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#### **Genocidal settlement is not a one-off event, but a structuring ontological logic of elimination constantly manifested in the everyday reiteration of the very modes of spatial inhabitance and subjective modes of being that define settler identity.**

Rifkin 14 [Rifkin, Mark. *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance*. University of Minnesota Press, 2014. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt6wr811. Accessed 21 July 2021](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt6wr811.%20Accessed%2021%20July%202021).] [pT] \*bracketed.

If nineteenth-century American literary studies tends to focus on the ways [Natives] enter the narrative frame and the kinds of meanings and associations they bear, recent attempts to theorize settler colonialism have sought to shift attention from its effects on Indigenous subjects to its implications for nonnative political attachments, forms of inhabitance, and modes of being, illuminating and tracking the pervasive operation of settlement as a system. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is a structure not an event” (2).6 He suggests that a “logic of elimination” drives settler governance and sociality, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence” (388). Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/ period of conquest, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settler-colonial society” (390). In Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work, whiteness func-tions as the central way of understanding the domination and displacement of Indigenous peoples by nonnatives.7 In “Writing Off Indigenous Sovereignty,” she argues, “As a regime of power, patriarchal white sovereignty operates ideologically, materially and discursively to reproduce and maintain its investment in the nation as a white possession” (88), and in “Writing Off Treaties,” she suggests, “At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will, thus it is open to being possessed,” such that “possession . . . forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity” (83–84). For Jodi Byrd, the deployment of [Nativeness] as a mobile figure works as the principal mode of U.S. settler colonialism. She observes that “colonization and racialization . . . have often been conflated,” in ways that “tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion” and that “misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism” (xxiii, xvii). She argues that settlement works through the translation of indigeneity as [Nativeness], casting place-based political collectivities as (racialized) populations subject to U.S. jurisdiction and management: “the [Native] is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself ”; “ideas of [Natives] and [Nativeness] have served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself ” (xix).

#### Discourses of space exploration are inextricably tied to the colonial legacies that created them – space is rendered Terra Nullius; another empty wilderness open to the extension of colonial interests.

**Smiles 20** – Deondre Smiles is Ojibwe, Black, and settler, and he is a citizen of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, as well as an Assistant Professor in the Department of Geography at the University of Victoria, in B.C., Canada, “The Settler Logics of (Outer) Space,” Society and Space, October 26th, 2020, [https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space //](https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space%20//) sam dd

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.

#### Their alarmist narrative of extinction is a product of antiqueer, settler anxieties that arise not only from settlers’ guilt for destroying the planet’s ability to sustain itself, but also from the settler’s need to strengthen solidarity and defer confrontation with native genocide.

**Dalley 18** [Hamish Dalley (2018), “The deaths of settler colonialism: extinction as a metaphor of decolonization in contemporary settler literature”, Settler Colonial Studies, 8:1, 30-46, DOI: [10.1080/2201473X.2016.1238160](https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2016.1238160)]//DD PT

Considering the problem of futurity offers a useful foil to traditional analyses of settler-colonial narrative, which typically examine settlers’ attitudes towards history in order to highlight a constitutive anxiety about the past – about origins. Settler colonialism, the argument goes, has a problem with historical narration that arises from a contradiction in its founding mythology. In Stephen Turner’s formulation, the settler subject is by definition one who comes from elsewhere but who strives to make this place home. The settlement narrative must explain how this gap – which is at once geographical, historical, and existential – has been bridged, and the settler transformed from outsider into indigene. Yet the transformation must remain constitutively incomplete, because the desire to be at home necessarily invokes the spectre of the native, whose existence (which cannot be disavowed completely because it is needed to define the settler’s difference, superiority, and hence claim to the land) inscribes the settler’s foreignness, thus reinstating the gap between settler and colony that the narrative was meant to efface.1 Settler-colonial narrative is thus shaped around its need to erase and evoke the native, to make the indigene both invisible and present in a contradictory pattern that prevents settlers from ever moving on from the moment of colonization.2 As evidence of this constitutive contradiction, critics have identified in settler-colonial discourse symptoms of psychic distress such as disavowal, inversion, and repression.3 Indeed, the frozen temporality of settler-colonial narrative, fixated on the moment of the frontier, recalls nothing so much as Freud’s description of the ‘repetition compulsion’ attending trauma.4 As Lorenzo Veracini puts it, because: ‘settler society’ can thus be seen as a fantasy where a perception of a constant struggle is juxtaposed against an ideal of ‘peace’ that can never be reached, settler projects embrace and reject violence at the same time. The settler colonial situation is thus a circumstance where the tension between contradictory impulses produces long-lasting psychic conflicts and a number of associated psychopathologies.5 Current scholarship has thus focused primarily on settler-colonial narrative’s view of the past, asking how such a contradictory and troubled relationship to history might affect present-day ideological formations. Critics have rarely considered what such narratological tensions might produce when the settler gaze is turned to the future. Few social formations are more stubbornly resistant to change than settlement, suggesting that a future beyond settler colonialism might be simply unthinkable. Veracini, indeed, suggests that settler-colonial narrative can never contemplate an ending: that settler decolonization is inconceivable because settlers lack the metaphorical tools to imagine their own demise.6 This article outlines why I partly disagree with that view. I argue that the narratological paradox that defines settler-colonial narrative does make the future a problematic object of contemplation. But that does not make settler decolonization unthinkable per se; as I will show, settlers do often try to imagine their demise – but they do so in a way that reasserts the paradoxes of their founding ideology, with the result that the radical potentiality of decolonization is undone even as it is invoked. I argue that, notwithstanding Veracini’s analysis, there is a metaphor via which the end of settler colonialism unspools – the quasi-biological concept of extinction, which, when deployed as a narrative trope, offers settlers a chance to consider and disavow their demise, just as they consider and then disavow the violence of their origins. This article traces the importance of the trope of extinction for contemporary settler-colonial literature, with a focus on South Africa, Canada, and Australia. It explores variations in how the death of settler colonialism is conceptualized, drawing a distinction between historio-civilizational narratives of the rise and fall of empires, and a species-oriented notion of extinction that draws force from public anxiety about climate change – an invocation that adds another level of ambivalence by drawing on ‘rational’ fears for the future (because climate change may well render the planet uninhabitable to humans) in order to narrativize a form of social death that, strictly speaking, belongs to a different order of knowledge altogether. As such, my analysis is intended to draw the attention of settler-colonial studies toward futurity and the ambivalence of settler paranoia, while highlighting a potential point of cross-fertilization between settler-colonial and eco-critical approaches to contemporary literature. That ‘extinction’ should be a key word in the settler-colonial lexicon is no surprise. In Patrick Wolfe’s phrase,7 settler colonialism is predicated on a ‘logic of elimination’ that tends towards the extermination – by one means or another – of indigenous peoples.8 This logic is apparent in archetypal settler narratives like James Fenimore Cooper’s The Last of the Mohicans (1826), a historical novel whose very title blends the melancholia and triumph that demarcate settlers’ affective responses to the supposed inevitability of indigenous extinction. Concepts like ‘stadial development’ – by which societies progress through stages, progressively eliminating earlier social forms – and ‘fatal impact’ – which names the biological inevitability of strong peoples supplanting weak – all contribute to the notion that settler colonialism is a kind of ‘ecological process’ 9 that necessitates the extinction of inferior races. What is surprising, though, is how often the trope of extinction also appears with reference to settlers themselves; it makes sense for settlers to narrate how their presence entails others’ destruction, but it is less clear why their attempts to imagine futures should presume extinction to be their own logical end as well. The idea appears repeatedly in English-language literary treatments of settler colonialism. Consider, for instance, the following rumination on the future of South African settler society, from Olive Schreiner’s 1883 Story of an African Farm: It was one of them, one of those wild old Bushmen, that painted those pictures there. He did not know why he painted but he wanted to make something, so he made these. […] Now the Boers have shot them all, so that we never see a yellow face peeping out among the stones. […] And the wild bucks have gone, and those days, and we are here. But we will be gone soon, and only the stones will lie on, looking at everything like they look now.10 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? I explore this question with reference to examples of contemporary literary treatments of extinction from select English-speaking settler-colonial contexts: South Africa, Australia, and Canada.15 The next section of this article traces key elements of extinction narrative in a range of settler-colonial texts, while the section that follows offers a detailed reading of one of the best examples of a sustained literary exploration of human finitude, Margaret Atwood’s Maddaddam trilogy (2003–2013). I advance four specific arguments. First, extinction narratives take at least two forms depending on whether the ‘end’ of settler society is framed primarily in historical-civilizational terms or in a stronger, biological sense; the key question is whether the ‘thing’ that is going extinct is a society or a species. Second, biologically oriented extinction narratives rely on a more or less conscious slippage between ‘the settler’ and ‘the human’. Third, this slippage is ideologically ambivalent: on the one hand, it contains a radical charge that invokes environmentalist discourse and climate-change anxiety to imagine social forms that re-write settler-colonial dynamics; on the other, it replicates a core aspect of imperialist ideology by normalizing whiteness as 4 H. DALLEY equivalent to humanity. Fourth, these ideological effects are mediated by gender, insofar as extinction narratives invoke issues of biological reproduction, community protection, and violence that function to differentiate and reify masculine and feminine roles in the putative de-colonial future. Overall, my central claim is that extinction is a core trope through which settler futurity emerges, one with crucial narrative and ideological effects that shape much of the contemporary literature emerging from white colonial settings.

#### Settler colonialism is genocide. The position of the Native necessitates endless violence against them by ensuring that the settler can hold the Natives’ territory. The role of the ballot is to center indigenous scholarship.

**Wolfe 06** [Patrick Wolfe (2006) Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native, Journal of Genocide Research, 8:4, 387-409, DOI: [10.1080/14623520601056240](https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240)] [pT] \*bracketed

Why, then, logic of elimination rather than genocide? As stated at the outset, settler colonialism is a specific social formation and it is desirable to retain that specificity. So far as I can tell, an understanding of settler colonialism would not be particularly helpful for understanding the mass killings of, say, witches in medieval Europe, Tutsis in Rwanda, enemies of the people in Cambodia, or Jews in the Nazi fatherland (the Lebensraum is, of course, another matter). By the same token, with the possible exception of the witches (whose murders appear to have been built into a great social transition), these mass killings would seem to have little to tell us about the long-run structural consistency of settler colonizers’ attempts to eliminate native societies. In contrast to the Holocaust, which was endemic to Nazism rather than to Germany (which was by no means the only—or even, historically, the most—anti-Semitic society in Europe), settler colonialism is relatively impervious to regime change. The genocide of American [Natives] or of Aboriginal people in Australia has not been subject to election results. So why not a special kind of genocide?—Raymond Evans’ and Bill Thorpe’s etymologically deft “indigenocide,” for instance,67 or one of the hyphenated genocides (“cultural genocide,” “ethnocide,” “politicide,” etc.)68 that have variously been proposed? The apparently insurmountable problem with the qualified genocides is that, in their very defensiveness, they threaten to undo themselves. They are never quite the real thing, just as patronizingly hyphenated ethnics are not fully Australian or fully American. Apart from this categorical problem, there is a historical basis to the relative diminution of the qualified genocides. This basis is, of course, the Holocaust, the non-paradigmatic paradigm that, being the indispensable example, can never merely exemplify. Keeping one eye on the Holocaust, which is always the unqualified referent of the qualified genocides, can only disadvantage Indigenous people because it discursively reinforces the figure of lack at the heart of the non-Western. Moreover, whereas the Holocaust exonerates anti-Semitic Western nations who were on the side opposing the Nazis, those same nations have nothing to gain from their liability for colonial genocides. On historical as well as categorical grounds, therefore, the hyphenated genocides devalue Indigenous attrition. No such problem bedevils analysis of the logic of elimination, which, in its specificity to settler colonialism, is premised on the securing—the obtaining and the maintaining—of territory.69 This logic certainly requires the elimination of the owners of that territory, but not in any particular way. To this extent, it is a larger category than genocide. For instance, the style of romantic stereotyping that I have termed “repressive authenticity,” which is a feature of settler-colonial discourse in many countries, is not genocidal in itself, though it eliminates large numbers of empirical natives from official reckonings and, as such, is often concomitant with genocidal practice.70 Indeed, depending on the historical conjuncture, assimilation can be a more effective mode of elimination than conventional forms of killing, since it does not involve such a disruptive affront to the rule of law that is ideologically central to the cohesion of settler society. When invasion is recognized as a structure rather than an event, its history does not stop—or, more to the point, become relatively trivial—when it moves on from the era of frontier homicide. Rather, narrating that history involves charting the continuities, discontinuities, adjustments, and departures whereby a logic that initially informed frontier killing transmutes into different modalities, discourses and institutional formations as it undergirds the historical development and complexification of settler society. This is not a hierarchical procedure.

#### The alternative is one of decolonization – an ethic of incommensurability leads to infinite native futures.

**Tuck and Yang 12** [Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor.” Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, vol. 1, no. 1, Sept. 2012, p., <http://resolver.scholarsportal.info/resolve/19298692/v01i0001/nfp_dinam.xml>.] [pT]

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework. We want to say, first, that decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions - decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity. Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics - moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone - these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability.

#### Settler colonialism is the root cause of climate change that not only locks in Native Deaths but exponential violence.

Davis 16 [Heather, Postdoctoral scholar @ the Institute for the Arts and Humanities @ PSU, PhD @ Concordia, Boundaries of the Human in the Age of Life Sciences Conference, April 18 <http://sites.psu.edu/iahboundaries/heather-davis-5/> amrita]

We live in a land of multiple, conflicting time scales. In the dominant imaginary of America, history begins after the invasion of colonial settlers from 1492 onwards. But for indigenous peoples living in what is now known as the United States, history extends far back, and also reaches far into the future, where this “great nation” is merely a blip in a much longer narrative. These two narratives speak to the history of erasure and conflict within the structures of settler colonialism. This erasure is manifest not only in this deliberate historical amnesia, but in the settler colonial project itself, insofar as it is tied to the eradication of indigenous peoples and their ways of life through genocide, forced assimilation, and—most importantly for Kyle White’s purposes in this talk—through the complete transformation of the landscape. The damming of rivers, clear-cutting of forests, and importation of plants and animals remade the worlds of North America into the vision of a displaced Europe, fundamentally altering the climate and ecosystems. Settler colonialism, in North America and elsewhere, is marked by this process of terraforming. As Whyte argues, “industrial settler campaigns erase what makes a place ecologically unique in terms of human and nonhuman relations, the ecological history of a place, and the sharing of the environment by different human societies**.”1** The entwinement of indigenous governance systems and entire ways of life with particular fish, animals, and plants meant that these displacements and transformations of the landscape had drastic effects on people’s ability to continue to practice their culture and way of life. Further, the forced displacement that many tribal communities suffered through the trail of tears and trail of death involved adaptation to entirely new environments, to new climates. These processes of environmental transformation and forced displacement can be understood as climate change**.** And so, as Whyte makes clear, the current climate disruptions can be viewed as a continuation of, rather than a break from, previous eras that begin with colonialism and extend through advanced capitalism. In this light climate change, and the uneven impacts on the global poor, can be understood not just as an unfortunate coincidence or accident, but rather as a deliberate extension of colonial logic. As Whyte writes, “Thinking about climate injustice against Indigenous peoples is like thinking back to the future. For climate injustice against Indigenous [people] is a cyclical course of history that is situated within the larger struggle of anthropogenic environmental change brought about by colonialism, industrialism and capitalism—not two unfortunately converging courses of history.”2. Therefore, in order to adequately address climate change, we also need to seriously think through and enact processes of decolonization. This involves self-governance for indigenous peoples, but it also fundamentally questions the bounds and the legitimacy of the nation-state structure. As we are already seeing around the world, people will not simply sit still in the face of ecological destruction, but will move, adapt, and try to find ways of recomposing with their companion species. The adaptability of many indigenous peoples and their semi-nomadic ways of life meant that their societies were incredibly resilient in the face of climate disruptions. However, as a result of settler colonialism and the attendant nation-state structures, borders and treaties bind people inside a given territory. This means that people will not necessarily continue to have access to the animals, plants, rocks and waters that they rely upon and are entwined within. If wild rice, for example, begins to move further and further north due to warming weather patterns, the people who care for those plants, and who are in turn cared for by wild rice, cannot necessarily follow. “Indigenous peoples cannot practically plan to shift their seasonal subsistence and economic activities if a valuable plant’s or animal’s habitat moves outside of a treaty area or crosses a transnational border.”3 And the links to particular ecological systems are not incidental, as they are often viewed within western, industrialized nations where our ways of life systematically divorce us from and deny our implication within ecologies. Instead, governance systems, cultural practices, and gendered roles are all tied to relations with particular plants, animals, skies, rocks, waters. “Kenny Pheasant, an elder, says ‘Decline of the sturgeon has corresponded with decline in sturgeon clan families.’”4 Similarly, the resiliency of people across the world for collective continuance is dependent upon this freedom of movement which is systematically denied by the state forms of governance we currently have in place. What is truly terrifying about the times we live in is not only the cyclical recurrence of climate change. It is not the fact that white people and people with power are now having to face what indigenous peoples, black people descended from the horrors of slavery, and others have faced for the past five hundred years – that could be considered some kind of perverted justice. But the scale of the destruction has increased exponentially, while our governance systems often work against efforts to sustain liveable climates and the abilities of people to adapt. As Ta-nehisi Coates writes, “Once, the Dream’s parameters were caged by technology and by the limits of horsepower and wind. But the Dreamers have improved themselves, and the damming of seas for voltage, the extraction of coal, the transmuting of oil into food, have enabled an expansion in plunder with no known precedent. And this revolution has freed the Dreamers to plunder not just the bodies of humans but the body of the Earth itself.”5 Industrialized capitalism might make us forget our entwined relations and dependency on this body of the Earth, but we are surrounded by rich traditions and many people that have not forgotten this vital lesson and if we are to adapt with any grace to what is coming, we would all do well to begin to listen to those voices.

## Case

### 1NC – AT: Util

#### Anti-Nativeness is a prior question to any of their impacts –

#### 1] Framework proves case should be sidelined absent justifications for anti-Native value systems, this is a new link – they utilize abstract scenarios to DISAVOW from anti-Native communicative practices.

#### 2] Extinction is inevitable and the squo for Native folks – but civil society is inherently parasitic on Nativeness – this means that infinite future Native generations would be forced to suffer in the anti-Native world – extinction is capped at a magnitude of 7 billion people which means our impacts outweigh on magnitude – you should be willing to let the world collapse if we win that its anti-Native

#### 3] 1AR Claims that extinction forecloses future VTL – a) requires them to win a UQ claim that the future will have more value which is empirically disproven – links back to cruel optimism or b) says that value to life is inevitable which is anti-Native – it’s the same logics slave masters used to say hey at least the slaves are alive so we shouldn’t do anything.

#### 4] Util is the logic of all lives matter – their rhetorical privileging of all lives in the face of the 1NC’s demand for Native life to be prioritize is the way that the issue of genocide is always sidelined and settlers are never held accountable for their actions.

#### 5] Detachment DA --

Bjork ’93 [Rebecca Bjork; 1993; Former Associate Professor at the University of Utah; Reflections on the Ongoing Struggle; Debater's Research Guide 1992-1993: Wake Forest University, Symposium, <http://groups.wfu.edu/debate/MiscSites/DRGArticles/Oudingetal1992Pollution.htm>]

I remember listening to a lecture a few years ago given by Tom Goodnight at the University summer debate camp.  Goodnight lamented what he saw as the debate community's participation in, and unthinking perpetuation of what he termed the "death culture."  He argued that the embracing of "big impact" arguments--nuclear war, environmental destruction, genocide, famine, and the like-by debaters and coaches signals a morbid and detached fascination with such events, one that views these real human tragedies as part of a "game" in which so-called "objective and neutral" advocates actively seek to find in their research the "impact to outweigh all other impacts"--the round-winning argument that will carry them to their goal of winning tournament X, Y, or Z. He concluded that our "use" of such events in this way is tantamount to a celebration of them; our detached, rational discussions reinforce a detached, rational viewpoint, when emotional and moral outrage may be a more appropriate response.  In the last few years, my academic research has led me to be persuaded by Goodnight's unspoken assumption; language is not merely some transparent tool used to transmit information, but rather is an incredibly powerful medium, the use of which inevitably has real political and material consequences. Given this assumption, I believe that it is important for us to examine the "discourse of debate practice:" that is, the language, discourses, and meanings that we, as a community of debaters and coaches, unthinkingly employ in academic debate.  If it is the case that the language we use has real implications for how we view the world, how we view others, and how we act in the world, then it is imperative that we critically examine our own discourse practices with an eye to how our language does violence to others. I am shocked and surprised when I hear myself saying things like, "we killed them," or "take no prisoners," or "let's blow them out of the water."  I am tired of the "ideal" debater being defined as one who has mastered the art of verbal assault to the point where accusing opponents of lying, cheating, or being deliberately misleading is a sign of strength. But what I am most tired of is how women debaters are marginalized and rendered voiceless in such a discourse community.  Women who verbally assault their opponents are labeled "bitches" because it is not socially acceptable for women to be verbally aggressive.  Women who get angry and storm out of a room when a disappointing decision is rendered are labeled "hysterical" because, as we all know, women are more emotional then men.  I am tired of hearing comments like, "those 'girls' from school X aren't really interested in debate; they just want to meet men."  We can all point to examples (although only a few) of women who have succeeded at the top levels of debate.  But I find myself wondering how many more women gave up because they were tired of negotiating the mine field of discrimination, sexual harassment, and isolation they found in the debate community. As members of this community, however, we have great freedom to define it in whatever ways we see fit.  After all, what is debate except a collection of shared understandings and explicit or implicit rules for interaction?  What I am calling for is a critical examination of how we, as individual members of this community, characterize our activity, ourselves, and our interactions with others through language.  We must become aware of the ways in which our mostly hidden and unspoken assumptions about what "good" debate is function to exclude not only women, but ethnic minorities from the amazing intellectual opportunities that training in debate provides.  Our nation and indeed, our planet, faces incredibly difficult challenges in the years ahead.  I believe that it is not acceptable anymore for us to go along as we always have, assuming that things will straighten themselves out. If the rioting in Los Angeles taught us anything, it is that complacency breeds resentment and frustration.  We may not be able to change the world, but we can change our own community, and if we fail to do so, we give up the only real power that we have.

### 1NC – AT: Warming

#### They say “scientific consensus”—that’s about warming EXISTING not it causing EXTINCTION—Pepsi challenge for a single peer-reviewed impact card

Seidov 14—Researcher at NOAA and PhD in Geophysics, Fluid Dynamics, and Thermodynamics [Dan, “Are you aware of any peer-reviewed paper that explicitly classifies current global climate change as an existential risk (risk of human extinction)?” Research Gate, 4 Nov 2014, http://tinyurl.com/jrnfafu, accessed 6 Sep 2016]

The current global climate change does not have a potential to cause human extinction. Past severe climate changes were critical for many ancient civilizations, yet our existence proofs that they were not potent enough to cause entire termination of the humankind. The projected changes, even in the worst case scenarios, can cause many dramatic local changes. For example, change in rainfall patterns in agricultural countries may lead to possible famine and other dramatic events. However, any imaginable climate changes based on modern climate science cannot generate existential risks for the entire human civilization. In my view, a paper predicting such a catastrophe in any foreseeable future, at least on the time scale of human civilization, that is, thousands of years, has no chance of being published in any serious research journal.

#### Empirics

Thomas 15—Associate Professor of history (specializing in nature and environmental history) at the University of Notre Dame [Julia Adeney, “Who is the “we” Endangered by Climate Change?” in Fernando Vidal & Nélia Dias (eds.) *Endangerment, Biodiversity and Culture*, p. 241]

Up to this point, the biologist and the historian describe the planetary situation in homologous terms and name the human species as the culprit of climate change. But there the similarities end. For Stager, thinking in terms of the species is easy, and his general argument is that most species, including ours, will survive pretty well, especially if we allow for migration. Looking back on the Eocene era 55 million years ago, which produced temperatures 18–22°F higher than today’s, Stager maintains that the Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum (PETM) was not so very terrible: “On a relatively bright note, we also know that many plants and animals, including our own primate ancestors, made it through PETM just fine.”12 This depends, of course, on how you define “just fine.” Looking forward into the deep future, Stager explores two models of climate change: a “moderate” one, projecting a rise in atmospheric carbon concentrations to 550–600 parts per million (ppm) with globally averaged temperature increases of 3 to 7°F (2 to 4°C); and an “extreme” one, with carbon reaching 2,000 ppm and temperature rises of “at least 9 to 16°F (5 to 9°C).”13 Either way, Stager argues, the human species is here to stay. Moreover, he even hints that a new “ethics of carbon pollution” may credit us with having rescued our distant descendants from the “ice age devastation” formerly projected for 50,000 years from now.14 By extending the timescale of judgment beyond the wildest imaginings of most historians and moral philosophers, Stager suggests that warming the planet might be considered a virtuous act. By his large-scale measure, not only will we be “fine,” but we will be good.

#### Global ecosystems are stable even with “catastrophic” warming

Robert Mendelsohn et al ’16, \*Mendelsohn: Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor of Forest Policy; Professor of Economics; and Professor, School of Management at Yale, \*\*Iain C. Prentice: Chair in Biosphere and Climate Impacts at Imperial College London, \*\*\*Oswald Schmitz: Oastler Professor of Population and Community Ecology at Yale, \*\*\*\*Benjamin Stocker: Visiting Researcher, Faculty of Natural Sciences, Department of Life Sciences at Imperial College London, \*\*\*\*\*Robert Buchkowski: Ph.D Student, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, \*\*\*\*\*\*Benjamin Dawson: Masters Candidate in Environmental Economics at Yale, “The Ecosystem Impacts of Severe Warming,” *American Economic Review: Papers & Proceedings*, Vol. 106 No. 5, pgs. 613-614, <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/aer.p20161104>

\*NPP= Net Primary Production

II. Results

An important predicted ecosystem change caused by warming is the shift of biomes over geographic space (Table 1). Warming is expected to cause tropical forests to expand into where temperate forests are now and temperate forests to expand into where boreal forests are now. As temperatures rise by 6°C, temperate forests start to give way to temperate parkland. As temperatures warm by about 9°C, tropical forests give way to tropical savanna.

Global average NPP increases rapidly as a result of CO2 fertilization and warming during the twenty-first century and then slows thereafter. Biomass changes from 375 GtC in 2105 to 325 to 450 GtC by 2300.

The consequence of all these vegetative changes to animals and other biota are only partially understood. The increasing tropical and temperate forest habitat will provide increasing support to the many species dependent on this habitat. Increasing NPP, providing more food, will likely support larger populations worldwide. However, the declining extent of boreal forests will shrink endemic boreal species (such as grizzly bears, bald eagles, moose, and common loon) possibly at the risk of extinction. There are also likely to be many species threatened by being stranded on islands and mountain tops or who face natural and human barriers that prevent migration.

From a market perspective, the increasing NPP of cropland and pasture means more food. The increasing NPP of forestland means more wood. From a nonmarket perspective, the expanding temperate and tropical forests will be beneficial whereas the contracting boreal forest is harmful. The increases in NPP are likely to lead to desirable increases in wildlife populations. Increases (decreases) in biomass will generally be beneficial (harmful). There are also potential damages from the increased risk of extinction for specific species (especially boreal, polar, and island species). The movement of biomes across space will also create challenges for conservation strategies that are designed for stability.

III. Conclusion

The modeling undertaken provides a first glimpse of what may happen to ecosystems as global temperatures increase well beyond 5°C. The results suggest that the global ecosystem is surprisingly robust to a world that is warmer, wetter, and CO2 enriched. There is scant evidence of global collapse. Global ecosystems will survive and maintain their productivity. But there is evidence of substantial change with severe warming as biomes shift across space and extinction risks rise for selected species.

There is no support for globally catastrophic consequences to ecosystems across a wide range of global warming scenarios. But there will be ecological impacts. Up to 5°C may be beneficial, as warming causes temperate and tropical forests to expand and plant growth to increase. But beyond 5°C, plant growth flattens, forests turn to savanna, and species extinction risks increase.

The welfare magnitude of all these changes is not clear—more research is needed before any quantitative conclusions can be drawn. But it is possible to marshal scientific evidence to study ecosystem change. It is worthwhile to conduct further research into this area to quantify the value of important consequences. What are the impacts to animals and insects? How do we value these large changes in ecosystems? How can we adapt and manage global ecosystems in a warming world?