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#### Settler colonialism structures the world in a settler-native-slave relationship, erasing indigenous peoples, causing constant ontological violence.

Tuck and Yang 12 [Eve Tuck is an award winning Unangax̂ scholar in the field of Indigenous studies and educational research. She is Associate Professor of Critical Race and Indigenous Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. Yang is a Ph.D. Social and Cultural Studies in Education, University of California, Berkeley] “Decolonization is not a metaphor”, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society //AA

Our intention in this descriptive exercise is not be exhaustive, or even inarguable; instead, we wish to emphasize that (a) decolonization will take a different shape in each of these contexts - though they can overlap - and that (b) neither external nor internal colonialism adequately describe the form of colonialism which operates in the United States or other nation-states in which the colonizer comes to stay. Settler colonialism operates through internal/external colonial modes simultaneously because there is no spatial separation between metropole and colony. For example, in the United States, many Indigenous peoples have been forcibly removed from their homelands onto reservations, indentured, and abducted into state custody, signaling the form of colonization as simultaneously internal (via boarding schools and other biopolitical modes of control) and external (via uranium mining on Indigenous land in the US Southwest and oil extraction on Indigenous land in Alaska) with a frontier (the US military still nicknames all enemy territory “Indian Country”). The horizons of the settler colonial nation-state are total and require a mode of total appropriation of Indigenous life and land, rather than the selective expropriation of profit-producing fragments. Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain. Thus, relying solely on postcolonial literatures or theories of coloniality that ignore settler colonialism will not help to envision the shape that decolonization must take in settler colonial contexts. Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article.) Land is what is most valuable, contested, required. This is both because the settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound **epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence**. This violence is not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is reasserted each day of occupation. This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that **settler colonialism is a structure and not an event.** In the process of settler colonialism, land is remade into property and human relationships to land are restricted to the relationship of the owner to his property. Epistemological, ontological, and cosmological relationships to land are interred, indeed made pre-modern and backward. Made savage. In order for **the settlers** to make a place their home, they must **destroy and disappear the Indigenous peoples that live there.** **Indigenous peoples are those who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they came to be in a particular place - indeed how we/they came to be a place**. Our/their relationships to land comprise our/their epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies. For **the settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and over time and through law and policy, Indigenous peoples’ claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource.** Indigenous peoples must be erased, must be made into ghosts (Tuck and Ree, forthcoming). At the same time, settler colonialism involves the subjugation and forced labor of chattel slaves, whose bodies and lives become the property, and who are kept landless. Slavery in settler colonial contexts is distinct from other forms of indenture whereby excess labor is extracted from persons. First, chattels are commodities of labor and therefore it is the slave’s person that is the excess. Second, unlike workers who may aspire to own land, the slave’s very presence on the land is already an excess that must be dis-located. Thus, the slave is a desirable commodity but the person underneath is imprisonable, punishable, and murderable. The violence of keeping/killing the chattel slave makes them deathlike monsters in the settler imagination; they are reconfigured/disfigured as the threat, the razor’s edge of safety and terror. The settler, if known by his actions and how he justifies them, sees himself as holding dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as the anthropocentric normal, and as more developed, more human, more deserving than other groups or species. **The settler is making a new "home" and that home is rooted in a homesteading worldview where the wild land and wild people were made for his benefit**. He can only make his identity as a settler by making the land produce, and produce excessively, because "civilization" is defined as production in excess of the "natural" world (i.e. in excess of the sustainable production already present in the Indigenous world). In order for excess production, he needs excess labor, which he cannot provide himself. The chattel slave serves as that excess labor, labor that can never be paid because payment would have to be in the form of property (land). The settler's wealth is land, or a fungible version of it, and so payment for labor is impossible.6 The settler positions himself as both superior and normal; the settler is natural, whereas the Indigenous inhabitant and the chattel slave are unnatural, even supernatural. **Settlers are not immigrants**. Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies. Therefore, settler nations are not immigrant nations (See also A.J. Barker, 2009). Not unique, the United States, as a settler colonial nation-state, also operates as an empire - utilizing external forms and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the settler colonial project. This means, and this is perplexing to some, that dispossessed people are brought onto seized Indigenous land through other colonial projects. Other colonial projects include enslavement, as discussed, but also military recruitment, low-wage and high-wage labor recruitment (such as agricultural workers and overseas-trained engineers), and displacement/migration (such as the coerced immigration from nations torn by U.S. wars or devastated by U.S. economic policy). In this set of settler colonial relations, colonial subjects who are displaced by external colonialism, as well as racialized and minoritized by internal colonialism, still occupy and settle stolen Indigenous land. Settlers are diverse, not just of white **European descent, and include people of color, even from other colonial contexts**. This tightly wound set of conditions and racialized, globalized relations exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization, and by solidarity, against settler colonial forces. Decolonization in exploitative colonial situations could involve the seizing of imperial wealth by the postcolonial subject. In settler colonial situations, seizing imperial wealth is inextricably tied to settlement and re-invasion. Likewise, the promise of integration and civil rights is predicated on securing a share of a settler-appropriated wealth (as well as expropriated ‘third-world’ wealth). Decolonization in a settler context is fraught because empire, settlement, and internal colony have no spatial separation. Each of these features of settler colonialism in the US context - empire, settlement, and internal colony - make it a site of contradictory decolonial desires7. Decolonization as metaphor allows people to equivocate these contradictory decolonial desires because it turns decolonization into an empty signifier to be filled by any track towards liberation. In reality, the tracks walk all over land/people in settler contexts. Though the details are not fixed or agreed upon, in our view, decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonization is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity. “Decolonization never takes place unnoticed” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). Settler colonialism and its decolonization implicates and unsettles everyone.

#### The WTO as a mechanism is dangerous – indigenous rights are not respected despite rising climate issues and neoliberal globalization – don’t let them spin out of the WTO – their aff depends on the WTO as a unifying agent

Indigenous Environmental Network 1 (December 9, 2013) [The Indigenous Environmental Network is a coalition of indigenous, grassroots environmental justice activists, primarily based in the United States. Group members have represented Native American concerns at international events such as the United Nations Climate Change conferences in Copenhagen and Paris] <https://www.ienearth.org/the-world-trade-organization-wto-and-indigenous-peoples-resisting-globalization-asserting-self-determination/>

The World Trade Organization (WTO) and Indigenous Peoples: Resisting Globalization, Asserting Self-Determination We, the Indigenous Peoples of Mother Earth gathered here in Bali, Indonesia on 2-6 December 2013, organizing our own workshop and various events parallel to the World Trade Organization Ninth Ministerial Meeting (WTO MC9), hereby agreed to resist neoliberal globalization and assert our right to Self-Determination. As Indigenous Peoples of the land and the waters, we have a close relationship to Mother Earth and nature. This relationship tells us that life on Mother Earth is in danger and coming to a time of great transformation. We are accepting the responsibility as the guardians of the earth, which has been designated by our respective Original Instructions woven into our cosmovisions, cultures, languages, and ways of life. We are telling the trade ministers of the world governments that we must all work together to create a new paradigm in global trade instruments and economic systems that fully recognizes the vital life-giving cycles, well-being and territorial integrity of Mother Earth. We reaffirm our responsibilities to protect and defend our lands, water, territories, natural resources, culture and traditional knowledge, all of which are vital to the survival of all of humanity and for future generations. We will persevere in our struggle in reclaiming our inherent rights as Indigenous Peoples and for the well-being of Mother Earth. Until the right to self-determination of Indigenous Peoples and universal laws that recognize Mother Earth as a living being are observed and respected, genuine sustainable development will not be achieved. We share a common history of colonization and globalization. For centuries, we experienced the colonization of our lands, territories, air, ice, oceans and waters, mountains and forests. Colonialism institutionalized the oppression and exploitation of Indigenous Peoples up to the current era of globalization, exacerbated by the neoliberal impositions of multilateral trade agreements implemented over six decades through the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), replaced by the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995. In its 9th Ministerial Conference, we believe that the WTO will only push for greater neoliberal policies on globalization, liberalization, privatization, deregulation, and denationalization that will consequently intensify the violation of our inherent rights as Indigenous Peoples and the multiple crises that humanity confronts today. Thus, with our common problems, aspirations and struggles, we resolved to strengthen our unity as Indigenous Peoples and link our struggles with various democratic sectors and organizations worldwide until our right to self-determination and liberation is achieved. The World Trade Organization and Violation of Indigenous Peoples’ Rights The WTO is the primary instrument of neoliberal globalization to further economic globalization especially in international trade. It aims to build a unitary system of trade relations of countries around the world governed by various agreements. WTO’s catchphrases of “borderless world”, “leveling the playing field” and “free market democracies”, involves the removal of restrictions or so-called trade barriers that hinder greater corporate profit. While the WTO binds the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) to implement the neoliberal policies on trade of goods and services, the few capitalist countries on the other hand, protect their economies from these “free market” policies. Several WTO Ministerials, such as the Doha Development Round in 2001, collapsed due to continuing disagreements over subsidies on agricultural products, market access, and special safeguard mechanisms, and massive Peoples’ protests. In its 9th Ministerial Conference, the WTO will make decisions on any of the multilateral trade related agreements such as the Agreement on Agriculture (AoA), Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMS), and General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), and forge new multilateral agreements. The proposed agreement for the MC9 called the Bali Package will push for greater liberalization in agriculture, acceleration of LDCs in the WTO, and expedite trade facilitation through restructuring of GATT articles on imports-exports and trade costs. The Bali Package, along with post-Bali issues on International Technology Agreement (ITA) and Trade in Services Agreement (TISA), are labeled by developed countries as the solution to the stalled Doha Round to pursue intensified trade liberalization. Indigenous Peoples, especially future generations, will be extremely affected by these decisions and agreements. For over 6 six decades now, since colonization, neoliberal policies have intensified the sufferings of the Indigenous Peoples. Our lands, territories and natural resources have been exploited by unsustainable development projects, such as mono-cultural chemically intensive plantations, extractive industries such as mining, oil drilling, hydro projects and other environmentally destructive “renewable” energy projects. Trade and investment liberalization have resulted in development aggression and plunder of our territories. We have been displaced from our Indigenous lands and territories. Our Indigenous knowledge, values and spirituality have been bastardized. And our rights to self-determination, to our own governance and own self-determined development have been violated. While defending our inherent and collective rights, we continue to suffer from militarization and State terrorism, including extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearance, assassination, arbitrary arrests, imprisonment, criminalization of community resistance, harassment and vilification as “terrorists.” All of this has happened for the sake of globalization, and is bound to worsen as the WTO imposes more agreements and policies. Our experiences show that the removal of tariffs and quantitative restrictions on import goods has led to the influx of foreign products in domestic markets. The AoA has unleashed agricultural liberalization and imposed the importation of agricultural crops even if locally produced. It has forced many developing countries to favor transnational agricultural companies like Monsanto and compelled impoverished Indigenous Peoples to use high yielding varieties (HYV) seeds without being informed of the negative effects. The AoA pushes for commercial agricultural production, replacing traditional plant varieties with genetically altered species marketed by agriculture companies, and chemical-laden foods. The AoA eliminates the ability of Indigenous Peoples to produce culturally appropriate and sufficient food. Such trading system is detrimental to Indigenous Peoples’ food security, health and sustainability. It forces dependency to the capitalist market and weakens Indigenous Peoples’ ability to self-determined development and food sovereignty. The WTO demands reduction of subsidies on price support, while capitalist countries refuse to apply this in their own economies. This has damaged livelihoods resulting in bankruptcy of farmers including Indigenous Peoples, as they are unable to compete with subsidized and cheaper imports from abroad. States worsen this situation by failing to protect Indigenous Peoples’ sources of livelihood and food, land and resources. Through our harmonious relations with nature as part of our spirituality, culture and beliefs, we maintain knowledge and practice of Indigenous medicines from medicinal plants and animals. We, however, are denied rights and control over our Indigenous medicines when these are taken over by big corporations as their intellectual property rights under WTO. Big pharmaceutical corporations race for patents to gain exclusive control for the production, marketing, distribution and sales of products derived from indigenous knowledge and practice. We are also alarmed that the WTO allows the patenting of life forms including extraction of genetic information under its TRIPS. These capitalist monsters treat Indigenous Peoples as valuable and vulnerable targets for medical research and experiments. Trade agreements on services have further marginalized and impoverished us, with very limited access to basic social and health services, a situation worsened by government neglect and discrimination. Our right to quality and affordable education and health is further violated by GATS which allows foreign corporations to own and operate educational and health institutions leading to profit-oriented and corporate owned services that are available only to the few who have the means to pay. Education is designed to meet the needs and interests of the multinational corporations and the advanced capitalist countries above the social values and needs of Indigenous communities and national development of poor countries. As a result, the youth and the next generations’ futures are bleak and the survival of our Indigenous knowledge is in peril. Globalization has even destroyed our biological and cultural diversity, ecosystems, values and traditional knowledge that constitute our existence as humans and as Indigenous Peoples. It is the culprit of the climate crisis, which exacerbates the historical, political, and economic marginalization of Indigenous Peoples. It puts Indigenous Peoples in a very vulnerable situation, notwithstanding the fact that Indigenous Peoples have contributed the least to the climate crisis. **The** dominant world capitalist system under which the WTO and similar trade agreements operate is the culprit to the multiple crises that humanity confronts today. The neoliberal policies of globalization, liberalization, deregulation, privatization and denationalization are the root causes of the protracted economic, financial, political, and climatic crises that have put Indigenous Peoples in more oppressive and exploitative conditions and the planet on the brink of destruction. The WTO MC9 in its Bali Package is hell-bent on pushing and imposing more new deals that would intensify our misery ten-fold, as it demands the acceleration of neoliberal globalization for more profit to the few ruling elite of the advanced capitalist countries and their transnational corporations above the interest of Indigenous Peoples, humanity and Mother Earth. Clearly, the WTO advances the neoliberal globalization framework and violates all the rights of Peoples, including Indigenous Peoples and Nations, to self-determination, life and liberty. The WTO is an instrument that serves the primary interest of the multinational corporations and the few advanced capitalist countries to the detriment of Indigenous Peoples worldwide, humanity, Mother Earth and all life.

#### The alternative is to recognize indigenous people’s right to self-determination and sovereignty – this includes a rejection of colonial trade agreements like the WTO, State resources and developing indigenous spaces

Indigenous Environmental Network 2 [The Indigenous Environmental Network is a coalition of indigenous, grassroots environmental justice activists, primarily based in the United States. Group members have represented Native American concerns at international events such as the United Nations Climate Change conferences in Copenhagen and Paris] https://www.ienearth.org/the-world-trade-organization-wto-and-indigenous-peoples-resisting-globalization-asserting-self-determination/

We will persevere in our struggle to gain self-determination and autonomy. Until our right to self-determination is respected, genuine sustainable development will not be achieved. We are united to oppose and reject the commodification, privatization and plunder of nature, which includes the green economy, false- or market-based solutions including biodiversity and conservations offsets that put profit above humanity and the planet. We are in solidarity to resist neoliberal globalization. We are united to fight for our rights to self-determination and assert the future we want. We declare to Junk WTO, oppose new deals, and push for an alternative trade agenda appropriate to Indigenous Peoples. We push for an alternative trade system appropriate for us. We do not just reject trade per se, but push for trade systems that respect and recognize our traditional economies and governance. We envision systems that promote solidarity, mutual cooperation and respect, based on the needs and development of our communities and empowerment of our people. We demand systems that underpin our inherent right to self-determination and our permanent sovereignty over our traditional lands, territories and resources, forests, water, and everything that sustains life for the future generations. We demand systems that reject, and call for the abolition of, all colonial, unequal, and neocolonial trade agreements such as the WTO and other similar trade agreements. We will continue to strengthen our ranks and further develop and mobilize the capacities of the young generations and women in advancing our struggles against neoliberal globalization and its instruments like the WTO until its removal. We will link our struggles not only with Indigenous Peoples worldwide, but also with other Peoples’ movements, democratic and marginalized sectors and civil society organizations (CSOs) that have common goals and aspirations with that of Indigenous Peoples. We join the worldwide movement to Junk WTO and reject Neoliberal Globalization. We commit to consolidate our efforts to engage the WTO and other multilateral, regional and bilateral trade syndicates/agreements, and we strongly oppose agreements forged without our knowledge, participation, and consent. In our engagement to these trade agreements, we shall bring to the forefront as main points of assertion our inherent right to self-determination, self-determined and sustainable development, the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), the Alta Outcome Document and other declarations on our collective rights as Indigenous Peoples. We shall strive to achieve gains that go beyond the mechanisms and opportunities in the UN, and of the benevolence of States and governments. Like in other international fora, processes and mechanisms, we shall create our own spaces asserting our rights to lands, territories, and self-determination. We must take collective control of our natural resources based on the principles of people’s participation, gender equality, environmental and social justice, self-reliant and sustainable management systems and mindful of the needs of the whole of humanity while maintaining a deep respect, responsibility and recognition of the natural laws of Mother Earth and all creatures within. We must regain sovereignty over our lands and resources from multinational corporations and capitalist countries. We focus on building sustainable communities based on indigenous knowledge and peoples’ development, not on capitalist development. We must strive to promote and assert our sustainable ways of life, social and cultural values for the common good and the whole of society, collective interest over individual, service over profit, respect and care for nature and Mother Earth, including our viable solutions as opposed to false solutions to climate change. While we continue to unite as Indigenous Peoples worldwide, we also uphold the spirit of international solidarity with other sectors, organizations, activists and genuine advocates of our issues. This solidarity advances our global campaign for Indigenous Peoples’ rights to self-determination and liberation. Junk WTO! No New Deals! Our Immediate Demands As we conclude our workshop and events parallel to the WTO MC9, we state the following demands to the World Trade Organization, the States and Corporations: We demand for focus on new economies based on the principles of living in harmony with nature and governed by the absolute limits and boundaries of ecological sustainability, the carrying capacities of Mother Earth, and in recognition of the Universal Declaration on the Rights of Mother Earth. We demand for a stop to the capitalism of nature. All economic frameworks and trade regimes that privatize and financialise the functions of nature through green economy initiatives must be halted. Mother Earth is the source of life which needs to be protected, not a resource to be exploited and commodified as a natural capital. We call for the halt of all policies controlling the reproductive capacity of Mother Earth through market-based mechanisms that allow for the quantification and commodification of the natural processes of Mother Earth being branded as ecosystem services. We demand for the respect of Indigenous Peoples’ collective rights, such as but not limited to their traditional lands, territories, resources, free prior informed consent (FPIC), self-determination, culture and identity, and traditional management systems as enshrined in the UNDRIP and other international standards in negotiations and agreements. All trade agreements on investments, programs and projects affecting our lands, territories, communities, culture and identity without our FPIC must be immediately revoked and cancelled. We demand for the repeal of all trade agreements affecting us without our meaningful, full and effective participation and FPIC. Likewise, we demand for Indigenous Peoples’ full and active participation in decision-making processes and discourses on trade and other matters affecting us at all levels. Our right to FPIC is fundamental, and thus we continue to assert that this must be respected. Nothing About Us, Without Us! We demand for the full recognition of Indigenous Peoples’ inherent and inalienable right to self-determination and permanent sovereignty over our lands, territories, resources, air, ice, oceans, waters, mountains and forests. We demand an end to the militarization of our communities, for States and corporations to be held accountable on human rights violations, and ensured justice to the victims and their families and communities who have experienced such atrocities. Likewise, States should provide concrete support, such as appropriate technologies and funds, to help us develop for ourselves our own self-determined and sustainable development models and methods. Stop the theft and patenting of our traditional seeds, medicines, traditional knowledge, and our identity. Stop the commodification of our sacred culture for mega-tourism projects and other big businesses. Stop the criminalization of community resistance and end the culture of impunity. Pull out State armed forces in Indigenous territories, and uphold the responsibility to provide basic social services to Indigenous communities.

#### The ROB is to center indigenous knowledge production -- Our epistemology is a pre-requisite – they don’t get to weigh the case or their framing if we win their starting point is flawed

Ballantyne 14 [Erin Freeland, Dechinta Bush U, *Dechinta Bush University: Mobilizing a knowledge economy of reciprocity, resurgence and decolonization*, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 3, No. 3, 2014, pgs 67-85,]

As the conversation of Dechinta grew, the ugly politics of education on a broad political scale quickly surfaced. It became clear that education is a domain of power and privilege that is fiercely protected. Questions relating to control over its content, production and process were, apparently, not open for discussion. Curricula were deeply homogenized, deterritorialized and standardized. Post-secondary in the territory was overtly geared toward training people for industry and the endless promise of mining, pipeline and oil and gas booms (and busts). People were either emphatically supportive of the notion of ‘Elders as professors’ being recognized as equals and collaborating with university professors, or incensed by its disruption of typical academic power. The creation of Dechinta was polarizing, and reactions were telling of the deeply embedded sense of entitlement and power that the state, and existing institutions, had over determining what did and did not count as ‘education’. Rather than support spaces where academic and Indigenous knowledge would overlap, Indigenous knowledge was viewed as curriculum that should be relegated to ‘culture camps’. That processes like hunting and moose-hide tanning could draw parallels, or even inform governance, consensus building and self-determination, continue to elude most mainstream reporters, critics and institutions. Coming back to the land is a battle. ‘Education’ on the land is a direct hit to the exoskeleton of continued colonial power. By specifically disrupting education as a domain of settler colonial control to be deconstructed and re-imagined, Dechinta has challenged the most comprehensive, yet skilfully cloaked machine of settler colonial capitalism - the prescriptive education process, which produces more settler colonial bodies, thinkers, and believers. Building strong relationships of reciprocity with the land results in the crumbling of settler capitalism because it fundamentally shifts the relationships people experience and what they believe about who they|||people||| are, how they are in relation to and with land, and what they believe to be true. Being together on the land, learning with the land, and having a strong relationship with the land is antithetical to settler capitalism itself. The power of settler colonization relies on the total deterritorialization of people’s relationship with land. Deleuze and Guattari’s (1972) work on deterritorialization, ‘the process whereby colonization leads not just to the loss of territory but also to the destruction of the ontological conditions of the colonized culture’s territoriality,’ is a fitting philosophical conjecture to Dene expressions of how they are dislocated from their relationships with land due to process of nation-building and capitalism, and how this deterritorialization separates people from practices with the land that keeps them healthy, even if they still live on the land (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 192; Hipwell, 2004, p. 304). As Said (1993) has stated: land, in the final instance, is what empire is about. In this way, our relationships with land are central to the great unsettling. Reconnection, and the exchange of skills, knowledge and practice with land, thus directly threaten the settler colonial project. It removes bodies from the forces designed to encode the body as capital. The foremost space of enclosure, of encoding, is the ‘school’. The ongoing trend in Indigenous and Northern settler education since its earliest colonial intrusion has been to train Indigenous bodies to serve the needs of industry. Education has happened in Denendeh since time immemorial. It has been the settler prerogative to dismantle Indigenous ways of knowing and being, of education. Returning learning to an intergenerational exchange, on the land - which has at its very core the fundamental teachings that, if we take care of the land, the land takes care of us - will shake the foundation of settler colonization by breaking the dependency that has been created on capitalism through deterritorialization. Transformational learning supports intergenerational learners and teachers to think critically and re-imagine what the purpose of learning is. Learning on the land is healing and being in community on the land is challenging, pulling our attention to the hard work of decolonization. The year after our initial gathering, Dechinta launched a pilot semester with three courses nested within an interdisciplinary approach. Student evaluations of the program indicated it was profoundly ‘transformative’, and was for some the first ‘safe space’ of education that they had encountered (Luig et al, 2011). Interdisciplinary and collaborative, the pilot set the stage for the following four years. Dechinta now has 8 original courses, and a two semester-long program growing into a full degree that operates from -50 winters to the steamy height of summer. The challenges have been substantial. Conflict between academics and Indigenous students have made real the tensions of working on decolonization in concert, even with those who identify, or who are identified as allies. Solving conflict and difficulties through shared governance circles, while combating ingrained reactions of lateral violence and other social expressions codified in settler colonization are truly challenging, but deeply rewarding. Through the building of relationships we have a growing cohort of faculty dedicated to not just teaching but sharing in the creation of safe spaces, where the hard mental work of decolonizing in theory is met with the even harder work of decolonizing as practice. When students and faculty create a community where their relationships are ordered through their relationships with land, the work of decolonization move from a discussion in theory to practice of being and becoming a source of decolonial power. At Dechinta we debate this, and experiment with its meaning in tangible ways. Here, skills categorized as ‘subsistence’ or ‘arts and crafts’ are fundamental in forming and understanding theory. Such practices are themselves theory in action.

#### Utilitarian risk calculus is irredeemably violent and will always create zones of sacrifice drawn along lines of racist and colonial logics – even if their scaling of impact calculus to global extinction is necessary for assessing violence it is insufficient

**Grove 19** – Associate Professor of Political Science and Director of the Hawai’i Research Center for Future Studies at the University of Hawai’I at Mānoa, PhD in International Relations at Johns Hopkins University [Jairus, Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics at the End of the World, DKP]

Rather than see these two career trajectories as opposed, I think Crutzen's thinking displays a continuous concern for the Northern Hemisphere and a particular cartography, rather than a geography, of human survival.9 Crutzen, as well as the concept of the Anthropocene itself, cannot escape preceding geopolitical conceptions of the Earth. Crutzen and others who rush so quickly to the necessity to transition efforts from climate abatement to climate mod¬ification are unsurprisingly not moved by claims that artificial cooling will likely cause droughts and famines in the tropics and subtropical zones of the global south; nor are they moved by how such plans may accelerate ocean acidification.10 **The utilitarian risk calculus that favors the greatest good for the greatest number has no geographical or historical sensibility of how unequally aggregate conceptions**

**of the good are distributed around the planet.** Global thinking, even in its scientific and seemingly universalist claims to an atmosphere that "we" all share, belies the geopolitics that enlivens scientific concern, as well as the global public policy agenda of geoengineering that seeks to act on behalf of it. Saving humanity as an aggregate, whether from nuclear war, Styrofoam, or climate turbulence, **has never meant an egalitarian distribution of survivors and sacrifices.** Instead, **our new cosmopolitanism**— the global environment—**follows** almost exactly the drawn lines, that is, the cartography or **racialized and selective solidarities and zones of indifference that characterize economic development**, the **selective application of combat, and,** before that, the **zones of** settlement and **colonization**. **More than a result of** contemporary **white supremacy** or lingering white privilege, the territorialization of who lives and who dies, **who matters and who must be left behind for the sake of humanity, represents a five-hundred-year geopolitical tradition of conquest, colonization, extraction, and the martial forms of life that made** them all **possible through war and** through more subtle and languid forms of **organized killing.** I am not suggesting that Crutzen and others are part of a vast conspiracy; rather, I want to outline how climate change, species loss, slavery, the elimination of native peoples, and the globalization of extractive capitalism are all part of the same global ordering. That is, all of these crises are geopolitical. The particular geopolitical arrangement of what others have called the longue durie, and what I am calling the Eurocene, is geologically significant but is not universally part of "human activity" despite the false syllogism at the heart of popular ecological thinking that a global threat to humanity must be shared in cause and crisis by all of humanity.11 Departing from Sloterdijk, I am hesitant to so easily locate modernity or explication as the root or cause of the global catastrophe. No single strategy, war, act of colonization, technological breakthrough, or worldview fully explains the apocalypse before us. However, there is something like what Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari call a refrain that holds the vast assemblage together, a geopolitical melody hummed along with the global expansion of a form of life characterized by homogenization rather than diversification. Accordingly, if we are to make some sense of such a vast world that is, even for Crutzen and Birks, "quite complex and difficult to model," I think we must consider the particular refrain of geopolitics that is capable of, by scientific as well as more humbly embodied standards, destroying worlds along with the world.12 To eschew geopolitics simply because, as a refrain, it is too big, too grand, or too universal would ignore the conditions of possibility for nuclear weapons, power politics, and carbon-based globalization, and would greatly impoverish the explanatory capability of even the best climate models. So maybe it is not so strange that Crutzen and others' attention to the nuclear threat of great powers has all but disappeared despite the fact that Russia and the United States still possess thousands of nuclear weapons, and as of late have been all too vocal about using them. Instead, the Anthropocene, as envisioned by Crutzen as a universal concern, requires with it a depoliticization of the causes of that concern. Therefore, Crutzen's fascination with nuclear winter is geopolitical not because it is about nuclear weapons—although that does not hurt. Rather, Crutzen's attention to nuclear winter is geopolitical because it is an image of the Earth system as a system with particular beneficiaries animating that interest. Sloterdijk's diagnosis of what I am terming the Eurocene, or the space of what he calls European "earth-users," is present in the very cybernetic understanding of the planet as a spatial and substantive whole.13 In the cases of both nuclear winter and climate change, the atmosphere is a model, or more accurately, the last model. The whole Earth becomes a single integer in a larger set of planet systems **rather than a set of habitats, zones, or locales.** The Earth is merely another system isomorphic as a unit of analysis with Mars or the exoplanet TRAPPIST-if. The shift in scale from place to the planetary is much more than a pulling back from the ground upward. The integrated Earth as the representation of a system and as an actual material system is aided by a process of integration, proceeded by a few hundred years of Sloterdijk's conception of explication where each part of each environment is disaggregated, described, and then reassembled to explain the whole. The process of integration is not merely a metaphoric or metaphysical geopolitics. It is the condition of possibility to understand the planetary as being political, as well as the condition of possibility for its charting as an economic and military cartography. Unlike the Weltanschauung of Heidegger's world image, the planetary "user space" requires five hundred years of conquest, fossil fuel extraction and exploitation, settlement, hundreds of expert fields from geography to chemistry to ecology, and the normative consolidation of cosmopolitanism as a right to the freedom of movement at least for those capable of the feat.14 **The worldview or world image alone is a necessary but insufficient cause**. **The practices that** habituated, expanded, and **intensified that worldview are what is critical to its emergence.** In this sense, the Anthropocene, like Crutzen's award-winning models of climate change and nuclear winter, is much more than an explanatory model. These models are the outcome of five centuries of integration and homogenization such that the infrastructure capable of making the Earth as a system knowable could be built, and the circulation of knowledge and data could be amassed to even make the diagnosis of a geological epoch in the first place.15 Properly accounting for the origins of our ecological crisis is vital. **No political project oriented** **toward the** many possible **futures** stretching out before us **can consider the questions of ecology and justice on a global**, much less geological, **scale unless we first take on the** unfortunate **historical generality of the Anthropocene. The continuing project of Europeanization, now led by U.S. imperial power** (although perhaps not for much longer), **is central to how the planet got to this point.** Understanding this is essential for how any "we" worthy of the plurality of the planet can invent something less nasty and brutish than what currently counts as global order. A consideration of the Eurocene, a geological history and name that foregrounds the geopolitical confrontation that stands in the way of any such future, is required in order to take **the scale of our predicament seriously, while also confronting the power politics that made that scale possible.**

# 2NR

#### The framing debate first: We are going to extend our framing – The role of the ballot is to center indigenous knowledge production - Ballantyne 14 – education is a domain of control and ownership but by voting neg we disrupt such control by transferring control – injecting indigenous knowledge into education has an external impact – the ROB debate here:

If better debater : a) arbitrary question that maximizes judge intervention – what is better debater? – a better debater can easily be defined as a debater with more bids, more toc titles, ETC. Doesn’t reflect in-round performance. B) implied so restating it isn’t clash intensive c) we reduce intervention – keep it to minimalist binaries D) we have a card – evidence quality backs up claims E) we use the round to make productive change within academia – yours only focuses on Ws and Ls.

If fairness – in round fairness can never be achieved – speech time skews prove that – side bias also proves that – more valuable to look for change. Our words have implications – we advocate for shifts within debate and the real world – that’s what a negative ballot can do

#### Framing – extend Grove 19 – util risk calcus reduces bodies to numbers – this links to the K – indigenous people will be viewed as insiginifcant percentages pushed to the back – takes out their framing – w/o framing the implication is the case can’t be weighed seriously – our rotb also pre-fiats their FW anyway

1. **THESIS**
   1. **Settler Colonialism is not an event but a structure. The tangential relationship** between land and ownership is that one that draws the divide between settlers and the natives and blacks expulsed from the land and from their rights – extend Tuck and Yang 12. The 1AC attempts to walk towards progress within this line w/o changing it. Only a negative ballot shifts the line settler violence and reconciliation towards land rearrangement and academic evolution.
   2. **EXTEND The Indigenous Environmental Network cards - the WTO is a mechanism the 1AC relies on to pass policy but its ties are centered to propping up large corporations not the humans who populate the Earth. This profit-driven mindset mistreats land and violates indigenous sovereignty and people which means you should reject it on face. The impact of letting neoliberal globalization continue is climate change which makes all suffer**
      1. **They will say the aff fights against the WTO or something but a) hold them to evidence about them b) the WTO literally has to unify states into passing a version of the plan in each state’s nation so in order for the wto to matter they need enforcement this is a double bind**
         1. **Either A) the WTO has enforcement mechanism to keep states in check which means you do contribute to settler colinalism by following a policy in their eyes or B) they don’t have enforcement and the aff fails anyway due to circumvention so you vote neg on presumption**

#### Our alternative is autonomous spaces which states provide resources to prop up indigenous people and movements. These spaces reject colonial trade agreements like the WTO because they hold globalization together. We don’t just give indigenous people money and say bye-bye to the WTO – our method invokes indigenous movements that reject the capitalist-classist rich country first approach – they use indigenous people as test subjects and steal their medicine – rejecting colonial trade agreements solves for these anti-indigenous systems. We aren’t anti state – read our card for crying out loud – we advocate that these trade agreements be rejected and that states cooperate to give indigenous people soverignty

\*

#### We are going for a floating pik. Its too late for 2AR floating piks bad theory – no 3NR to respond – their L for not planning ahead. The ALT helps develop indigenous spaces of sovereignty where the passing of IP reduction for medicine can be passed and petitioned. Our alt and K is not anti-policy or anti-government it’s anti WTO, anti colonial trade systems and anti-indigenous violence – this means the PiK is best – the net benefit is indigenous sovereignty – that OWs – the AFF’s reliance on state action means that can never be met – our method is superior. We also have a pre-fiat implication to center knowledge. You can sign the ballot right now. It’s over!

#### Perms are a test of competition, not an advocacy. This means voting aff just passes the aff with fiat, but the alt won’t occur, since perms aren’t an advocacy. This is simply a settler trick to get what they want, using the indigenous bodies for their own purposes.

* 1. Mutually exclusive – autonomous spaces and rejection of colonial trade agreements obviously can’t work with any 1AC advocacy
  2. No intrinsic perms either – don’t let them advocate for only small instances of the alt – they should be forced to all or nothing – otw they have infinite advocacies to make the 2NR impossible
  3. Double bind and time-frame perms are incredibly confusing and cheating – you can’t apply nonsense conditional scenarios to a debate because that makes the aff advocacy a moving target that is unrespondable too. DTA on all perms resolves this

Contingent change – how long has the answer been an unconvincing “oo things are changing I swear” – BS – small instances where the supreme court doesn’t suck does not challenge the K – c/a IEN 1 – states refuse indigenous sovereignty – let colonial trade arguments destroy indigenous land //// c/a tuck and yang 12 – our theory of power is not disrupted by small state change – our theory of power indicates indigenous bodies are reduced

Cede the political/state strategies good – first we don’t reject the state – second we don’t cede the possibility of the political – its that our K is a functional pre-req to reject colonial agreements that can be as policy based as it needs to be. Also the idea of “the political” came after indigenous suffering – indigenous suffering and indigenous sovereignty are both concepts that pre-date the idea of policy making at the level the aff is refering to

For Zanotti – ask yourself what combining state solutions means and why that is necessary – even if its theoretically good why is it necessary for this round? Independently state solutions don’t have spillover – government and policy makers will never hear this round but our alt has an implication to our words – insofar as we petition against these colonial structures – that petitioning requires movement

1. Theory: Theory is settlerism – arbitrary rules only exclude set col ideas and reify the position of the settler relationship
   1. Theory also is effectively attempt at owning the debate space to your ideas – this turns and OWs the shell – c/a Balatanye 14 – your attempts to put rules education is equivalent to control of land – restrictions and rulings link into the K – exactly what indigenous people and philosophy despise
   2. K before Theory – we have critiqued what your aff represents in the debate space – we have also citied indigenous knowledge production as a pre-fiat implication to this round – your theory doesn’t center indigenous knowledge production and thus can’t be weighed first – balatanye is well warranted

#### FRAMING && WEIGHING

* 1. Set COL FUNDAMENTALLY OWS AND LINKS
  2. Set violence is eternal and consistent until addressed
  3. Colonial trade agreements propping up climate change OWs – CC is clearly an extinction level scenario that is ramping up as we speak – we OW on scope – not every person in the world will suffer from disease or even nuke war but CC will absolutely make every person across the world suffer as AVG degree temp changes are universally felt

1. CASE APPLICATIONS
   1. K TURNS CASE – you makes claims about racial and economic lines but the AFF reinscribes those globally – the poor will suffer due to climate change first
   2. Even if they make arguments about why the WTO is good – it doesn’t turn their propagation or prove that they aren’t complicit behind settler violence
   3. Them conceding the WTO is bad isn’t resolving the K – its merely admission that the AFF is horrible and they should lose because its just a worse argument

### AT Perm -- Tuck and Yang

#### Perm fails because pairing the aff with the alt diverts away from decol

Tuck and Yang 12 [Eve Tuck is an award winning Unangax̂ scholar in the field of Indigenous studies and educational research. She is Associate Professor of Critical Race and Indigenous Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. Yang is a Ph.D. Social and Cultural Studies in Education, University of California, Berkeley] “Decolonization is not a metaphor”, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society //AA

Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.

#### This means specifically doing the aff with the alt in any form of a perm is bad but doesn’t link to any alt fails if perm fails arguments.

#### Perms are a test of competition, not an advocacy. This means voting aff just passes the aff with fiat, but the alt won’t occur, since perms aren’t an advocacy. This is simply a settler trick to get what they want, using the indigenous bodies for their own purposes.

#### Reject all perms since they recreate settler reconciliation in round by saying decolonization can be pushed off or molded to work alongside settler actions

# 1NC Creation

## Thesis

#### Modernity is structured through the Settler-Native-Slave triad – the foundational architect of settler colonialism that creates the possibility for the 1AC’s political and ethical theorizing. Settler colonialism operates through the creation of the exceptional settler citizen, the native marked by elimination, and blackness reduced to enslavability. La Paperson 17.

La Paperson [K. Wayne Yang – also writes as La Paperson. Associate Professor & Director of Undergraduate Studies] A Third University is Possible. 2017. Minnesota University Press.

The Settler–Native–Slave Triad Does Not Describe Identities One of the main interventions of settler colonial studies has been to insist that the patterning of social relations is shaped by colonialism’s thirst for land and thus is shaped to fit modes of empire. Because colonialism is a perverted affair, our relationships are also warped into complicitous arrangements of violation, trespass, and collusion with its mechanisms. For Fanon, the psychosis of colonialism arises from the patterning of violence into the binary relationship between the immune humanity of the white settler and the impugned humanity of the native. For Fanon, the supremacist “right” to create settler space that is immune from violence, and the “right” to abuse the body of the Native to maintain white immunity, this is the spatial and fleshy immediacy of settler colonialism. Furthermore, the “humanity” of the settler is constructed upon his agency over the land and nature. As Maldonado-Torres explains, “I think, therefore I am” is actually an articulation of “I conquer, therefore I am,” a sense of identity posited upon the harnessing of nature and its “natural” people.[[8]](https://manifold.umn.edu/read/7ba69a54-7131-4598-9fec-815890725d91/section/06ac5ab1-761c-43da-8a6a-0cb7ecc1760b#en29) This creates a host of post+colonial problems that have come to define modernity. Because the humanity of the settler is predicated on his ability to “write the world,” to make history upon and over the natural world, the colonized is instructed to make her claim to humanity by similarly acting on the world or, more precisely, acting in his. Indeed, for Fanon, it is the perverse ontology of settler becomings—becoming landowner or becoming property, becoming killable or becoming a killer—and the mutual implication of tortured and torturer that mark the psychosis of colonialism. This problem of modernity and colonial psychosis is echoed in Jack Forbes’s writings: Columbus was a wétiko. He was mentally ill or insane, the carrier of a terribly contagious psychological disease, the wétiko psychosis. . . . The wétiko psychosis, and the problems it creates, have inspired many resistance movements and efforts at reform or revolution. Unfortunately, most of these efforts have failed because they have never diagnosed the wétiko.[[9]](https://manifold.umn.edu/read/7ba69a54-7131-4598-9fec-815890725d91/section/06ac5ab1-761c-43da-8a6a-0cb7ecc1760b#en30) Under Western modernity, becoming “free” means becoming a colonizer, and because of this, “the central contradiction of modernity is freedom.”[[10]](https://manifold.umn.edu/read/7ba69a54-7131-4598-9fec-815890725d91/section/06ac5ab1-761c-43da-8a6a-0cb7ecc1760b#en31) Critiques of settler colonialism, therefore, do not offer just another “type” of colonialism to add to the literature but a mode of analysis that has repercussions for any diagnosis of coloniality and for understanding the modern conditions of freedom. By modern conditions of freedom, I mean that Western freedom is a product of colonial modernity, and I mean that such freedom comes with conditions, with strings attached, most manifest as terms of unfreedom for nonhumans. As Cindi Mayweather says, “your freedom’s in a bind.”[[11]](https://manifold.umn.edu/read/7ba69a54-7131-4598-9fec-815890725d91/section/06ac5ab1-761c-43da-8a6a-0cb7ecc1760b#en32) For grasping the twisted plotlines written by colonialism, the settler–native–slave triad is one of the most useful and most problematic heuristics in settler colonial studies. This triad is useful because it quickly describes the crooked relationships constructed by settler colonialism: the settler who accumulates rights, land, and property; the native whose presence on land must be extinguished; the chattel slave who must be kept landless. Although simple, it nonetheless quickly complicates the binaries in terms of which we are trained to think: oppressor–oppressed, black–white, settler–native. Even though white supremacy might be a prime architect in the triad, a triadic analysis decenters white supremacy as the absolute pole or umbrella of oppression. Instead, it shows our skewed participation in the colonization of other peoples and places. We are all complicit, just some of us a lot more than others. We can think of the triad as a quick sketch of colonialism on a napkin. It is useful for drawing attention to a complicated problem and for **disrupting** other paradigms. That is about how useful it is. However, the settler–native–slave triad has also forwarded many problems, in large part because it seems to describe racial identities:settlers, Indigenous peoples, and Black people. Thinking of this triad as identities creates major pitfalls—four of which are pointed out in what follows. The most obvious is the misconstrued question, are Black people settlers? This question is symptomatic of a pitfall of settler elision, where everyone non-Native is assumed to fit the category of settler: settlers = non-Natives = people of color = migrants of color = settlers of color = Black people. Such a question cannot reckon with how Black people are often confronted by the impossibility of settlement, because antiblackness positions Black people as “out of place” on land. More revealing questions would be more specific: when and where have Black communities been settlers? When and where do they cease to be settlers? The same might be asked of other communities, Black and not, indeed, Indigenous and not. Such questions are not directly engaged by the triad, because “the slave” is not shorthand for a generalizable anywhere, anytime Black community anyway. We have another pitfall of turning the triad into an identity spectrum, where settler–native–slave are thought of as points on a graph and individuals or ethnic groups can be located partway between different categories. Settler–native–slave technologies operate everywhere on everybody in intersecting, sometimes contradictory ways, and always with a dynamic specificity that radically changes with context. Antiblack technologies operate on Mien people in Oakland, California, in 2016 differently from how antiblack/anti-Indigenous/pro-settler technologies might try to reconstruct Mien students into Asian students just a few miles away at UC Berkeley. We have the pitfall of anthropocentricism. Anthropocentric analyses of colonialism prefer to talk about colonized peoples, not animals, earth, water, and air. This continual return to the racialized human subject—which is identity’s main referent—undermines the work that Indigenous studies has done to emphasize the geopolitical, the land, and the circle of relations that do not begin and end with the human. Finally, we have another pitfall of untranslatability of North American identities to non-North settings, because settler–native–slave do not map neatly onto other racialized groups elsewhere. If not identities, then what are the settler–native–slave in the triad? The triad is a figurative shorthand—settler–native–slave are figurae to describe relations of power with respect to land. They sound like identities, but they are not identities per se. As figurae, they represent sites of exception that reveal the underlying logic of settler colonial power. As a suitable analogy, sites of exception are like planets, supernovae, and black holes. None is quite comparable to the others; yet each can be analyzed for its particular gravitational effects, which in interaction come to define the field of gravity in the surrounding space. Sites of exception are not comparable, even though their effects can be felt as an interlocking lattice of power. The “settler” is a juridical space; the “native” is a world to be disavowed and dismembered; the “slave” is an ontological system. Space, world, and system are not of the same scale or form. They are not comparable units of analysis. The “settler” is not an identity; it is the idealized juridical space of exceptional rights granted to normative settler citizens and the idealized exceptionalism by which the settler state exerts its sovereignty. The “settler” is a site of exception from which whiteness emerges. Whiteness is property; it is the right to have rights; it is the legal human; the anthropocentric normal is written in its image. Not all settlers at all times enjoy the full privileges available to the “settler”; rather, settler supremacy is constructed and maintained by a number of technologies: citizenship, private property, civil and criminal innocence, normative settler sexuality, and so on. Settler technologies may be to your advantage always, sometimes, or never, depending on who you are, where you are, and what time it is.[[12]](https://manifold.umn.edu/read/7ba69a54-7131-4598-9fec-815890725d91/section/06ac5ab1-761c-43da-8a6a-0cb7ecc1760b#en33) The “native” is not an Indigenous identity; it is a world to be obliterated, exceptionalized as the necropolitical target, and also to be splintered into pieces that are constructed as “naturally” eligible for “primitive accumulation.”[[13]](https://manifold.umn.edu/read/7ba69a54-7131-4598-9fec-815890725d91/section/06ac5ab1-761c-43da-8a6a-0cb7ecc1760b#en34) The “native” is a site of exception for that which and those who are written as premodern, primitive, and thus “before” law and “before” rights. The “native” is thus exceptionalized from having any recognizable laws or rights that matter in modernity. Technologies of Indigenous erasure include military materiel and methodologies to carry out terror or genocide or containment; frontier law that legitimates murder, rape, torture, and abduction; racial science of disappearance (such as blood quantum); the partitioning of earth into “natural resources” that can be separated, owned, sold, and developed; land privation, privatization, fungibility, and development; boarding schools and institutions of cultural assimilation; resource development and cultivation, and so on. Technologies of Indigenous erasure are applied to Indigenous people, but some are also applied to enemy Others in war, some are recommissioned to reinvent spaces of frontier and border, some are used to gentrify and redevelop ghettoized space.[[14]](https://manifold.umn.edu/read/7ba69a54-7131-4598-9fec-815890725d91/section/06ac5ab1-761c-43da-8a6a-0cb7ecc1760b#en35) Anti-indigenous technologies are applied to nonhumans—sometimes specifically to eliminate Indigenous people, such as killing the buffalo as a means to starve Plains peoples; sometimes in the name of progress, such as the killing of Haitian Kreyòl pigs; sometimes as a reflex of desecration, such as the poisoning of nonwhite waters. Primitive accumulation involves not only the gathering of “natural” resources as assets but also the externalizing of the “cost” of the accumulation in the form of contaminated water, disease, and other traumas to the “natural,” nonpropertied, that is, “indigenous,” world. To be subject to anti-Indian technologies does not require you to be an Indigenous person. The “slave” describes how blackness is transfigured into enslavability and murderability. The “slave” should not be analyzed as a category of labor that “reduces Blackness to a mere tool of settlement” but rather as an ontology of total fungibility and unending property constitutive of the very world order of settler colonialism.[[15]](https://manifold.umn.edu/read/7ba69a54-7131-4598-9fec-815890725d91/section/06ac5ab1-761c-43da-8a6a-0cb7ecc1760b#en36) That is, the logic of racial capital creates an indefinite being of property to be exchanged, to be shipped or stored, to be parted out, to be disposed. The technologies of antiblackness create ontological illegality or criminal presence, landlessness, lethal geographies, carceral apparatuses, trafficking and abduction, nonpersonhood, and so on. Obviously, technologies of antiblackness circulate onto non-Black bodies. In a U.S.–Mexican borderland context, for example, we see the condensation of antiblack and anti-Indigenous technologies to dispose of brown bodies and to create frontier space—a militarized zone of policing and death. In North American ghetto contexts, we see the wide-scale application of antiblack technologies upon whole communities who can be of mixed ethnicities. However, one incomparable technology of antiblackness is the production of the Black body as in itself the preeminent site for antiblackness.[[16]](https://manifold.umn.edu/read/7ba69a54-7131-4598-9fec-815890725d91/section/06ac5ab1-761c-43da-8a6a-0cb7ecc1760b#en37)Whereas settler technologies can focus on space, and technologies of Indigenous erasure can focus on land, technologies of antiblackness have a corporeal priority.

## Links

### Util (Long)

#### Utilitarian risk calculus is irredeemably violent and will always create zones of sacrifice drawn along lines of racist and colonial logics – even if their scaling of impact calculus to global extinction is necessary for assessing violence it is insufficient

**Grove 19** – Associate Professor of Political Science and Director of the Hawai’i Research Center for Future Studies at the University of Hawai’I at Mānoa, PhD in International Relations at Johns Hopkins University [Jairus, Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics at the End of the World, DKP]

Rather than see these two career trajectories as opposed, I think Crutzen's thinking displays a continuous concern for the Northern Hemisphere and a particular cartography, rather than a geography, of human survival.9 Crutzen, as well as the concept of the Anthropocene itself, cannot escape preceding geopolitical conceptions of the Earth. Crutzen and others who rush so quickly to the necessity to transition efforts from climate abatement to climate mod¬ification are unsurprisingly not moved by claims that artificial cooling will likely cause droughts and famines in the tropics and subtropical zones of the global south; nor are they moved by how such plans may accelerate ocean acidification.10 **The utilitarian risk calculus that favors the greatest good for the greatest number has no geographical or historical sensibility of how unequally aggregate conceptions**

**of the good are distributed around the planet.** Global thinking, even in its scientific and seemingly universalist claims to an atmosphere that "we" all share, belies the geopolitics that enlivens scientific concern, as well as the global public policy agenda of geoengineering that seeks to act on behalf of it. Saving humanity as an aggregate, whether from nuclear war, Styrofoam, or climate turbulence, **has never meant an egalitarian distribution of survivors and sacrifices.** Instead, **our new cosmopolitanism**— the global environment—**follows** almost exactly the drawn lines, that is, the cartography or **racialized and selective solidarities and zones of indifference that characterize economic development**, the **selective application of combat, and,** before that, the **zones of** settlement and **colonization**. **More than a result of** contemporary **white supremacy** or lingering white privilege, the territorialization of who lives and who dies, **who matters and who must be left behind for the sake of humanity, represents a five-hundred-year geopolitical tradition of conquest, colonization, extraction, and the martial forms of life that made** them all **possible through war and** through more subtle and languid forms of **organized killing.** I am not suggesting that Crutzen and others are part of a vast conspiracy; rather, I want to outline how climate change, species loss, slavery, the elimination of native peoples, and the globalization of extractive capitalism are all part of the same global ordering. That is, all of these crises are geopolitical. The particular geopolitical arrangement of what others have called the longue durie, and what I am calling the Eurocene, is geologically significant but is not universally part of "human activity" despite the false syllogism at the heart of popular ecological thinking that a global threat to humanity must be shared in cause and crisis by all of humanity.11 Departing from Sloterdijk, I am hesitant to so easily locate modernity or explication as the root or cause of the global catastrophe. **No single** strategy, war, act of colonization, technological breakthrough, or **worldview fully explains** the **apocalypse before us. However, there is** something like what Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari call a **refrain** that **holds the vast assemblage together**, a geopolitical melody hummed along with the global expansion of a form of life characterized by homogenization rather than diversification. Accordingly, if we are to make some sense of such a vast world that is, even for Crutzen and Birks, "quite complex and difficult to model," I think we must consider the particular refrain of geopolitics that is capable of, by scientific as well as more humbly embodied standards, **destroying worlds** along with the world.12 **To eschew geopolitics** simply **because,** as a refrain, **it is too big**, too grand, or too universal **would ignore the conditions of possibility for nuclear weapons, power politics, and carbon-based globalization, and would greatly impoverish** the **explanatory capability of** even the best **climate models.** So maybe it is not so strange that Crutzen and others' attention to the nuclear threat of great powers has all but disappeared despite the fact that Russia and the United States still possess thousands of nuclear weapons, and as of late have been all too vocal about using them. Instead, the Anthropocene, as envisioned by Crutzen as a universal concern, requires with it a depoliticization of the causes of that concern. Therefore, Crutzen's **fascination with nuclear winter is geopolitical** not because it is about nuclear weapons—although that does not hurt. Rather, Crutzen's attention to nuclear winter is geopolitical because it is an image of the Earth system as a system with particular beneficiaries animating that interest. Sloterdijk's diagnosis of what I am terming the Eurocene, or the space of what he calls European "earth-users," is present in the very cybernetic understanding of the planet as a spatial and substantive whole.13 In the cases of both nuclear winter and climate change, the atmosphere is a model, or more accurately, the last model. The whole Earth becomes a single integer in a larger set of planet systems **rather than a set of habitats, zones, or locales.** The Earth is merely another system isomorphic as a unit of analysis with Mars or the exoplanet TRAPPIST-if. The shift in scale from place to the planetary is much more than a pulling back from the ground upward. The integrated Earth as the representation of a system and as an actual material system is aided by a process of integration, proceeded by a few hundred years of Sloterdijk's conception of explication where each part of each environment is disaggregated, described, and then reassembled to explain the whole. **The process of integration is not merely a metaphoric or metaphysical** geopolitics. **It is the condition of possibility to understand the planetary as being political, as well as the condition of possibility for its charting as an economic and military cartography.** Unlike the Weltanschauung of Heidegger's world image, the planetary "user space" requires five hundred years of conquest, fossil fuel extraction and exploitation, settlement, hundreds of expert fields from geography to chemistry to ecology, and the normative consolidation of cosmopolitanism as a right to the freedom of movement at least for those capable of the feat.14 **The worldview or world image alone is a necessary but insufficient cause**. **The practices that** habituated, expanded, and **intensified that worldview are what is critical to its emergence.** In this sense, the Anthropocene, like Crutzen's award-winning models of climate change and nuclear winter, is much more than an explanatory model. These models are the outcome of five centuries of integration and homogenization such that the infrastructure capable of making the Earth as a system knowable could be built, and the circulation of knowledge and data could be amassed to even make the diagnosis of a geological epoch in the first place.15 Properly accounting for the origins of our ecological crisis is vital. **No political project oriented** **toward the** many possible **futures** stretching out before us **can consider the questions of ecology and justice on a global**, much less geological, **scale unless we first take on the** unfortunate **historical generality of the Anthropocene. The continuing project of Europeanization, now led by U.S. imperial power** (although perhaps not for much longer), **is central to how the planet got to this point.** **Understanding this is essential for how any "we" worthy of the plurality of the planet can invent something less nasty and brutish than what currently counts as global order.** **A consideration of the Eurocene**, a geological history and name **that foregrounds the geopolitical confrontation** that stands in the way of any such future, **is required in order to take the scale of our predicament seriously, while also confronting the power politics that made that scale possible.**

### Util – Short

#### Mill’s Utilitarianism was historically used as a justification for colonization AND the theory fundamentally excludes indigenous struggles

Campbell 10 Craig Grant Campbell (2010) [Assistant Teaching Professor of Education (Lifelong Learning and Adult Education) His academic training includes a doctorate in Adult and Higher Education from Northern Illinois University and graduate work in Cross Cultural Studies with Indigenous Knowledge Systems emphasis from the University of Alaska Fairbanks.]‘Mill’s Liberal Project and Defence of Colonialism from a Post-Colonial Perspective’, South African Journal of Philosophy, 29:2, 63-73. DOI: 10.4314/sajpem.v29i2.57049 //AA

Colonial rule was thus not a moral concern for either of the Mill's in that both believed it was good and just because it advanced civilization and promoted the general welfare of the colonized population. John Stuart Mill constantly defended the role of the East India Company before Britain's Parliament and went to great lengths to describe the multitude of ways in which Indian society had benefitted from British rule, especially with regard to public services and the establishment of political and social institutions. In 1853, for example, he stated: ‘It must be said that the years which have since elapsed have been marked by a degree of activity in every description of public improvement, not only greater than that exhibited previously, but unsurpassed, it is believed, in any country in any age’ (Mill 1977b:93). The above highlights Mill's belief that the mission of the East India Company was to help provide Indian society with the stimulus necessary for development and progress, without which they would remain a backward and stagnant race. Mill's views on colonialism reflected the age in which he lived, when few Europeans questioned the notion that their cultures were far superior to other contemporary cultures, that Western European society was at the forefront of development and civilization, and thus that it was their moral duty to spread their ‘ways’ to all peoples of the world (Habibi 1999:125). Mill's admiration for European culture and justification for British paternalism, is highlighted by his claim that, ‘among the inhabitants of our earth, the European family of nations is the only one which has ever yet to show any capability of spontaneous improvement beyond a certain low-level’ (Mill 1977c:197). Mill's claim that ‘…despotism is a legitimate mode of dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement…’ offers further support for his colonialism and his acknowledgement of the superiority of European cultures as the most progressive forces to stimulate growth and development within stagnant, non-progressive societies (Mill 1977a:224). Backward societies, according to Mill, had no right to non-interference as he did not believe that progression was a ‘natural, historical process’, but rather that ‘backward’ societies would remain in such a state unless there was paternalistic intervention by a more developed nation. Founded on his utilitarian justification, Mill claimed that in comparison to the chaos and despotism it replaced, British rule provided order, unification and a liberal challenge to the traditional repression which fuelled the stagnation of most ‘backward’ societies. This ‘vision’ is evident in the fact that Mill vehemently opposed a system of indirect rule where the ‘British propped up Indian princes as semi-autonomous allies and used them as bulwarks against possible threats from other princes or rebellious subjects’, and believed that such a system was detrimental to the ‘Imperial task’ (Zastoupil 1988:37). Indirect rule merely protected the atrocious behaviour of, what was considered by Mill, a ‘barbaric’ and ‘backward’ social system. Direct British rule, on the other hand, was the only appropriate method to fulfil the ‘civilising mission’ of colonial rule and therefore advocated the importance of good administration to bringing about social and political improvement.

#### Util justified colonization to help supposedly “backward” indigenous societies. Indigenous genocide was justified, and now with 0.9% of the US population being indigenous, Util justifies continued colonization and harms to indigenous people WHILE granting setters a moral high ground

## Impacts

### Imperialism, War, Colonization – 29 seconds

#### Settler Colonialism fuels and enables globalized violence

Tuck and Yang 12 [Eve Tuck is an award winning Unangax̂ scholar in the field of Indigenous studies and educational research. She is Associate Professor of Critical Race and Indigenous Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. Yang is a Ph.D. Social and Cultural Studies in Education, University of California, Berkeley] “Decolonization is not a metaphor” //AA

Settler colonialism fuels imperialism all around the globe. Oil is the motor and motive for war and so was salt, so will be water. Settler sovereignty over these very pieces of earth, air, and water is what makes possible these imperialisms. The same yellow pollen in the water of the Laguna Pueblo reservation in New Mexico, Leslie Marmon Silko reminds us, is the same uranium that annihilated over 200,000 strangers in 2 flashes. The same yellow pollen that poisons the land from where it came. Used in the same war that took a generation of young Pueblo men. Through the voice of her character Betonie, Silko writes, “Thirty thousand years ago they were not strangers. You saw what the evil had done; you saw the witchery ranging as wide as the world" (Silko, 1982, p. 174). In Tucson, Arizona, where Silko lives, her books are now banned in schools. Only curricular materials affirming the settler innocence, ingenuity, and right to America may be taught. In “No”, her response to the 2003 United States invasion of Iraq, Mvskoke/Creek poet Joy Harjo (2004) writes, “Yes, that was me you saw shaking with bravery, with a government issued rifle on my back. I’m sorry I could not greet you, as you deserved, my relative.” Don’t Native Americans participate in greater rates in the military? asks the young-ish man from Viet Nam. “Indian Country” was/is the term used in Viet Nam, Afghanistan, Iraq by the U.S. military for ‘enemy territory’. The first Black American President said without blinking, “There was a point before folks had left, before we had gotten everybody back on the helicopter and were flying back to base, where they said Geronimo has been killed, and Geronimo was the code name for bin Laden.” Elmer Pratt, Black Panther leader, falsely imprisoned for 27 years, was a Vietnam Veteran, was nicknamed ‘Geronimo’. Geronimo is settler nickname for the Bedonkohe Apache warrior who fought Mexican and then U.S. expansion into Apache tribal lands. The Colt .45 was perfected to kill Indigenous people during the ‘liberation’ of what became the Philippines, but it was first invented for the ‘Indian Wars’ in North America alongside The Hotchkiss Canon- a gattling gun that shot canonballs. The technologies of the permanent settler war are reserviced for foreign wars, including boarding schools, colonial schools, urban schools run by military personnel. It is properly called Indian Country. Ideologies of US settler colonialism directly informed Australian settler colonialism. South African apartheid townships, the kill-zones in what became the Philippine colony, then nation-state, the checkerboarding of Palestinian land with checkpoints, were modeled after U.S. seizures of land and containments of Indian bodies to reservations. The racial science developed in the U.S. (a settler colonial racial science) informed Hitler’s designs on racial purity (“This book is my bible” he said of Madison Grant’s The Passing of the Great Race). The admiration is sometimes mutual, the doctors and administrators of forced sterilizations of black, Native, disabled, poor, and mostly female people - The Sterilization Act accompanied the Racial Integrity Act and the Pocohontas Exception - praised the Nazi eugenics program. Forced sterilizations became illegal in California in 1964. The management technologies of North American settler colonialism have provided the tools for internal colonialisms elsewhere.

### Recreates impacts - 29 seconds

#### Settler colonialism structures violence as a necessary aspect of life—their impacts are inevitable under the settler state

Maldonado-Torres ‘8 [Nelson, Associate Prof of CompLit @ Rutgers U, Against War: Views from the Underside of Modernity, p. 217-21]

Dussel, Quijano, and Wynter lead us to the understanding that what happened in the Americas was a transformation and **naturalization of the non-ethics of war**—which represented a sort of exception to the ethics that regulate normal conduct in Christian countries—into a more **stable and long-standing reality of damnation**, and that this epistemic and material shift occurred in the colony**. Damnation, life in hell, is colonialism**: a reality characterized by the naturalization of war by means of the naturalization of slavery, now justified in relation to the very constitution of people and no longer solely or principally to their faith or belief. That human beings become slaves when they are vanquished in a war translates in the Americas into **the suspicion that the conquered people, and then non-European peoples in general, are constitutively inferior** and that therefore they should assume a position of slavery and serfdom. Later on, this idea would be solidified with respect to the slavery of African peoples, achieving stability up to the present with the tragic reality of different forms of racism. Through this process, what looked like a "state of exception" in the colonies became the rule in the modern world. However, deviating from Giorgio Agarnben's diagnosis, one must say that the colony--long before the concentration camp and the Nazi politics of extermination--served as the testing ground for the limits and possibilities of modernity, thereby revealing its darkest secrets." It is race, the **coloniality of powe**r, and its concomitant Eurocentrism (and not only national socialisms or forms of fascism) that **allow** the "state of exception" to continue to define ordinary relations in this, our so-called postmodern world. Race emerges within **a permanent state of exception where** forms of behavior that are legitimate in **war become a natural part of the ordinary way of life**. In that world, an otherwise extraordinary affair becomes the norm and living in it requires extraordinary effort." In the racial/ colonial world, the "**hell" of war becomes** a condition that defines the **reality** of racialized selves, which Fanon referred to as the damnes de la terre (condemned of the earth). The damne (condemned) is a subject who exists in a permanent "hell," and as such, this figure serves as the main referent or liminal other that guarantees the continued affirmation of modernity as a paradigm of war. The hell of the condemned is not defined by the alienation of colonized productive forces, but rather signals the dispensability of racialized subjects, that is, the idea that the world would be fundamentally better without them. The racialized subject is ultimately a dispensable source of value, and exploitation is conceived in this context as due torture, and not solely as the extraction of surplus value. Moreover, it is this very same conception that gives rise to the particular erotic dynamics that characterize the relation between the master and its slaves or racialized workers. **The condemned, in short, inhabit a context in which the confrontation with death and murder is ordinary**. Their "hell" is not simply "other people," as Sartre would have put it-at least at one point - but rather racist perceptions that are responsible for the suspension of ethical behavior toward peoples at the bottom of the color line. Through racial conceptions that became central to the modern self, modernity and coloniality produced a permanent state of war that racialized and colonized subjects cannot evade or escape. The modern function of race and the coloniality of power, I am suggesting here, can be understood as **a radicalization and naturalization of the non-ethics of war** in colonialism." This non-ethics included the practices of eliminating and enslaving certain subjects-for example, indigenous and black-as part of the enterprise of colonization. From here one could as well refer to them as the **death ethics of war. War,** however, is not only about killing or enslaving; it **also includes a particular treatment of sexuality and femininity: rape.** **Coloniality is an order of things that places people of color within the murderous and rapist view of a vigilant ego, and the primary targets of this rape are women.** But men of color are also seen through these lenses and feminized, to become fundamentally penetrable subjects for the ego conquiro. Racial- ization functions through gender and sex, and the ego conquiro is thereby constitutively a phallic ego as well." Dussel. who presents this thesis of the phallic character of the ego cogito, also makes links, albeit indirectly, with the reality of war. And thus, in the beginning of modernity, before Descartes discovered ... a terrifying anthropological dualism in Europe, the Spanish conquistadors arrived in America. The phallic conception of the European-medieval world is now added to the forms of submission of the vanquished Indians. "Males," Bartolome de las Casas writes, are reduced through "the hardest, most horrible, and harshest serfdom"; but this only occurs with those who have remained alive, because many of them have died; however, "in war typically they only leave alive young men (mozos) and women.""5 The indigenous people who survive the massacre or are left alive have to contend with a world that considers them to be dispensable. And since their bodies have been conceived of as inherently inferior or violent, they must be constantly subdued or civilized, which requires renewed acts of conquest and colonization. The survivors continue to live in a world defined by war, and this situation is peculiar in the case of women. AsT. Denean Sharpley-Whiting and Renee T, White put it in the preface to their anthology Spoils oJ War: Women oJ Color, Cultures, and Revolutions: A sexist and/or racist patriarchal culture and order posts and attempts to maintain, through violent acts of force if necessary, the subjugation and inferiority of women of color. As Joy James notes, "its explicit, general premise constructs a conceptual framework of male [and/or white] as normative in order to enforce a politicaljracial, economic, cultural. sexual] and intellectual mandate of male [and/or white] as superior." The warfront has always been a "feminized" and "colored" space for women of color. Their experiences and perceptions of war, conA ict, resistance, and struggle emerge from their specific racial-ethnic and gendered locations ... Inter arma silent leges: in time of war the law is silent," Walzer notes. Thus, this volume operates from the premise that war has been and is presently in our midst.” The links between **war, conquest, and the exploitation of women's bodies** are hardly accidental. In his study of war and gender, Joshua Goldstein argues that conquest usually proceeds through an extension of the rape and exploitation of women in wartime." He argues that to understand conquest, one needs to examine: I) male sexuality as a cause of aggression; 2) the feminization of enemies as symbolic domination; and 3) dependence on the exploitation of women's labor-including reproduction." My argument is, first, that these three elements came together in a powerful way in the idea of race that began to emerge in the conquest and colonization of the Americas. My second point is that through the idea of race, these **elements exceed the activity of conquest and come to define what from that point on passes as the idea of a "normal" world**. As a result, **the phenomenology of a racial context resembles, if it is not fundamentally i**dentical to, the phenomenology of war and conquest. Racism posits its targets as racialized and sexualized subjects that, once vanquished, are said to be inherently servile and whose bodies come to form part of an economy of sexual abuse, exploitation, and control. The coloniality of power cannot be fully understood without reference to the transformation and naturalization of war and conquest in modern times. **Hellish existence** in the colonial world carries with it both the racial and the gendered aspects of the naturalization of the non-ethics of war. **"Killability" and "rapeability" are inscribed into the images of colonial bodies and deeply mark their ordinary existence.** Lacking real authority, colonized men are permanently feminized and simultaneously represent a constant threat for whom any amount of authority, any visible trace of the phallus is multiplied in a symbolic hysteria that knows no lirnits.?" Mythical depiction of the black man's penis is a case in point: the black man is depicted as an aggressive sexual beast who desires to rape women, particularly white women. The black woman, in turn, is seen as always already sexually available to the rapist gaze of the white, and as fundamentally promiscuous. In short, the black woman is seen as a highly erotic being whose primary function is fulfilling sexual desire and reproduction. To be sure, any amount of "penis" in either one represents a threat, but in his most familiar and typical forms the black man represents the act of rape- "raping" -while the black woman is seen as the most legitimate victim of rape- "being raped." In an antiblack world black women appear as subjects who deserve to be raped and to suffer the consequences-in terms of a lack of protection from the legal system, sexual abuse, and lack of financial assistance to sustain themselves and their families-just as black men deserve to be penalized for raping, even without having committed the act. Both "raping" and "being raped" are attached to blackness as if they form part of the essence of black folk, who are seen as a dispensable population. Black bodies are seen as excessively violent and erotic, as well as being the legitimate recipients of excessive violence, erotic and otherwise." "Killability" and "rapeability" are part of their essence, understood in a phenomenological way. The "essence" of blackness in a colonial anti-black world is part of a larger context of meaning in which the death ethics of war gradually becomes a constitutive part of an allegedly normal world. In its modern racial and colonial connotations and uses, blackness is the invention and the projection of a social body oriented by the death ethics of war." This murderous and raping social body projects the features that define it onto sub-Others in order to be able to legitimate the same behavior that is allegedly descriptive of them. The same ideas that inspire perverted acts in war--particularly slavery, murder, and rape--are legitimized in modernity through the idea of race and gradually come to be seen as more or less normal thanks to the alleged obviousness and non-problematic character of black slavery and anti-black racism. To be sure, those who suffer the consequences of such a system are primarily blacks and indigenous peoples, but it also deeply affects all of those who appear as colored or close to darkness. In short, this system of symbolic representations, the material conditions that in part produce and continue to legitimate it, and the existential dynamics that occur therein (which are also at the same time derivative and constitutive of such a context) are part of a process that naturalizes the non-ethics or death ethics of war. Sub-ontological difference is the result of such naturalization and is legitimized through the idea of race. In such a world, ontology collapses into a Manicheanism, as Fanon suggested."

## Alts

#### Reject the aff’s framing of the problem and to adopt an ethic of incommensurability and full decolonization

Tuck and Yang 12 [Eve Tuck is an award winning Unangax̂ scholar in the field of Indigenous studies and educational research. She is Associate Professor of Critical Race and Indigenous Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. Yang is a Ph.D. Social and Cultural Studies in Education, University of California, Berkeley] “Decolonization is not a metaphor” //AA

**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 **decol**onization 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 **decol**onization **is not obliged to answer those questions** - **decol**onization **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 **decol**onization **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**. when you take away the punctuation he says of lines lifted from the documents about military-occupied land its acreage and location you take away its finality opening the possibility of other futures -Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012) **Decol**onization **offers a different perspective** to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, **rather than a complementary one**. **Decol**onization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.