### 1

#### Settler colonialism is the permeating structure of the nation-state which requires the elimination of indigenous life and land via the occupation of settlers. The appropriation of land turns Natives into ghosts and chattel slaves into excess labor.

Tuck and Yang 12 (Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

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

#### Civil Society reifies a temporal narrative that uses doomsday rhetoric to bracket out the indigenous as “relics of the past” that are anathemas to progress—that instills a linear futurism that absolves us of responsibility for settler colonialism

Lake 91, Associate Professor of Communication at the University of Southern California (Randall A., “BETWEEN MYTH AND HISTORY: ENACTING TIME IN NATIVE AMERICAN PROTEST RHETORIC,” May 1991, The Quarterly Journal of Speech 77(2):123-151, accessed 12-13-12 //Bosley) \*Evidence has been gendered modified

Nowhere is this contest more evident than in the on-going struggle among some contemporary Native Americans to withstand themanifold pressures of assimilation and preserve a semblance of "traditional" tribal cultures. Their struggle is infused with temporal concerns: thoroughly (and painfully) cognizant of the history of native/Euramerican relations on this continent, activists seek the meaning of this past, construe its relevance to their current condition, find in it their purpose and tactics, and presage the final victory to come. Superficially, Red Power rhetoric is no different from that of other social movements in these respects; all articulate a self-justificatory narrative that interweaves past, present, and future. **Red Power**'s story, however, is unusual, and ought be of particular concern to rhetorical scholars, for two reasons. First, it **struggles against a**n especially well-developed and **powerful Euramerican narrative which**, in telling the lessons of its own history, **renders Native Americans relics of the past**, thus **absent from** (and logically, silent in) **the present and** irrelevant **to the future.** Second, **Red Power** rhetoric **articulates a time grounded in ritual that challenges prevailing Euramerican metaphors of time itself** (expresses, that is, what Eliade [1954; 1959, esp. pp. 68-113; 1963, esp. pp. 75-91] calls "sacred," as differentiated from "profane" time), **and problematizes** the very categories of **"past," "present," and "future."** In short, **the "shared time" of Native American protest rhetoric subverts** not only our own sense of the appropriate time for and timeliness of native activism, but also **the very constructs with which we theorize about the temporal dimensions of (their) rhetoric.** This essay, then, examines certain temporal features of the Euramerican establishment's discourse concerning Native Americans, and then the Red Power movement's responses thereto. In each case, I examine, first, the characterization of Euramerican/native relations; second, the temporal metaphors that infuse these characterizations; and third, the discourse's rhetorical power and limitations. I argue that both groups exploit the resources of metaphors of time in arguments concerning the relative superiority of native and Euramerican cultures, the meaning and relevance of the "past," i.e., historical events in native/Euramerican relations, to the contemporary Native American activist cause, and the inevitability of the triumph of one way of life over the other. However, because movement and establishment invoke different metaphors, the claims made and the shared time created are starkly opposed. Drawing principally upon time's arrow, Euramerican discourse characterizes native cultures as outdated and regressive, native history as uncorrectable (if regrettable), and native activism as a historical anachronism. Activist rhetoric, in contrast, exploits primarily time's circle to characterize native "history" as an on-going tale of injustice, the modern movement as the fulfillment of ancient prophecies, and native cultures as the sort to which all human life will turn to survive.3 Finally, I consider implications of this analysis. The Iron Law of History and the Native Other . . . How should I live? Among my people a small voice? In your world silent? Among my people there is no horizon In your world I have seen the universe contained in glass . . . "[M]ost **commentators** on American culture," contends Arnold Krupat (1989, p. 3), "generally have ~~man~~aged to **proceed** as though there were no relation between the two, white and red, Euramerican and Native American, as if absence rather than avoidance defined the New World**: as if America was** indeed **'virgin land,'** empty, uninhabited, silent, dumb **until the Europeans brought the plow** and the pen to cultivate its wilderness." From the earliest days, however, **settlers seeking to carve out** a "**civilization**" in this land **confronted the** persistent and awkward **fact that the New World was anything but empty and silent**. And so, as Pearce (1953), among others, has documented amply, **this "civilization" came to define itself in opposition to native "savagism."**4 At first, driven by the aggressive spirit of Puritan Protestantism, **"civilization" articulated a rhetoric of "salvationism,"** which Krupat (1989, p. 142) describes as "the discursive equivalent of a glass trained on heaven through which all this world must be seen," and which narrowed the native horizon fundamentally to conversion and extermination. In the second quarter of the nineteenth century, this discourse became secularized, and God's will became an evolutionary law of nature (Krupat, 1989, p. 142). Salvationism became assimilationism. As Commissioner of Indian Affairs Morgan (cited in Forbes, 1964, p. 114) put it bluntly in 1889, natives were to "conform to the White ~~man~~'s ways, peaceably if they will, forceably if they must. . ." But whether decreed in heaven or on earth, by divine will or history, **the fate of the natives was** sealed, to be **supplanted by the inevitable march of American civilization**. As "**one who had no right to be heard from**" (Frost, 1949, p. 179), **the savage Other was, finally and irrevocably, to be silenced. The denouement of this narrative is the familiar theme of the** **"vanishing** **[Native]** red ~~man~~.**"** The belief that primitive native societies must and would give way before the advancing tide of Euramerican civilization, either to be absorbed or crushed, has a long history. Count Alexis de Tocqueville (cited in McNickle, 1973, p. 3) remarked in 1831: "The Indians have been ruined by a competition which they had not the means of sustaining." A century ago, a West Point cadet named Custer (cited in Steiner, 1968, p. x) lamented the passing of the race in a term paper for his ethics class: "The red ~~man~~ is alone in his misery. We behold him now on the verge of extinction, standing on his last foothold . . . and soon he will be talked of as a noble race who once existed but have passed away." In 1911, Boas (cited in Steiner, 1968, p. xi) noted that the proportion of people with Indian blood "is so insignificant that it may well be disregarded," for the race had "vanished comparatively rapidly." Three years later, Moorehead (1914, p. 10) lamented that "we have brought about the extinction of tribal and communistic life among the Indians." The theme of inevitable doom was common "in song and story," and exemplified by James E. Fraser's equestrian statue, "The End of the Trail," first shown at the 1915 San Francisco Exposition (McNickle, 1973, p. 3). Doomsaying continued into the middle of this century. In his 1932 chronicle, The Passing American, Linderman (cited in Steiner, 1968, p. xi) observed that even the Indian had forgotten the Indian: "The young Indians know next to nothing about their people . . . and now it is too late to learn." Journalist John Keats (cited in Steiner, 1968, p. xi) echoed this sentiment in 1964, asking: "But, who speaks for the Indian? Amazingly his cause is almost without rebels to support it." The closing line of Paul Radin's The Story of the American Indian (1927/1937, p. 371) stressed the finality of the 1890 massacre at Wounded Knee: "The white ~~man~~ had triumphed . . . the Indians were crushed. Their nerve was gone. Broken, disorganized, externally and internally they gave up the fight." In this way, the theme of the vanishing red ~~man~~ voices the evolutionary claim that time, indeed, marches on. Ironically, ~~man~~y of these pronouncements were sounded by observers acutely sympathetic to the plight of Native Americans. To a degree, the theme of the vanishing red ~~man~~, like its cousin the noble savage, romanticizes native people and martyrs them to Euramerican greed and racism. Yet, **the portrayal of** theirinevitable doom almostabsolves whites of culpability**, fixing blame** instead **on the** inexorable **march of abstract forces like "progress."** Unsurprisingly, **this theme** quickly became a self-fulfilling prophecy**, legitimizing even greater incursions upon the lands and liberties of native people** (McNickle, 1973, p. 62). As Native Americans occupied an ever-smaller part of the real world, to the general public they increasingly lived on only in the romantic fictions of literature and Hollywood (Forbes, 1964, p. 13; Friar & Friar, 1972), thereby cementing their consignment to history and, thus, irrelevancy. It is important to appreciate that **this Euramerican narrative relies for its temporal structure on time's arrow**, which itself has come to play a vital part in Euramerican thinking on the subject over the centuries. Nowhere is this better shown than in Toulmin and Goodfield's well-known The Discovery of Time (1965), in which the authors trace the "gradual emergence of a continuing sense of history out of earlier mythological and theological" conceptions of Nature (p. 15), argue that, by the nineteenth century, all natural sciences save physics and chemistry had rejected the a priori categories of Greek thought in favor of an historical consciousness (p. 247); and conclude that even the "laws of nature" may be discovered to be, not immutable, but subject to evolutionary change over time (pp. 263-265). Highly influential in solidifying the position of time's arrow has been Christianity, **in which time**—one product of the Creation—**unfolds unidirectionally the continuous action of God through history, progressing from the past into the future, until the eschatological end of time foretold in Revelation as Christ's second coming** (Puech, 1957/1983, p. 40).5 Further, in a process akin to what Burke (1966, pp. 380-409; 1945/1969, pp. 430-440) calls the "temporizing of essences," time's arrow is frequently normative. The history of the idea of "progress" is not coincident with that of "history" itself, and the former is in some respects at odds with the Christian story of the Fall and subsequent degeneration. Nonetheless, "progress" **is one ethical extension** of the doctrines of **history** and Darwinism, **and**, like them, **denies alternative conceptions such as time's cycle** (Bury, 1932/1960, esp. pp. xi—xxix, 334—349). In linear time, the inexorable march of progress ensures that **all events necessarily and certainly must become merely historical, superceded by the superior future** (Bury, 1932/1960, p. 109). Thus, anteriority comes to signify inferiority while posteriority implies superiority (Brown, 1982, p. 117), as **evidenced by** evolution's infamous sociopolitical cousins, **Social Darwinism and Manifest Destiny** (on the latter, see Bass & Cherwitz, 1978). In sum, the story of civilization's triumph over savagism presupposes a linear time in which each present moment becomes the past (or falls into "history") as life proceeds toward a qualitatively different future. This procession is inevitable and irreversible; history never literally repeats itself. And because the unfolding future typically is conceived not only as different, but also as better, "living **in the past" is anathema to the "progressive spirit."** As one among a host of stories that symbolize human experience in predominately linear terms, the narrative is rooted deeply in Euramerican thought.6 And in consigning Native Americans to the past, it sentenced them to metaphoric and literal death. Pearce's (1953) analysis is telling and merits extended quotation: **Westward American progress** would, in fact, be understood to be **reproduc**ing **this historical progression** [**from a lesser to** a **greater good**, from the simple to the complex, from savagism to civilization]; and **the savage would be understood as one who had not and somehow could not progress into the civilized, who would inevitably be destroyed by the civilized** . . . For the Indian was the remnant of a savage past away from which civilized men had struggled to grow. To study him was to study the past. To civilize him was to triumph over the past. To kill him was to kill the past. History would thus be the key to the moral worth of cultures; the history of American civilization would thus be conceived as threedimensional, progressing from past to present, from east to west, from lower to higher, (p. 49) This narrative is itself timeless, perennially available as a rhetorical resource**. Time's arrow treats past events as irretrievably past, as strictly historical. Argumentatively,** even when the vector from past to future is **"smooth," "**continuous**," or "**unbroken**," the past nonetheless is dissociated from the present** which, while perhaps the product of the former, is a qualitatively different stage in evolutionary advance. Thus, time's arrow furnishes a powerful way to cast vestigial traditional Native American life and efforts to sustain that life as anachronistic. Forms of this strategy recur today in Euramerican reactions to contemporary native activism.

#### Portraying nuclear conflict as a final Armageddon between first world nations depoliticizes the ongoing nuclear violence of mining, dumping, and testing against Indigenous peoples.

Kato 93

(Masahide, Professor in Department of Political Science, University of Hawaii, Honolulu; “Nuclear Globalism: Traversing Rockets, Satellites, and Nuclear War via the Strategic Gaze,” Alternatives, Volume 18, Number 3, Summer 1993, pg. 347-349, ISSN 0304-3754.)

The vigorous invasion of the logic of capitalist accumulation into the last vestige of relatively autonomous space in the periphery under late capitalism is propelled not only by the desire for incorporating every fabric of the society into the division of labor but also by the desire for "pure" destruction/extermination of the periphery." The penetration of capital into the social fabric and the destruction of nature and preexisting social organizations by capital are not separable. However, what we have witnessed in the phase of late capitalism is a rapid intensification of the destruction and extermination of the periphery. In this context, capital is no longer interested in incorporating some parts of the periphery into the international division of labor. The emergence of such "pure" destruction/extermination of the periphery can be explained, at least partially, by another problematic of late capitalism formulated by Ernest Mandel: the mass production of the means of destruction." Particularly, the latest phase of capitalism distinguishes itself from the earlier phases in its production of the "ultimate" means of destruction/extermination, i.e., nuclear weapons. Let us recall our earlier discussion about the critical historical conjuncture where the notion of "strategy" changed its nature and became deregulated/dispersed beyond the boundaries set by the interimperial rivalry. Herein, the perception of the ultimate means of destruction can be historically contextualized. The only instances of real nuclear catastrophe perceived and thus given due recognition by the First World community are the explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which occurred at this conjuncture. Beyond this historical threshold, whose meaning is relevant only to the interimperial rivalry, the nuclear catastrophe is confined to the realm of fantasy, for instance, apocalyptic imagery. And yet how can one deny the crude fact that nuclear war has been taking place on this earth in the name of "nuclear testing" since the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo in 1945? As of 1991, 1,924 nuclear explosions have occurred on earth." The major perpetrators of nuclear warfare are the United States (936 times), the former Soviet Union (715 times), France (192times), the United Kingdom (44 times), and China (36 times)." The primary targets of warfare ("test site" to use Nuke Speak terminology) have been invariably the sovereign nations of Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples. Thus history has already witnessed the nuclear wars against the Marshall Islands (66 times), French Polynesia (175 times), Australian Aborigines (9 times), Newe Sogobia (the Western Shoshone Nation) (814 times), the Christmas Islands (24 times), Hawaii (Kalama Island, also known as Johnston Island) (12 times), the Republic of Kazakhstan (467 times), and Uighur (Xinjian Province, China) (36 times)." Moreover, although I focus primarily on "nuclear tests" in this article, if we are to expand the notion of nuclear warfare to include any kind of violence accrued from the nuclear fuel cycle (particularly uranium mining and disposition of nuclear wastes), we must enlist Japan and the European nations as perpetrators and add the Navaho, Havasupai and other Indigenous Nations to the list of targets. Viewed as a whole, nuclear war, albeit undeclared, has been waged against the Fourth World, and Indigenous Nations. The dismal consequences of "intensive exploitation," "low intensity intervention," or the "nullification of the sovereignty" in the Third World produced by the First World have taken a form of nuclear extermination in the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations. Thus, from the perspectives of the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations, the nuclear catastrophe has never been the "unthinkable" single catastrophe but the real catastrophe of repetitive and ongoing nuclear explosions and exposure to radioactivity. Nevertheless, ongoing nuclear wars have been subordinated to the imaginary grand catastrophe by rendering them as mere preludes to the apocalypse. As a consequence, the history and ongoing processes of nuclear explosions as war have been totally wiped out from the history and consciousness of the First World community. Such a discursive strategy that aims to mask the "real" of nuclear warfare in the domain of imagery of nuclear catastrophe can be observed even in Stewart Firth's Nuclear Playground, which extensively covers the history of "nuclear testing" in the Pacific: Nuclear explosions in the atmosphere . . . were global in effect. The winds and seas carried radioactive contamination over vast areas of the fragile ecosphere on which we all depend for our survival and which we call the earth. In preparing for war, we were poisoning our planet and going into battle against nature itself. Although Firth's book is definitely a remarkablde study of the history of "nuclear testing" in the Pacific, the problematic division/distinction between the "nuclear explosions" and the nuclear war is kept intact. The imagery of final nuclear war narrated with the problematic use of the subject ("we") is located higher than the "real" of nuclear warfare in terms of discursive value. This ideological division/hierarchization is the very vehicle through which the history and the ongoing processes of the destruction of the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations by means of nuclear violence are obliterated and hence legitimatized. The discursive containment/obliteration of the "real" of nuclear warfare has been accomplished, ironic as it may sound, by nuclear criticism. Nuclear criticism, with its firm commitment to global discourse, has established the unshakable authority of the imagery of nuclear catastrophe over the real nuclear catastrophe happening in the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations almost on a daily basis.

#### Worker’s rights and striking is a lie and a settler colonial myth that seeks to perpetuate subjugation and colonization of locals and natives – examples prove and prefer our empirics

Englert, Sai 20 [I am a lecturer in the Institute for Area Studies. I work on political economy and development in the Middle East. My research focuses on the Israeli state, its changing relationship with the labour movement, and the consequences of the neoliberal transition. I also work on settler colonialism and settler labour movements more generally.] 7-20-2020 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659 Settlers, Workers, and the Logic of Accumulation by Dispossession Wiley Online Library, accessed 11-4-2021 //GS

Two observations emerge from this paper. Firstly, **a number of different strategies** **of** control and **wealth extraction are available for settler colonial regimes.** These cannot be accurately or helpfully described as being based on the elimination of the natives alone, as done by Wolfe and those ascribing to his paradigm. Indeed, this paper has built on existing literature that shows how many **settler colonies—notably in Africa** **and Latin America—were built on the exploitation of indigenous populations**. It is also important to note, as a number of authors have done, and the first case studies above have illustrated, that the particular regime adopted by a settler colony is neither static nor predetermined. Instead, it is the outcome of struggle and can, therefore, change over time.

Secondly, this paper focused both on **thinking through what links settler colonial regimes** **to broader** political and **economic structures** as well as what **separates them as distinct social formations**. In this light, it highlighted the processes of accumulation by dispossession, which occurs across capitalist economies, while also taking on a specific character in the settler colonial context.

The paper has argued that accumulation by **dispossession in a settler context is specific because it is carried out by all classes of settlers, including by workers who are traditionally understood as its victims**. It further points out that this also leads to specific social relations in settler colonial contexts, in which settler labour movements fight simultaneously over the distribution of wealth generated through their labour and the distribution of the colonial loot accumulated through the dispossession of the indigenous population. **This leads to a greater identification of settler labour** with the settler colonial project **and state**, as it is dependent on the latter for its participation in the redistributive process. Both points were then **demonstrated through two case studies taken from the history of Zionism in Palestine.**

This paper has built on existing literature that shows that **although the elimination of the native is key to some settler colonial regimes**, in certain periods, it does not accurately define the overall logic of settler colonialism, as claimed by Wolfe. In fact **settler colonial states and movements have and continue to mobilise** a wide variety of **policies towards indigenous peoples, including exploitation**, which the Wolfe-an model positions outside of the realm of settler colonial relations. This paper instead proposes another analytic approach, which highlights the specificity of social relations within settler colonial contexts in which **settler workers participate in the process of accumulation by dispossession**. This in turn, the paper has shown, shapes both the **internal class struggle within settler societies**, as well as the collective **assault** by the settler polity **against the indigenous populations it colonises** and dispossesses.

#### Thus, the only alternative is decolonization.

Tuck and Yang 12

(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

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

*when you take away the punctuation*

*he says of*

*lines lifted from the documents about*

*military-occupied land*

*its acreage and location*

*you take away its finality*

*opening the possibility of other futures*

-Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012)

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

#### The role of the ballot is to center indigenous scholarship and resistance-- Any ethical commitment requires that the aff place themselves in the center of Native scholarship and demands.

Carlson 16

(Elizabeth Carlson, PhD, is an Aamitigoozhi, Wemistigosi, and Wasicu (settler Canadian and American), whose Swedish, Saami, German, Scots-Irish, and English ancestors have settled on lands of the Anishinaabe and Omaha Nations which were unethically obtained by the US government. Elizabeth lives on Treaty 1 territory, the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, Nehiyawak, Dakota, Nakota, and Red River Metis peoples currently occupied by the city of Winnipeg, the province of Manitoba, (2016): Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies, Settler Colonial Studies, DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241213, JKS)

Arlo Kempf says that ‘where anticolonialism is a tool used to invoke resistance for the colonized, it is a tool used to invoke accountability for the colonizer’.42 Relational accountability should be a cornerstone of settler colonial studies. I believe settler colonial studies and scholars should ethically and overtly place themselves in relationship to the centuries of Indigenous oral, and later academic scholarship that conceptualizes and resists settler colonialism without necessarily using the term: SCT may be revelatory to many settler scholars, but Indigenous people have been speaking for a long time about colonial continuities based on their lived experiences. Some SCTs have sought to connect with these discussions and to foreground Indigenous resistance, survival and agency. Others, however, seem to use SCT as a pathway to explain the colonial encounter without engaging with Indigenous people and experiences – either on the grounds that this structural analysis already conceptually explains Indigenous experience, or because Indigenous resistance is rendered invisible.43 Ethical settler colonial theory (SCT) would recognize the foundational role Indigenous scholarship has in critiques of settler colonialism. It would acknowledge the limitations of settler scholars in articulating settler colonialism without dialogue with Indigenous peoples, and take as its norm making this dialogue evident. In my view, it is critical that we not view settler colonial studies as a new or unique field being established, which would enact a discovery narrative and contribute to Indigenous erasure, but rather take a longer and broader view. Indigenous oral and academic scholars are indeed the originators of this work. This space is not empty. Of course, powerful forces of socialization and discipline impact scholars in the academy. There is much pressure to claim unique space, to establish a name for ourselves, and to make academic discoveries. I am suggesting that settler colonial studies and anti-colonial scholars resist these hegemonic pressures and maintain a higher anti-colonial ethic. As has been argued, ‘the theory itself places ethical demands on us as settlers, including the demand that we actively refuse its potential to re-empower our own academic voices and to marginalize Indigenous resistance’.44 As settler scholars, we can reposition our work relationally and contextually with humi- lity and accountability. We can centre Indigenous resistance, knowledges, and scholarship in our work, and contextualize our work in Indigenous sovereignty. We can view oral Indigenous scholarship as legitimate scholarly sources. We can acknowledge explicitly and often the Indigenous traditions of resistance and scholarship that have taught us and pro- vided the foundations for our work. If our work has no foundation of Indigenous scholarship and mentorship, I believe our contributions to settler colonial studies are even more deeply problematic.

### Inequality

#### Unions worsen inequality

Epstein 20 [Richard A. Epstein Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow @ the Hoover Institution. "The Decline Of Unions Is Good News." https://www.hoover.org/research/decline-unions-good-news]

This continued trend has elicited howls of protest from union supporters who, of course, want to see an increase in union membership. It has also led several Democratic presidential candidates to make calls to reconfigure labor law. Bernie Sanders wants to double union membership and give federal workers the right to strike, as well as ban at-will contracts of employment, so that any dismissal could be subject to litigation under a “for cause” standard. Not to be outdone, Elizabeth Warren wants to make it illegal for firms to hire permanent replacements for striking workers. They are joined by Pete Buttigieg in demanding a change in federal labor law so that states may no longer pass right-to-work laws that insulate workers from the requirement to pay union dues in unionized firms. All of these new devices are proven job killers.

The arguments in favor of unions are also coming from some unexpected sources in academia, where a conservative case has been put forward on the ground that an increase in union membership is needed to combat job insecurity and economic inequality.

All of these pro-union critiques miss the basic point that the decline of union power is good news, not bad. That conclusion is driven not by some insidious effort to stifle the welfare of workers, but by the simple and profound point that the greatest protection for workers lies in a competitive economy that opens up more doors than it closes. The only way to achieve that result is by slashing the various restrictions that prevent job formation, as Justin Haskins of the Heartland Institute notes in a recent article at The Hill. The central economic insight is that jobs get created only when there is the prospect of gains from trade. Those gains in turn are maximized by cutting the multitude of regulations and taxes that do nothing more than shrink overall wealth by directing social resources to less productive ends.

#### Inequality is a non-factor for economic health

Giles 15 (8/18, Chris Giles is the Economics Editor of the Financial Times. Before that he was a leader writer. He reports on international and UK economics and writes a fortnightly column on the UK economy. “Inequality is unjust, not bad for growth”, https://www.ft.com/content/94a7b252-45a1-11e5-b3b2-1672f710807b)

Inequality is unjust, not bad for growth Disparity of income is both a virtue and a vice. The virtue of providing rewards for effort and generating economic growth must be balanced against the vice of inequality’s manifest injustice. Riches derived through good fortune, good parents or being born at a good time are far from easy to defend. The problem for society and governments is to determine an acceptable degree of redistribution, balancing the remaining inequality with the blunted incentives from higher taxes and benefits. Or so we thought. The past two years have witnessed huge growth in the industry of academic research rejecting this trade-off. Lower inequality boosts growth, its advocates claim, so countries really can have more redistribution, a narrower gap between rich and poor, alongside more sustained economic expansion. Leading the charge towards the new consensus are two somewhat surprising institutions — the International Monetary Fund and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. Are these traditional bastions of orthodoxy infusing their policy prescriptions with the most up-to-date empirical evidence or merely following fashion? There is no doubt that the new ideas are strongly held. Angel Gurría, head of the OECD, is convinced of the new reality. “Addressing high and growing inequality is critical to promote strong and sustained growth,” he says only to be outbid in rhetorical certainty by Christine Lagarde, the fund’s managing director. She reckons the rich should thank the poor. “Contrary to conventional wisdom, the benefits of higher income are trickling up, not down,” she says. For all the excitement among this rarefied global elite, the research results are mundane. Economic performance varies wildly over time and across countries, yet the evidence suggests inequality explains only a tiny fraction of these differences. Whatever effect the gap between rich and poor might have on growth, other forces dominate, so we should not look to redistribution as the new engine of growth. With the results almost entirely based on cross-country correlations, they also have troubling inconsistencies. Ms Lagarde and the IMF research think that a higher income share for the rich harms economic performance while the OECD says only inequality between the poorest and the middle matters. The Paris-based international organisation concludes that a lack of access to skills among the poor is the mechanism by which higher inequality hits growth at the same time as finding no role for skills in its equations on growth. If the global results are weak, they also have close to zero policy prescriptions for rich countries where the results have caused most excitement — the US and the UK in particular. Far from being examples of the worst excesses of capitalism, these Anglo-Saxon nations emerge from the IMF data set as countries with relatively strong growth, low inequality and high redistribution.

#### Inequality has zero effect on war

Gal Ariely 15, senior lecturer in the Department of Politics & Government, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, PhD from the University of Haifa’s School of Political Sciences, “Does National Identification Always Lead to Chauvinism? A Cross-national Analysis of Contextual Explanations,” Globalizations, 2015, https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/43980028/Ariely\_Globalizations\_2015.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A&Expires=1515397197&Signature=78lnbbHNRVjhLgOKyRPKm%2BK8M1o%3D&response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DDoes\_National\_Identification\_Always\_Lead.pdf

With respect to internal explanations, the effects of income inequality and ethnic diversity are presented in Table 3. Models 3.1 and 3.2 indicate that neither directly affects chauvinism. H4 is therefore not supported. The results suggest, however, that both have a negative effect on the national-identification slopes. Contrary to our expectations, countries with higher levels of economic and ethnic division appear to exhibit a weaker relation between national identification and chauvinism. While these findings might seem to contradict H5, the pattern was caused by outliers. After excluding South Africa—the most unequal and ethnic diverse country in our sample—the effect of ethnic diversity is not even of borderline significance. After excluding Chile—the most unequal country in our sample—the interaction effects for economic inequality were also far from significant

#### No inequality crisis – studies exaggerate the risk

Wright et al 19 [Joshua D. Wright is University Professor and the Executive Director of the Global Antitrust Institute at Scalia Law School at George Mason University. Professor Wright also holds a courtesy appointment in the Department of Economics. In 2013, the Senate unanimously confirmed Professor Wright as a member of the Federal Trade Commission (FTC), following his nomination by President Obama. He rejoined Scalia Law School as a full-time faculty member in Fall 2015. "Consumer Welfare & the Rule of Law: The Case Against the New Populist Antitrust Movement." https://regproject.org/paper/consumer-welfare-the-rule-of-law-the-case-against-the-new-populist-antitrust-movement/]

Examining household consumption trends tells a similar story. Scholars have argued that consumption might be a superior measure of welfare, given a “closer link between consumption and well-being.”87 Consumption trends would also seem to be relevant when considering antitrust enforcement efforts, as they offer more information regarding economic effects than isolated income or wealth measurements. Examining household consumption over the last couple decades indicates that inequality is increasing but at a muted rate.

Accordingly, the evidence does seem to indicate inequality is increasing by some amount. Potentially more-accurate measures of income and welfare, however, suggest this trend is not as significant as populists claim. So, the first assumption in this particular populist theory appears to be valid, if often overstated. That leads us to the second—and for this discussion, the critical—assumption that antitrust enforcement is driving the apparent inequality trend.

#### Tons of alt causes to inequality – wealth inequality living standards all sorts of different reasons as to why it occurs, the aff can’t solve

### Cap

#### Neolib model is inevitable and self-correcting

Kaletsky ’10 (Anatole, Masters in Economics from Harvard, Honour-Degree Graduate at King’s College and Cambrdige, editor-at-large of The Times of London, founding partner and chief economist of GaveKal Capital, He is on the governing board of the New York– based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007– 2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics outside the orthodoxy of “efficient markets.” From 1976 to 1990, Kaletsky was New York bureau chief and Washington correspondent of the Financial Times and a business writer on The Economist, “Capitalism 4 0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis” )

The world did not end. Despite all the forebodings of disaster in the 2007– 09 financial crisis, the first decade of the twenty-first century passed rather uneventfully into the second. The riots, soup kitchens, and bankruptcies predicted by many of the world’s most respected economists did not materialize— and no one any longer expects the global capitalist system to collapse, whatever that emotive word might mean. Yet the capitalist system’s survival does not mean that the precrisis faith in the wisdom of financial markets and the efficiency of free enterprise will ever again be what it was before the bankruptcy of Lehman Brothers on September 15, 2008. A return to decent economic growth and normal financial conditions is likely by the middle of 2010, but will this imply a return to business as usual for politicians, economists, and financiers? Although globalization will continue and many parts of the world will gradually regain their prosperity of the precrisis period, the traumatic effects of 2007– 09 will not be quickly forgotten. And the economic costs will linger for decades in the debts squeezing taxpayers and government budgets, the disrupted lives of the jobless, and the vanished dreams of homeowners and investors around the world. For what collapsed on September 15, 2008, was not just a bank or a financial system. What fell apart that day was an entire political philosophy and economic system, a way of thinking about and living in the world. The question now is what will replace the global capitalism that crumbled in the autumn of 2008. The central argument of this book is that global capitalism will be replaced by nothing other than global capitalism. The traumatic events of 2007– 09 will neither destroy nor diminish the fundamental human urges that have always powered the capitalist system— ambition, initiative, individualism, the competitive spirit. These natural human qualities will instead be redirected and reenergized to create a new version of capitalism that will ultimately be even more successful and productive than the system it replaced. To explain this process of renewal, and identify some of the most important features of the reinvigorated capitalist system, is the ambition of this book. This transformation will take many years to complete, but some of its consequences can already be discerned. With the benefit of even a year’s hindsight, it is clear that these consequences will be different from the nihilistic predictions from both ends of the political spectrum at the height of the crisis. On the Left, anticapitalist ideologues seemed honestly to believe that a few weeks of financial chaos could bring about the disintegration of a politico-economic system that had survived two hundred years of revolutions, depressions, and world wars. On the Right, free-market zealots insisted that private enterprise would be destroyed by government interventions that were clearly necessary to save the system— and many continue to believe that the crisis could have been resolved much better if governments had simply allowed financial institutions to collapse. A balanced reassessment of the crisis must challenge both left-wing hysteria and right-wing hubris. Rather than blaming the meltdown of the global financial system on greedy bankers, incompetent regulators, gullible homeowners, or foolish Chinese bureaucrats, this book puts what happened into historical and ideological perspective. It reinterprets the crisis in the context of the economic reforms and geopolitical upheavals that have repeatedly transformed the nature of capitalism since the late eighteenth century, most recently in the Thatcher-Reagan revolution of 1979– 89. The central argument is that capitalism has never been a static system that follows a fixed set of rules, characterized by a permanent division of responsibilities between private enterprise and governments. Contrary to the teachings of modern economic theory, no immutable laws govern the behavior of a capitalist economy. Instead, capitalism is an adaptive social system that mutates and evolves in response to a changing environment. When capitalism is seriously threatened by a systemic crisis, a new version emerges that is better suited to the changing environment and replaces the previously dominant form. Once we recognize that capitalism is not a static set of institutions, but an evolutionary system that reinvents and reinvigorates itself through crises, we can see the events of 2007– 09 in another light: as the catalyst for the fourth systemic transformation of capitalism, comparable to the transformations triggered by the crises of the 1970s, the crises of the 1930s, and the Napoleonic Wars of 1803– 15. Hence the title of this book.

#### Neolib solves war and collapse causes it – historical evidence and studies prove

Tures 3 – Associate Professor of Political Science @ LaGrange College (John A. Tures, Associate Professor of Political Science at LaGrange College, 2003, “ECONOMIC FREEDOM AND CONFLICT REDUCTION: EVIDENCE FROM THE 1970S, 1980S, AND 1990S”, Cato Journal, Vol. 22, No. 3. http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj22n3/cj22n3-9.pdf)

The last three decades have witnessed an unprecedented expansion of market-based reforms and the profusion of economic freedom in the international system. This shift in economic policy has sparked a debate about whether free markets are superior to state controls. Numerous studies have compared the neoliberal and statist policies on issues of production capacity, economic growth, commercial vol- umes, and egalitarianism. An overlooked research agenda, however, is the relationship between levels of economic freedom and violence within countries. Proponents of the statist approach might note that a strong gov- ernment can bend the market to its will, directing activity toward policies necessary to achieve greater levels of gross domestic product and growth. By extracting more resources for the economy, a pow- erful state can redistribute benefits to keep the populace happy. Higher taxes can also pay for an army and police force that intimidate people. Such governments range from command economies of totali- tarian systems to autocratic dictators and military juntas. Other eco- nomically unfree systems include some of the authoritarian “Asian tigers.” A combination of historical evidence, modern theorists, and statistical findings, however, has indicated that a reduced role for the state in regulating economic transactions is associated with a decrease in internal conflicts. Countries where the government dominates the commercial realm experience an increase in the level of domestic violence. Scholars have traced the history of revolutions to explain the relationship between statism and internal upheavals. Contemporary authors also posit a relationship between economic liberty and peace. Statistical tests show a strong connection between economic freedom and conflict reduction during the past three decades.

#### Neoliberalism solves poverty and political repression

Chen 00 Chen, Law Minnesota ’00 (Nov/Dec-Fordham Intl LJ)

**The antiglobalization movement has failed to refute** the following: **Dramatic improvements in welfare at every wealth and income level**. 180 **Since 1820 global wealth has expanded tenfold, thanks largely to technological advances and the erosion of barriers to trade. The world economic order, simply put, is lifting people out of poverty**. **According to the World Bank, the percentage of the world's population living in extreme poverty fell from 28.3 to 23.4% between 1987 and 1998**. 182 (The World Bank defines extreme and absolute poverty according to "reference lines set at $ 1 and $ 2 per day" in 1993 terms, adjusted for "the relative purchasing power of currencies across countries.") 183 A more optimistic study has concluded that "**the share of the world's population earning less than US$ 2 per day shrank by more than half" between 1980 and 1990,** "from 34 to 16.6 percent." 184 In concrete terms, "**economic growth associated with globalization**" over the course of that decade **helped lift 1.4 billion people out of absolute poverty**. 185 Whatever its precise magnitude, **this improvement in global welfare has taken place because of**, not in spite of, **flourishing world trade**. 186 The meaning of American victory in the Cold War. The liberal democracies of the north Atlantic alliance decisively defeated their primary political rivals in the Eastern bloc. Capitalism coupled with generous civil liberties crushed central planning coupled with dictatorship of the proletariat. "America, so the world supposes, won the Cold War." 187 And the world is right. The true nature of the environmental crisis. The most serious environmental problems involve "the depletion and destruction of the global commons." 188 Climate change, ozone depletion, [\*247] and the loss of species, habitats, and biodiversity are today's top environmental priorities. 189 None can be solved without substantial economic development and intense international cooperation. The systematic degradation of the biosphere respects no political boundaries. Worse, it is exacerbated by poverty. Of the myriad environmental problems in this mutually dependent world, "persistent poverty may turn out to be the most aggravating and destructive." 190 We must remember "above all else" that "human degradation and deprivation ... constitute the greatest threat not only to national, regional, and world security, but to essential life-supporting ecological systems." The enhancement of individual liberty through globalization. **By dislodging local tyrants and ideologies, globalization has minimized the sort of personal abuse that too often seems endemic**