# Don’t Pick the Daisies AC (FLOWERS)

## I affirm. Part 1: An Open Space.

#### [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.

## Part 2: Eye on the Target

#### [Utrata] PRIVATE ENTITIES SPACE STATIONS ARE KICKING PEOPLE OFF THEIR LAND.

**Utrata:** Utrata, Alina. [Ph.D. candidate, Department of Politics and International Studies at the University of Cambridge; Gates-Cambridge and Marshall scholar] “Lost in Space.” *Boston Review*, July 14, 2021. <https://bostonreview.net/articles/lost-in-space/> MB/CH

In 1982 Bezos said in his high school valedictorian speech that “the Earth is finite and if the world economy and population is to keep expanding, space is the only way to go.” His views have not changed much since then. “[Within a few centuries] we’ll be using all of the solar energy that impacts the Earth,” he told a crowd at an event hosted by Blue Origin. “That’s an actual limit.” This Malthusian logic underpins his arguments about the inevitability of humanity’s growth and the necessity of expanding into space. There are short-term problems, he explains, such as poverty and pollution, and there are long-term problems, such as running out of energy. If we do not want to become “a civilization of rationing and stasis,” Bezos warns, we must expand to the stars where “resources are, for all practical purposes, infinite.” For Musk space colonization is also a means to preserve human civilization, albeit as a hedge against eventual extinction. “I don’t have an immediate doomsday prophecy,” he told an international conference in 2016, “but history suggests that there will be some extinction event. The alternative is to become a space-faring civilization and multi-planetary species.” Whereas Bezos emphasizes the cyclical logic of capitalist growth—we must expand, in order to keep expanding—Musk is more explicit in his plans for colonial settlement. One of his proposals—to allow individuals to purchase one-way tickets to Mars which can be paid off through promised jobs in the new colony— has been called Martian indentured servitude. “Mars would have a labor shortage for a long time,” Musk explained, so “jobs would not be in short supply.” And while Bezos imagines that humans will be able to travel between Earth and space often, Musk contends that the Mars colony should be self-sufficient, able “to survive if the resupply ships stop coming from Earth for any reason.” And while Bezos imagines that humans will be able to travel between Earth and space often, Musk contends that the Mars colony should be self-sufficient, able “to survive if the resupply ships stop coming from Earth for any reason.” Imperialist conceptions of ownership transform space into an “empty frontier” where certain individuals can project their political dreams. For two entrepreneurs whose businesses have been lauded as exceptionally visionary, their celestial utopias stand out for their lack of political creativity and awareness. Bezos’s notion that imperial expansion is the only way to support an ever-growing population is an old colonialist appeal, now repackaged for the stars. The infinite need for resources, as well as the “poverty and pollution” that Bezos dismisses as short-term problems, are deeply enmeshed in capitalism’s cycles of extraction and are currently causing Earth’s climate crisis. Given the green-orientation of his enterprises, Musk is presumably aware of the climate crisis—or at least the opportunities it presents for government funding. Yet he has not explicitly named climate change as one of the potential “extinction events” that a Mars colony might protect against. Putting aside the question of whether terraforming Mars is actually feasible—for the record, a Nature Astronomy article suggests it is not—settling space won’t be cost-free to Earth. As science writer Shannon Stirone pointed out in The Atlantic, “Mars has a very thin atmosphere; it has no magnetic field to help protect its surface from radiation from the sun or galactic cosmic rays; it has no breathable air and the average surface temperature is a deadly 80 degrees below zero . . . . For humans to live there in any capacity they would need to build tunnels and live underground.” The environmental and human destruction necessary to make space habitable would dwarf any technological or political response needed to stop the climate crisis now. And—like capitalism and climate change—the impacts of colonizing space will be far worse for some rather than others, particularly in the Global South. For example, when Indonesian president Joko Widodo offered SpaceX the island of Biak in Papua, home to an ongoing secessionist campaign, local communities protested that the building of the launch station would cause vast ecological damage and community displacement. They had reason to worry. This is precisely what happened in Boca Chica, a small town on the southern tip of Texas where SpaceX had built a previous launch site. After SpaceX moved into town, residents of the Texas community were pushed out from their homes as the area became unsafe due to rocket activity, which has since damaged a wildlife refuge in the area. SpaceX has offered to purchase residents’ homes, but below the price many think is fair. An email from SpaceX to Boca Chica holdouts stated, “As the scale and frequency of spaceflight activities at the site continue to accelerate, your property will frequently fall within established hazard zones in which no civilians will be permitted to remain, in order to comply with all federal and other public safety regulations.” SpaceX’s impact on the area demonstrated little concern for its displacement and damage of the local community. While we all may use, explore, or research space, no state can claim to own it—though this does not mean states will not try. Musk and Bezos rely on the notion that colonizing space somehow differs from colonizing Earth. Implicit in their arguments is the belief that it was not the systems of colonial-capitalism, but rather the context surrounding their implementation, that wreaked havoc in the past.

#### [Haskins 1] The dream of space colonization is the same as the ideologies of racist cowboys in the 1400s.

**Haskins 1**: Haskins, Caroline. [Current Editorial Intern for the Future section at The Outline. Former Editorial Intern for Motherboard, Vice's science/tech site.] “THE RACIST LANGUAGE OF SPACE EXPLORATION”, *The Outline*, August 14, 2018. EM

“I don’t know who it will be, and I don’t know what they will discover, or what they will accomplish,” Cruz said. “But I think it is every bit as vast and promising a frontier as the New World was some centuries ago.” **“You could argue that the effort to colonize space is likely to involve new forms of inequality**: shifts in tax revenues and administrative priorities devoted to that,” said Michael Ralph, a professor of anthropology at NYU. “As opposed to [supporting] other social institutions that benefit people like health care, education, infrastructure.” Earning money in space is an exciting prospect for a far-right, pro-business, anti-regulation politician like Cruz, and he explicitly associated it with European countries having colonized the Americas. **Starting in the late 1400s, Great Britain, Spain, and Portugal funded missions to the Americas in order to gather natural resources that would power up their economies. By stealing the land that made this resource extraction possible, colonizers used genocide, enslavement, biological weaponry, and warfare and that resulted in the deaths of tens of millions of indigenous people living in the “New World.” The concept of race, and therefore racism, was invented as a way of justifying their violence and legitimizing a hierarchy of race-divided labor.** Based off of what we know right now, the Moon and Mars are devoid of life, so this colonizing language is not actually putting other beings at risk. **But, there is the risk that the same racist mythology used to justify violence and inequality on earth — such as the use of frontier, “cowboy” mythology to condone and promote the murder and displacement of indigenous people in the American West — will be used to justify missions to space.**

#### [Haskins 2] Billionaire’s rhetoric of colonization as “adventures” erases the violence they used on colonization in history.

**Haskins 2**: Haskins, Caroline. [Current Editorial Intern for the Future section at The Outline. Former Editorial Intern for Motherboard, Vice's science/tech site.] “THE RACIST LANGUAGE OF SPACE EXPLORATION”, *The Outline*, August 14, 2018. EM

In the Destination Mars subcommittee meeting, Cruz said, “At the end of the day, the commercial sector is going to be able to invest billions more in dollars in getting this job [of getting to Mars] done.” **In his Thursday remarks regarding the Space Force, Pence also implied that celestial territories would be treated as private property (even though owning private property in space is explicitly illegal per the Outer Space Treaty, which the U.S. and dozens of other nations signed in 1967).** “While other nations increasingly possess the capability to operate in space, not all of them share our commitment to freedom, to private property, and the rule of law,” Pence said. “So as we continue to carry American leadership in space, so also will we carry America’s commitment to freedom into this new frontier.” **This approach to public-private partnerships directly mirrors colonist practices. For instance, the British East India Company violently colonized parts of India on behalf of the company, but over time, ownership of the stolen land shifted to Great Britain. While these risks feel a part of a far away future, in the present, idealizing colonization as a positive, replicable aspect of American history speaks to an unsettling indifference from leaders about the violent history of colonization. And by referencing historical events that victimized people of color, leaders paint a vision of the future in which people of color continue to be excluded, Walkowicz said that the social and economic legacy of colonization is ignored. By using narratives of adventurism and heroics, white Americans were able to convince other white Americans that they were not only entitled to steal and conquest land and persons, but that it was their destiny. Ralph said to The Outline that this mythology remains central to the way Americans conceptualize their history and culture. “Colonization is portrayed as a heroic conquest,” Ralph said.** “These practices are framed as central to American identity, essential to governance, politics, and all major social institution. But not depicted as a colonizing that is one caused by violence, displacement, dispossession.” **Even when people aren’t explicitly referring to settlements in space as “colonies,” they still use the rhetoric of colonizing the New World and the American frontier, which erases the stories of and violence against the people of color who lived and ranched in the region. But how did this language start being used in the first place? Presidents have also used frontierism and colonialism to get white citizens behind their agenda. When President John F. Kennedy announced his intention to bring Americans to the Moon in 1962, he paraphrased one of the earliest colonists on the North American continent.** “William Bradford, speaking in 1630 of the founding of the Plymouth Bay Colony, said that all great and honorable actions are accompanied with great difficulties, and both must be enterprised and overcome with answerable courage,” Kennedy said. Bradford was the governor of the Plymouth Bay Colony at the time of the Pequot War. In an overnight attack, British colonizers massacred four hundred soldiers, non-soldiers, and children. Bradford later described the act of genocide as a Christian victory. “...victory seemed a sweet sacrifice, and they gave the prays therof to God,” Bradford wrote, “who had wrought so wonderfully for them, thus to inclose their enemies in their hands, and give them so speedy a victory over so proud and insulting an enemy.” Although Kennedy did not characterize his vision for the Moon as creating a “colony” specifically, the association he wanted to create is clear: **The Moon is the next version of the New World, the next frontier for American conquest.** In his speech, Kennedy continues that men like Bradford teach us that “man, in his quest for knowledge and progress, is determined and cannot be deterred.” However, if “man” is a stand-in for “white colonizers,” “knowledge and progress” unabashedly brushes over the lives of indigenous persons and people of color that were lost in their quest to “explore.” It’s a profusely sanitized version of reality. “It’s fascinating that a term like ‘colonizing’ can be seen in neutral terms when it can’t exist without violence and dispossession,” Ralph said. It can’t exist without violence to establish a political hierarchy. Every colonial project is about managing populations, subjugating people, extracting resources.” But Kennedy was not the first person to use of colonizing language in the context of space. John Wilkins, one of the first people who ever theorized about humanity’s future in space, wrote “A Discourse Concerning a New World and Another Planet” back in 1638, where he argued that the Moon will be a place for human habitation in the future. Although it was a piece of science fiction theorization at the time, Wilkins justified his argument by saying that God created the Earth and stars for people to use in his honor. Colonizers are adventurers, Wilkins argues, whose ideals are worth replicating on other planets. “The invention of some other means for our convenience to the Moon cannot seem more incredible to us, than this did at first to them, to be discouraged in our hopes of the like success,” Wilkins wrote, admitting that any mission to the moon would be far in the future. “We have not now any [Sir Francis] Drake, or Columbus, to undertake this voyage, or any Daedalus to invent a convenience through the air.” Sir Francis Drake was a slave-trader, and of course, Christopher Columbus is responsible for the genocide of almost 3 million people on the island of Hispaniola (now the Dominican Republic and Haiti). As space travel has become more technologically feasible, science-fiction writers have speculated about how a space society would actually function. Arthur C. Clarke envisioned that “colonial” would be a dirty word in space in his 1954 book Earthflight: “And to do [enter Solar politics], one had to go to Earth; as in the days of the Caesars, there was no alternative. Those who believed otherwise or pretended to — risked being tagged with the dreaded word colonial.’” For Clarke, **colonialism was equated with privilege in a space society,** not because of racism and violence on Earth**.** Later in the novel, Clarke doesn’t hesitate to compare travelling between planets, and the nobility of doing so, with British colonizers travelling between continents in earlier centuries. Adilifu Nama, a professor of African American Studies at Loyola Marymount University who has written about the representation of race in science fiction, said that science fiction movies and books during the 1950s and 1960s often included narratives of invasion from alien lifeforms directly alongside conceptualizations of existing in other worlds. These anxious science fiction narratives became popular during the Civil Rights Movement. “We had [an] invasion emerging [during the Civil Rights Movement] of black folks invading these once pristine white spaces: with public transportation, public schools, and eventually particular neighbourhoods and black folks having access to better, more upscale neighbourhoods,” Nama said. “So there is also this invasion society around racial purity, and the tensions of science fiction can be read not only as Cold War anxieties, but racial anxieties about the other.”

## Thus:

#### [Flowers 1] I affirm the statement, “the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust,” as a performative act of Indigenous refusal politics through settler opposition to violence against Indigenous people. This directly rejects private entities’ actions while respecting Indigenous protest movements.

**Indigenous woman Rachel Flowers 1:** 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

**In our struggles of freedom it** i**s essential that we maintain a treaty-like relationship wherein Indigenous peoples and settlers are** linked together **but neither interferes in the matters of the other. When the state interferes in our business, then it** i**s the obligation of settler** subject**s to oppose the misconduct of their government. Not for *our* benefit, but because that is what it means to live lawfully in a treaty relationship. In this way, settlers are n**o**t obliged to “co-resist” with Indigenous peoples, but rather, to uphold the integrity of a nation-to-nation relationship. Until the settler can imagine alternatives to relations of domination-subordination framed as “co- existence”, put those changes into practice and sustain them, Indigenous peoples need not entertain their fantasies or sympathies.** Are settlers willing to relinquish their privilege? Certainly some settlers oppose their own government and its colonial policy because they can recognize it as such. The politics of recognition is predominantly attentive to the desire of the master (colonizer) to gain recognition as an essential “being-for-itself” but is only recognized by the dependent and unessential consciousness of the slave (colonized), which isn’t really recognition at all (Coulthard, 2014). As Coulthard (2014) notes, in settler colonial contexts such as Canada, the state (master) does not need or desire the recognition of the colonized (slave) but rather our lands, resources, and labor (p. 39). How does this understanding of the politics of recognition shift if we conceive of settlers as colonial subjects who do desire recognition by the colonized?

She adds:

As Fanon (1968) would have it, There is no conciliation possible [between the native world and the colonial world], one of them is superfluous... To dislocate the colonial world does not mean that once the borders have been eliminated there will be a right of way between the two sectors. **To destroy the colonial world means nothing less than** demolishing the colonist’s sector**, burying it deep within the earth or banishing it from the territory (pp. 4-6).** All this is to say that, through an analysis of power relations and their historical formation, the “conditions that are necessary to transform some or to abolish others” are revealed and open a field of possibilities for struggle and strategies of resistance (Foucault, 1982, p. 343). This resistance is not only about refusing or disobeying unjust law or power; it also concerns an unwillingness to give assistance to those individuals who administer such laws or the regime (of knowledge or power) itself: “To will this change is at the same time not to be willing to bear or reproduce the present; the project of willing thus began with, but exceeds, negation: to oppose the old directives is to will what follows” (Ahmed, 2014, p. 141). For Indigenous peoples’ struggles, the unified “no” is also a resounding “yes” to something different, yes to a reality “to come”. Any conciliation possible is displaced into the future and is contingent on the progress of anticolonial struggle.

To clarify, the aff is a performative form of settler solidarity – it doesn’t commodify the ballot, but communicates an Indigenous message. Voting aff means LISTENING TO AND SPREADING Indigenous scholarship – it endorses Flowers’s method of rupturing colonial oppression, and puts Indigenous people in the driver’s seat.

## Part 3: New Relations

#### [Flowers 2] Indigenous groups are DEMANDING that settlers transform their relationship to colonized people by aligning with them.

**Flowers 2:** 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

In both Indigenous studies and direct action there is momentum to turn away from settler institutions and re-center Indigenous law thereby opening a space **to transform Indigenous-settler relations**. Moreover**, Indigenous peoples are increasingly** calling for solidarity from settlers **to stand with us at a wide range of demonstrations in a shared anti-colonial resistance, particularly in ongoing advocacy for missing and murdered Indigenous women.3 Theorists of Indigenous resurgence have clearly articulated that settlers have an opportunity to listen, learn, and act in relation to colonial difference alongside assertions of Indigenous sovereignty** and nationhood (Arvin, Tuck & Morrill, 2013; Coulthard, 2013; Simpson, 2008; 2011)**.** Moreover, Indigenous feminist theories, “offer new and reclaimed ways of thinking through not only how settler colonialism has impacted Indigenous and settler communities, but also how feminist theories can imagine and realize different modes of nationalism and alliances in the future” (Arvin, Tuck & Morrill, 2013, p. 9). **There has and continues to be space offered by Indigenous peoples for settlers to align themselves with our struggles to support** the transformation of the colonial relationship and constructing alternatives to it, or put differently, to move forward in a shared future**. The emphasis from Indigenous peoples on *sharing* and *co-existing* is essential to our ontologies and governance systems since these concepts are predicated on interrelatedness, and therefore, create a constellation of responsibilities to both the human and non-human world.** There is an invitation to reimagine the future in common terms, “when we do not presume that [settler colonial states] should or will always continue to exist, we create the space to reflect on what might be more just forms of governance, not only for Native peoples, but for the rest of the world” (Smith, 2005, p. 311). Leanne Simpson (2014) strikingly explains how one person is capable of “propelling us to rebel against the permanence of settler colonial reality and not just ‘dream alternative realities’ but to create them, on the ground in the physical world, in spite of being occupied. If we accept colonial permanence, then our rebellion can only take place within settler colonial thought and reality; we become too willing to sacrifice the context that creates and produces cultural workers like Kwezens” (p. 8).

#### [Flowers 3] Further, the aff’s form of Indigenous refusal politics flips the set col script – it’s a way for Indigenous people to take the lead and put the burden on settlers to follow.

**Flowers 3:** 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

Irlbacher-Fox (2012) makes an important contribution to guide how we might think through settler solidarity. She writes, **“Co-existence through co-resistance is the responsibility of** all **settlers, and we achieve it in part by making change in our own systems and among other settlers, taking our cue from Indigenous action and direction”. She asserts that co-existence means co-resistance, which productively identifies the role of the settlers in** dismantling their own systems of exploitation **and extraction. This relationship requires the settler to refuse “to collaborate in maintaining injustice as the basis of the relationship between the state and Indigenous peoples”s (Irlbacher-Fox, 2014, p. 156).** However, there is, to my mind, an insidious move in this that disavows the settler by focusing on individual actions, falsely separating them from the state and suggesting that settler subjectivity is not co-constituted through the colonial state. The state is invested in the production of colonized subjects to replicate its governance. Indeed, settler subjectivity itself directly and covertly engages with and mimics colonial institutional structures. Unjust forms of state-sanctioned violence are mechanisms that are put into operation designed to “ensure its own preservation” by reproducing power relations of domination (Foucault, 1982, p. 336). In thinking through these relations it is crucial to interrogate the relationship between power and political will and how it functions in creating new forms of subjectivity. A settler political will should be willful, that is, willing to disobey a general will and always working toward an alternative future. Revolution is only possible when subjects violate the directives of commanding bodies, a willing willfulness to create the world anew by opposing the old orders (Foucault, 1982, p. 336). The will to change is simultaneously a negation and an affirmation. It is, as Foucault (1982) writes, **“through the refusal of this kind of individuality that has been imposed on us” that new forms of subjectivity emerge (p. 336). The political will of decolonization refuses to reproduce the present and affirms alternative futures.**

#### [Flowers 4] Next, the aff is key to ENDING THE CYCLE OF SET COL – it replaces the politics of forgiveness with settler accountability.

**Flowers 4:** 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, women 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.

Since rejecting appropriation is the only way to put that refusal into practice, I affirm