# Settler Colonialism K

## Framework

#### [Pratt et al 1] AMERICAN EDUCATION IS BUILT ON A COLONIZING LEGACY – schools prioritize Western knowledge production at the expense of Indigenous thought.

Pratt et al 1 – brackets in original text: Pratt, Yvonne Poitras [The University of Calgary], Dustin Louie [The University of Calgary], Aubrey Hanson [The University of Calgary], Jacqueline Ottmann [University of Saskatchewan]. “Indigenous Education and Decolonization.” *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, January 2018. CH

Even when explicitly assimilative institutions no longer exist as such—as is the case with Canada’s residential schools—colonizing dynamics can prevail in contemporary schooling. Hegemonic forces such as Eurocentrism, paired with vestigial colonial structures and policies, can persist in marginalizing Indigenous people and perspectives. Jacob et al. (2015) assert that “[s]ome countries such as Vietnam continue to perpetuate active assimilation policies that in many ways threaten indigenous peoples’ ability to preserve their languages, cultures, and identities” (p. 7). In another example, colonial structures in postcolonial contexts in Africa have “impeded the inclusion of bearers of local, indigenous knowledges in formal, institutionalized education” (Dei, 2000, p. 44). Colonization in contemporary schooling can occur at multiple levels despite an ethos of multiculturalism or other inclusive discourses: at the epistemological level of knowledge systems, at the material level of representation, at the discursive level of curriculum, or at the human level of whose bodies are safe and whose experiences are valued. Colonization may occur in the name of integration or “under the disguise of equality,” but ultimately works “to suppress and destroy cultural identities of Indigenous students” (Almeida, 1998, p. 7). Hidden curriculum and the streaming of students into non-academic versus academic programming are two examples of how colonizing dynamics exist in contemporary schooling. The curriculum in formal schooling immerses students into the assumptions and language of the dominant or colonial culture. The “hidden curriculum” includes the “unwritten rules, regulations, standards and expectations that form part of the learning process in schools and classrooms, not specifically taught to students through the planned or open curriculum and the content” (Rahman, 2013, p. 660). The hidden curriculum conveyed through the colonizer’s language reflects dominant worldviews, beliefs, and value systems and informs how the written, mandated curriculum is delivered. Rahman (2013) explains that this hidden curriculum forces Indigenous students to negotiate, and perhaps abandon, their own cultural ways of being and doing within inflexible dominant systems in order to survive in school.

#### [ROJ] The Role of the Judge is to Decolonize Educational Spaces, which means keeping the space open to non-Eurocentric ways of knowing. This is key to any other framework, since we can’t test it if we arbitrarily exclude ways of knowing.

#### [Pratt et al 2] Successful decolonizing demands recognition of how dominant power hierarchies function, a necessity for all exploring any non-Western knowledge.

Pratt et al 2: Pratt, Yvonne Poitras [The University of Calgary], Dustin Louie [The University of Calgary], Aubrey Hanson [The University of Calgary], Jacqueline Ottmann [University of Saskatchewan]. “Indigenous Education and Decolonization.” *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, January 2018. CH

Indigenous education attends to understandings of education that are indigenous to particular lands and places, and “the path and process whereby individuals gain knowledge and meaning from their indigenous heritages” (Jacob, Cheng, & Porter, 2015, p. 3). There are as many unique approaches to Indigenous education as there are diverse Indigenous nations around the globe—yet a central aim is “holistically nurturing future leaders who will be able to speak and act on behalf of their people” (p. 2). In a contemporary context, it is a continuance of Indigenous Knowledges, yet also entails fostering ethical, reciprocal relations between Indigenous and other knowledge systems (Ermine, 2007). Returning to the epistemological and ontological systems of a country’s Indigenous peoples in order to shape educational systems or institutions in that place is a way of Indigenizing education. Indigenous educators also recognize that colonialism continues to shape contemporary schooling: colonial education can exist even when explicitly assimilative systems of formal education have been closed and condemned. Colonial dynamics in contemporary schooling are often less visible because of how deeply and unknowingly educators can be entrenched in hegemonic assumptions, arising from colonial mentalities and further entrenched by dominant structural systems. Indigenous Knowledges are bodies of knowledge that arise from the long-term occupancy of a specific place over time. Such knowledges include “traditional norms and social values [alongside] mental constructs that guide, organize, and regulate the people’s way of living and making sense of their world” (Dei, Hall, & Goldin Rosenberg, 2000, p. 6). Such knowledges arise from the collective experiences and understandings of a people.

They add:

Colonizing is the physical and ideological domination of peoples in order to separate them from their culture and resources, while creating external and internalized assumptions of the supremacy of the colonizer. Conversely, the project of decolonizing challenges and disrupts assumptions of colonial superiority. For Smith (2012), decolonization is the revitalization of the ways of being and knowing prior to colonization, while unearthing the manner in which colonization was achieved. It is not enough to simply reconnect with the past; in order to pursue decolonization, we must also untangle the complex web of internalized oppression created by colonization. Furthermore, decolonization requires the colonizers to recognize and challenge their own socialized presumptions of superiority.

#### [ROB] Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Better Resistance Strategy Against Colonialist Violence. This means each side offers a method of rejecting oppression as a means of promoting authentic freedom.

### **Links**

#### [Flowers] The aff’s attempts to reform white institutions are a form of nation-state apology and redeem the irredeemable. Their appeals to “negative action” and reform are a way for states to distance themselves from a legacy of colonialism.

**Flowers:** Flowers, Rachel. [University of Victoria, Political Science] “Refusal to forgive: Indigenous women’s love and rage” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* Vol. 4, No. 2, 2015, pp. 32-49, 2015. AZ

State violence continues to constitute the regulative norm of colonial dispossession directed at Indigenous women. **Even though the settler polity** is ostensibly **dedicated to** a new relationship and **reconciliation**, it **is predicated on the disappearance of Indigenous peoples, wom[x]n in particular.** The story of the settler colony is founded on disappearing peoples, from *terra nullius* to missing and murdered Indigenous women. Colonialism operates as a form of structured dispossession and the current relationship between Indigenous peoples and the state is part of that continuum. Ongoing **extractionist politics continue to inform our place-based arts of resistance and critiques in our struggles not only *for* land but also informed *by* the land. Indigenous peoples’ resistance to the calls for forgiveness is a legitimate rejection of a new relationship that is simply** the old relationship with new clothes. In our hwulmuhw snuw’uy’ulh6, we have stories and dances that demonstrate that some beings are duplicitous and must be approached with caution or outsmarted in order to stop them from causing any further harm to the people or the village; suspicion, anger and resentment cannot be disqualified. To disregard anger and resentment as destructive emotions is an uncritical move to absolve the unforgiven, whereby blame is placed on the injured party, who is seen as an irrational ‘blockade’ blinded by their rage compared to the ‘reasonable’ apologist. Moreover, when apologies offered (by the state and individuals) can be understood as displays of virtuousness, as spoken desires to forget the past and to move forward in a shared future, how can forgiveness be expected? These apologies are events that express regret and ask forgiveness for an event in the past, they are not commitments to structural change that acknowledge and identify the processes and structures that permit atrocities to occur and which continue to dispossess and dominate Indigenous peoples. For example, the Canadian state’s 2008 apology for the residential school system revealed the country’s escapist forgetfulness. Many elders and residential school survivors believe that the apology lacked substance, but it still provided a necessary piece of their healing. I have a sense that the apology contributed to a process of desubjectification for many residential school survivors. Here, desubjectification is a process of breaking free from one’s subject position. This involves adopting a critical attitude toward, or destroying, the discourses and norms by which one is made a subject, namely, a colonized subject. In Foucauldian terms, through a process of desubjectification, individuals stop comparing themselves with the ‘legitimate’ norms and ethics imposed by power/knowledge and stop changing themselves/their behavior in order to align with structural and institutionally ordered power/knowledge. Residential schools were a fundamental overseer of discipline and subjectification yet there is little to no acknowledgement that the violence of the residential school system is connected to the forms of violence that Indigenous women continue to experience throughout their lives. Advocacy for forgiveness is steeped in promises of peace and healing; it is not surprising that forgiveness is desired and tempting because of its seemingly redemptive quality and appeals to basic Indigenous principles of harmony. **Refusal to forgive, then, must be understood as not only negation, but also affirmation. In refusing the ongoing violence of the colonial state, it demonstrates a commitment to affirm my hwulmuhw teachings as a Leey’qsun wom[o]n and direct my love *inward*. One of the ways we accomplish this is by giving authority to** our own **laws and governance.** It is essential that the revival of our laws and practices is not undertaken in the spirit of competition. By this I am referring to ways in which claims of authenticity or cultural authority are used by some to assert power over others; this is not resurgence. One of the first laws we learn is to be kind and help one another, to conduct oneself with kindness. Treating each other with kindness instead of lateral violence is one simple gesture that should go without saying, and makes our communities stronger and healthier. Our laws also provide our original responsibility to love and care for the lands, the waters, the sky, and all its beings. The law to be of good mind and heart is a law of the everyday. A good mind and a good heart, or ‘uy shqwaluwun’, is the core of our way of being. We must affirm our love for one another through our laws and re-vitalize them in our daily lives and in our minds, to share our ‘uy shqwaluwun’ inward. Simpson (2015) reminds us, “Although individuals have the responsibility to self-actualize within this system, intelligence in this context is not an individual’s property to own; once an individual has carried a particular teaching around to the point where they can easily embody that teaching, they, then, also become responsible for sharing it according to the ethics and protocols of the system. This is primarily done by modeling the teaching.” The same is true for the kind of love that we learn from the conduct of our old people. They understand and embody love and share it with us, so that we might learn to embody it and share it according to our ethics and protocols.

#### [Ryan] US hegemony breeds colonialism.

**Ryan**: Ryan, David. “Colonialism and Hegemony in Latin America: An Introduction.” The International History Review 21, no. 2 (1999): 287–96. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40109004>.

The answer depends on one's definition of terms. Studies of colonialism frequently use the words colonialism and imperialism interchangeably, restrict imperialism to the practice of colonization, or assume that the word colonial can be limited to territorial administration. In inter-American history, colonization cannot be restricted to the acquisition of territory and the process through which metropolitan powers control it, although even by this standard, US history is colonialist in its 'border colonization' of 'the west',1 maintenance of internal colonies, and nearly fifty years' rule over the Philippines. In applying the term colonialism to US policy towards Latin America, one distinguishes between colonization as territorial acqui- sition, colony as a particular type of socio-political organization, and colonialism as a system of domination. As Jurgen Osterhammel suggests: **Colonialism is a relationship of domination between an indigenous (or forcibly imported) majority and a minority of foreign invaders. The fundamental decisions affecting the lives of the colonized people are made and implemented by the colon- ial rulers in pursuit of interests that are often defined in a distant metropolis. Rejecting cultural compromises with the colonized population, the colonizers are convinced of their own superiority and of their ordained mandate to rule.2 Hence, colonialism applies to relationships between markets and econ- omies, as well as to the hegemony of ideologies.** When applied to the post-war inter- American relationship, colonialism extends beyond the boundaries of the power the United States wielded directly in Central America and the Caribbean through the privileges it derived from 'unequal treaties' which 'permit' it to intervene to protect US citizens, to maintain 'a well-defined free-trade regime', and to station troops within the other country or its territorial waters to overawe the recalcitrant. **Colonialism is also 'represented by consuls, diplomats, or "residents", all of whom intervene in diplomatic policy in an "advisory" capacity, particularly in conflicts over succession, and underscore their "advice" with the threat of military intervention where it appears warranted'.3 US attitudes resemble those of earlier European 'Lords of All the World'.**

## B. Impacts

**[Barker] ERASURE:** their framing of the aff moves the topic AWAY from something specific to Indigenous populations to something that affects everyone equally. That means they participate in a broader cultural genocide that outweighs the affirmative.

**Barker:** MA U of Victoria, BASc McMaster University [Adam J., “(Re-)Ordering the New World: Settler Colonialism, Space, and Identity” Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Leicester 224-234, December 2012]

Dynamics of Erasure **It is important to begin by investigating the erasure of Indigenous presence from place.** Erasure is essential to both occupation and bricolage, the two other colonising acts that are critical to settler colonial spatial production. Erasure of Indigenous presence can take many forms and may precede and continue throughout the time of Settler occupation. The variety of ways that settler colonialism produces space is predicated on consuming elements of Indigenous relational networks. Elements of Indigenous relational networks are extracted (removed from contexts that sustain meaning), processed and redeployed through settler colonial social space. What is Erasure? Historical geographer Cole Harris chose to reprint his essay ‘The Good Life Around Idaho Peak, originally researched and written more than thirty years ago, in a 1997 collected volume partly because it contains an egregious error that reflects the mind‐set of colonialism” (xvi). In the first version of this essay, Harris asserted that Idaho Peak, north of Nelson, British Columbia, had never been a site of Indigenous settlement. In the 1997 volume, he recanted: “[m]y proposition that no Native people had ever lived near Idaho Peak is absurd, and grows out of the common assumption, with which I grew up, that a mining rush had been superimposed on wilderness” (p.124). Harris, one of the most important and influential scholars of British Columbia’s native‐newcomer history, bases this striking reversal on a 1930 report by ethnographer James Teit of which he had previously been unaware. Based on interviews conducted between 1904 and 1907 with elders of the Sinixt (Lake) people whose ancestors had lived in the region, Teit’s report details Indigenous peoples’ village sites and the devastating impacts of imported disease (pp.194‐195). In this case, not only were the physical bodies and communities of Indigenous peoples destroyed and reduced by pathogens introduced by European and American newcomers, even Settler knowledge of indigeneity was discarded and ignored. In Harris’ analysis, “[m]ine is another example, from one who should have known better, of the substitution of wilderness for an erased Native world” (1997 p.xvi). This is **erasure**: the total removal of Indigenous being on the land, even from history, memory, and culture, to facilitate the transfer of those lands. **This can even be accomplished without the removal of Indigenous bodies;** it is the relational networks with place that sustain Indigenous being **that** are the true targets of erasure. Veracini notes that settler colonialism is most often pursued by settler collectives operating in corporate form (Veracini, 2010a pp.59‐62). **It is easy and not uncommon to ascribe Settler peoples the role of occupation while attributing erasure to a combination of ‘just war’ by state and imperial para‐/military** forces, and uncontrollable diseases like smallpox or influenza, washing Settler hands of responsibility. Individual **Settler people deny their colonial responsibilities** through this corporate ‘limited liability’ **such that set**tler **col**onialism **“obscures the conditions of its own production”** (p.14). **However, Settler peoples are — historically and in the present — directly implicated in acts of erasure.** It is more acceptable to suggest that the British Empire or the American state ‘have colonised’ than to suggest that the Settler populations of the northern bloc ‘are colonisers/colonial.’ **This is part of the complex dynamic whereby** Settler people, even as they are or become aware of the existence of settler colonial atrocities, **are able to deny their own complicity** (Regan, 2010) or even those of their forbears.60 **The goal of erasure is the reconciliation of the colonial difference through the materialisation of perceived terra nullius** (Tully, 2000), an ‘empty land’ that, if not actually empty, is at least open: to the entrance of settlers, to being reshaped, to the extraction of advantage. The literature on terra nullius is extensive, and it was recently condemned as part of the ‘doctrine of discovery’ by the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (2012). For the purposes of settler colonial erasure, terra nullius can be thought of as the creation of a vast, conceptual space of exception. Settler state sovereignty is premised on spaces of exception that reduce Indigenous people to homo sacer (Morgensen, 2011), and Settler identities are entwined with spatial segregation through frontier narratives that exile indigeneity to the wilderness beyond the reach of the civilising state (Larsen, 2003 pp.92‐94). Thus state space is premised on the erasure of indigeneity itself; Indigenous bodies stripped of sacred nature can be consumed or disposed of in a variety of ways without consequence. The governmental act of regulating and extinguishing indigeneity exceeds Settler sovereignty in two major ways: first, in the extension of the power of life or death over populations whose relationships are not considered part of the state (thus an extra‐territorial assertion of sovereign power), and second, in the extension of the state over territories to which Settler people have no legitimate claim based on the presence of Indigenous peoples. According with Agamben’s observations of the creation of spaces of exception and the imposition of spatial restriction, and the reduction of human life to numbers, both Canada and the United States imposed ‘band lists’ on Indigenous communities. These lists of names of ‘official’ members, later identified by personal identification cards (numbered), issued by the government, were used to control Indigenous movements on and off of reserves and to prevent the entry of Indigenous individuals into colonial spaces, like cities and towns (Frideres et al., 2004 pp. 95‐102). Further, the governments of these states have turned the extermination of Indigenous peoples into a demographic problem. By claiming the sole responsibility to determine who is ‘Indian’ (as per the Constitution in Canada or a whole host of statutes at federal and state levels in America), states were able to legislate rules of heritage. These ‘status’ laws — based often on varying levels of blood quantum in the USA (Garoutte, 2003 pp.38‐60), and an odd, collaping system of parentage in Canada (Lawrence, 2003 p.6) — ensure that, even as Indigenous populations increase, ‘Indian’ people are disappearing. Physical Erasure Indigenous peoples perceived across settler colonial difference are often constructed as a threat: to the advantages conferred by the occupation of spaces of opportunity, to the safety of Settler people and to the norms and ‘civilised’ values of settler colonisers. As a consequence, all manner of violence is directed at Indigenous peoples, resulting in the physical elimination, removal, or disappearance of indigeneity from place. Physical erasure of Indigenous peoples is often initiated extraterritorially by para‐/military forces. This is important for understanding the concept of ‘the frontier’ (below); however, it should not be read to implicate only metropole powers in physical erasure.Settler collectives also participate in the physical erasure of Indigenous peoples and spaces. With rare exceptions, it has been expected that Indigenous peoples will assimilate into and disappear from Settler spaces, rather than the other way around. There are, of course, exceptions to this. There are widespread accounts of Settler people either excluded or exiled from larger collectives, or remnants of failed or collapses collectives, being adopted into Indigenous societies. For example, the second Roanoke colony is believed to have been assimilated into local Indigenous societies sometime between 1578 and 1590 (Kupperman, 2000 p.12). In a different but related vein, the Métis people of the Red River Valley, while a hybrid of Scottish, French, English, Cree and other peoples, are widely recognised as an emergent Indigenous peoplehood (Read & Webb, 2012; Tough & McGregor, 2011). Although the Métis are both culturally and genetically related to European peoples, they assert indigenised networks of being on the land rather than dominating colonial displacement of indigeneity.61 Indigenous networks were capable of absorbing these non‐indigenous Others absent the violent intercession of colonial force. As Chapter 3 has shown, settler colonial space is created by the direct assertion of Settler power over place with the result that exceptional examples such as Roanoke or the Métis are rare. Of course, personal relationships between Settler and Indigenous peoples are not completely encompassed by the drive for erasure, but the threat of colonial violence is ever‐present. Even when pursued ‘peacefully,’ intermarriage and socialintegration of Indigenous peoples into Settler spaces occurs in a highly coercive and uneven environment. For example, settler colonial logics that divide and sort have consistently dehumanised Indigenous people, and especially Indigenous women (Smith, 2005; Maracle, 1996 pp.14‐19), leading to widespread gendered and racialised violence. The selective dehumanisation of Indigenous women by settler colonisers contributes to very real physical erasures; consider the contemporary case of the hundreds of missing and murdered Indigenous women in and around Vancouver (Dean, 2010 p.14). More broadly, Settler collectives also play direct roles in spreading disease (Swanky, 2012; Wright, 1992 pp.74, 103‐104) and in extermination through dispossession. Returning to the example of the Pacific Northwest, Settler ranchers did not necessarily intend to physically erase Indigenous populations, but as they monopolised both grazing lands and food markets in the British Columbia Interior, they deprived Indigenous communities of networks of resources that had sustained them since time immemorial (Thistle, 2011; Harris & Demeritt, 1997 pp.234‐240). Erasure through deprivation continues to this day. Despite the fact that Settler societies of the northern bloc are among the most affluent in history, Indigenous communities continue to endure starvation, lack of access to clean drinking water, lack of medical and other health and social services (including education), enforced isolation, and denial of a sufficient land base for social health and reproduction. Conceptual Erasure As well as the removal of the physical presence of Indigenous people from the land, settler colonial logics call for the removal of Indigenous peoples — at least as autonomous, intelligent actors — from the understood history of places (Veracini, 2007). Bureaucratic management techniques ensure that the business of solving the ‘Indian problem’ does not impact on the daily life of the average Settler person by positioning Indigenous populations as inventories to be liquidated rather than people to be engaged with. Erasure has been at times a matter of counting: how many ‘Indians’ are left, how many fewer than last year, how much property should be allocated ‘per Indian,’ and when will the ‘vanishing Indian’ become reality (Veracini, 2010a: 39‐40; Neu, 2000). This further allows individual Settlers to deny complicity in the erasure of Indigenous presence: the modern, industrial state counts, includes or excludes, and ultimately disposes of Indigenous peoples, and the state is impersonal. **That** the state exists because of settler colonisation, **that Settler people serve as bureaucrats and colonial agents, or that erasure and occupation go hand in hand is rarely acknowledged**. Indigenous histories, especially those living histories sustained in oral traditions, are the storehouse of knowledge of rituals, sacred places, and place‐ based personalities and tend to confound settler colonisation. These histories constantly remind Settler peoples of their illegitimacy on the land; they point out that there are ways of relating to place beyond the understanding of contemporary Settler peoples; and, they provide a source of strength and identity for Indigenous groups even after they have been separated from their places or their spaces have been replaced by colonial spaces. As Holm et al., point out, even the stories of loss regarding a sacred space can be a source of identity (Holm et al. 2003 pp.9‐12; see also Chapter 1). Settler **colonisers**, then, if **they wish to avoid the discomfort associated with living Indigenous histories, must follow a logic of deliberately constructing histories in which Indigenous peoples are either absent or relegated at the** margins. These **then serve as the reference point for Settler people to judge their own ‘progress’ or ‘development’** as a people against anachronistic ‘savages’ who lack agency or power. This is also projected temporally forward: settler colonisation does not intend simply to erase these histories, but also to predetermine the future through “master narratives” (Austin, 2010) of technological progress, the inevitability of civilisation, rights‐based social assimilation, and the wholesale replacement of Indigenous systems of law and governance (Alfred, 2009a). Settler collectives create and perpetuate Settler myths such as the “Peacemaker myth” (Regan, 2010), the heroic trope of the frontier pioneer (Nettlebeck & Foster, 2012), and the up‐by‐the‐bootstraps myth of the self‐made Settler (Ramirez, 2012), to name but a few. Often these myths were created and are perpetuated by playing off of stereotypes about settlement in other colonial jurisdictions. Historian Chris Arnett has remarked: ... there remains the colonial myth that, contrary to what happened south of the 49th parallel, the British resettlement of British Columbia was benign, bloodless and law‐abiding ... Granted the “Indian Wars” of British Columbia came nowhere near the wholesale slaughter of aboriginal people that too often characterized the inter‐racial conflict in the western United States, but as one historian has observed, “human conflict does not decline in complexity as it does in scale.” Artnett, 1999 p.14 Both American and Canadian settler colonisation involved in varying combinations: treaty‐making and breaking; violent military and para‐military force; and, concerted attempts at cultural assimilation or extermination. In Regan’s work, she positions the peacemaker narrative in opposition to the violent reality of residential schools (Regan, 2010). As she points out, many physical buildings of residential schools still exist, though Settler people are unable to “see” them (2010 pp.5‐6). Steeped in national myths premised on narratives of treaty making and cooperation, and especially played off against perceptions of American ‘militant’ conquest, residential schools physically disappear to Settler Canadians: the structures are not seen, the damage not perceived. The residential school project in Canada, jointly pursued by the federal government and churches, was premised on the belief that ‘primitive’ and ‘disappearing’ Indigenous peoples could best be served by ushering their extinction through assimilation.62 However, given that the role of residential schools in erasure cannot be denied, Settler people instead must either deny their own involvement with them (and thus with settler colonisation) or deny that they existed at all. **This is symptomatic of widespread Settler denial that serves not just to erase indigeneity, but also to erase** the **colonising act of erasure**. **Erasure and** Transfer **Erasure is required at some stage for each type of** **settler colonial land transfer**. Sometimes this is obvious; for example “necropolitical transfer” (Veracini, 2010a: 35) involves the physical liquidation of Indigenous peoples by military action. However, erasure is involved in many other kinds of transfer either concurrent to (and hidden by) occupation and bricolage, or (usually) before or after these other colonising acts. Notably, Veracini describes that “perception transfer” — “**when indigenous peoples are** **disavowed** **in a variety of ways and their actual presence is not registered** (... for example, when indigenous people are understood as part of the landscape)” — **“is a crucial prerequisite to other forms of transfer**” (Veracini, 2010a p.36). Veracini then draws attention to an important dynamic: “when really existing indigenous people enter the field of settler perception, they are deemed to have entered the settler space and can therefore be considered exogenous” (2010a p.36). The implication is that erasure is unidirectional. **Indigenous peoples cannot be retrieved or revived from their erased condition without serious disruption to settler colonial space. All transfer**, regardless of whether it relies on physical or conceptual erasure, **is intended to be permanent**. Arguments that certain kinds of transfer are ‘better’ than others — such as the Canadian assertion of the peacemaker myth juxtaposed against violent American frontier adventurism — are seeking to differentiate between genocidal acts based on arbitrary distinctions, splitting colonial hairs.

## Thus, C. Alternative

#### [Tuck & Yang] We should reject the aff’s framing of the problem and adopt an ethic of incommensurability and full decolonization.

Tuck & Yang: 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.

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.