#### The gratuitous violence of Black and Indigenous women demands the mutilation of nonhuman flesh to create intelligibility for the conquistador human within modernity. King:

**Tiffany Lethabo King, The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2019, (HTE)**

The triadic model is echoed in Spiller’s text canonical “Mama’s Baby, Papa’s Maybe” (1987). As Spillers plots the unfolding of an economy of signification in which the captive emerges through a series of mutilations, she also focuses on the time-space of the “socio-political order of the New World.”50 **This socio-political “order[,] with its human sequence written in blood, represents for its African and Indigenous peoples a scene of actual mutilation , dismemberment, and exile.”51 The human and its “sequence,” or repition and arrangement for its continuance, is a mode of being that requires genocide, mutilation, displacement, and the negation of Black and Indigenous peoples and their ways of living.** Conquest is constituted by a violence formidable enough to encompass both chattel slavery and Native genocide as it extends across Spillers’s, Wynter’s, and Gilroy’s Atlantic. While Spillers does not explicitly take on Native genocide in the essay, a reparative reading could view this text as a possible point of departure for thinking about Blackness and Indigeneity (as flesh) in relationship to the human’s process of self-actualization.52 Black and Native flesh is certainly a space of engagement in the work of Frank Wilderson, who also uses a triadic frame (Red, White, and Black), reworks and alters Spillers’s conceptualization of flesh to elaborate on how the making of **the human requires the unmaking of Black and Native bodies into nonhuman matter. Wilderson’s nontraditional deployment of Spiller’s “body” and “flesh” engenders the human with a body. Conversely, the nonhuman (slave and savage) is fleshy matter that exists outside the realm of the body and, thus, humanity.53 Perhaps because flesh both exists outside the entrapments of humanism and moves (and is touched) through the experience of captivity,** Wilderson reads “flesh” as an experience that is also a part of the hold. Like Wilderson, I stretch the meaning of Spillers’s flesh beyond the more conventional reading that posits the body as captive and **the flesh as the pre-ontological** and liberated **space outside of enslavement**. I read Spillers’s flesh as a not-yet form of Black freedom that exists in the immanence of slavery (and anti-Black violence) and not only in the transcendence of/or before slavery and its afterlife.54 The flesh is a form of (Spillerian) Black life that finds liberation in the freedom of having “nothing to prove.”54 Similarly, under the political economic worldview, Wilderson argues that the Native is ontologically rendered nonhuman “flesh.” The Black /slave is rendered nonhuman flesh under both “political” and “libidinal” economies. Although Wilderson does not identify Black and Native bodies as ontological equivalents, Native (the savage’s) and Black.(the Black’s) grammars of suffering do share the urgent concerns of the flesh. Wilderson sets forth the conditions of possibility that could result in the making of Black and Native flesh: The Middle Passage turns for example Ashanti spatial and temporal capacity into spatial and temporal incapacity — a body into flesh. This process begins as early as the 1200s for the Slave. **By the 1530s, modernity is more self-conscious of its coordinates, and Whiteness begins its ontological consolidation and negative knowledge of itself by turning (part of ) the Aztec body, for example into Indian flesh.** In this moment the White body completes itself and proceeds to lay the groundwork for the intra-Settler ensemble of questions foundational to its ethical dilemmas (i.e., Marxism, feminism, psychoanalysis). In the final analysis, **Settler ontology is guaranteed by way of negative knowledge of what it is not rather than by way of its positive claims of what it is.56** In exploring the set of negations at work in the making of the human, Wilderson momentarily identifies a moment of interlocution for which, I argue, the discourse of conquest, and its production of flesh, serves as passage. When speaking in terms of the flesh, a space of possible dialogue emerges under rare conditions in which Wilderson argues that **the “genocidal modality of the ‘Savage’ grammar of suffering articulate[s] itself quite well within the two modalities of the ‘Slave's’ grammar of suffering, accumulation and fungibility.”57** For Wilderson, both of these grammars of sulcon made available by humanism, of which, I argue later, the field of White settler colonial studies is part. **It is virtually impossible for the Native or also Black to speak through registers of intelligibility that are predicated on their very deathlike settlement, space, and labor** (see chapter 3)**. Native feminisms theorizations of conquest, genocide, imperialism, and colonialism linger in fleshy matters of death in ways that draw attention to the limitations of causal models** that reduce colonialism to Marxian discussions of labor, space, and even settlement. **Within Native feminism, one finds another unflinching interrogation of how the conquistador human produces flesh.” Flesh in the form of the “scalp,” “the squaw,” and the Indigenous woman’s womb becomes space that confronts the violence of murder and conquest every day. The flesh and the violence of making flesh is a grammatical system that circulates within both Native feminist decolonial thought and Black studies**.°8 **Through the contemporary age, Native women’s political campaigns and struggles, such as the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women movement, have had to contend with the ways that Native and Indigenous women, as well as Two Spirit and trans people, are rendered “flesh.**”5® In 2014, Marlene Bird of Saskatchewan was beaten, sexually assaulted, and set on fire by her male assailant, Leslie Black. The court transcript reveals that after Black set Bird on fire, he walked to the 7-Eleven convenience store, bought candy, and then walked back past Bird as she lay burning on the ground.® In February 2018, the White man who allegedly murdered and dumped the body of fifteen-year- old Tina Fontaine in the Red River in Winnipeg, Manitoba, was acquitted of all charges, even though he was heard implicating himself in her murder in police recordings. The report Red River Women by the British Broad- casting Corporation (BBC) tells grisly tales of the severed limbs (arms and legs) of the Native women who have been murdered in Winnipeg.” Native feminist thought, speech, and action must always speak back to the gratuitous violence that is perpetrated against Native women to render them flesh. Attending to the lingua franca of conquest and flesh will enable a different perspective from which to attend to the ways that Black and Native studies continue to be in conversation about and struggle against the project of the human.

#### Our ontological, epistemic, and ethical views of the world are built from, interwoven with, and inseparable from the creation and destruction of “indianness”. Their re-orienting of the subject will always be done on native ground. Byrd:

**Jodi Byrd in 2011. The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism, University of Minnesota Press Minneapolis**

This book, on the other hand, is also interested in the quandaries poststructuralism has left us: **the traces of indigenous savagery and “Indianness” that stand a priori prior to theorizations of origin, history, freedom, constraint, and difference.³ These traces of “Indianness” are vitally important to understanding how power and domination have been articulated and practiced by empire, and yet because they are traces, they have often remained deactivated as a point of critical inquiry as theory has transited across disciplines and schools.** Indianness can be felt and intuited as a presence, and yet apprehending it as a process is difficult, if not impossible, precisely because **Indianness has served as the field through which structures have always already been produced.** **Within the matrix of critical theory, Indianness moves not through absence but through reiteration, through meme, as theories circulate and fracture, quote and build. The prior ontological concerns that interpellate Indianness and savagery as ethnographic evidence and example, lamentable and tragic loss, are deferred through repetitions. How we have come to know intimacy, kinship, and identity within an empire born out of settler colonialism is predicated upon discourses of indigenous displacements that remain within the present everydayness of settler colonialism,** even if its constellations have been naturalized by hegemony and even as its oppressive logics are expanded to contain more and more historical experiences. I hope to show through the juridical, cultural, and literary readings within this book that indigenous critical theory provides alternatives to the entanglements of race and colonialism, intimacy and relationship that continue to preoccupy poststructuralist and postcolonial studies**.** The stakes could not be greater, given that currently U.S. empire has manifested its face to the world as a war machine that strips life even as it demands racialized and gendered normativities. The post-/ national rhetorics of grief, homeland, pain, terrorism, and security have given rise to what Judith Butler describes as a process through which the Other be- comes unreal. “The derealization of the ‘Other,’” Butler writes, “means that it is neither alive nor dead, but interminably spectral. The infinite paranoia that imagines the war against terrorism as a war without end will be one that jus- tifies itself endlessly in relation to the spectral infinity of its enemy, regardless of whether or not there are established grounds to suspect the continuing operation of terror cells with violent aims.”4 But this process of derealization that Butler marks in the post-/ grief that swept the United States, one could argue, has been functioning in Atlantic and Pacific “New Worlds” since . As Geonpul scholar Aileen Moreton-Robinson argues, discourses of security are “deployed in response to a perceived threat of invasion and dis- possession from Indigenous people,” and in the process, paranoid patriarchal white sovereignty manages its anxiety over dispossession and threat through a “pathological relationship to indigenous sovereignty.”5 **In the United States, the Indian is the original enemy combatant who cannot be grieved. Within dominant discourses of post-racial identity that depend on the derealization of the Other, desires for amnesty and security from the contradictory and violent occupations of colonialist wars exist in a world where,** as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak points out, **“metropolitan multiculturalism—the latter phase of dominant postcolonialism—pre- comprehends U.S. manifest destiny as transformed asylum for the rest of the world**.”6 As a result, **the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself.** The Transit of Empire, then, might best be understood as a series of preliminary reflections on how ideas of **Indians and Indianness have served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonial- ism enacts itself as settler imperialism at this crucial moment in history when everything appears to be headed towards collapse.**

#### Settler colonialism and anti-Blackness have been sewn into the Universe. The Sun, the Moon, the stars, the plants, and the animals have been subjugated to the world breaking force of conquest. Walker:

**Alice Walker in 1982. "Only Justice Can Stop a Curse | Reimagine!." *Reimaginerpe.org*. n.d. Web. 16 Oct. 2019. <**[**https://www.reimaginerpe.org/node/946**](https://www.reimaginerpe.org/node/946)**> Q//H**

**This is a curse-prayer** that Zora Neale Hurston, novelist and anthropologist, collected in the 1920s. And by then it was already old. I have often marveled at it. At **the precision of its anger, the absoluteness of its bitterness**. Its utter hatred of the enemies it condemns. It is a curse-prayer by a person who would readily, almost happily, commit suicide, if it meant her enemies would also die. Horribly**. I am sure it was a woman who first prayed this curse. And I see her - Black,** Yellow, Brown or Red, "aboriginal" as the Ancients are called in South Africa and Australia and other **lands invaded, expropriated and occupied by whites**. And I think, with astonishment, that the curse-prayer of this colored woman—starved, enslaved, humiliated and carelessly trampled to death—over centuries, is coming to pass. Indeed, **like ancient peoples of color the world over, who have tried to tell the white man of the destruction that would inevitably follow from the uranium mining plunder of their sacred lands, this woman—along with millions and billions of obliterated sisters, brothers and children—seems to have put such enormous energy into her hope for revenge, that her curse seems close to bringing it about**. And it is this hope for revenge, finally, I think, that is at the heart of People of Color's resistance to any anti-nuclear movement. In any case, this has been my own problem. When I have considered the enormity of the white man's crimes against humanity. Against women. Against every living person of color. Against the poor. Against my mother and my father. Against me . . . . When I consider that at this very moment he wishes to take away what little freedom I have died to achieve., through denial of my right to vote . . . . Has already taken away education, medicine, housing and food. . . . That William Shockley is saying at this moment that he will run for the Senate of my country to push his theory that Blacks are genetically inferior and should be sterilized. . . . When I consider that he is, they are, a real and present threat to my life and the life of my daughter, my people, I think - in perfect harmony with my sisters of long ago**: Let the earth marinate in poisons. Let the bombs cover the ground like rain. For nothing short of total destruction will ever teach them anything. And it would be good, perhaps, to put an end to the species in any case, rather than let the white man continue to subjugate it, and continue to let their lust dominate, exploit and despoil not just our planet, but the rest of the universe, which is their clear and oft-stated intention; leaving their arrogance and litter not just on the moon, but on everything they can reach. If we have any true love for the stars, planets, the rest of Creation, we must do everything we can to keep white man away from them. They who have appointed themselves our representatives to the rest of the universe. They who have never met any new creature without exploiting, abusing, and destroying it**. They who say we poor and colored and female and elderly blight neighborhoods, while they blight worlds**. What they have done to the Old, they will do to the New. Under the white man every star would become a South Africa, every planet a Vietnam**. Fatally irradiating ourselves may in fact be the only way to save others from what Earth has already become. And this is a consideration that I believe requires some serious thought from every one of us. **However, just as the sun shines on the godly and the ungodly alike, so does nuclear radiation**. **And with this knowledge it becomes increasingly difficult to embrace the thought of extinction purely for the assumed satisfaction of—from the grave—achieving revenge. Or even of accepting our demise as a planet as a simple and just preventative medicine administered to the universe. Life is better than death, I believe, if only because it is less boring, and because it has fresh peaches in it. In any case, Earth is my home—though for centuries white people have tried to convince me I have no right to exist, except in the dirtiest, darkest corners of the globe. So let me tell you: I intend to protect my home. Praying—not a curse—only the hope that my courage will not fail my love. But if by some miracle, and all our struggle, the earth is spared, only justice to every living thing (and everything alive) will save humankind. And we are not saved yet. Only justice can stop a curse.**

#### C**ome to a deeper understanding** of the ways our identities and the spaces that we occupy are made up of violence — violences that can’t be understood, articulated, reconciled, or redeemed.

#### Now affirm:

#### The settler continually consolidates itself on Earth and its endless violence by reaching out and taking the Universe. This reifies settler colonial logics of property rights, *terra nullius,* military hegemony, rhetorical imperialism, and indigenous destruction. Smiles:

**Deondre Smiles in 2020. The Settler Logics of (Outer) Space.** [**https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space**](https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space)

To most scholars, and certainly to the virtual majority of Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island, it is no secret that the country we call the United States of America was built upon the brutal subjugation of Indigenous people and Indigenous lands. Fueled by the American settler myths of terra nullius (no man’s land) and Manifest Destiny, the American settler state proceeded upon a project of cultural and physical genocide, with lasting effects that endure to the present day. The ‘settler myth’ permeates American culture. Words such as ‘pioneer’, the ‘West’, ‘Manifest Destiny’ grab the imagination as connected to the growth of the country in its early history. America sprang forth from a vast open ‘wilderness’. Of course, for Indigenous people, we know differently—these lands had complex cultural frameworks and political entities long before colonization. Words like ‘pioneer’ and ‘Manifest Destiny’, have deep meanings for us too, as they are indicative of the very real damage dealt against our cultures and nations, damage that we have had to work very hard to undo. Trump’s address raises key insights into the continuing logics of settler colonialism, as well as questions of its future trajectories. Trump’s invocation of ideas such as the ‘frontier’ and ‘taming the wilderness’ draws attention to the brutal violence that accompanied the building of the American state. Scholars such as Greg Grandin (2019) make the case that the frontier is part of what America is—whether it is the ‘Wild West’, or the U.S.-Mexican border, America is always contending with a frontier that must be defined.  Language surrounding ‘frontier’ is troubling because it perpetuates the rationale of why the American settler state even exists—it could make better use of the land than Native people would, after all, they lived in wilderness. This myth tells us that what we know as the modern world was built through the hard work of European settlers; Indigenous people had nothing to offer or contribute. For someone like Mr. Trump, whose misgivings and hostility towards Native people have been historically documented, this myth fits well with his narrative as President—he is building a ‘new’ America, one that will return to its place of power and influence. The fact that similar language is being used around the potential of American power being extended to space could reasonably be expected, given the economic and military potential that comes from such a move. **Space represents yet another ‘unknown’ to be conquered and bent to America’s will.** However, such **interplanetary conquest does not exist solely in outer space**. **I wish to situate the very real colonial legacies and violence associated with the desire to explore space, tracing the ways that they are perpetuated and reified through their destructive engagements with Indigenous peoples. I argue that a scientific venture such as space exploration does not exist in a vacuum, but instead draws from settler colonialism and feeds back into it through the prioritization of ‘science’ over Indigenous epistemologies**. I begin by exploring the ways that space exploration by the American settler state is situated within questions of hegemony, imperialism, and terra nullius, including a brief synopsis of the controversy surrounding the planned construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea. I conclude by exploring Indigenous engagement with ‘space’ in both its Earthbound and beyond-earth forms as it relates to outer space, and what implications this might have for the ways we think about our engagement with space as the American settler state begins to turn its gaze skyward once again. I position this essay alongside a growing body of academic work, as well as journalistic endeavors (Haskins, 2020; Koren, 2020) that demands that the American settler colonial state exercise self-reflexivity as to why it engages with outer space, and who is advantaged and disadvantaged here on Earth as a result of this engagement. **Settler Colonialism and ‘Space’** A brief exploration of what settler colonialism is, and its engagement with ‘space’ here on Earth is necessary to start. Settler colonialism is commonly understood to be a form of colonialism that is based upon the permanent presence of colonists upon land. This is a distinction from forms of colonialism based upon resource extraction (Wolfe, 2006; Veracini, 2013). What this means is that the settler colony is intimately tied with the space within which it exists—it cannot exist or sustain itself without settler control over land and space. This permanent presence upon land by ‘settlers’ is usually at the expense of the Indigenous, or original people, in a given space or territory. To reiterate: control over space is paramount. As Wolfe states, “**Land is life—or at least, land is necessary for life. Thus, contests for land can be—indeed, often are—contests for life**” (2006: 387).  **Without land, the settler state ‘dies’; conversely, deprivation of land from the indigenous population means that in settler logic, indigeneity dies** (Povinelli, 2002; Wolfe, 2006.) The ultimate aims of settler colonialism is therefore the occupation and remaking of space. As Wolfe (2006) describes, **the settler state seeks to make use of** land and **resources in order to continue** on; **whether that is through** homesteading/**residence**, farming and agriculture, **mining**, **or any** number of **activities that settler colonial logic deems necessary to its own survival**. **These activities are tied to a racist and hubristic logic that only settler society itself possesses the ability to make proper use of land and space** (Wolfe, 2006). **This is mated with a viewpoint of landscapes prior to European arrival as** terra nullius**, or empty land that was owned by no one, via European/Western conceptions of land ownership and tenure** (Wolfe, 1994). Because of this overarching goal of space, there is an inherent anxiety in settler colonies about space, and how it can be occupied and subsequently rewritten to remove Indigenous presence. In Anglo settler colonies, this often takes place within a lens of conservation. Scholars such as Banivanua Mar (2010), Lannoy (2012), Wright (2014) and Tristan Ahtone (2019) have written extensively on the ways that settler reinscription of space can be extremely damaging to Indigenous people from a lens of ‘conservation’. However, dispossession of Indigenous space in favor of settler uses can also be tied to some of the most destructive forces of our time. For example, Aboriginal land in the Australian Outback was viewed as ‘empty’ land that was turned into weapons ranges where the British military tested nuclear weapons in the 1950s, which directly led to negative health effects upon Aboriginal communities downwind from the testing sites (Vincent, 2010). Indigenous nations in the United States have struggled with environmental damage related to military-industrial exploitation as well. But, what does this all look like in regard to outer space? In order to really understand the potential (settler) colonial logics of space exploration, we must go back and explore the ways in which space exploration became inextricably tied with questions of state hegemony and geopolitics during the Cold War. US and Soviet space programs were born partially out of military utility, and propaganda value—the ability to send a nuclear warhead across a great distance to strike the enemy via a ICBM and the accompanying geopolitical respect that came with such a capability was something that greatly appealed to the superpowers, and when the Soviets took an early lead in the ‘Space Race’ with Sputnik and their Luna probes, the United States poured money and resources into making up ground (Werth, 2004). The fear of not only falling behind the Soviets militarily as well as a perceived loss of prestige in the court of world opinion spurred the US onto a course of space exploration that led to the Apollo moon landings in the late 1960s and the early 70s (Werth, 2004; Cornish, 2019). I argue that this fits neatly into the American settler creation myth referenced by Trump—after ‘conquering’ a continent and bringing it under American dominion, why would the United States stop solely at ‘space’ on Earth? To return to Grandin (2019), **space represented yet another frontier to be conquered and known by the settler colonial state; if not explicitly for the possibility of further settlement, then for the preservation of its existing spatial extent on Earth.** However, scholars such as Alan Marshall (1995) have cautioned that **newer logics of space exploration such as potential resource extraction tie in with existing military logics in a way that creates a new way of thinking about the ‘openness’ of outer space to the logics of empire**, in what Marshall **calls** res nullius (1995: 51)[i].
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Telescopes on Mauna Kea. But we cannot forget the concept of terra nullius and how our **exploration of the stars has real effects on Indigenous landscapes here on Earth**. We also cannot forget about forms of space exploration that may not be explicitly tied to military means. Doing so deprives us of another lens through which to view the tensions between settler and Indigenous views of space and to which end is useful. Indeed, **even** reinscribing of Indigenous space towards **‘peaceful’ settler space exploration have very real consequences for Indigenous sovereignty** and Indigenous spaces. Perhaps the most prominent example of the fractures between settler space exploration and Indigenous peoples is **the on-going** controversy surrounding the **construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea, on the island of Hawaii**. While an extremely detailed description of the processes of construction on the TMT **and the** **opposition presented to it by Native Hawai’ians and their allies** is beyond the scope of this essay, and in fact is already expertly done by a number of scholars[ii], the controversy surrounding **TMT is a prime example of the logics presented towards ‘space’ in both Earth-bound and beyond-Earth contexts by the settler colonial state as well as the violence that these logics place upon Indigenous spaces, such as Mauna Kea, which in particular already plays host to a number of telescopes and observatories (**Witze, 2020). In particular, astronomers such as Chanda Prescod-Weinstein, Lucianne Walkowicz, and others have taken decisive action to push back against the idea that settler scientific advancement via space exploration should take precedence over Indigenous sovereignty in Earth-space. Prescod-Weinstein and Walkowicz, alongside Sarah Tuttle, Brian Nord and Hilding Neilson (2020) make clear that settler scientific pursuits such as building the TMT are simply new footnotes in a long history of colonial disrespect of Indigenous people and Indigenous spaces in the name of science, and that astronomy is not innocent of this disrespect. In fact, Native Hawai’ian scholars such as Iokepa Casumbal-Salazar strike at the heart of the professed neutrality of sciences like astronomy:  One scientist told me that astronomy is a “benign science” because it is based on observation, and that it is universally beneficial because it offers “basic human knowledge” that everyone should know “like human anatomy.” Such a statement underscores the cultural bias within conventional notions of what constitutes the “human” and “knowledge.” In the absence of a critical self-reflection on this inherent ethnocentrism, the tacit claim to universal truth reproduces the cultural supremacy of Western science as self-evident. Here, the needs of astronomers for tall peaks in remote locations supplant the needs of Indigenous communities on whose ancestral territories these observatories are built (2017: 8). As Casumbal-Salazar and other scholars who have written about the TMT and the violence that has been done to Native Hawai’ians (such as police actions designed to dislodge blockades that prevented construction) as well as the potential violence to come such as the construction of the telescope have skillfully said, when it comes to the infringement upon Indigenous space by settler scientific endeavors tied to space exploration, there is no neutrality to be had—dispossession and violence are dispossession and violence, no matter the potential ‘good for humanity’ that might come about through these things. Such contestations over outer space and ethical engagement with previously unknown spaces will continue to happen. Outer space is not the first ‘final frontier’ (apologies to Gene Roddenberry) that has been discussed in settler logics and academic spaces. In terms of settler colonialism, scholars have written about how Antarctica was initially thought of as the ‘perfect’ settler colony—land that could be had without the messy business of pushing Indigenous people off of it (see Howkins 2010). Of course, we know now that engagement with Antarctica should be constrained by ecological concern—who is to say that these concerns will be heeded in ‘unpopulated’ space? What can be done to push back against these settler logics? I want to now turn our attention towards the possibilities that exist regarding Indigenous engagement with outer space.  After all, the timing could not be more urgent to do so—we are now at a point where after generations and generations of building the myth that America was built out of nothing, **we are now ready to resume the project of extending the reach of American military and economic might in space.** To be fair, there are plenty of advances that can be made scientifically with a renewed focus on space exploration. **However, history shows us that space exploration has been historically tied to military hegemony**, and there is nothing in Mr. Trump’s temperament or attitude towards a re-engagement with space that suggest that his push toward the stars will be anything different. A sustained conversation needs to be had—will this exploration be ethical and beneficial to all Americans? One potential avenue of Indigenous involvement comes through the active involvement of Indigenous peoples and Indigenous perspectives in space exploration, of course. This involvement can be possible through viewing outer space through a ‘decolonial’ lens, for instance. Astronomers such as Prescod-Weinstein and Walkowicz have spoken about the need to avoid replicating colonial frameworks of occupation and use of space when exploring places such as Mars, for example (Mandelbaum, 2018). The rise of logics of resource extraction in outer-space bodies have led to engagements by other academics such as Alice Gorman on the agency and personhood of the Moon. Collaborations between Indigenous people and space agencies such as NASA help provide the Indigenous perspective inside space exploration and the information that is gleaned from it, with implications both in space and on a Earth that is dealing with climate crisis (Bean, 2018; Bartels, 2019). Another potential avenue of engagement with Indigenous methodologies and epistemologies related to space comes with engaging with Indigenous thinkers who are already deeply immersed into explorations of Indigenous ‘space’ here on Earth—the recent works of Indigenous thinkers such as Waziyatawin (2008) Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2017), Natchee Blu Barnd (2018) and others provide a unique viewpoint into the ways that Indigenous peoples make and remake space—perhaps this can provide another blueprint for how we might engage with space beyond Earth. And that is just the work that exists within the academic canon. **Indigenous people have always been engaged with the worlds beyond the Earth, in ways that often stood counter to accepted ‘settler’ conventions of space exploration** (Young, 1987). In one example, **when asked about the Moon landings, several Inuit said, "We didn't know this was the first time you white people had been to the moon. Our shamans have been going for years. They go all the time...We do go to visit the moon and moon people all the time. The issue is not whether we go to visit our relatives, but how we treat them and their homeland when we go** (Young, 1987: 272).”In another example, turning to my own people, the Ojibwe, we have long standing cultural connections to the stars that influence storytelling, governance, and religious tenets (CHIN, 2003). This engagement continues through to the present day, and points to a promising future. A new generation of Indigenous artists, filmmakers, and writers are beginning to create works that place the Indigenous individual themselves into narratives of space travel and futurity, unsettling existing settler notions of what our future in space might look like. As Leo Cornum (2015) writes, “**Outer space, perhaps because of its appeal to our sense of endless possibility, has become the imaginative site for re-envisioning how black, indigenous and other oppressed people can relate to each other outside of and despite the colonial gaze.”** These previous examples should serve as a reminder that the historical underpinnings of our great national myth are built upon shaky intellectual ground—we need to be honest about this. America did not just spring forth out of nothing; it came from the brutal occupation and control of Native lands. Despite the best efforts of the settler state, Native people are still here, we still exist and make vital contributions to both our tribal communities and science. We cannot expect Donald Trump to turn his back on the national myth of what made the United States the United States—in his mind, this is the glorious history of what made America great in the past. And it should serve as no surprise that Trump and others wish to extend this history into outer space. Even when Trump’s days in the White House are over, the settler colonial logics that underpin our engagement with land on Earth will still loom large over the ways that we may potentially engage with outer space. But for those of us who do work in Indigenous geographies and Indigenous studies, it becomes even more vital that we heed the calls of Indigenous thinkers inside and outside formal academic structures, validate Indigenous histories, and push to deconstruct the American settler myth and to provide a new way of looking at the stars, especially at a crucial moment where the settler state turns its gaze towards the same.

#### The continual presence of a settler state on this land ensures further genocide. Property and Indians can never coexist. Tuck and Yang: Eve ​Tuck and​, ​State University of New York at New Paltz, K. Wayne ​Yang​, ​University of California, San Diego, http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/ar ticle/view/18630/15554​ Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 20​12​,. Pp. 1-40 (HTE)

Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain.​ ​ ​**Within ​settler colonialism​, the​ most important concern is land/​water/air /subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article.)​** Land is what is most valuable, contested, required. ​**This is both because the ​settlers make Indigenous land their​ new home and ​source of capital, and also because​ the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic,​ ontological​, cosmological ​violence. This violence is ​not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is ​reasserted each day of occupation**​. ​This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that ​**settler colonialism is a structure and not an event. I​n the process of settler colonialism, ​land is remade into property and human relationships to land are restricted to the relationship of the owner to**   
**his property. Epistemological​, ontological​, and cosmological ​relationships to land are​ interred, indeed made pre-modern and backward. ​Made savage**.​ ​In order for the settlers to make a place their home, they must destroy and disappear the Indigenous peoples that live there. Indigenous peoples are those   
who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they came to be in a particular place - indeed how we/they came to be a place. Our/their relationships to land comprise our/their epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies. **​For ​the ​settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way​ and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and ​over time​ and ​through law and policy​, Indigenous peoples’ claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource.​ Indigenous peoples must be ​erased, must be ​made into ghosts​** ​(Tuck and Ree, forthcoming).

#### The role of the judge is to be a decolonial educator.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater with the best understanding of conquest.

#### Colonialism functions in education through rhetorical imperialism, centralizing decolonial framing and discourse is key. Only then are we able to determine nuanced liberation strategies. Grande:

**Grande, Sandy 2015: *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought, Tenth Anniversary Edition* . United States of America. Rowman & Littlefield Publisher Inc. (pp 55-56). Sandy Grande is associate professor and Chair of the Education Department at Connecticut College. Her research interfaces critical Indigenous theories with the concerns of education. In addition to Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought. (HTE)**

**However the question of sovereignty is resolved politically, there will be significant implications on the intellectual lives of indigenous peoples, particularly in terms of education.** Lyons (2000, 452) **views the history of colonization, in part as the manifestation of “rhetorical imperialism,” that is “the ability of dominant powers to assert control of others by setting the terms of the debate.”** He cites, for example, Marhsall’s use of “rhetorical imperialism” in the Worcester v. Georgia opinion: “(T)reaty’ and ‘nation’ are words of our own language, selected in our diplomatic and legislative proceedings…having each a definite and well-understood meaning. We have applied them to Indians, as we have applied them to other nations of the earth. They are applied to all in the same sense” (Lyons 2000, 425). Indeed, through history of federal Indian law terms and definitions have continually changed over time. Indians have gone from ‘sovereign’ to ‘wards’ and from ‘nations’ to ‘tribes,’ while the practice of treaty making has given way to one of agreements (Lyons 2000, 453). **As each change served the needs of the nation-state, Lyons argues that “the erosion of Indian national sovereignty can be credited in part to a rhetorically imperialist use of language by white powers”** (2000, 453). Thus, just language was central to the colonialist project, it must be central to the project of decolonization. Indigenous scholar Haunaini-Kay Trask writes, “Thinking in one’s own cultural referents leads to conceptualizing in one’s own world view which, in turn, leads to disagreement with the eventual opposition to the dominant ideology” (1993, 54). **Thus, where a revolutionary critical pedagogy compels students and educations to question how “knowledge is related historically, culturally and institutionally to the processes of production and consumption,” a Red pedagogy compels students to question how (whitestream) knowledge is related to the process of colonization.** Furthermore, **it asks how traditional indigenous knowledge can inform the project of decolonization**. In short, this implies a threefold process of education. Specifically, a **Red pedagogy necessitates: (1) the subjection of the process of whitestream schooling to critical pedagogical analyses; (2) the decoupling and dethinking of education from its Western, colonialist contexts; and (3) the institution of indigenous efforts to reground students and educations in traditional knowledge and teaching.** In short, a Red Pedagogy aims to create awareness of what Trask terms “disagreements,” helping to foster discontent about the “inconsistencies between the world as it is and as it should be” (Alfred 1999, 132).

#### Refusal is not just a “no,” but a generative process that challenges and interrupts sanctioned modes of protocol and decorum in settler communicative spheres like debate. King 2:

**(Black woman. Tiffany King, Assistant Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies at the Georgia State University “Humans Involved: Lurking in the Lines of Posthumanist Flight” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3, No. 1, pp. 163-170) NIJ**

**Native feminist politics of decolonial refusal and Black feminist abolitionist politics of skepticism informed by a misandry and misanthropic distrust of and animus toward the (over)representation of man/men as the human diverge from the polite, communicative acts of the public sphere**, much like the politics of the “feminist killjoy.”4 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: I use “misandry” (hatred of men) and “misanthropic” (distrust or deep skepticism about humankind or humanity) to illustrate how Sylvia Wynter and other Black scholars attend to the ways that the human— and investments in the human—and its revised forms or genres of the human as woman/feminist still reproduce violent exclusions that make the death of Black and Native people viable and in-evitable. In other words, neither men nor women (as humans) can absorb Black females/males/children/LGBT and trans people into their collective folds. Both the hatred of “misandry” and the distrust and pessimism of “misanthropy” are appropriate methods to describe the inflection of the critique levied by Wynter and the other Black scholars examined in this article. END FOOTNOTE] Throughout this article, I deploy the term “feminist” both ambivalently and strategically to mark and distinguish the scholarly tradition created by Black and Native women, queer, trans, and other people marginalized within these respective communities and their anticolonial and abolitionist movements.5 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See Sylvia Wynter’s afterword, “Beyond Miranda’s Meanings: Un/silencing the ‘Demonic Ground’ of Caliban’s ‘Woman,’” in Out of the Kumbla: Caribbean Women and Literature, ed. Carole Boyce Davies (Chicago, Ill.: Africa World Press, 1990) 355– 72. Wynter warns Black women in the United States and the Caribbean that they need not uncritically embrace womanism as a political position, which can effectively oppose the elisions, racism, and false universalism of white feminism. “Feminism” as well as “womanism” are bounded and exclusive terms that do not effectively throw the category of the human into continual flux. END FOOTENOTE], Until a more useful and legible term emerges, I will use “feminist” to mark the practices of refusal and skepticism (misandry/misanthropy) as ones that largely exist outside more masculinist traditions within Indigenous/Native studies and Black studies. “Decolonial refusal” and “abolitionist skepticism” depart from the kinds of masculinist anticolonial traditions that attempt to reason Native/ Black man to White Man within humanist logic in at least two significant ways. First, **neither participate in the communicative acts of the humanist public sphere from within the terms of the debate. Further, they do not play by the rules**.6 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See the critiques of the anticolonial tradition within Caribbean philosophy articulated by Shona Jackson in her book Creole Indigeneity (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012). Jackson argues that anticolonial Caribbean masculinist philosophy tends to argue from inside the logic of Western philosophy in order to counter it. For instance, in a valorization of the laborer as human and inheritor of the nation-state, Caribbean philosophy tends to reproduce the Hegelian telos of labor as a humanizing agent for the slave, which inadvertently makes the slave a subordinate human and effectively erases the ostensibly “nonlaboring” humanity of Indigenous peoples in the Anglophone Caribbean. END FOOTENOTE] Specifically, the Native and Black “feminist” politics discussed throughout launch a critique of both the logic of the discussion about the human and identity as well as the mode of communication. In fact, **practices of refusal and skepticism interrupt and flout (disregard) codes of civil** and collegial **discursive protocol**  to focus on and illumine the violence that structures the posthumanist discourse. Attending to the comportment, tone, and intensity of an engagement is just as important as focusing on its content. The particular manner in which Black and Native feminists push back against violence is important. The force, break with decorum, and style in which Black and Native feminists confront discursive violence can change the nature of future encounters. Given that Black women who confront the logics of “nonrepresentational theory” are really confronting genocide and the white, whimsical disavowal of Black and Native negation on the way to subjectlessness, it is understandable that there is an equally discordant response. **Refusal and skepticism are modes of engagement that are uncooperative and force an impasse in a discursive exchange.** This article tracks how traditions of “decolonial refusal” and “abolitionist skepticism” that emerge from Native/Indigenous and Black studies expose the limits and violence of contemporary nonidentitarian and nonrepresentational impulses within white “critical” theory. Further, this article asks whether Western forms of nonrepresentational (subjectless and nonidentitarian) theory can truly transcend the human through self- critique, self-abnegation, and masochism alone. **External pressure, specifically the kind of pressure that “decolonial refusal” and “abolitionist skepticism” as forms of resistance** that **enact** outright rejection of or view “posthumanist” attempts with a “hermeneutics of suspicion,”7 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See the work of Black feminists such as Susana M. Morris, author of Close Kin and Distant Relatives: The Paradox of Respectability in Black Women’s Literature (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014), as well as womanist theologians who appropriate the phrase “hermeneutics of suspicion” as coined by Paul Ricoeur to describe the reading and interpretive practices of Black woman who are distrustful of traditional tropes about heteronormativity or conventional ways of thinking about what is natural and normal. Further, in Morris’s case, as well as within the tradition of Black women of faith and theologians, canonical and biblical texts are interpreted through a lens that acknowledges white supremacy and misogyny, and critically challenges racism and sexism (or kyriarchy in Morris’s case). Within Black feminist and womanist traditions, it is **a position** that can recognize the limitations of text and **that refuses to accept the** doctrine, theories, or message of an **ideology wholesale**. END FOOTENOTE] **is needed in order to truly address the recurrent problem of the violence of the human** in continental theory. While this article does not directly stake a claim in embracing or rejecting identity per se, it does take up the category of the human. Because the category of the human is modified by identity in ways that position certain people (white, male, able- bodied) within greater or lesser proximity to humanness, identity is already taken up in this discussion. Conversations about the human are very much tethered to conversations about identity. In the final section, the article will explore how Black and Native/Indigenous absorption into the category of the human would disfigure the category of the human beyond recognition. Engaging how forms of Native decolonization and Black abolition scrutinize the violently exclusive means in which the human has been written and conceived is generative because it sets some workable terms of engagement for interrogating Western and mainstream claims to and disavowals of identity. Rather than answer how Native decolonization and Black abolition construe the human or identity, the article examines how Native and Black feminists use refusal and misandry to question the very systems, institutions, and order of knowledge that secure humanity as an exclusive experience and bound identity in violent ways. I consider the practices and postures of refusal assumed by Native/Indigenous scholars such as Audra Simpson, Eve Tuck, Jodi Byrd, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith to be particularly instructive for exposing the violence of ostensibly nonrepresentational Deleuzoguattarian rhizomes and lines of flight. While reparative readings and “working with what is productive” about Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s work is certainly a part of the Native feminist scholarly tradition, this article focuses on the underexamined ways that Native feminists refuse to entertain certain logics and foundations that actually structure Deleuzoguattarian thought.8 [I thank one of the reviewers, who reminded me that Native feminist thought’s engagement with continental theory, specifically the work of Deleuze and Guattari, can be likened more to “constellations” as it takes up Deleuzoguattarian thought rather than a single point that always departs from a place of refusal. END FOOTENOTE] Further, I discuss “decolonial refusal” in relation to how Black scholars like Sylvia Wynter, Zakiyyah Iman Jackson, and Amber Jamilla Musser work within a Black feminist tradition animated by a kind of skepticism or suspicion capable of ferreting out the trace of the white liberal human within (self-)professed subjectless, futureless, and nonrepresentational white theoretical traditions. In other words, in the work of Sylvia Wynter, one senses a general suspicion and deep distrust of the ability of Western theory— specifically its attempt at self- critique and self- correction in the name of justice for humanity— to revise its cognitive orders to work itself out of its current “closed system,” which reproduces exclusion and structural oppositions based on the negation of the other.9 [INSERT FOOTENOTE: See Katherine McKittrick, “Diachronic Loops/Deadweight Tonnage/Bad Made Measure,” Cultural Geographies 23, no. 1 (2016): 3– 18, doi:10.1177/14744740156 12716, for an exemplary explication of how Sylvia Wynter uses the decolonial scholarship of an “autopoiesis.” END FOOTENOTE] Wynter’s study of decolonial theory and its elaboration of autopoiesis informs her understanding of how the human and its overrepresentation as man emerges. Recognizing that humans (of various genres) write themselves through a “self- perpetuating and self- referencing closed belief system” that often prevents them from seeing or noticing “the process of recursion,” Wynter works to expose these blind spots.10 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See McKittrick, “Diachronic Loops,” in which the author cites the importance of the work of H. Maturana and F. Varela, Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living (London: D. Reidel, 1972), for the study of the human’s process of self- writing. END FOOTNOTE] Wynter understands that one of the limitations of Western liberal thought is that it cannot see itself in the process of writing itself. I observe a similar kind of cynicism about the way the academic left invokes “post humanism” in the work of Jackson and Musser. Musser in particular questions the capacity of queer theories to turn to sensations like masochism within the field of affect studies to overcome the subject. Further, Jackson’s and Musser’s work is skeptical that white transcendence can happen on its own terms or rely solely on its own processes of self-critique and self- correction. I read Jackson’s and Musser’s work as distrustful of the ability for “posthumanism” to be accountable to Black and Indigenous peoples or for affect theory on its own to not replicate and reinforce the subjugation of the other as it moves toward self- annihilation. Both the human and the post human are causes for suspicion within Black studies. Like Wynter, the field of Black studies has consistently made the liberal human an object of study and scrutiny, particularly the nefarious manner in which it violently produces Black existence as other than and at times nonhuman. Wynter’s empirical method of tracking the internal epistemic crises and revolutions of Europe from the outside has functioned as a model for one way that Black studies can unfurl a critique of the human as well as Western modes of thought. I use the terms “misanthropy” and “misandry” in this article to evoke how Black studies has remained attentive to, wary about, and deeply distrustful of the human condition, humankind, and the humanas-man/men in the case of Black “feminists.” Both Black studies’ distrust of the “human” and Black feminism’s distrust of humanism in its version as man/men (which at times seeks to incorporate Black men) relentlessly scrutinize how the category of the human and in this case the “posthuman” reproduce Black death. I link misandry (skepticism of humankind-as-man) to the kind of skepticism and “hermeneutics of suspicion” that Black feminist scholars like Wynter, Jackson, and Musser at times apply to their reading and engagement with revisions to or expansions of the category of the human, posthuman discourses, and nonrepresentational theory In this article, **I connect discursive performance of skepticism to embodied and affective responses I have witnessed in the academy that challenge the sanctioned modes of protocol, politesse, and decorum in the university.** For example, Wynter assumes a critically disinterested posture as she gazes empirically on and examines intra-European epistemic shifts over time. Paget Henry has described Wynter as an anthropologist of the Occident, as Europe becomes an object of study rather than the center of thought and humanity.11 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Paget Henry, Caliban’s Reason: Introducing Afro-Caribbean Philosophy (New York: Routledge, 2002), 19. END FOOTENOTE] Throughout the body of Wynter’s work, she seems to be more interested in drawing our attention to the capacity of European orders of knowledge to shift over time— or their fragility— than in celebrating the progress that European systems of knowledge have claimed to make. Wynter’s tracking is just a tracking and not a celebration of the progress narrative that Western civilization tells about itself and its capacity to define, refine, and recognize new kinds of humanity over time. This comportment of critical disinterest is often read as an affront to the codes and customs of scholarly discourse and dialogue in the academic community, particularly when it is in response to the white thinkers of the Western cannon. **Decolonial refusal and abolitionist skepticism respond to how perverse and reprehensible it is to ask Indigenous and Black people who cannot seem to escape death to** **move beyond** the human or **the desire to be human.** In fact, Black and Indigenous people have never been fully folded into the category of the human. . As Zakiyyah Iman Jackson has argued**, It has largely gone unnoticed by posthumanists that their queries into ontology often find their homologous (even anticipatory) appearance in decolonial philosophies that confront slavery and colonialism’s inextricability from the Enlightenment humanism they are trying to displace. Perhaps this foresight on the part of decolonial theory is rather unsurprising considering that exigencies of race have crucially anticipated and shaped discourses governing the non- human** (animal, technology, object, and plant).12 [Zakkiyah Iman Jackson, “Review: Animal: New Directions in the Theorization of Race and Posthumanism,” Feminist Studies 39, no. 3 (2013): 681. END FOOTENOTE] A crucial point that Jackson emphasizes is that Black and Indigenous studies, particularly decolonial studies, has already grappled with and anticipated the late twentieth century impulses inspired by Leo Bersani and Lee Edelman to annihilate the self and jettison the future. **Indigenous and Black “sex**” (as activity, reproduction, pleasure, world-building, and not-human sexuality) **are already subsumed by death**. For some reason, white critical theory cannot seem to fathom that self- annihilation is something white people need to figure out by themselves. In other words, “they can have that.”13 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: This is a colloquialism or form of vernacular often used by Blacks and People of Color to express that they disagree with something and more specifically reject an idea and will leave that to the people whom it concerns to deal with. END FOOTNOTE] Within Native feminist theorizing, ethnographic refusal can be traced to Audra Simpson’s 2007 article, “On Ethnographic Refusal.” In this seminal work, Simpson reflects on and gains inspiration from the tradition of refusal practiced by the people of Kahnawake.14 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Simpson’s ethnographic work specifically focuses on the Kahnawake Mohawk who reside in a reservation in the territory is now referred to as southwest Quebec. END FOOTNOTE] **Simpson shares that** **Kahnawake refusals are at the core and spirit of her own ethnographic and ethical practices of refusal.** I was interested in the larger picture, in the discursive, material and moral territory that was simultaneously historical and contemporary (this “national” space) and the ways in which Kahnawakero:non, **the “people of Kahnawake,” had refused the authority of the state at almost every turn.** The ways in which their formation of the initial membership code (now replaced by a lineage code and board of elders to implement the code and determine cases) was refused; the ways in which their interactions with border guards at the international boundary line were predicated upon a refusal; how refusal worked in everyday encounters to enunciate repeatedly to ourselves and to outsiders that “this is who we are, this is who you are, these are my rights.”15 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Audra Simpson, “On Ethnographic Refusal: Indigeneity, ‘Voice’ and Colonial Citizenship,” Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue, no. 9 (December 2007): 73. END FOOTNOTE] Because Simpson was concerned with applying the political and everyday modes of Kahnawake refusal, she attended to the “collective limit” established by her and her Kahnawake participants. 16 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 77. END FOOTNOTE] The collective limit was relationally and ethically determined by what was shared but more importantly by what was not shared. Simpson’s ability to discern the collective limit could only be achieved through a form of relational knowledge production that regards and cares for the other. Simpson recounts how one of her participants forced her to recognize a collective limit. Approaching and then arriving at the limit, Simpson experiences the following: And although I pushed him, hoping that there might be something explicit said from the space of his exclusion— or more explicit than he gave me— it was enough that he said what he said. “Enough” is certainly enough. “Enough,” I realised, was when I reached the limit of my own return and our collective arrival. Can I do this and still come home; what am I revealing here and why? Where will this get us? Who benefits from this and why? And “enough” was when they shut down (or told me to turn off the recorder), or told me outright funny things like “nobody seems to know”— when everybody does know and talks about it all the time. Dominion then has to be exercised over these representations, and that was determined when enough was said. The ethnographic limit then, was reached not just when it would cause harm (or extreme discomfort)— the limit was arrived at when the representation would bite all of us and compromise the representational territory that we have gained for ourselves in the past 100 years.17 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 78. END FOOTNOTE] Extending her discussion of ethnographic refusal beyond the bounds of ethnographic concerns, Simpson also ponders whether this enactment of refusal can be applied to theoretical work. Simpson outright poses a question: “What is theoretically generative about these refusals?”18 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid. END FOOTNOTE] The question that Simpson asks in 2007 is clarified by Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang in the 2014 essay “R- Words: Refusing Research.” **Arguing that modes of refusal extended into the theoretical and methodological terrains of knowledge production are productive and necessary,** Tuck and Yang state: For the purposes of our discussion, the most important insight to draw from Simpson’s article is her emphasis that **refusals are not subtractive, but are theoretically generative, expansive. Refusal is not just a “no,” but a redirection to ideas otherwise unacknowledged or unquestioned.** Unlike a settler colonial configuration of knowledge that is petulantly exasperated and resentful of limits, **a methodology of refusal regards limits on knowledge as productive, as indeed a good thing**.19 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “R- Words: Refusing Research,” in Humanizing Research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry with Youth and Communities (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE, 2014), 239. END FOOTNOTE] In line with Simpson’s intervention, Tuck and Yang posit that “refusal itself could be developed into both method and theory.”20 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 242. END FOOTNOTE] For Tuck and Yang, a generative practice of refusal and a decolonial and abolitionist tradition is making Western thought “turn back upon itself as settler colonial knowledge, as opposed to universal, liberal, or neutral knowledge without horizon.”21 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 243. END FOOTNOTE] In fact, the coauthors suggest “making the settler colonial metanarrative the object of . . . research.”22 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 244. END FOOTNOTE] What this move effectively does is question the uninterrogated assumptions and exposes the violent particularities of the metanarrative. **Scrutiny as a practice of refusal also slows down or perhaps halts the momentum of the machinery that allows, as Tuck and Yang argue, “knowledge to facilitate interdictions on Indigenous and Black life**.”23 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 244. END FOOTNOTE] Taking a cue from Simpson and Tuck and Yang, I turn to Tuck’s 2010 critique of Deleuze’s notion of “desire” as an example of the theoretical practice of refusal, which Simpson wonders about and which Tuck and Yang elaborated on in 2014. Eve Tuck’s 2010 article “Breaking Up with Deleuze” refuses Deleuze’s understanding and imposition of his definition of desire for Native studies and Native resurgence in particular. Tuck refuses the Deleuzoguattarian nomadic due to its totalizing moves and specifically its evasion and refusal of Native and alternative notions of refusal that emerge from Native struggles for survival.24 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Eve Tuck, “Breaking Up with Deleuze: Desire and Valuing the Irreconcilable,” International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education 23, no. 5 (2010): 635– 50. END FOOTNOTE] For Tuck, paying attention to “the continuity of ancestors,” or genealogies, in Native and in all modes of knowledge production is imperative. For Indigenous and Native studies, it reverses the erasure enacted by continental European and settler-colonial theory, which uses a tradition of ongoing genocide to annihilate Native thinkers and subsequently their epistemologies and theories. Prior to Byrd’s indictment of Deleuzoguattarian laudatory accounts of America’s terrain of “Indians without Ancestry,” Tuck reroutes us back to ancestral and genealogical thinking as a way of asserting Indigenous presence and its epistemological systems and traditions, devoid of Cartesian boundary- making impulses and desires. Tuck’s work also prepares us in 2010 for the critique that Byrd levies in 2011, which exposes the traditions, roots, and genealogies of Western poststructuralist theory. Such theory created the conditions of possibility and emergence for Deleuzoguattarian genocidal forms of rhizomatic and nonrepresentational thought. Black Caribbean feminist Michelle V. Rowley argues we need to especially attend to a theory’s “politics and conditions of emergence.”25 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See Michelle V. Rowley, “The Idea of Ancestry: Of Feminist Genealogies and Many Other Things,” in Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives, 3rd ed., ed. Carole R. McCann and Syeung Kyung Kim (New York: Routledge, 2013), 810– 81, where Rowley argues that transnational feminisms need to attend to how the white feminist wave as a metaphor and theory emerges, disciplines are thought, and more importantly how “its wins” are gained through the exploitation and suffering of women from the Global South. Rowley describes this work as attending to the “politics and conditions of emergence” of feminist metaphors and theories. END FOOTNOTE] In other words, we need to consider on whose backs or through whose blood a theory developed and then circulated while hiding its own violence.

### Underview

#### K is top layer—

**If we prove that their metaphysics are violent then they are making the space unsafe. Safety is internal link to fairness/education or any impact**

#### 1. Debaters can’t focus on iterative testing, and learning from rounds, if violent epistemologies continue to produce violence on them

#### 2. Debates are never fair if someone is under attack while their opponent feels comfortable.

#### Next, debaters must have a material advocacy tied to the voices of the speaker; they need to be able to enact their offense to solve their harms. – This means post-fiat impacts don’t matter.

#### 1. Presumption: Voting neg will do nothing- people are still dying in this world, with or without your ballot. Your education doesn’t go anywhere, and it’s already been taught. Non-uniques all offence- vote aff on presumption

#### 2. Limits: There are a virtually unlimited amount of actions that the government can take, however there are a limited amount of actions that debaters can perform in the space which controls the IL to fairness since we can actually engage in the 1AC’s advocacy.

#### Next, no 1NR theory—

#### 1. Crossapply the King 2 card, it’s the settler trying to set the terms of the debate. This reifies rhetorical imperialism, reject it as a form of resistance.

#### 2. Time crunched 1ar means that it makes it impossible to affirm, this means that black and indigenous people must spend more time answering theory instead of having clash on substance. This means that we are not able to have discourse surrounding material methods of resisting anti-colonial violence, this means that b and I debaters are not able to take what we learn and change our communities. This impacts to more dead b and I people, the only way that kids are able to resist violence in our communities is by having debates about methods of resistance which theory makes impossible

#### 3. What we understand as fair or educational is always framed thru settler colonialism, Crossapply byrd.