### **A. Links**

#### 1. First, the aff centers this topic around all lives.

#### [McKinson] This topic is unique to colonization.

**McKinson**: McKinson, Kimberley D. [Kimberley D. McKinson is a cultural anthropologist who conducts ethnographic research in Jamaica. She received her Ph.D. from the University of California, Irvine, and is currently an assistant professor of anthropology at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, The City University of New York (CUNY). McKinson’s research is situated at the intersections of urban security/insecurity, material culture, Caribbean postcoloniality, and critical Black historiography. Her work has been supported by the National Science Foundation, the University of California Center for New Racial Studies, the University of California Collaboratory for Ethnographic Design, and CUNY. McKinson is presently at work on her first book, Palimpsestic Securityscapes: Making Home and Excavating Memory in Postcolonial Jamaica.] “Do Black Lives Matter in Outer Space?”, *Sapiens Anthropology Magazine*, September 30, 2020. EM

**As the history of the space race shows, the dream of colonizing space has always been tied to narratives about domination and greatness. In the U.S., the historic NASA workforce has largely been White and male.** As writer Mark Dery noted in a groundbreaking essay about Afrofuturism, such men seem to believe they possess the power to design, own, and control “the unreal estate of the future.” **These narratives are not unlike the ones of Euro-American colonization and imperialism on Earth, which are stories of the exploitation, exclusion, and dehumanization of Black people, other people of color, and Indigenous people in the name of exploration, adventure, and expansion by White people. Today the scions of space colonization are the billionaire entrepreneurs who have founded commercial spaceflight companies—Musk (SpaceX), Jeff Bezos (Blue Origin), and Sir Richard Branson (Virgin Galactic). In other words, they are no longer political leaders from ideologically opposed nation-states, as they were during the Cold War. They are still, however, privileged and wealthy White men. (The combined net worth of Musk, Bezos, and Branson is over US$273 billion.) Their endeavors to colonize Mars and their fantasies for the future of humankind must be understood in the context of the racialized histories of colonization on Earth.**

## B. Impacts

**THIS ISN’T A LINK OF OMISSION –** it’s about the aff’s ACTIVE CHOICE to frame Indigenous issues ones that effect all people, an act of settler privilege that the Indigenous don’t have.

**[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.