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## 1AC

#### Settler femicide is a cyclical and ontological antagonism that affects every aspect of living in indigenous communities and requires the elimination of Native life and the dispossession of land. This dispossession is borne by living and dead Native women who are rendered extractable because they signify the possibility of Native futures.

Simpson 16

(Audra, Kahnawake Mohawks, Associate Professor of Anthropology, The State is a Man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the Gender of Settler Sovereignty Theory & Event 19 (4): in press., JKS)

Flesh and Sovereignty I want to explain why and to do so with recourse to her body and its relationship not so much with this movement but with death and its failure to die. Spence fasted for six weeks, drinking one cup of fish broth in the morning, one at night. During that time The Sarah Palin of electoral politics in Canada, then Conservative (Algonquin) Senator Patrick Brazeau declared at a fundraising dinner that he had the flu and lost more weight in one week than she did in six weeks. This prompted a heckler to chime in, (and be reported in the Press repeatedly), “I think she gained weight!”26 Spence’s fleshy body was not seen as a sign of resurgent Indigenous life to white Canada, it was not seen as a stubborn, resolute, and sovereign refusal to die, staying alive to have that conversation about Crown obligations, about housing and about historical obligations -- it was read as a failure to do what it was supposed to do – perish. Not only do Conservative, neoliberal governments require extractive relationships to territory at all times, focusing upon surplus rather than social welfare or care of its supposed citizens (even if they are differently citizened, as Indigenous peoples are),27 those that are Conservative settler regimes require a double move, to extract from land and kill land if necessary – it is metaphorically a resource that gives itself to you for this purpose. Harper’s regime is most open about this way of viewing territory. Now all settler colonial regimes, some would argue (here I am thinking of Patrick Wolfe’s work and those on his tail or trail) have territory as its irreducible element, a desire for territory, not labor, or exclusively labor for example. But Theresa Spence’s two bodies, her Chiefly one and her Womanly one were especially untenable because they were both Indian bodies. An Indian woman’s body in settler regimes such as the US, in Canada is loaded with meaning – signifying other political orders, land itself, of the dangerous possibility of reproducing Indian life and most dangerously, other political orders. Other life forms, other sovereignties, other forms of political will. Indian women in the aforementioned example of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy transmit the clan, and with that: family, responsibility, relatedness to territory. Feminist scholars have argued that Native women’s bodies were to the settler eye, like land, and as such in the settler mind, the Native woman is rendered “unrapeable” (or, highly rapeable”) because she was like land, matter to be extracted from, used, sullied, taken from, over and over again, something that is already violated and violatable in a great march to accumulate surplus, to so called “production.” This helps us to understand the so-called “phenomenon” of the disappeared women, the murdered and missing Native women and girls in Canada. When we account for this way of looking at Indian women it is not a mystery, is not without explanation, their so called “disappearances” are consistent with this ongoing project of dispossession. And we can see that this is sociology and this is criminal. Sherene Razack (2002), Andrea Smith (2005), Beverly Jacobs and Amnesty International (2004, 2009), the film-makers Christine Welsh (2006) and Sharmeen Chinoy (2006),29 as well as countless activists and heartbroken, devastated family members who have marched and petitioned who have stayed on the police have all documented, theorized, and written about these deaths, these disappearances, which are explained not only by police ineptitude, by police racism, by gendered indifference, but by Canada’s dispossession of Indian people from land. This dispossession is raced and gendered, and its violence is still born by the living, the dead, and the disappeared corporealities of Native women. The disappearance of Indian women now takes on a sturdy sociological appearance: “missing” in the past decade, gone from their homes, murdered on the now-legendary “Highway of Tears”30in Northern British Columbia, off streets or reservations. Indian women “disappear” because they have been deemed killable, rapeable, expendable. Their bodies have historically been rendered less valuable because of what they are taken to represent: land, reproduction, Indigenous kinship and governance, an alternative to heteropatriarchal and Victorian rules of descent. As such, they suffer disproportionately to other women. Their lives are shorter, they are poorer, less educated, sicker, raped more frequently, and they “disappear.” Their disappearance thus is not an unexplainable phenomenon; like the so called “Oka Crisis” of 1990 in Mohawk territory, these not-so-mysterious disappearances are symptomatic of what administrators have called in Canada (and sometimes in the United States) “the Indian Problem.” And the Indian’s problem”: dispossession and settler governance are not up for examination and scrutiny, as they were with INM and the pushbacks such as Oka, Ipperwash, Elsipogtog. Theresa Spence’s fleshy life, disciplined in a spectacular declaration to not eat in order to effect a political end was a sovereign exception to the exception that Indian people find themselves in settler states of occupation, Indigenous dispossession and right now, what may be qualified as neoliberal indifference and aggression to corporeal life. The Chief’s two bodies signaled too much for a settler eye and imagination to hear let alone act upon, and were she to have died, her body would have been in fact, the eliminatory logic of the state laid bare, and made all too real. And in these times when the drive to death is apparent, when we are sent the memo repeatedly on the relationship between ideological degradation, gender, dispossession and governance, rendered in the bodies of the murdered and missing women, when Indigenous people are rising up all over, holding hands with settlers in absolute concern, grief and outrage, the language normatively should not be “reconciliation” since the historical violence of colonialism is not over, it is ongoing (Coulthard 2014).

#### Violence towards indigenous women represents intergenerational violence and incalculable trauma for indigenous peoples who already carry the weight of colonization.

Deer 15

(Sarah Deer has worked to end violence against women for over 20 years. She began as a volunteer rape victim advocate as an undergraduate and later received her J.D. with a Tribal Lawyer Certificate from the University of Kansas School of Law. She is currently a professor at Mitchell Hamline School of Law. Her scholarship focuses on the intersection of federal Indian law and victims’ rights. A citizen of the Muscogee (Creek) Nation of Oklahoma, Deer is a co-author of three textbooks on tribal law., “The Beginning and End of Rape Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America”, University of Minnesota Press, hardback, JKS)

I want to move now to a more important question: “What harm is rape doing to tribal nations?” Answering this question requires a more difficult inquiry than number crunching because each dehumanizing number in a data set represents a woman’s life. Each woman’s life is connected to many other women’s lives—daughters, sisters, mothers, cousins, and friends.28 Trying to conceive of the community harm that is done by extremely high rates of rape can be overwhelming. Louise Erdrich’s novel The Round House tells the story of the rape of one Native woman from the perspective of the woman’s thirteen-year-old son, a perspective that underscores the ripple effect. In the novel, both son and father suffer greatly in processing the experience that their mother and wife has suffered. Their lives are forever changed, which in turn, changes the other people in their worlds. I approach this topic with some degree of trepidation because this kind of exploration has not always benefited Native people. Native communities are too often portrayed as traumatized, broken, and dysfunctional—all stereotypes of inferiority that neglect to honor the resilience and survival of the people by focusing on the bad rather than the good. Nonetheless, many of the challenges experienced by Native people today can be connected to the experience of rape, and the failure to confront these issues will be to the detriment of all Native people. There has been a growing trend among Native women’s organizations to share painful information in ways that also celebrate and honor the strength in Native cultures. A prime example is the Barrette Project of the Minnesota Indian Women’s Sexual Assault Coalition. MIWSAC, a grassroots coalition of tribal anti-rape organizations, created the project as a public awareness “exhibit. The “living memorial” exhibit (and its companion book) is made up of beaded and quilled barrettes, each accompanied by the testimony of a Native woman or girl affected by rape. The exhibit thus contains elements and images of honor, beauty, and strength while simultaneously offering up difficult truths. MIWSAC’s description of the project is particularly instructive in this regard: We utilize beaded barrettes because they represent so much to us as Native women; pride and beauty—a piece of our dance regalia—the love we feel when clipping a barrette in our daughters hair—or fear and helplessness, knowing that the same barrette may have been jerked from her hair as she was being assaulted. It is because we feel that beaded barrettes carry with them this strong symbolism that we wanted to use them as a physical representation of our stories, that we share on our traveling memorial—red, velvet covered boards with the stories and barrettes displayed.29 MIWSAC and related organizations have provided a platform for Native women to tell their stories on their own terms, and these perspectives, I believe, carry more significant information than any statistical report. LeAnn Littlewolf (Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe) describes the experience of widespread rape in the lives of Native women: The issue of sexual violence is too familiar. I can reach out around me and see so many faces of women I know who have lived through this incomprehensible experience. I can feel its deep reach into the lives of women and see the way it unfurls its effects into our families and to our communities. This is the Native way, “ as we find ourselves inextricably connected. And yet, being raped disconnects everything. The violation cannot be explained and this makes it impossible to reconcile. It changes the very reality of life. It is, of course, impossible for statistics themselves to convey the incredible amount of pain and trauma experienced by survivors of rape. The devastating long-term impact of rape has been well established in a variety of fields, including psychology, medicine, sociology, ethnography, and anthropology. Feminist philosopher Claudia Card writes that rape “breaks the spirit, humiliates, tames, [and] produces a docile, deferential, obedient soul.”31 The harm is simultaneously physical and spiritual, and is perhaps best captured by phrases like “soul murder” and “spiritual murder.”33 Unresolved trauma can often be the source of substance abuse and addiction—frequently described as “self-medicating” in the world of anti-rape activism. Mainstream studies of the aftermath of rape have concluded that survivors are at a high risk for developing mental and physical problems as a result of the assault.34 For Native women, the widespread nature of rape infiltrates every aspect of life. Renowned psychiatrist Judith Lewis Herman, who has dedicated her career to studying the experience[…]”“of sexual assault survivors, has described the impact of rape as having lifelong implications: “resolution of the trauma is never final; recovery is never complete.”35 Context is always critical. Imagine living in a world in which almost every woman you know has been raped. Now imagine living in a world in which four generations of women and their ancestors have been raped. Now imagine that not a single rapist has ever been prosecuted for these crimes. That dynamic is a reality for many Native women—and thus for some survivors, it can be difficult to separate the more immediate experience of their assault from the larger experience that their people have endured through a history of forced removal, displacement, and destruction. All these events are attacks on the human soul; the destruction of indigenous culture and the rape of a woman connote a kind of spiritual death that is difficult to describe to those who have not experienced it. It is not only Native women who have been raped but Native nations as a whole. Survivors not only struggle to cope with their own feelings but also bear the burden of society’s judgment. There is no one “right” way to respond to being raped. Myriad reactions are justifiable and “logical” in the aftermath of an assault, and most of the counterintuitive behavior people observe is shrouded in the shame and confusion experienced by survivors. Victim blaming is not just external—feelings of self-blame and guilt can be even more overwhelming than the trauma itself. Survivor and professor Susan Brison explains this dynamic aptly when she writes, “It can be less painful to believe that you did something blameworthy than it is to think that you live in a world where you can be attacked at any time, in any place, simply because you are a woman.”36 Several studies have found self-blame to be a significant factor in the recovery and general well-being of survivors.37 If she was assaulted outside her home, a survivor may fear “leaving her home, or if she was assaulted in her home, she may never want to return home. If someone she trusted raped her, she may doubt her own intelligence, decision-making ability, and sanity. Rape victims often struggle with “triggers” or memories of the assault associated with sight, smell, and sound. If the rapist was a doctor or nurse, a survivor may avoid necessary medical care. If the rapist was a police officer, she may never call for help again (and may teach her daughters not to call, either—no matter how bad things may seem). In short, rape affects more than the individual victims; it has an impact on the entire community. Women play significant roles in tribal communities, culturally, spiritually, and politically, and have been referred to as the “backbone” of tribal sovereignty.38 Sovereignty thus suffers when the women suffer. The fact that over one-third of Native women have been traumatized by rape inhibits their ability to contribute productively to the community. The insidious and cyclical nature of sexual violence compounds the trauma, particularly in communities where there has been no effective intervention for centuries.” “This is not to say that women who experience sexual assault are doomed to a life of despair and pain. On the contrary, Native women survivors who have shared their stories of survival with me have impressed upon me their strength of will and resolve in the face of brutality and oppression. Native women can indeed survive and heal after rape, but the immediate and lingering aftereffects of the crime can result in significant (if temporary) impairments in their lives. I seek to acknowledge and document the devastation left in the wake of rape, and to address how tribal legal systems might play a role in responding to this devastation.”

#### Err heavily aff to check for cognitive bias that artificially inflates the benefits of space expansionism and drives modern space activity – it’s embedded within a broader metanarrative about Settler-Colonialism on the Earth, with Space being analogized to the “final frontier” that Settlers are naturally predestined to exploit. Support for the “validity” of the space expansion narrative then justifies all violent conquest and colonialism by positing it as the natural relation between humans, Earth, and the cosmos

Deudney 20 (Daniel Deudney – PhD in Political Science @ Princeton University, “Dark Skies: Space Expansionism, Planetary Geopolitics & The Ends of Humanity”, 2020, pgs. 12-13, EmmieeM)

The projects advanced by space expansionists, and the problems they seek to address, gain further intellectual power because they are embedded in a larger metanarrative about humanity, Earth, and cosmos, an epic story that connects past, present, and future. Space expansionism seamlessly combines Big History with Big Futurism. Space expansionism is more than the sum of its programmatic parts because it advances a comprehensive account, a narrative whole, in which its many projects are nested. The space expansionist narrative has extremely broad spatial and temporal scope, offering a macrohistorical, planetary scale account of human development and its interaction with nature. Space expansionists tell this large story about the human past and present, and then extrapolate it into imagined space futures. In this story, the present sits at a decisive intersection point, culminating millennia of steadily rising interdependence and interaction on the Earth, but at the threshold of an ultimately limitless expansion across the “final frontier” of cosmic outer space (see Figure 1.2). In an era when Grand Narratives—particularly those associated with the Enlightenment—have become suspect among the humanistic intelligentsia, space expansionists cast themselves as the avant-garde of technological civilization and advance the most comprehensively progressive Grand Narrative of Enlightenment modernity

This narrative employs numerous geohistorical analogies suggesting that expansion into outer space continues patterns of spatial expansion across Earth history. In the largest temporal frame, the space enterprise is likened to the expansion of organic life on Earth, as well as many historical terrestrial expansions of humanity on Earth. Familiar Earth geographic features, notably oceans, islands, and frontiers, are analogized with the features of outer space. In this story, technological advancement, from the control of fire and the invention of clothing to large sailing ships and malaria prophylaxis turn formidable natural barriers into new frontiers, enabling humans to expand their habitats through further exploration, conquest, and colonization, a pattern that will continue as new technologies enable expansions into outer space. This expansion narrative gains further credibility by incorporating powerful high modernist Promethean ideas about the cosmos, nature and life, and scientific and technological progress. Although expansionists claim space ventures will benefit all humanity, they also anticipate special advantage for those who first undertake them, while peoples who fail to seize opportunities for space expansion will fall behind.

#### Vote affirmative to endorse a remapping of planetary consciousness that centers indigenous self-determination and allows a redefinition and reshaping of what space looks like for indigenous women. Quests for outer space dominance and attempts to render space *terra nullius* and void of occupation reifies settlerist and hegemonic domination over the “unknown.” Indigenous peoples, especially women, are always spatially criminalized as improper subjects of the state—remapping reorganizes and preserves a space that was never blank or fixed in time or space, and the aff’s examination of spatialized power dynamics builds avenues to recover a violent history of erasure and provides imaginative modes to unsettle colonial spaces and patriarchal institutions

Goeman 13 [Mishuana, Tonawanda Band of Seneca Indians, an assistant professor of gender studies at the University of California, Los Angeles, Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping our Nations, Regents of the University of Minnesota, “Introduction” pg. 1-36. Bracketed/slashed for ableist language //hdm, rc HKR-RM]

In this book, I interrogate the use of historical and culturally situated spatial epistemologies, geographic metaphors, and the realities they produce; examine the discourse of spatial decolonization; and trace a trajectory of spatial configuration in Native women's writing. Yet this is not a treatise on Native women's construction of self, nor do I believe that such a text would be appropriate apart from a lengthy discussion of individual cultural con­struction that coincides with tribal specificities as well as those that interro­gate how the United States, Mexico, and Canada map difference. The texts with which I have chosen to work are documents: they provide evidence of the reality of Native women imagining and partaking in a future that pro­duces possibilities for Native people. Rather than stand on the periphery, Native women are at the center of how our nations, both tribal and nontribal, have been imagined. The Native literature I discuss reorganizes a space that was never blank or fixed in time or space. Examining discourses of spatialized power dynamics in literature was a strategic move on my part. The imag­inative possibilities and creations offered in the play of a poem, imagery of a novel, or complex relationships set up in a short story provide avenues beyond a recovery of a violent history of erasure and provide imaginative modes to unsettle settler space. That is, the literary (as opposed to other forms of dis­course, such as journalism, surveys, BIA/field reports, Indian agents' diaries, etc., in which Native women are continually a shadow presence tenders an avenue for the "imaginative" creation of new possibilities, which must hap­pen through imaginative modes precisely because the "real" of settler colo­nial society is built on the violent erasures of alternative modes of mapping and geographic understandings.2 The Americas as a social, economic, politi­cal, and inherently spatial construction has a history and a relationship to people who have lived here long before Europeans arrived. It also has a his­tory of colonization, imperialism, and nation-building. The authors I examine in this project employ elements of Native concep­tions of space in their narratives to (re) map a history of what Mary Louise Pratt terms a "European planetary consciousness," a consciousness that is deeply patriarchal in nature.3 This "planetary consciousness," which still largely orders the world, has had major implications for Native and non-Native communities alike. It has its historic roots in early geography and travel writing, a point I attend to in my last chapter, on Leslie Marmon Silko's Almanac of the Dead. Colonization resulted in a sorting of space based on ideological premises of hierarchies and binaries, and Indigenous women did not fare well in these systems of inequity. Settler colonialism continues to depend on imposing a "planetary consciousness" and naturalizing geographic concepts and sets of social relationships. Yet geography and the language we use to order space are formed in a "contact zone" in which various cultures interact. A main point of this book is to examine Native narratives that mediate and refute colonial organizing of land, bodies, and social and political landscapes. (Re) mapping, as a powerful discursive discourse with material groundings, rose as the principal method in which I would address the unsettling of imperial and colonial geographies. The various intersections constructed by the colonial geographies enframe the boundaries of the state and manage its population, thus affecting our current actions in the world. Aboriginal scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith reminds us about the connection among policy, people, and the mapping of space: "Imperialism and colonialism brought complete disorder to colonized peoples, disconnecting them from their histories, their landscapes, their languages, their social relations and their own ways of thinking, feeling, and interacting with the world."4 The relationships among Native peoples and between others begin to be ordered along gender, sexuality, and racial regimes that exert power and bring into being sets of social, political, and economic relationships. (Re) mapping, as I define it throughout this text and in my previous work, is the labor Native authors and the communities they write within and about undertake, in the simultaneously metaphoric and material capacities of map making, to generate new possibilities. The framing of "re" with parentheses connotes the fact that in (re)mapping, Native women employ traditional and new tribal stories as a means of continuation or what Gerald Vizenor aptly calls stories of survivance. My objective to chart women's efforts to define themselves and their communities by interrogating the possibilities of spatial interventions, such as those found in literary mappings, reflects my belief that power inheres in our stories. My aim here, however, should not be mistaken as Utopian recovery of land through mapping pure ideas of indigeneity (which I find troublesome) on top of colonial maps. Even if we were to recover the historical and legal dimensions of territory, for instance, I am not so sure that this alone would unsettle colonialism. Recovery has a certain saliency in Native American studies; it is appealing to people who have been dispossessed materially and culturally. I contend, however, that it is also our responsibility to interrogate our ever-changing Native epistemologies that frame our understanding of land and our relationships to it and to other peoples. In this vein, (re)mapping is not just about regaining that which was lost and returning to an original and pure point in history, but instead understanding the processes that have defined our current spatialities in order to sustain vibrant Native futures. Iwill examine the consequential geographies, a term Edward Soja uses to foreground a concept of spatial justice, albeit one that problematically does not address settler colonialism, in order to examine "spatial expression that is more than just a background reflection or set of physical attributes to be descriptively mapped."5 As such, my interests lie in examining the theoretical dimensions of power that struggle over geography's hold, rather than a recovery project. What are the relationships set forth during colonialism that continue to mark us today? What happens when non-normative geographies are examined? I use the parentheses in (re)mapping deliberately to avoid the pitfalls of recovery or a seeming return of the past to the present. (Re)mapping is about acknowledging the power of Native epistemologies in defining our moves toward spatial decolonization, a specific form of spatial justice I address throughout. It is about recognizing that "our geographies, like our histories, take on a material form as social relations become spatial but are also creatively represented in images, ideas, and imaginings."6 For me, Native women's literature presents ways of thinking through the contradictions that arise from the paradoxes and contradictions that colonialism presents and that Native people experience on a daily basis. Whether it was within the crisp white pages of Joy Harjo's book How We Became Human, or my musty working copy of Leslie Marmon Silko's Almanac of the Dead, which traveled with me across the country four times, accruing black coffee stains, strange smells, and creased corners, I begin to see a pattern of confronting the epistemologies that sought to incorporate Native people through their disappearance or social deaths. As I wrote the chapter on Almanac (particularly on the "Five Hundred Year Map"), I began to unravel more of my own stories. As a Seneca woman from a family that moved and migrated around the East Coast, these experiences made the nodes, centers, and webs formed in Almanac comprehensible. The layered geographies in Native literature intersect with many of my own experiences and understanding of social, cultural, and political space. My dad, a "traditional" Iroquois ironworker, would pack up our gray Chevy pickup and make my brother and me a cozy spot in the bed of the truck among all our belongings: our clothes, my mom's cookware and beadwork, my dad's tools, and an odd piece of furniture or two that always changed with each move.7 We would drive for hours huddled up in the back of the truck, fighting and playing until we arrived at a new destination or one of our home bases. We would go either to Tonawanda or, more frequently, to northern rural Maine, a place called Twelve Corners named and claimed by my grandfather. Much of this depended on where my father had a paying job. The literary narratives involved in Silko's compiling a story about History (capital H intended) and its visual representation catalyzed my introspection into the geographies that prevail in my own life and my navigation through these very different terrains. Unlike the maps that designate Indian land as existing only in certain places, wherever we went there were Natives and Native spaces, and if there weren't, we carved them out. Critical explorations of space, as figured in feminist geographer Doreen Massey's book For Space, delineate the possibilities that space holds rather than glance over it as a surface upon which we act. Much about Native mobility sees space as such, whereas in my experience we literally influenced the spaces and people around us as much as these spaces imprinted upon us. So, what exactly is space, and how do we pin down a definition when we have been conditioned to think of it as a surface of expanse and enormousness? Even if we delimit our definition by the modifier of Native spaces, the term still holds up as boundlessness. In fact, I struggled with constraining the geographies in this book until I settled for a discussion of the spaces between Mexico's northern border and Canada' s southern border for pragmatic reasons, but I am well aware that these spaces are influenced by and intersect with much broader spaces. Massey's turn to uprooting normative modes of thinking of space defined as that which becomes "obvious" in the "tellings" that position space as "an expanse we travel across" is helpful as we progress throughout this text that wishes to (re)map our geographical knowledges. In order to reconceive space, Massey opens with a telling of arrival to "new" spaces that will be named the Americas, formed through the "crossing and conquering [of] space."8 Specifically, she begins her exploration with stories of the Spanish conquistadors and the positioned narratives of "discovery." The "we" implied in this instance is that of Europeans, for as Massey's analysis of this moment continues, this depiction of space "~~immobilizes~~" and "differentiates" Europeans as the history and mapmakers carrying with it "social and political effects." Massey asks to reimagine space and "to question that habit of thinking of space as surface" and instead think of it as a "meeting-up of histories." In many ways this project is interested in the constant meetings that compose space: meeting between Native peoples, between Native and non-Native peoples, between people of color, between different migrating populations and especially meetings of different conceptions of land and ways of being in the world. As such, Massey s work with space is incorporated throughout the following chapters as she distills space into three functions that I posit are of utmost importance in decolonization projects: first, space can be defined "as the product of interrelations"; second, "as the spheres of possibility"; and third, "as always under construction" or a "simultaneity of stories-so-far." This definition moves us from essentialism, a common accu­sation made of Native scholars as we labor to maintain tribal traditions, polit­ical ground, and our lands, in that alternative spatialities are not mired in individual liberalism, but maintain their political viability. Alternative spa­tialities that I examine in this book imagine that many histories and ways of seeing and mapping the world can occur at the same time, and most impor­tantly that our spatialities were and continue to be in process. As Massey effec­tively contends, "only if the future is open is there any ground for a politics which can make a difference."9 Unsettling colonial maps is what drives this study of colonial spatial vio­lence in twentieth-century Native American literature. The stories fill in the spaces between Native lives mapped onto reservations or urban centers or somewhere in between, or those lives relegated to a romanticized Amer­ican past; the stories I am attuned to provide a window into the complexities of spatial subjectivities and geographic histories, giving us a richer under­standing of how Native people imagine community and create relationships. My personal storyties the multiscalar spaces of body, Twelve Corners, the reservation, region, state, and nation intimately together. By accounting for the various scales of geography in relation to Native peoples and a history of conquest, we can begin to understand the relationship between lands and bodies as more than just a surface upon which we travel or a descriptive geog­raphy. "Multiscalar discourses of ownership," contends Katherine McKit-trick, who examines black women's geographies during the transatlantic slave trade, is "one of the many ways violence operates across gender, sexuality, and race . . . having 'things,' owning lands, invading territories, possessing someone, are, in part, narratives of displacement that reward and value par­ticular forms of conquest."16 When I speak of the (re)mapping discourses created by the women in the pages of this book, I am speaking of the move toward geographies that do not limit, contain, or fix the various scales of space from the body to nation in ways that limit definitions of self and community staked out as property. My intervention into these various colonial scales and my interrogation of Native women's geographies should not be read as a longing to further construct or revamp that elusive "Indian" that is propped up through racial and gender codes, nor is it a putting of Indians in place or taking them out of it temporally and geographically. Instead, I am con­cerned with producing decolonized spatial knowledges and attendant geog­raphies that acknowledge colonial spatial process as ongoing but imbued with power struggles. I ask a similar question to that of aboriginal scholar Irene Watson: "Are we free to roam?" and if so, "do I remain the unsettled native, left to unsettle the settled spaces of empire?"17 Rather than construct a healthy relationship to land and place, colonial spatial structures inhibit it by con­stricting Native mobilities and pathologizing mobile Native bodies. Embodied geographies thus become pivotal to address in decoloniza­tion projects, and it is here that Native feminisms can play a major role in our thinking about the connections between land, individuals, and con­structions of nations. Bodies that are differently marked through the corpo­real or through a performance — whether through gender, race, sexuality, or nationality — articulate differently in different spaces. As Native bodies travel through various geographies, they are read differently and thus experience lived realities that are constantly shifting. For as Michel Foucault and ensu­ing scholars have argued, the body never exists outside of space and is con­nected to other indicators that are used to relegate power relations between the bourgeois and those deemed as degenerate subjects.18 For Indigenous people traveling through constructed colonial and imperial spaces, the body can be hypervisible as the abnormal body, and at times hyper-invisible as it becomes spatially disjointed from the map of the nation in both physical and mental imaginings. In "Fatal Couplings of Power and Difference," geographer Ruth Wilson Gilmore speaks about "the range of kinds of places — as intimate as the body and as abstract as a productive region or a nation -state,"19 and it is in this range of connected places that I will discuss how Native women have mapped their lives.

#### Voting aff is uniquely key – attempts to suture indigenous resistance to other movements and “tack on” indigenous feminist scholarship redacts self-determination and makes resistance impossible

Walia 12 (Decolonizing together Moving beyond a politics of solidarity toward a practice of decolonization by Harsha Walia [activist based in Vancouver, unceded Coast Salish territories; active in migrant justice, Indigenous solidarity, feminist, anti-racist, and anti-capitalist movements; delivered numerous presentations to the United Nations.] Jan 1, 2012 <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/decolonizing-together> SM, rc HKR-RM)

A growing number of social movements are recognizing that Indigenous self-determination must become the foundation for all our broader social justice mobilizing. Indigenous peoples in Canada are the most impacted by the pillage of lands, experience disproportionate poverty and homelessness, are overrepresented in statistics of missing and murdered women and are the primary targets of repressive policing and prosecutions in the criminal injustice system. Rather than being treated as a single issue within a laundry list of demands, Indigenous self-determination is increasingly understood as intertwined with struggles against racism, poverty, police violence, war and occupation, violence against women and environmental justice. Incorporating Indigenous self-determination into these movements can, however, subordinate and compartmentalize Indigenous struggle within the machinery of existing Leftist narratives. Anarchists point to the antiauthoritarian tendencies within Indigenous communities, environmentalists highlight the connection to land that Indigenous communities have, anti-racists subsume Indigenous people into the broader discourse about systemic oppression in Canada, and women’s organizations point to the relentless violence inflicted on Indigenous women in discussions about patriarchy. We have to be cautious not to replicate the Canadian state’s assimilationist model of liberal pluralism, forcing Indigenous identities to fit within our existing groups and narratives. The inherent right to traditional lands and to self-determination is expressed collectively and should not be subsumed within the discourse of individual or human rights. Furthermore, it is imperative to understand that being Indigenous is not just an identity but a way of life, which is intricately connected to Indigenous peoples’ relationship to the land and all its inhabitants. Indigenous struggle cannot simply be accommodated within other struggles; it demands solidarity on its own terms.

#### The role of the ballot is to center native feminism – any other rubric of evaluation is genocidal and perpetuates a world ruled by a white, patriarchal, and racist metaphysics. Other appeals to cohere notions of “fairness” and “clash” are themselves “self-serving” and “arbitrary” by ignoring the violent underpinnings of the communicative sphere of debate.

King 17. Tiffany King is an Assistant Professor of Women's and Gender Studies at the Georgia State University ["Humans Involved: Lurking in the Lines of Posthumanist Flight," 2017, *Critical Ethnic Studies*]//vikas

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

#### Extinction is an empty superlative that teases with global demise to mask structural culpability with the ongoing violences driving extinction – assign their arguments 0 risk.
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Extinction has become an emblem of Western, and white-dominated, fears about ‘the end of the(ir) world’. This scientific term is saturated with emotional potency, stretched and contorted to embody almost any nightmare, from climate change to asteroid strikes. In academic and public contexts alike, it is regularly interchanged with other terms and concepts – for instance, ‘species death’, global warming or ecological collapse. Diffused into sublime scales – mass extinctions measured in millions of (Gregorian calendar) years, a planet [totalized by the threat of nuclear destruction](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0306312709341598) – ‘extinction’ has become an empty superlative, one that that gestures to an abstract form of [unthinkability.](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1354066116632853) It teases Western subjects with images of generalized demise that might, if it gets bad enough, even threaten us, or the [figure of ‘humanity’ that we enshrine as a universal.](https://www.routledge.com/International-Intervention-in-a-Secular-Age-Re-Enchanting-Humanity/Mitchell/p/book/9780415705066) This figure of ‘humanity’, derived from Western European enlightenment ideals, emphasizes individual, autonomous actors who are fully integrated into the global market system; who are responsible citizens of nation-states; who conform to Western ideas of health and well-being; who partake of ‘culture’; who participate in democratic state-based politics; who refrain from physical violence; and who manage their ‘resources’ responsibly (Mitchell 2014).

Oddly, exposure to the fear of extinction contributes to the formation and bolstering of [contemporary Western subjects](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0263276415619219). Contemplating the sublime destruction of ‘humanity’ offers the thrill of [abjection:](https://www.amazon.ca/Powers-Horror-Abjection-Julia-Kristeva/dp/0231053479) the perverse pleasure derived from exposure to something by which one is revolted. C[laire Colebrook](http://www.openhumanitiespress.org/books/titles/death-of-the-posthuman/) detects this thrill-seeking impulse in the profusion of Western blockbuster films and TV shows that imagine and envision the destruction of earth, or at least of ‘humanity’. It also throbs through a flurry of recent best-selling books – both fiction and speculative non-fiction (see [Oreskes and Conway 2014](https://www.amazon.ca/dp/B00K33E4J2/ref=dp-kindle-redirect?_encoding=UTF8&btkr=1); [Newitz 2013](https://www.amazon.com/Scatter-Adapt-Remember-Survive-Extinction/dp/0307949427); [Weisman 2008](http://www.worldwithoutus.com/)). In a forthcoming intervention, [Noah Theriault](http://www.history.cmu.edu/faculty/theriault.html) and I (2018) argue that these imaginaries are a form of porn that normalizes the profound violences driving extinction, while cocooning its viewers in the secure space of the voyeur. Certainly, there are many Western scientists, conservationists and policy-makers who are genuinely committed to stopping the extinction of others, perhaps out of fear for their own futures. Yet extinction is not quite real for Western, and especially white, subjects; it is a fantasy of negation that evokes thrill, melancholy, anger and existential purpose. It is a metaphor that expresses the destructive desires of these beings, and the negativity against which we define our subjectivity.

But extinction is not a metaphor: it is a very real [expression of violence](https://worldlyir.wordpress.com/2017/07/28/decolonizing-against-extinction-part-i-extinction-is-violence/) that systematically destroys particular beings, worlds, life forms and the relations that enable them to flourish. These are real, unique beings, worlds and relations – as well as somebody’s family, Ancestors, siblings, future generations – who are violently destroyed. Extinction can only be used unironically as a metaphor by people who have never been threatened with it, told it is their inevitable fate, or lost their relatives and Ancestors to it – and who assume that they probably never will.

This argument is directly inspired by the call to arms issued in 2012 by [Eve Tuck and Wayne K. Yang](http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/view/18630) and more recently by [Cutcha Risling-Baldy](http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/view/22155). The first, seminal piece demonstrates how settler cultures use the violence of metaphorical abstraction to excuse themselves from the real work of decolonization: ensuring that land and power is in Indigenous hands. Risling-Baldy’s brilliant follow-up extends this logic to explain how First People like Coyote have been reduced to metaphors through settler appropriation. In both cases, engagement with Indigenous peoples and their relations masks moves to innocence: acts that make it appear as if settlers are engaging in decolonization, while in fact we are consolidating the power structures that privilege us.

In this series, want to show how Western, and white-dominated, discourses on ‘extinction’ appear to address the systematic destruction of peoples and other beings while enacting moves to innocence that mask their culpability and perpetuate structures of violence. As I argued in [Part I of this serie](https://worldlyir.wordpress.com/2017/07/28/decolonizing-against-extinction-part-i-extinction-is-violence/)s, extinction is an expression of colonial violence. As such, it needs to be addressed through direct decolonization, including the dismantling of settler colonial structures of violence, and the resurgence of Indigenous worlds. Following Tuck, Yang and Risling-Baldy’s lead, I want to show how and why the violences that drive extinction have come to be invisible within mainstream discourses. Salient amongst these is the practice of genocide against Indigenous peoples other than humans.

…it is literally genocide.

What Western science calls ‘extinction’ is not an unfortunate, unintended consequence of desirable ‘human’ activities. It is an embodiment of particular patterns of  structural violence that disproportionately affect specific racialized groups.  In some cases, ‘extinction’ is directly, deliberately and systematically inflicted in order to create space for aggressors, including settler states. For this reason, it has rightly been framed as an aspect or tool of colonial genocides against Indigenous human peoples. Indeed, many theorists have shown that the ‘extirpation’ of life forms (their total removal from a particular place) is an instrument for enacting genocide upon Indigenous humans (see [Mazis 2008;](https://www.academia.edu/10310917/Mazis_The_World_of_Wolves_Lessons_about_the_Sacredness_of_the_Surround" \t "_blank)[Laduke 1999](https://www.amazon.ca/All-Our-Relations-Native-Struggles/dp/0896085996); [Stannard 1994](http://www.oupcanada.com/catalog/9780195085570.html)). Specifically, the removal of key sources of food, clothing and other basic materials makes survival on the land impossible for the people targeted.

#### Necessitating the political is quite actually, unnecessary and can’t solve. Every example of state ‘progress’ the 1NC gives or move to justify the need for political implementation is a new performative link. They are symbolic gestures made by the settler state to consolidate power and erase the indigenous labor that makes those moments of resistance for indigenous peoples and women possible.
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Tribal leaders in the US context in the 1960s and 1970s pushed US congressional representatives to hold an inquiry into the key issues facing Indigenous peoples, which led to the American Indian Policy Review Commission (an inquiry). The numerous results included the establishment of US laws and policies that protected Indigenous children from harmful adoption practices (the Indian Child Welfare Act) (Parker 2018). While settler nations often came to be supportive of some of the approaches just described, their own actions toward reconciliation are often limited. By limited, I mean that they are more symbolic in intent and less about actually transforming the conditions that perpetuate violence, domination, and denial of rights. In the next set of paragraphs, I’ll review several examples of what I mean by limited forms of reconciliation, which include apologies, recognizing Indigenous peoples as ‘semi-sovereigns’, and developing laws or policies that protect Indigenous cultural integrity and cultural heritage. In some of these approaches, it was Indigenous peoples who played active roles at the earliest stages of raising awareness of critical issues needing redress. Yet settler nations and their citizens didn’t follow through in good faith with transformative actions. To begin with, few people in the US even know that about a decade ago the US Senate Committee on Indian Affairs advanced a joint-resolution to apologize to Native Americans for federal wrongdoings. The resolution ultimately failed to gain support. Of course, even the proposed apology had the following disclaimer that sanctions rigid limits: ‘Nothing in this Joint Resolution – (1) authorizes or supports any claim against the United States; or (2) serves as a settlement of any claim against the United States’ (S.J.Res.14). US-generated prerogatives for how to implement reconciliation often produce morally horrendous and unjust results. For example, the 1975 Indian Self-Determination and Educational Assistance Act and other laws, policies, and changes were part of sweeping reforms intended to restore some measures of Indigenous self-government, economic and bodily security, and protection of cultural integrity. However, in 1978, the Oliphant versus Squamish case decided that the US wouldn’t endorse tribes’ having criminal jurisdiction over non-tribal members who committed crimes in tribal jurisdictions (Duthu 2008). Sarah Deer’s work shows how this lack of tribal jurisdiction is among the major legal factors contributing to the high incidences of rape against Indigenous women by non-tribal members on reservations (Deer 2015). Yet Deer documents how US efforts to address this violence included attempts by politicians to cast the US as in the role of saving Indigenous women. Deer discusses how the 2013 reforms to the Violence against Women Act were originally introduced by a senator as the ‘Save Native Women Act’ (96) – a title later changed. According to Deer though, the ultimate reforms nonetheless pertained to rapes committed within domestic situations, which don’t cover ‘acquaintance rape, all child sexual abuse, and all stranger rape com- mitted by non-Indians. The only sexual assault that can be covered is that committed by an intimate partner’ (Deer 2015, 105). Deer shows how some US politicians justified these limits on the idea that tribes are incompetent to run their own police and courts – and the allegation of incompetence is used to justify US supervision and control (Deer 2015). The Standing Rock Tribe’s resistance to the Dakota Access Pipeline involved engagement with several US laws and policies that were probably intended by the US to be reconciliatory in various ways. They include the US duty to consult tribes in advance of impactful government or private actions, procedures that seek to protect Indigenous cultural heritage, and requirements to respect treaty rights and the government-to-government relationship (between federally-recognized tribes and the US). Yet, the ways these laws and policies are constructed makes it difficult for any tribe to really have a voice and to participate on equal or fair terms with parties such as pipeline builders and US agencies (e.g. the US Army Corps of Engineers (ACE)). Consider how such difficulty played out in ways that worked to portray the tribe as blameworthy for the conflict (instead of achieving reconciliation). US District Judge Boasberg, upon denying the Tribe’s request to temporarily halt pipe- line construction, stated that ‘Tribal and NHPA (National Historic Preservation Act) Section 106 consultation was adequate and the Tribe largely refused to engage in consultations’ (205 F. Supp. 3d. 4, 76). Or, in another case pertaining to legal and political standing, one North Dakota politician stated, This isn’t about tribal rights or protecting cultural resources. The pipeline does not cross any land owned by the Standing Rock Sioux ... To suggest that the Standing Rock tribe has the legal ability to block the pipeline is to turn America’s property rights upside down. (Cramer 2016) Yet the Tribe and its supporters have valid legal and policy claims that they were not sufficiently engaged or allowed to voice concerns meaningfully. For example, ACE’s 100 page Environmental Assessment focused too much on the fact the pipeline is ‘technically’ off the reservation (instead of focusing on the pipeline’s threats to the main water source of the Tribe), it was not sufficiently transparent or consultative, it failed to acknowledge treaty rights and treaty history, and it excluded multiple considerations that would affect the Tribes’ concerns about pipeline leaks, environmental justice, and cultural heri- tage. One consideration involved the fact that the pipeline was rerouted from an older route that would have been closer to the (largely white settler) city of Bismarck (Colwell 2016; Grijalva 2017). In other settler nation contexts, I see comparable concerns. In Australia, Aboriginal and Torres Straight Island peoples issued the Uluru Statement from the Heart in 2017. The state- ment calls for reform of Australia’s constitution to include an elected commission of Indi- genous representatives – ‘an Indigenous Voice to Parliament’ – and a treaty making and agreement process supervised by a new Makarrata Commission. ‘Makarrata’, in the Yolngu people’s language, is a word that means the resumption of acceptable relation- ships after the occurrence of hostility (Fenley 2011). Megan Davis writes that [The statement] was a dramatic departure from the conventional wisdom on ‘recognition’. Indigenous people called instead for ‘voice, treaty, truth’: a single alteration to the text of the Constitution enshrining a voice, and extra-constitutional reforms in legislation enabling a Makarrata and, consequently, truth-telling. (Davis 2017) Davis describes how the Australian government should have been ready for the reforms, since the statement sits in a continuum of Aboriginal advocacy for structural reform: the Yirrkala Bark Petitions of 1963, the Barunga Statement of 1988, the Eva Valley Statement of 1993, the Kalkaringi State- ment of 1998, the report on the Social Justice Package by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission in 1995 and the Kirribilli Statement of 2015. (Davis 2017) Yet the Australian government rejected the Uluru Statement as anti-democratic, violat- ing equal civil rights, and unfavorable to the majority of Australians. The rejection can be interpreted as actually blaming Indigenous peoples for requesting privileged treatment. he Australian Prime Minister stated that Our democracy is built on the foundation of all Australian citizens having equal civic rights, all being able to vote for, stand for and serve in either of the two chambers of our national Parlia- ment – the House of Representatives and the Senate...A constitutionally enshrined additional representative assembly for which only Indigenous Australians could vote for or serve in is inconsistent with this fundamental principle. (Turnbull 2017) Despite the Australian government’s investment in meeting with Indigenous peoples over time and desire to receive the statement, Australian politicians rejected it as undemocratic. In all these brief examples, the following appears to be a good part of what is going on: settler nations’ attempts at reconciliation actually further empower them and their citizens to believe they occupy firm moral grounds in their treatment of Indigenous peoples. Settler Australians get to say that they made a good faith attempt at reconciliation but the ‘demands’ of Indigenous Australians are ‘undemocratic’ and disrupt civil rights. Settler Americans get to say that they did their part to save Indigenous women and made improvements to VAWA. Any further problems or limitations are the result of tribes’ failing in governance capacity or competence (not the US). Proponents of the Dakota Access Pipeline get to believe that it’s the Standing Rock Tribe who seeks to violate the rule of law and simply failed to engage US legal and policy processes. The joint-resolution to apologize to Native Americans, if passed, would have provided a sort of moral ground, so to speak, that settlers have apologized without there being a need or plan for any further transformations in US/Indigenous relationships. It seems that Indigenous/settler reconciliation amounts to processes that transfigure Indigenous peoples into dependents or special sovereigns who are clamoring for settler nations to grant them undue privileges and benefits. And settler nations and citizens gain additional empowerment – whether through institutions, actions, or communications – to exercise something like a right to judge whether Indigenous peoples are good or bad dependents, sovereigns, or citizens. In Sarah Deer’s book, The Beginning and End of Rape, she has to remind the readers that it’s the actions of Native women that led to there being even attempts at law and policy reform – since often US politicians and others are more likely to be remembered (Deer 2015). Megan Davis’ reminder to the Australian government and citizenry recalls that Indi- genous peoples have been articulating reforms for years, and that the Uluru Statement’s reforms ‘are not new, just newly urgent’ (Davis 2017). I hope the examples of reconciliation processes are sufficiently clear to show that settler nations and citizens often create the illusion that they stand on moral ground in their treat- ment of Indigenous peoples. By doing so, these processes overtly and unabashedly intensify at least one system of oppression: settler colonialism. There is a wide range of work on settler colonialism in Indigenous studies and beyond (Lefevre 2015; see a note on pg. 783 in Speed 2017). Here I want to focus on how settler colonialism – when it works to create illusory moral grounds – is a specifically parasitic system of domination. I continue to be skeptical of Indigenous/settler reconciliation processes that don’t change the parasitic dynamics of settler colonialism. I want to convey some of the basis of my skepticism here.

#### Reject their generic feminism indicts and links, because we reject it too! – whitewashed feminist strategies are not our aff and fail resistance by misunderstanding racism and its impact on the erasure of native women’s identity. Indigenous feminism is key

Grande 4 (Sandy, Associate Professor of Education at Connecticut College, Ph.D., “Red Pedagogy”, pg. 124-126, rc HKR-RM)

I feel compelled to begin by stating: I am not a feminist. Rather, I am indigena}¶ While, like other indigenous women, I recognize the invaluable contributions¶ that feminists have made to both critical theory and praxis in education,¶ I also believe the well-documented failure of whitestream feminists to¶ engage race and acknowledge the complicity of white women in the history¶ of domination positions it alongside other colonialist discourses. Indeed the¶ colonialist project could not have flourished without the active participation¶ of white women; therefore, as Annette M. Jaimes notes (1992, 311-344),¶ some American Indian women continue to hold white women in disdain as¶ they are first and foremost perceived as constituents of the same white¶ supremacy and colonialism that oppresses all Indians. Thus, in contrast to¶ dominant modes of feminist critique that locate women's oppression in the¶ structures of patriarchy, this analysis is premised on the understanding that¶ the collective oppression of indigenous women is primarily an effect of¶ colonialism—a multidimensional force underwritten by Western Christianity,¶ defined by white supremacy, and fueled by global capitalism.¶ To begin, it is necessary to map the complex and contradictory terrain of¶ both feminist theory and indigenous women. Just as the political space of¶ feminism is multifarious, so is the sociocultural space occupied by women¶ who identify as "American Indian." As Devon Mihesuah (1998) notes, American¶ Indian women differ in everything from blood-quantum to skin color,¶ and from religious affiliation to "opinions about what it means to be Indian."¶ Interfaced with such diversity, however, Indian women share commonalities¶ that extend beyond their gender—most significantly, the struggles against¶ genocide, cultural imperialism, and assimilation.¶ While these common experiences do not constitute a shared American Indian¶ history or contemporary reality, nor does the heterogeneity of experience¶ preclude the power and existence of grand narratives (e.g., colonization, capitalism,¶ the Enlightenment). Critical scholar Henry Giroux (1997) maintains¶ that "grand narratives" interface with the heterogeneity of experience, providing¶ for the historical and relational placement of different groups within¶ some "common project." In other words, while indigenous women may indeed¶ differ in everything "from blood-quantum to skin color," their shared experience¶ as "conquered peoples" historically and relationally places them¶ within the "common project" of colonization (Mihesuah 1998, 38). Furthermore,¶ it is this placement that connects the lives and experiences of indigenous¶ women (the colonized) to each other while it distinguishes them from¶ white women (the colonizers).¶ Generally speaking, such "binaries" (colonizer/colonized) are anathema to¶ "mainstream" feminism, dismissed as everything from essentialist and universalizing¶ to masculinist and coercive (Lather 1998). Insofar as this dismissal erases their lived experience, indigenous women view it as a rhetorical¶ device that not only relativizes difference but also conveniently allows¶ white women to deny their complicity in the colonialist project. Indeed,¶ "mainstream" feminists have been widely critiqued for failing to acknowledge¶ their privilege and the historical significance of racial and class differences¶ among women. Women of color, in particular, have taken issue with¶ their presumptions of a universal "sisterhood" and unproblematized patriarchy.¶ On this point, bell hooks (1989, 19-20) is worth quoting at length:¶ Ideologically, thinking in this direction enables Western women, especially privileged¶ white women, to suggest that racism and class exploitation are merely an¶ offspring of the parent system: patriarchy. Within the feminist movement in the¶ West, this has led to the assumption of resisting patriarchal domination as a¶ more legitimate feminist action than resisting racism and other forms of domination.¶ Such thinking prevails despite radical critiques made by black women¶ and women of color who question this proposition. To speculate that an oppositional¶ division between men and women existed in early human communities is¶ to impose on the past, on these non-white groups, a worldview that fits all too¶ neatly within contemporary feminist paradigms that name man as the enemy and¶ woman as the victim.¶ hooks's critique resonates deeply for indigenous women who continue to assert¶ the historical-material "difference" of their experiences. Indeed, this¶ analysis joins the voices of indigenous with African-American and other "labeled¶ women" working to create awareness of the interlocking systems of¶ domination, particularly those forces that have empowered white women "to¶ act as exploiters and oppressors" (hooks 1989, 603).¶ The historical divide between white and subaltern women suggests that¶ what has long passed as "mainstream" feminism is actually whitestream¶ feminism,2 that is, a feminist discourse that is not only dominated by white¶ women but also principally structured on the basis of white, middle-class¶ experience, serving their ethnopolitical interests and capital investments.¶ Currently, however, the critique of feminism as a whitestream discourse is¶ viewed as "passe," a "well-rehearsed argument" that no longer holds validity.¶ 3 While women of color and other marginalized women have long critiqued¶ the racist underpinnings of whitestream feminism, I am not convinced¶ that the discourse has fundamentally changed. Thus, on some level,¶ this analysis serves as a test of my own doubts about this supposed transformation.¶ There is no mistaking that the contemporary terrain of feminism is broadly¶ diverse." Even a cursory examination of the field reveals a multiplicity of contemporary¶ feminisms: liberal, postmodern, post-structural, Marxist, critical race, socialist, lesbian, womanist, and transnational feminisms. Upon closer examination,¶ however, it becomes apparent that there is little if any intersection¶ among these feminisms. In other words, women of color tend be the ones writing¶ about race and feminism, lesbi-bi-transgendered women about sexuality¶ and feminism, working-class women about class and feminism, and middleclass¶ heterosexual women about a depoliticized feminism. Thus, it isn't that the¶ feminist discourse has intrinsically diversified, but rather has simply evolved to¶ be more pluralistic, "inviting" different voices at the same time the existing¶ axes of power are retained. More pointedly, contemporary feminism is a ghettoized¶ terrain, marked by an uneven playing field wherein whitestream feminists¶ commandeer "the center," and subaltern women, the margins. This reality¶ calls into question the self-proclaimed death of whitestream feminism,¶ (re)inviting examinations of the field from a variety of perspectives.

#### Settlerism comes first – the desire to sustain a defense of American hegemony as an extension of freedom and democratic justice is a smokescreen for American imperialism that can only cohere itself through the coercive expansionism of settler colonialism and genocide which outweighs.

**Singh 19** — (Nikhil Pal Singh is Professor of Social and Cultural Analysis and History at New York University and Faculty Director of the NYU Prison Education Program. His most recent book is Race and America’s Long War., “The Pervasive Power of the Settler Mindset,” Boston Review, 9/26/19, Available Online at http://bostonreview.net/war-security-race/nikhil-pal-singh-pervasive-power-settler-mindset, accessed 9-22-2020, HKR-AS)

Settler colonial narratives thus needed to be rewritten to suit extra-territorial and global purposes. To be clear, rising U.S. globalism and imperialism were not simply an extension of settler freedom, but nor should we lose sight of how they were intertwined with it. As Fortune’s writers insisted: “The U.S. economy has never proved that it can operate without the periodic injection of new and real wealth. The whole frontier saga, indeed, centered around this economic imperative.” As such, “The analogy between the domestic frontier in 1787 when the Constitution was formed and the present international frontier is perhaps not an idle one.” Franklin Delano Roosevelt himself viewed the 1940 “destroyers for bases” agreement with Great Britain—which saw the exchange of U.S. naval ships for land rights on British possessions—as the most important action in “the reinforcement of our national defense . . . since the Louisiana Purchase.” A decade later, as historian Megan Black has recently shown, engineers from the U.S. Department of the Interior—with longstanding expertise charting Indian reservation lands for hidden energy and mineral resources—were dispatched the world over to survey sources of strategic minerals required to defend “the free world.” In short order, U.S. military forces were calling Vietnam “Indian Country,” forcibly sequestering its peasants on reservations, while fighting to ensure its reserves of tungsten and tin didn’t fall to the red tide of international communism. U.S. imperialism abroad, however, did not erase the influence of settler ethics and practices closer to home. As Time Magazine magnate Henry Luce suggested, even as non-interventionist sentiment ran high in the run up to World War II, “Americans had to learn how to hate Germans, but hating Japs comes natural—as natural as fighting Indians once was.” In turn, few events evoked the Indian removal of the 1830s more than the 1940s herding of 100,000 Japanese and Japanese-Americans into camps in the Western interior while many of their white neighbors avidly claimed their farmlands and possessions. An expansive and celebratory vision of white settlement also retained its purchase: by the 1950s, Andrew Jackson’s studded republic was remade through the promise of homeownership on “the crabgrass frontier.” Working in conjunction with real estate and banking industries, federal housing authorities drew up “residential security maps” that identified with stark red-lines where the valued property, credit, and people needed go—and where untrustworthy denizens should remain fixed. By the late 1960s, as sharply racialized contests over public space and civic belonging gave way to the “wars” on crime and drugs, sociologist Sidney Willhelm foresaw that urban blacks in particular, who were no longer required for industrial labor, were “going the way of the American Indian” into carceral warehouses. It is hardly incidental that Michigan’s Oakland County Executive Brooks Patterson thought it apt, quite recently, to characterize inner city Detroit as a “reservation, where we herd all the Indians into the city, build a fence around it, and then throw in the blankets and the corn.” This push and pull of U.S. settler ethics, narratives, and corollary institutions of violence in the name of freedom has yielded a distinctive and multi-layered carceral history and geography, at once domestic and transnational: a global archipelago of prisons, internment camps, and detention centers. In the past years, at Standing Rock, its raw circuitry of indigenous sequester and citizen protection was once again laid bare as state police and U.S. military forces had tense stand-offs with thousands of Sioux and supporters who were blocking construction of the Dakota Access oil pipeline through Indian reservation lands. Here, we might observe how settler ethics and practices continue to create liberated citizens and subordinated subjects together; the former are defined by democratic, formally egalitarian claims to nationhood, legal status, consumer choice and protection, and the latter defined as atavistic, backward, passively disappearing, slated for elimination, subject to sequestration, or bound by what is thought to be permanent inferior status. “**Savagery,” in short, has been a fungible and centrifugal construct, with fears of the native fueling racism as well as nativism, while a recursive, blank-slate conception of settler primacy and preeminence animates movements, programs, and policies for eliminating or warding off alien or foreign presence**. **The inceptive structuring of indigenous elimination as a condition of the settlers’ freedom has yielded an enduring tendency among American officials, and among the publics they conscript, to think of democratic self-rule as interdependent with expansive and coercive rule over alien subjects**. After 9/11, this historical subtext returned to the foreground as Americans were told not only that fighting terrorists overseas meant not having to fight them at home, but also that continuing to shop and spend at home was no less the duty of a civilized and prosperous people. The term “enemy combatant” itself was a neologism invented for “unlawful” fighters, those deserving no legal standing or status—those who could be detained (and tortured) with impunity—those subject to an unlimited deprivation of freedom, one whose avowed legal precedent, once again referred back to the Indian wars. As inhabitants of a finite and ecologically stressed planet, the challenges of undoing settler ethics—its ways of war, its presumptions about a need for limitless growth, its hostile vision of blank slate autonomy without dependency, and its delimitations of social and political membership—have never been higher. For more than simple racism or discrimination, the destructive premise at the core of the settler narrative is that freedom itself must be built upon eliminationism, and that growth therefore requires expiry. And it this temptation—to remain on the right side of might that makes right—that stalks the future of a planet in the grips of climate destruction, secular stagnation, and unevenly distributed misery. Earthly co-existence, material subsistence, and ecological sustainability demand nothing less than a new dispensation of human freedom. Otherwise, there truly will be none left to mourn.

#### Dispossession and remapping controls the root cause to the vast majority of global structures, including capitalism, liberalism, and violence.

Baker 17

(Oliver Baker, PhD Candidate Mellon Fellow American Literary Studies, Democracy, Class, and White Settler Colonialism, Public, Volume 28, Number 55, June 2017, pp. 144-153(10), JKS)

Although critical studies of colonial and racial dispossession might appear skeptical of —or in the case of Afro-pessimism and the work of Wilderson, overtly defined against-alliance-based models of political organization and struggle, I want to end by suggesting that they nonetheless serve as indispensable, critical tools that can help those in struggle today to build collective movements for liberation and justice. For instance, conceptualizing the dispossession of Indigenous and Black peoples provides a way of understanding decolonial and antiracist struggles as revolutionary anticapitalist movements rather than forms of liberal identity politics as they are so often mischaracterized. The recent protests, uprisings, and riots in Ferguson, Baltimore, Charlotte, and other US cities where the Black community and allies have mobilized to fight against racial terror and violence are not so much struggles for identitarian recognition as they are the political events that negate the social death of the Black position. These are events that serve as the most recent instances in a centuries-old movement against white supremacist violence and terror that protects the flows of capital, maintains a reactionary white working class wedded to their capitalist exploiters and the project of empire, and upholds the coherence of liberal humanism. Furthermore, recent Indigenous-led blockades of oil and natural gas pipelines that threaten to pass through and potentially destroy Indigenous lands and water are not the actions of an ethnic minority group seeking state recognition or greater inclusion in liberal democracy. Instead, they are actions that defend Indigenous sovereignty by negating the processes of enclosure, occupation, and elimination on which depend the state form and liberal settler society in the first place. In this way, movements that defend Black lives and Indigenous sovereignty are struggles against capitalism precisely because they are struggles against the colonial and racial forms of dispossession that continue to play a constitutive role in its development. As such, these movements do not seek accommodation and inclusion but instead work toward the undoing of colonial and capitalist systems that remain premised on the elimination and social death of Indigenous and Black peoples. Ultimately, what critical studies of dispossession offer are a framework through which oppressed groups can learn to organize, unify, and forge solidarity around and according to the structural differences that divide and differentiate them. For example, mapping how colonized and racialized groups do not share a mutual position of oppression with settler wage labourers, allows for these groups to organize their struggles around the goal of dismantling rather than ignoring the divisions, differentiations, and antagonisms through which each group's oppression is produced and maintained. By forging solidarity around structural difference, an alliance-based politics could emerge in which the demands, gains, and achievements of some do not rest on the colonial unknowing, invisibility, and reproduction of structural marginality of others. It is in this way that instead of delegitimizing the efforts of those who struggle as workers or as subjects of the democratic commons, critical studies of colonial and racial dispossession help to reconceptualise the direction, purpose, and goals of such efforts away from reform and compromise and toward transformative change. Indeed, the critical study of “the ongoing effects of colonial dispossession,” writes Coulthard, “in no way displaces questions of distributive justice or class struggle; rather, it simply situates these questions more firmly alongside and in relation to other sites and relations of power that inform our settler-colonial present”28 While everyone struggles from the position in which they are constrained and constituted, the potential for variegated forms of struggle to become revolutionary lies in a systematic knowledge of how unity and solidarity must be forged precisely through difference and not in spite of it. With a critical view, then, of how colonial and racial dispossession relate to wage labour exploitation and modern liberal civil society, those struggling under the political identity of the worker or in the spaces of the democratic commons learn that these sites of resistance must only serve as transitional rather than permanent or universal models of social belonging lest they end in reform and failure. To understand that the humanity of the wage worker and the freedom of liberal democracy depend upon ongoing forms of colonial and racial dispossession is to learn that compromising with a system that dispossesses some groups as the condition of possibility for the exploitation of others neither liberates settler working classes nor does it create a society that could ever hope to be called democratic.