism in concert with this new techno-cultural apparatus. If orientalism produces ‘the Orient’ as a space of disorder, Euro-American diplomatic and geopolitical discourses have often produced the ‘Middle East’ as a corollary space of disease. From the middle of the nineteenth century the major powers treated the Ottoman Empire as a ‘sick man,’ hemorrhaging territories in an epidemic of disastrous wars, and in the early twentieth century Britain and France joined forces to impose their own ‘cure.’ Sir Mark Sykes, who negotiated the agreement with François-Georges Picot to partition the post-Ottoman Middle East between Britain and France—and evidently no stranger to the performative power of mapping—described their remedy as ‘cutting out the cancer.’68 The metaphor has proved to be remarkably durable, and its rhetorical power has been enhanced through these new, advanced mappings that are so many performances of an intrinsically biopolitical field. Displays like Figure 8.5, for example, are the product of a smoothing algorithm that converts point data into a continuous surface. The technique was used to produce the maps of ethno-sectarian violence in Baghdad displayed by Petraeus in his reports to Congress in September 2007 and April 2008. These maps closely, even deliberately resemble medical scans of the body politic, so that violence is visualized as a series of tumors, and it is no accident that Petraeus described it as ‘a cancer that continues to spread if left unchecked.’69 The same techniques are used to visualize insurgent attacks in Afghanistan, and the same metaphor is deployed. Lt. General William Caldwell, who conducted many of the Press Briefings in Baghdad, now serves in Kabul, and he has provided an astonishing prescription for ‘curing Afghanistan.’ (p.175) In his view, combat operations in Afghanistan should no longer be described ‘in the language of war’; instead Afghanistan should be treated as ‘an ailing patient—in many ways analogous to a weakened person under attack by an aggressive infection.’ Caldwell describes the surge of combat troops and the increase in offensive operations as ‘a late but powerful and much-needed dose of antibiotics’ designed ‘to allow the country’s indigenous immune system to be restored.’ He concedes that, ‘similar to a powerful antibiotic, the use of large numbers of combat troops brings with it side effects that can cause discomfort and pain to the body politic of Afghanistan. The effects range from disruption of civilian day-to-day life to, regrettably, sometimes civilian casualties.’ But Caldwell is adamant that ‘senior NATO commanders seek to minimize civilian casualties and thus apply combat power with restraint and, to the extent possible, surgical precision.’70 Kilcullen had anticipated this bio-medical diagnosis when he described the stages of counterinsurgency as infection, contagion, intervention and rejection. ‘I use a medical analogy advisedly here,’ he explained, to render insurgency in the language of ‘immune systems.’ The oncological metaphor raises the stakes much higher, of course, and licenses even more drastic measures: the Army Field Manual compares counterinsurgents to ‘surgeons cutting out cancerous tissue while keeping other vital organs intact.’71 These are simple models and you might think that in these elementary forms nothing much turns on them. But they matter for two reasons. First, their techno-cultural translation into maps, screens and displays underscores the performative role of what Foucault once called the ‘nomination of the visible.’ **The capacity to produce a target—to detect a ‘tumor’—by rational-scientific means becomes inseparable from a series of truth-claims about the danger posed by the target-tumor. The lexicon has mutated— danger into risk, prevention into pre-emption, detection into destruction— and the tumor has metastasized**: by November 2009 Obama was warning that ‘the cancer is in Pakistan.’ The **aggressive propensity of biopolitics has been aggravated throughout these transformations—the second reason these tropes matter—because they make military violence appear to be intrinsically therapeutic. As the oncological metaphor depoliticizes and pathologizes insurgency,** so it turns counterinsurgency’s kinetic operations on the ground or in the air into chemotherapy—Caldwell’s ‘side-effects’ that can cause ‘discomfort and pain’: killing insurgent cells and sometimes innocent bodies to save the body politic. **Martial biopolitics and military orientalism march in lockstep through spaces of constructed visibility that are also always spaces of constructed invisibility.**

#### **And it turns the case**

**Pan ‘12** (Chengxin, Senior Lecturer in International Politics @ Deakin U., Australia, *Knowledge, Desire and Power in Global Politics: Western Representations of China’s Rise*, p. 105)

If changing Chinese public opinion and Beijing’s growing assertiveness in foreign policy are better understood in the context of mutual responsiveness, then threatening as they may appear, they at least partly reflect the **self-fulfilling effect** of the China threat theory as practice. That is, they are to some extent socially constructed by Western representations of the China threat. At this juncture, we may return to the question raised earlier—What’s the cost of having an enemy? The cost, simply put, is that perceiving China as a threat and acting upon that perception help **bring that feared China threat closer to reality**. Though not an objective description of China, the ‘China threat’ paradigm is no mere fantasy, as it has the **constitutive power to make its prediction come true**. If this China paradigm ends up bearing some resemblance to Chinese reality, it is because the reality is itself partly constituted by it. With US strategic planners continuing to operate on the basis of the China threat, this self-fulfilling process has persisted to the present day. For example, in July 2010, when China objected to the joint USSouth Korean navy exercise in the Yellow Sea to no avail, it announced that its navy would conduct live fire drills in the East China Sea for the duration of the US-South Korean manoeuvres. 129 Meanwhile, a Global Times (a Chinese daily tabloid affiliated with the official People’s Daily) editorial opines that ‘Whatever harm the US military manoeuvre may have inflicted upon the mind of the Chinese, the United States will have to pay for it, sooner or later’.130

#### **The judge has an ethical obligation to reject orientalism. If we prove that the discourse, representations, or research of the affirmative reinforces the system of orientalism the judge can correctively say no to the Aff.**

**Sered 17** (Danielle Sered, currently serves as Executive Director of Common Justice, Published in 1996 but Edited in 2017 TERMS & ISSUES Orientalism <https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/postcolonialstudies/2014/06/21/orientalism/>) MC

Said calls into question the underlying assumptions that form the foundation of Orientalist thinking. **A rejection of Orientalism entails a rejection of biological generalizations, cultural constructions, and racial and religious prejudices. It is a rejection of greed as a primary motivating factor in intellectual pursuit. It is an erasure of the line between ‘the West’ and ‘the Other**.’ Said argues for the use of ‘narrative’ rather than ‘vision’ in interpreting the geographical landscape known as the Orient, meaning that a historian and a scholar would turn not to a panoramic view of half of the globe, but rather to a focused and complex type of history that allows space for the dynamic variety of human experience. Rejection of Orientalist thinking does not entail a denial of the differences between ‘the West’ and ‘the Orient,’ but rather an evaluation of such differences in a more critical and objective fashion. ‘**The Orient’ cannot be studied in a non-Orientalist manner; rather, the scholar is obliged to study more focused and smaller culturally consistent regions. The person who has until now been known as ‘the Oriental’ must be given a voice. Scholarship from afar and second-hand representation must take a back seat to narrative and self-representation on the part of the ‘Oriental.’**

**Plan flaws:**

1. **Musk does not care if something is unjust. XA their own card Silverman 21 below.**
2. **Turn – calling something unjust just makes Musk push it harder. See all his Tweets making fun of Warren and Sanders for asking him to share a small amount of money.**
3. **Turn – only private companies that care about morality are banned by the aff, this just leaves rogue or immoral actors in space.**

**Off the 1-2**

**1. This is only about close encounters not collisions, this proves that collision detection is working.**

**2. Turn this means that it is better to have private groups looking to detect and stop collisions than governments that fail it this. Aff plan stops good actors only.**

**Off their 3**

**this is a massive turn to their plan XA the plan flaws from above**

**Able2Shine reads green.**

**Silverman**, 20**21** – The New Republic Staff Writer

Jacob Silverman is a staff writer at The New Republic and the author of Terms of Service: Social Media and the Price of Constant Connection. “Elon Musk Wants to Move Fast and Break Space”, April 19, 2021, https://newrepublic.com/article/162096/spacex-starlink-satellite-internet-profit-space, accessed 12/5/21, sb//rc matt

**SpaceX has once again followed**

**Musk’s instinct to go it alone.** Starlink has an automated AI avoidance system about which it’s released

few details. Critics have said that an automated system isn’t useful when avoiding collisions requires different

satellite owners or governments cooperating with one another. If your satellite is programmed to move

automatically, how can I anticipate where to send mine without provoking a collision? From unpredictable self-

driving vehicles to rockets strewing debris across Texas wetlands to the increasingly busy sky overhead, the world has become Elon Musk’s test lab. Whether you

believe in Musk’s solar system–altering mission or not, people are experimenting with his products all around you. The risks apply to nearly all of us, while the

rewards will accrue to Musk and his shareholders. Not all blame can be heaped at the fanboy-worshipped feet of Musk. A lack of government investment in new

technologies and public infrastructure has rendered NASA and the space program a shadow of itself. The inclusion of broadband investment in the recent Biden

stimulus package was long overdue. Self-driving car regulations vary by state. Absent meaningful federal action, there’s little to stop Musk from rolling out Tesla’s

autonomous capabilities as a series of incremental patches and upgrades, rather than ensuring that the system is fully tested and secure. In the same way, with

satellites becoming cheaper to launch and easily iterated upon, space is his to do with as he pleases. With SpaceX now launching U.S. government satellites and

ferrying NASA astronauts—the company was recently chosen to return Americans to the moon—it seems as if the U.S. government has picked its winner. Like most

of Elon Musk’s companies, SpaceX/Starlink has benefited enormously from government funding. Last year, the company received $885.5 million in subsidies from

the Federal Communications Commission as part of a program to bring internet access to rural areas. Starlink received about 10 percent of all funding the FCC

distributed this way; the rest of the $9.2 billion was apportioned among 179 other companies, indicating a strong degree of U.S. government support for Musk’s

project. As a professor of aerospace engineering told The Wall Street Journal, **“Musk is just doing what’s legal … but legal is not**

**necessarily safe or sustainable.” But who’s going to stop him?**

**At best they do not solve the worst actor, at worst they hypercharge the problem by only have Musk in LEO with all his toys.**

**Group their cards 4-6**

1. **Accidents don’t cause war. See the Indian missile launch on Friday into Pak that did not**
2. **NonUnique – could also come from the surface.**
3. **Turn- Musk is the real problem, XA plan flaws**
4. **Off card 5 is all a hypothetical scenario and talks about ground tracking checks.**

**Card 7**

1. **China is not the biggest threat, theyre inflating these impacts as a byproduct of orientalism.**
2. **This is a huge Link to orientalism we have read above**

**Card 8-9**

**1. Empirically denied. Tons of collisions and no war already.**

**2. K comes first before this impact.**

**Card 10**

1. **Empirically denied, it has happened and did not cause this.**
2. **The amount of nuclear fuel is small.**
3. **Turn – Only russia uses it. Plan does not solve Russia**

**Card 11**

**Totally false this is not nuclear bombs, more like three mile island, no extinction.**

**Cards 12 and 13**

**1. Ozone and Warming are seperate, they are diff impacts scenarios.**

**2. The hole in Ozone from satellites theory was long ago disproven.**

**3. Small ozone holes heal faster than they form.**

1. **This is all hypothetical has not happened**
2. **The impact assumes total ozone loss, don’t regard it.**
3. **Impact is Non-unique there was less oZone in the 70s and 80s than now**
4. **Alt Cause – New CFC sources are appearing on earth now and do much more damage. The aff doesn’t do crap abt it.**
5. **The west created this problem with AC machines and then blamed China and this is a link to Orientalism**
6. **Turn: Worse in the Aff because it is Starlink and their Card 3 says Musk still launches**

#### **(?) 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) matt

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.

#### **(?) Conflict is caused when settler models of government and population management enter international politics to correct uncivilized and undeveloped states**

**Bell and Schreiner 18** (Colleen Bell, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Faculty Member in Political Studies, University of Saskatchewan, Kendra Schreiner, London School of Economics, “The International Relations of Police Power in Settler Colonialism: The ‘‘civilizing’’ mission of Canada’s Mounties,” Page 125 – 127 International Journal 2018, Vol. 73(1) 111–128  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0020702018768480>, ) MC

Conclusion We have argued that Canada’s Mounties have an older international history than is commonly acknowledged, and certainly older than the RCMP’s mission to Namibia in 1989. As demonstrated, many officers themselves understood their work—especially in the Northern frontier—as an international encounter with Indigenous peoples who understood themselves then, like now, as autonomous nations. Similarly, the work of the Mounties defies clear institutional distinctions between police and military, in part because their work was as much about securing the ‘‘inside’’ as it was about establishing the sovereign status of Canada itself. Not only is our reinterpretation of history inclusive of First Nations and Indigenous accounts of themselves and ‘‘Canada,’’ but it also contributes to contextualization of settler colonialism as a set of international occurrences. Our analysis thus eschews the European Westphalian state as the starting point from which to analyze the ‘‘international.’’ Our analysis shows that in order for theories of international relations to accurately account for key events in international politics, **they must include the colonial dimension**. To develop our argument, we examined three dimensions of police power in international relations historically and with respect to the role of the Mounties specifically. First, we showed that the concept of police power, although initially conceived of in domestic terms, was internationalized following the onset of ideas of civilization. Hence, European ideas of civilization which had initially beenfocused on disorder within, came to furnish British colonial ambitions. We then addressed the role of imperial or colonial policing in the settlement of Canada involving an elaborate array of ‘‘civilizing’’ techniques, many of which are still in operation today in the policing of Indigenous nations and dispossession of their lands. Finally, we connect the Mounties’ role in settler colonialism in Canada to the emergence of a ‘‘Greater Britain,’’ a twentieth-century movement of Anglo-Saxon states who have disproportionately shaped international relations and institutions ever since. Historians of imperialism note that there is no easy separation between the dynamics of power within colonial spaces and imperial homelands. Models of governance and population management in both spheres have proven to have a dynamic cross-fertilization. Hence, domestic policing was not simply turned outwards at particular moments, but the model of colonial policing also informed the development of policing within imperial metropoles. More specifically, this crossfertilization provided ‘‘the model for involvement by British police in peacekeeping and police reform missions in post-colonial and neocolonial situations.’’66 It provided a base of expertise and institutional capability to police in both ‘‘domestic’’ contexts and ‘‘international’’ ones. Likewise, Canada’s role in recent international missions in the global periphery cannot be considered independent of its own internal periphery and the conflict between claims to nationhood and sovereignty. Surprisingly, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau seemed to edge towards recognition of this important connection in a recent appearance at the UN General Assembly in which he highlighted Canada’s mistreatment of Indigenous peoples. Some media outlets regarded his speech as a ‘‘strange inward-looking focus[,] ... a misuse of the UN platform at worst and a missed opportunity at best.’’67 Although government policy that is in line with his words is questionable, the sentiment does reveal a glimmer of recognition that reconciliation with Indigenous nations will never be possible if Canada cannot set the historical record straight. In contrast to former prime minister Stephen Harper’s statement at a 2009 press conference at the G20 that Canada has ‘‘no history of colonialism,’’ Trudeau’s comments are a sign of hope that internationalisms can become more inclusive of Indigenous experiences and perspectives.68 However, imperial policing continues to guide the counterinsurgency strategies deployed in the Global South by a number of Western states, including Canada, the US, and the United Kingdom.69 Counterinsurgency promises to exercise notonly traditional war-fighting techniques, but also strategies of governance and development over the masses, as one solution to insurgency. Although the civilizing discourse that was connected to colonization and imperial policing fell out of use for some time, it has returned as a category of international power with the ‘‘war on terror.’’ From this perspective**, conflict is deemed to be a consequence of underdevelopment and failed governance. In other words, civilizational claims (even if named differently) inform this analysis. And yet such a framing treats conflict and underdevelopment as internal dynamics threatening to emanate outwards, and misses the international politics at work in their making.** Rather than an acceptance of this ‘‘internal’’ framing, what is needed is further analysis on the politics of violence involved in the production of liberal societies and the destruction of non-liberal ones.70 This article makes clear one instance of this political violence, which too often has been ignored in conceptual debates within the discipline of international relations. This study shows that ‘‘the international’’ is not simply restricted to the war and balance of power dynamics among Westphalian sovereign states. Rather, international politics is also evident in the use of force in the making of settler colonial states. Such ‘‘small wars’’ demand that there be more consideration of how the organization of world politics, indeed the contemporary international system of states, is informed by imperialism and hierarchy.71 In addition, this view challenges conventional definitions of war, and begs for further analysis of police power in the use of force internationally. Rather than merely a clash of force between states, war is at the heart of the construction of ‘‘civilization’’—in this case, settler society in Canada. **The arguments presented here challenge us to consider the limits of conceptions of the international that are derived from a set of presuppositions about the existence of Westphalian states or their formation from the perspective of imperial actors. In most cases, these conceptualizations lack attentiveness to sovereignty not simply as a ‘‘fact’’ but as a complex ensemble of living on the land and making claims to it, in the presence of other political communities who might make similar claims.**

#### **(?) Threats of extinction are a white settler-colonialist fantasy that you should ignore in your decision calculus – extinction is only presumed bad because it brings settlers closer to the state of being indigenous who are presumed to be dead or on the verge of death**

**Dalley, 18**

(Hamish, professor at Daemen College, “The deaths of settler colonialism: extinction as a metaphor of decolonization in contemporary settler literature”, Settler Colonial Studies Vol 8 No 1) matt

**Settlers love to contemplate the possibility of their own extinction**; to read many contemporary literary representations of settler colonialism is to find settlers strangely satisfied in dreaming of ends that never come. This tendency is widely prevalent in English-language **representations of settler colonialism** produced since the 1980s: the possibility of an ending – the likelihood that the settler race will one day die out – is a common theme in literary and pop culture considerations of colonialism’s future. **Yet it has barely been remarked how surprising it is that this theme is so present**. For settlers, of all people, to obsessively ruminate on their own finitude is **counterintuitive**, for few modern social formations have been more resistant to change than settler colonialism. With a few exceptions (French Algeria being the largest), the settler societies established in the last 300 years in the Americas, Australasia, and Southern Africa have **all retained the basic features that define them as settler states** – namely, the **structural privileging of settlers** at the expense of indigenous peoples, and **the normalization of whiteness** as the marker of political agency and rights – and they have done so notwithstanding the sustained resistance that has been mounted whenever such an order has been built. Settlers think all the time that they might one day end, even though (perhaps **because**) **that ending seems unlikely ever to happen**. The significance of this paradox for settler-colonial literature is the subject of this article. Considering the problem of futurity offers a **useful foil** to traditional analyses of settlercolonial narrative, which typically examine settlers’ attitudes towards history in order to highlight a constitutive anxiety about the past – about origins. Settler colonialism, the argument goes,

marked

has a problem with historical narration that arises from a contradiction in its founding mythology. In Stephen Turner’s formulation, the settler subject is by definition one who comes from elsewhere but who strives to make this place home. The settlement narrative must explain how this gap – which is at once geographical, historical, and existential – has been bridged, and the settler transformed from outsider into indigene. Yet the transformation must remain constitutively incomplete, because the desire to be at home necessarily invokes the spectre of the native, whose existence (which cannot be disavowed completely because it is needed to define the settler’s difference, superiority, and hence claim to the land) inscribes the settler’s foreignness, thus reinstating the gap between settler and colony that the narrative was meant to efface.1 Settler-colonial narrative is thus shaped around its need to **erase and evoke** the native, to **make the indigene both invisible and present** in a **contradictory pattern** that prevents settlers from ever moving on from the moment o

f colonization.2 As evidence of this constitutive contradiction, critics have identified in settler-colonial discourse symptoms of psychic distress such as disavowal, inversion, and repression.3 Indeed, the frozen temporality of settler-colonial narrative, fixated on the moment of the frontier, recalls nothing so much as Freud’s description of the ‘repetition compulsion’ attending trauma.4 As Lorenzo Veracini puts it, because: ‘settler society’ can thus be seen as a fantasy where a perception of a constant struggle is juxtaposed against an ideal of ‘peace’ that can never be reached, **settler projects embrace and reject violence at the same time.** The settler colonial situation is thus a circumstance where the tension between contradictory impulses produces long-lasting psychic conflicts and a number of associated psychopathologies.5 Current scholarship has thus focused primarily on settler-colonial narrative’s view of the past, asking how such a contradictory and troubled relationship to history might affect present-day ideological formations. Critics have rarely considered what such narratological tensions might produce **when the settler gaze is turned to the future**. Few social formations are more stubbornly resistant to change than settlement, suggesting that a future beyond settler colonialism might be simply unthinkable. Veracini, indeed, suggests that settler-colonial narrative can never contemplate an ending: that settler decolonization is inconceivable because **settlers lack the metaphorical tools to imagine their own demise**.6 This article outlines why I partly disagree with that view. I argue that the narratological paradox that defines settler-colonial narrative does make the future a problematic object of contemplation. But that does not make settler decolonization unthinkable per se; as I will show, settlers do often try to imagine their demise – but they do so in a way that reasserts the paradoxes of their founding ideology, with the result that the radical potentiality of decolonization is undone even as it is invoked. I argue that, notwithstanding Veracini’s analysis, there is a metaphor via which the end of settler colonialism unspools – the quasi-biological concept of extinction, which, when deployed as a narrative trope, offers settlers a chance to consider and disavow their demise, just as they consider and then disavow the violence of their origins. This article traces the importance of the trope of extinction for contemporary settler-colonial literature, with a focus on South Africa, Canada, and Australia. It explores variations in how the death of settler colonialism is conceptualized, drawing a distinction between historio-civilizational narratives of the rise and fall of empires, and a species-oriented notion of extinction that draws force from public anxiety about climate change – an invocation that adds another level of ambivalence by drawing on ‘rational’ fears for the future (because climate change may well render the planet uninhabitable to humans) in order to narrativize a form of social death that, strictly speaking, belongs to a different order of knowledge altogether. As such, my analysis is intended to draw the attention of settlercolonial studies toward futurity and the ambivalence of settler paranoia, while highlighting a potential point of cross-fertilization between settler-colonial and eco-critical approaches to contemporary literature. That ‘**extinction’** should be a key word in the settler-colonial lexicon is **no surprise**. In Patrick Wolfe’s phrase,7 settler colonialism is predicated on a ‘logic of elimination’ that tends towards the extermination – by one means or another – of indigenous peoples.8 This logic is **apparent** in **archetypal** settler narratives like James Fenimore Cooper’s The Last of the Mohicans (1826), a historical novel whose very title blends the melancholia and triumph that demarcate settlers’ affective responses to the supposed inevitability of indigenous extinction. Concepts like ‘stadial development’ – by which societies progress through stages, progressively eliminating earlier social forms – and ‘fatal impact’ – which names the biological inevitability of strong peoples supplanting weak – all contribute to the notion that settler colonialism is a kind of ‘ecological process’ 9 that necessitates the extinction of inferior races. What is surprising, though, is how often the trope of extinction also appears with reference to settlers themselves; it makes sense for settlers to narrate how their presence entails others’ destruction, but it is less clear why their attempts to imagine futures should presume extinction to be their own logical end as well. The idea appears repeatedly in English-language literary treatments of settler colonialism. Consider, for instance, the following rumination on the future of South African settler society, from Olive Schreiner’s 1883 Story of an African Farm: It was one of them, one of those wild old Bushmen, that painted those pictures there. He did not know why he painted but he wanted to make something, so he made these. […] Now the Boers have shot them all, so that we never see a yellow face peeping out among the stones. […] And the wild bucks have gone, and those days, and we are here. But we will be gone soon, and only the stones will lie on, looking at everything like they look now.10 In this example, the narrating settler character, Waldo, recognizes prior indigenous inhabitation but his knowledge comes freighted with an expected sense of biological superiority, made apparent by his description of the ‘Bushman’s’ ‘yellow face’, and lack of mental self-awareness. What is not clear is why Waldo’s contemplation of colonial genocide should turn immediately to the assumption that a similar fate awaits his people as well. A similar presumption of racial vulnerability permeates other late nineteenthcentury novels from the imperial metropole, such as Dracula and War of the Worlds, which are plotted around the prospect of invasions that would see the extinction of British imperialism, and, in the process, the human species. Such anxieties draw energy from a pattern of settler defensiveness that can be observed across numerous settler-colonial contexts. Marilyn Lake’s and Henry Reynold’s account of the emergence of transnational ‘whiteness’ highlights the paradoxical fact that while white male settlers have been arguably the most privileged class in history, they have routinely perceived themselves to be ‘under siege’, threatened with destruction to the extent that their very identity of ‘whiteness was born in the apprehension of imminent loss’. 11 The fear of looming annihilation serves a powerful ideological function in settler communities, **working to** foster racial solidarity, **suppress dissent, and legitimate violence against indigenous populations who,** by any objective measure, **are far more at risk of extermination than the settlers** who fear them. Ann Curthoys and Dirk Moses have traced this pattern in Australia and Israel-Palestine, respectively.12 This scholarship suggests that narratives of settler extinction are acts of **ideological mystification**, **obscuring** the brutal inequalities of the frontier **behind a mask of white vulnerability** – an argument with which I sympathize. However, this article shows how there is more to settler-colonial extinction narratives than bad faith. I argue that we need a more nuanced understanding of how they encode a specifically **settler-colonial framework for imagining the future**, one that has implications for how we understand contemporary literatures from settler societies, and which allows us to see extinction as a genuine, if flawed, attempt to envisage social change. In the remainder of this paper I consider extinction’s function as a metaphor of decolonization. I use this phrase to invoke, without completely endorsing, Tuck and Yang’s argument that to treat decolonization figuratively, as I argue extinction narratives do, is necessarily to preclude radical change, creating opportunities for settler ‘moves to innocence’ that re-legitimate racial inequality.13 The counterview to this pessimistic perspective is offered by Veracini, who suggests that progressive change to settler-colonial relationships will only happen if narratives can be found that make decolonization thinkable.14 This article enters the debate between these two perspectives by asking what it means for settler writers to imagine the future via the trope of extinction. Does extinction offer a meaningful way to think about ending settler colonialism, or does it re-activate settler-colonial patterns of thought that allow exclusionary social structures to persist?

#### **(?) Turns the case – Their view of space as an external object makes militarization inevitable and creates a state of permanent war**

**Dickens and Ormrod 16** [(Peter Dickens, Senior Research Associate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Cambridge, member of the Red-Green Study Group in London, James S Ormrod, Principal Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton), “The Future of Outer Space”, *The Palgrave Handbook of Society, Culture and Outer Space*]

This continued relationship was not coincidental. As a number of contributions here show, the appeal of outer space lay in the promise of conquering the wondrous or Godly and hence **the elevation of the status of humanity** (or, rather more specifically, white men). This is not necessarily that dissimilar to the process Sims describes in his chapter, whereby myths ‘record time’. Ormrod illustrates this in his chapter through analysis of Tsiolkovsky’s science fiction in which the best human beings are able to fly like angels in space. As Kilgore notes in his chapter, Carl Sagan owed his continued appeal to his simultaneous reproduction of wonder as well as knowledge. The British celebrity cosmologist Brian Cox (see Mellor, this volume, for more on him) has arguably taken this even further, such that his popular shows and writing dedicate more time to what is unknown than to knowledge itself. These lacunae became spaces for wild imaginative projects – projects more captivating than any empirical knowledge. It is no wonder that the continued disenchantment and re-enchantment of the universe have become a major theme in recent work. Based largely on studies of astronauts’ experiences, Kilbryde (2015) argues that space exploration can potentially be a means of overcoming the dualism through which outer space is constructed as an object, and thus of experiencing unity. This is provided that the sense of awe and wonder it engenders is not sought as a ‘possession’ of the individual or as something to be subsequently rationalized.

It is the invocation of obstacles that produces space as something potentially unconquerable, and hence worth conquering. And yet the obliteration of the irrational or wondrous sweeps the ground from underneath such a project. To the extent that outer space has become an abstract space, it has been foreclosed as a frontier. It is a frontier, but a frontier without a future. In removing the possibility of an elsewhere, it serves only to secure terrestrial hegemony. In their own ways, both Baudrillard and Virilio present such a view of outer space. For Baudrillard, it was in any case a frontier that served as **a model for terrestrial life**, which set the permissible limits for struggle and confrontation within it. He concludes,

Through the orbital inscription of a spatial object, **it is the planet earth that becomes a satellite**, it is the terrestrial principle of reality that becomes eccentric, hyperreal, and insignificant. Through the orbital installation of a system of control like peaceful coexistence, **all the terrestrial microsystems are** satellized **and lose their autonomy**. (p. 35)

Everyone on Earth is neutralized and homogenized. The proliferation of space technology since he was writing, and the blurring of civilian and military technologies, has only broadened the potential of such an understanding. Parks and Schwoch (2012, p. 4), in the context of the ‘satellization’ of global security, refer to the satellites as ‘the ultimate rationalization and instrumentalization of the quest for global security and domination’.

For Virilio, there was such **a homology between the technologies of war, the image of space as a battlefield and the political discourses about space** that the future seemed equally foreclosed. He makes the claim that any space is constituted ‘from the outside’ (cited in Bormann, 2009, p. 80). That is to say, it is perceived on the basis of that which precedes it. Bormann is therefore able to argue that ‘nothing about outer space is “out there”, what we get to know about outer space is always socially, spatially and locally embedded’ (p. 80). Bormann, following Virilio, seems to believe that this is especially true of the vacuum of outer space:

[O]ther than the view there is no physical or physiological contact. No hearing, no feeling in the sense of touching materials, with the exception of an actual Moon landing. Thus the conquest of space, of outer space – isn’t it more the conquest of the image of space?

(Virilio & Ujica, 2003, cited in Bormann, 2009, p. 84)

Bormann reaches the pessimistic conclusion that **‘the perpetuation of outer space as a sphere of permanent war and its claims to weaponization will soon make no alternative possible’** (p. 84). This is the product, in the large part, of her assumption that ‘[w]hat we get to know about the space of outer space is dominated by information provided through the possibilities (and limits) of military technology’ (p. 81).