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

Tuck and Yang 12

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

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

#### Policy operates through the performance of settler benevolence despite its hierarchical nature. Rather than focus on the plan’s consequences and technical details, you should unsettle domestic policymaking and vote neg.

Strakosch 18

(Elizabeth Strakosch is a lecturer in public policy and governance, and her research focuses on the intersection of policy and political relationships., (2018): The technical is political: settler colonialism and the Australian Indigenous policy system, Australian Journal of Political Science, DOI: 10.1080/10361146.2018.1555230, JKS)

As SCS points out, there are many similarities between the Anglophone settler colonies. For example, they share parallel policy histories of frontier violence, confinement to reser- vations, assimilation and self-management, and all understand themselves as having trans- cended past colonialism. However, Australia is usefully understood as a settler colonial ‘limit case’ in which specific historical and political circumstances combine to produce a particular intolerance of Indigenous political orders. Legal historian Lisa Ford describes ‘Australia’s peculiar territorial sovereignty’ as ‘antithetical to Indigenous self-government’ and ‘uniquely oppressive to Indigenous rights’ (2008, 70–75). This history of sovereign denial means that ‘judicial and political systems have not treated Indigenous sovereignty as a serious issue’ and the state has not made use legal mechanisms of political encounter such as treaty (Moreton-Robinson 2007, 4). Instead, bureaucracy has been the frontline of colonisation and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have always been dealt with as a domestic population who are legitimate subjects of state intervention and improvement. I argue that domestic policy, despite its focus on administration and technical ‘best practice’, is the key space where the Australian state encounters Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander polities and seeks to resolve colonial conflict in its favour. In doing this I build upon arguments first made by Maori scholar Dominic O’Sullivan (2015) and settler Australian scholar Will Sanders (2017) to suggest that the technical realm of policy is in fact profoundly political – it constitutes a central site where foundational political relationships are asserted and contested. Such an analysis gives us a new perspective on settler-Indigenous relationships in Australia. Equally critically, it offers insights into the problematic conditions facing the contempor- ary Australian Indigenous policy sector.2 The current policy system is dysfunctional and is not achieving the primary stated aim of ameliorating Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander material disadvantage. It has been described as ‘a labyrinth of policies and programs’ which is in ‘great disarray’ about how to achieve its goals (Moran 2016, 1), consumed by ‘bureaucratic involution’ (Sullivan 2008, 132) and characterised by ‘anarchic’ instability (Lea 2012, 111). On the ground, constellations of Indigenous non-government organisations, state actors and community leaders are often able to navigate these processes and achieve outcomes for communities. Yet, despite constant political commitments and media attention, the wider policy system remains an impediment rather than a help to these agents. The scholarly explanations offered for this policy failure – ideology, complexity and racism – are all illuminating, and I argue that these explanations are deepened by the structural analysis offered by colonial critiques. When we identify domestic policy as a critical site where the Australian state aims to resolve its contested relationship with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, then we can better understand the political stakes, and why such policies remain sites of complexity, unequal power and competing goals. Australian Indigenous policy carries a ‘sovereign burden’ which it does not acknowledge and which conditions its dysfunctions. Importantly, policy as a field of settler colonial political interaction can be used to construct different forms of settler-Indigenous relationship. In the latter half of last century, for example, it was used to institutionalise principles of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander self-management and ‘self-determination’ (Bradfield 2006). At a deeper level, however, this field remains conditioned by the basic features of domestic policy – settler unilateralism, sovereign performance and problematisation of Indigenous life. These fundamental dynamics mean that any alternative relationships constructed in the policy field can be unilaterally revoked and this revocation framed as the result of Indigen- ous dysfunction. Right now, policy is depoliticised and presented as a neutral administra- tive space that seeks to redress material Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander disadvantage. When policy is configured this more ‘traditional’ way as a unidirectional, apolitical realm of governmental expertise, it is not that it has ceased to construct political relationships. It is only that it does so in a particular way, while denying any political effects. As I argue below, it is in these phases that policy becomes particularly contested, paradoxical and ineffective. This article seeks to hold foundational sovereign conflict and everyday policy practice in the same frame by drawing on a combination of political theory and empirical policy research. I first build a picture of contemporary Australian Indigenous policy based on studies of federal policy between 2000 and 2007, and after the 2007 Northern Territory intervention. This section anchors the claim that contemporary Indigenous policy is not functioning effectively and that this requires further scholarly explanation. In the second section, I briefly outline Indigenous and settler colonial critiques of contemporary colonialism and explore colonial dynamics in relation to Australian political institutions. I emphasise the fact that settler colonialism is centrally concerned with political legitimation as well as the more often foregrounded economic dynamics of dispossession. This section establishes the broad argument that Australian Indigenous policy is subject to intense ongoing contest over the terms of political coexistence. Finally, I use the case study of the 2014–2018 Indigenous Advancement Strategy to investigate the settler colonial dimensions of Australian Indigenous policy. I argue that policy is a site of settler sovereign legitimation, and explore three key dynamics. Firstly, policy is grounded by a fundamental settler unilateralism, as the state seeks to demonstrate its sovereign authority through its everyday ‘unexceptional’ governance of Indigenous peoples as domestic subjects. Policy, treaty and law can all be mechanisms to entrench settler colonial authority, but domestic policy is especially hierarchical and denies its own political status. Secondly, policy constitutes a state performance of its own neutrality and benign intent, even though the state apparatus is involved in colonial conflict rather than necessarily being a site of resolution. Finally, policy is a site of problematisation, where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people are framed in abject ways that authorise the extension of state jurisdiction and intervention into their lives. In this way they are framed as exceptionally in need of state help, although the provision of this help remains unexceptional.

#### Extinction impacts are fabricated by the settler death drive. Settlers have a psychological investment in imagining the end of the world to create a sense of white vulnerability at the expense of enacting decolonization. You should presume the aff to be false

Dalley 16

(Hamish Dalley received his Ph.D. from the Australian National University in 2013, and is now an Assistant Professor of English at Daemen College, Amherst, New York, where he is responsible for teaching in World and Postcolonial Literatures., (2016): The deaths of settler colonialism: extinction as a metaphor of decolonization in contemporary settler literature, Settler Colonial Studies, DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1238160, JKS)

Settlers love to contemplate the possibility of their own extinction; to read many contemporary literary representations of settler colonialism is to find settlers strangely satisfied in dreaming of ends that never come. This tendency is widely prevalent in English-language representations of settler colonialism produced since the 1980s: the possibility of an ending – the likelihood that the settler race will one day die out – is a common theme in literary and pop culture considerations of colonialism’s future. Yet it has barely been remarked how surprising it is that this theme is so present. For settlers, of all people, to obsessively ruminate on their own finitude is counterintuitive, for few modern social for- mations have been more resistant to change than settler colonialism. With a few excep- tions (French Algeria being the largest), the settler societies established in the last 300 years in the Americas, Australasia, and Southern Africa have all retained the basic features that define them as settler states – namely, the structural privileging of settlers at the expense of indigenous peoples, and the normalization of whiteness as the marker of pol- itical agency and rights – and they have done so notwithstanding the sustained resistance¶ that has been mounted whenever such an order has been built. Settlers think all the time that they might one day end, even though (perhaps because) that ending seems unlikely ever to happen. The significance of this paradox for settler-colonial literature is the subject of this article.¶ Considering the problem of futurity offers a useful foil to traditional analyses of settler- colonial narrative, which typically examine settlers’ attitudes towards history in order to highlight a constitutive anxiety about the past – about origins. Settler colonialism, the argument goes, has a problem with historical narration that arises from a contradiction in its founding mythology. In Stephen Turner’s formulation, the settler subject is by definition one who comes from elsewhere but who strives to make this place home. The settlement narrative must explain how this gap – which is at once geographical, historical, and existential – has been bridged, and the settler transformed from outsider into indigene. Yet the transformation must remain constitutively incomplete, because the desire to be at home necessarily invokes the spectre of the native, whose existence (which cannot be disavowed completely because it is needed to define the settler’s difference, superior- ity, and hence claim to the land) inscribes the settler’s foreignness, thus reinstating the gap between settler and colony that the narrative was meant to efface.1 Settler-colonial narrative is thus shaped around its need to erase and evoke the native, to make the indigene both invisible and present in a contradictory pattern that prevents settlers from ever moving on from the moment of colonization.2 As evidence of this constitutive contradiction, critics have identified in settler-colonial discourse symptoms of psychic distress such as disavowal, inversion, and repression.3 Indeed, the frozen temporality of settler-colonial narrative, fixated on the moment of the frontier, recalls nothing so much as Freud’s description of the ‘repetition compulsion’ attending trauma.4 As Lorenzo Veracini puts it, because:¶ ‘settler society’ can thus be seen as a fantasy where a perception of a constant struggle is juxtaposed against an ideal of ‘peace’ that can never be reached, settler projects embrace and reject violence at the same time. The settler colonial situation is thus a circumstance where the tension between contradictory impulses produces long-lasting psychic conflicts and a number of associated psychopathologies.5¶ Current scholarship has thus focused primarily on settler-colonial narrative’s view of the past, asking how such a contradictory and troubled relationship to history might affect present-day ideological formations. Critics have rarely considered what such narratological tensions might produce when the settler gaze is turned to the future. Few social formations are more stubbornly resistant to change than settlement, suggesting that a future beyond settler colonialism might be simply unthinkable. Veracini, indeed, suggests that settler-colonial narrative can never contemplate an ending: that settler decolonization is inconceivable because settlers lack the metaphorical tools to imagine their own demise.6 This article outlines why I partly disagree with that view. I argue that the narratological paradox that defines settler-colonial narrative does make the future a problematic object of contemplation. But that does not make settler decolonization unthinkable per se; as I will show, settlers do often try to imagine their demise – but they do so in a way that reasserts the paradoxes of their founding ideology, with the result that the radical potentiality of decolonization is undone even as it is invoked.¶ I argue that, notwithstanding Veracini’s analysis, there is a metaphor via which the end of settler colonialism unspools – the quasi-biological concept of extinction, which, when deployed as a narrative trope, offers settlers a chance to consider and disavow their demise, just as they consider and then disavow the violence of their origins. This article traces the importance of the trope of extinction for contemporary settler-colonial litera- ture, with a focus on South Africa, Canada, and Australia. It explores variations in how the death of settler colonialism is conceptualized, drawing a distinction between his- torio-civilizational narratives of the rise and fall of empires, and a species-oriented notion of extinction that draws force from public anxiety about climate change – an invocation that adds another level of ambivalence by drawing on ‘rational’ fears for the future (because climate change may well render the planet uninhabitable to humans) in order to narrativize a form of social death that, strictly speaking, belongs to a different order of knowledge altogether. As such, my analysis is intended to draw the attention of settler- colonial studies toward futurity and the ambivalence of settler paranoia, while highlighting a potential point of cross-fertilization between settler-colonial and eco-critical approaches to contemporary literature.¶ That ‘extinction’ should be a key word in the settler-colonial lexicon is no surprise. In Patrick Wolfe’s phrase,7 settler colonialism is predicated on a ‘logic of elimination’ that tends towards the extermination – by one means or another – of indigenous peoples.8 This logic is apparent in archetypal settler narratives like James Fenimore Cooper’s The Last of the Mohicans (1826), a historical novel whose very title blends the melancholia and triumph that demarcate settlers’ affective responses to the supposed inevitability of indigenous extinction. Concepts like ‘stadial development’ – by which societies progress through stages, progressively eliminating earlier social forms – and ‘fatal impact’ – which names the biological inevitability of strong peoples supplanting weak – all contribute to the notion that settler colonialism is a kind of ‘ecological process’ that necessitates the extinction of inferior races. What is surprising, though, is how often the trope of extinction also appears with reference to settlers themselves; it makes sense for settlers to narrate how their presence entails others’ destruction, but it is less clear why their attempts to imagine futures should presume extinction to be their own logical end as well.¶ The idea appears repeatedly in English-language literary treatments of settler colonial- ism. Consider, for instance, the following rumination on the future of South African settler society, from Olive Schreiner’s 1883 Story of an African Farm:¶ It was one of them, one of those wild old Bushmen, that painted those pictures there. He did not know why he painted but he wanted to make something, so he made these. [...] Now the Boers have shot them all, so that we never see a yellow face peeping out among the stones. [...] And the wild bucks have gone, and those days, and we are here. But we will be gone soon, and only the stones will lie on, looking at everything like they look now.10¶ In this example, the narrating settler character, Waldo, recognizes prior indigenous inha- bitation but his knowledge comes freighted with an expected sense of biological super- iority, made apparent by his description of the ‘Bushman’s’ ‘yellow face’, and lack of mental self-awareness. What is not clear is why Waldo’s contemplation of colonial geno- cide should turn immediately to the assumption that a similar fate awaits his people as well. A similar presumption of racial vulnerability permeates other late nineteenth- century novels from the imperial metropole, such as Dracula and War of the Worlds,¶ which are plotted around the prospect of invasions that would see the extinction of British imperialism, and, in the process, the human species.¶ Such anxieties draw energy from a pattern of settler defensiveness that can be observed across numerous settler-colonial contexts. Marilyn Lake’s and Henry Reynold’s account of the emergence of transnational ‘whiteness’ highlights the paradoxical fact that while white male settlers have been arguably the most privileged class in history, they have routinely perceived themselves to be ‘under siege’, threatened with destruction to the extent that their very identity of ‘whiteness was born in the apprehension of immi- nent loss’.11 The fear of looming annihilation serves a powerful ideological function in settler communities, working to foster racial solidarity, suppress dissent, and legitimate violence against indigenous populations who, by any objective measure, are far more at risk of extermination than the settlers who fear them. Ann Curthoys and Dirk Moses have traced this pattern in Australia and Israel-Palestine, respectively.12 This scholarship suggests that narratives of settler extinction are acts of ideological mystification, obscuring the brutal inequalities of the frontier behind a mask of white vulnerability – an argument with which I sympathize. However, this article shows how there is more to settler-colonial extinction narratives than bad faith. I argue that we need a more nuanced understanding of how they encode a specifically settler-colonial framework for imagining the future, one that has implications for how we understand contemporary literatures from settler societies, and which allows us to see extinction as a genuine, if flawed, attempt to envisage social change.¶ In the remainder of this paper I consider extinction’s function as a metaphor of decolonization. I use this phrase to invoke, without completely endorsing, Tuck and Yang’s argu- ment that to treat decolonization figuratively, as I argue extinction narratives do, is necessarily to preclude radical change, creating opportunities for settler ‘moves to innocence’ that re-legitimate racial inequality.13 The counterview to this pessimistic perspec- tive is offered by Veracini, who suggests that progressive change to settler-colonial relationships will only happen if narratives can be found that make decolonization think- able.14 This article enters the debate between these two perspectives by asking what it means for settler writers to imagine the future via the trope of extinction. Does extinction offer a meaningful way to think about ending settler colonialism, or does it re-activate settler-colonial patterns of thought that allow exclusionary social structures to persist?¶ I explore this question with reference to examples of contemporary literary treatments of extinction from select English-speaking settler-colonial contexts: South Africa, Australia, and Canada.15 The next section of this article traces key elements of extinction narrative in a range of settler-colonial texts, while the section that follows offers a detailed reading of one of the best examples of a sustained literary exploration of human finitude, Margaret Atwood’s Maddaddam trilogy (2003–2013). I advance four specific arguments. First, extinc- tion narratives take at least two forms depending on whether the ‘end’ of settler society is framed primarily in historical-civilizational terms or in a stronger, biological sense; the key question is whether the ‘thing’ that is going extinct is a society or a species. Second, biologically oriented extinction narratives rely on a more or less conscious slippage between ‘the settler’ and ‘the human’. Third, this slippage is ideologically ambivalent: on the one hand, it contains a radical charge that invokes environmentalist discourse and climate-change anxiety to imagine social forms that re-write settler-colonial dynamics; on the other, it replicates a core aspect of imperialist ideology by normalizing whiteness as¶ equivalent to humanity. Fourth, these ideological effects are mediated by gender, insofar as extinction narratives invoke issues of biological reproduction, community protection, and violence that function to differentiate and reify masculine and feminine roles in the putative de-colonial future. Overall, my central claim is that extinction is a core trope through which settler futurity emerges, one with crucial narrative and ideological effects that shape much of the contemporary literature emerging from white colonial settings.

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

Tuck and Yang 12

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

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework. We want to say, first, that decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity. Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability. *when you take away the punctuation he says of lines lifted from the documents about military-occupied land its acreage and location you take away its finality opening the possibility of other futures* -Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012) Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.

### FW

#### The role of the ballot is to best recognize Indigenous scholarship and resistance—any ethical commitment requires that the aff center discussion in Native scholarship and demands.

Carlson 16

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

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

## Case

### 1NC China Econ U

#### Chinese economic collapse inevitable- omicron, housing

Economist 12-1-21 https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/chinas-economy-looks-especially-vulnerable-to-the-spread-of-omicron/21806564

Travel is vital to innovation. Unfortunately what is true of business is also true of viruses. At some point on its journey around the globe the covid-19 virus re invented itself. The new Omicron variant will further entrench China’s tight restrictions on business travel. Indeed it may cause more disruption to China’s economy than to other gdp heavyweights. That is not because the virus will spread more widely in China. On the contrary. It is because the government will try so hard to stop it from doing so. Since the end of May, China has recorded 7,728 covid-19 infections. America has recorded 15.2m. And yet China’s curbs on movement and gathering have been tighter, especially near outbreaks (see chart 1). Its policy of “zero tolerance” towards covid-19 also entails limited tolerance for international travel. It requires visitors to endure a quarantine of at least 14 days in an assigned hotel. The number of mainlanders crossing the border has dropped by 99%, according to Wind, a data provider. These restrictions have stopped previous variants from spreading. But periodic local lockdowns have also depressed consumption, especially of services like catering. And the restrictions on cross-border travel will inflict unseen damage on innovation. Cutting business-travel spending in half is as bad for a country’s productivity as cutting r&d spending by a quarter, according to one study by Mariacristina Piva of the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore in Milan and her co-authors. If the Omicron variant is more infectious than other strains, it will increase the likelihood of covid-19 outbreaks in China, leading to more frequent lockdowns. If the restrictions were as severe as those China briefly imposed in mid-August, when it was fighting an outbreak that began in the city of Nanjing, the toll on growth could be considerable. If imposed for an entire quarter, the curbs could subtract almost $130bn from China’s gdp, according to our calculations based on a model of lockdowns by Goldman Sachs, a bank—equivalent to around 3% of quarterly output. Omicron is not the only threat to China’s economy. Even before its emergence, most forecasters thought that China’s growth would slow to 4.5-5.5% next year, as a crackdown on private business and a property slowdown bite. Worse scenarios are imaginable. If China suffers a property slump as bad as the one it endured in 2014-15, gdp growth could fall to 3% in the fourth quarter of 2022, compared with a year earlier, according to Oxford Economics, a consultancy. That would drag growth for the whole year down to 3.8%. If housing investment instead crashed as badly as it did in America or Spain in the second half of the 2000s, growth in China could fall to 1% in the final quarter of 2022 (see chart 2). That would take growth for the year down to 2.1%. Losses would leave “numerous” smaller banks with less capital than the regulatory minimum of 10.5%, the firm says.

#### Chinese government failing to stabilize economy

Tang 12-2-21

(Frank, https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3158194/chinas-economic-growth-biggest-challenge-beijing-2022-senior)

Stabilising economic growth in the coming year will require Beijing to implement new measures, as a larger-than-expected decline in the growth rate this year has sparked market concerns over China’s development prospects, a senior government adviser warned on Thursday. The comments by Yang Weimin, deputy director of the Chinese People’s Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC)’s Economic Affairs Committee, suggest that Beijing’s policymakers could rally more supportive policies in 2022 in response to economic deterioration and rising external challenges. A raft of pressing issues will be discussed at the upcoming central economic work conference in mid-December, including stabilising the economy and markets through cross-cyclical adjustments; balancing the pandemic control and economic growth; managing the risks caused by the domestic slowdown and external spillover; and maintaining exports by improving external relations.

#### 1. Soft power key to China’s rise

Mikail Kalimuddin 17, M.A., Brown University, Branch Head of the Singapore Defence Policy Office, 2017, “The Role of Soft Power in China’s Security Strategy: Case Studies on the south China Sea and Taiwan,” https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/1038741.pdf

A second set of implications concerns the growth of China’s soft power. As was highlighted in the introductory chapter of this thesis, many major powers currently have more soft power at their disposal than China does. If this differential in soft power narrows, or even flips in favor of China, these states may find that their existing strategies for managing China’s rise are no longer as effective. Simply put, policymakers dealing with security issues involving China will need to pay careful attention to changes in Chinese soft power, and be prepared to adjust their national strategies accordingly. As was shown in the research, China’s security strategy leverages multiple sources of power, presenting China with many avenues to enhance its soft power. China’s economic power is huge and still growing; its effects are particularly pronounced in Asia.

Of all the sources of power, this is the one that policymakers are probably most cognizant of and prepared to deal with. In terms of military power, China’s growth potential is significant, and involves more than just sheer size. The PLA is currently engaged in a massive modernization effort under Xi’s leadership, shedding much of its antiquated doctrine and organization. As the PLA takes on new missions that involve it maintaining a greater external presence, China’s ability to wield soft power through its military will grow both quantitatively and qualitatively. Considering the PLA held its first ever exercise with a foreign military only as recently as in 2002, one can only assume that its untapped potential is significant121. The advancement of Chinese military technology is a possible game-changer. Achieving parity with the US in military technology will have considerable hard power benefits for China, but the effect on Chinese soft power could be as large, if not greater. If countries are presented with a compelling reason to consider China as their primary technology partner, they may also be encouraged to fundamentally reconsider the centrality of their security relationships with the US.

China’s institutional soft power deserves added attention. Compared with economic and military heft, institutional power takes time to cultivate. As China produces ever more scientists, academics, and professionals who operate at the cutting-edge of their fields, increasing numbers of these individuals will take on positions of influence in institutions around the world and even create institutions of their own. China’s ability to influence the regional and global discourse on a wide range of issues will increase correspondingly. In areas like cyber and space, where international norms have yet to be settled upon, this growth in institutional soft power will be particularly valuable.

#### 2. Collapses the liberal order

Eric Orts 18, the Guardsmark Professor at The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 6/27/18, “Foreign Affairs: Six Future Scenarios (and a Seventh),” https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/foreign-affairs-six-future-scenarios-seventh-eric-orts

7. Fascist Nationalism. There is another possible future that the Foreign Affairs scenarios do not contemplate, and it’s a dark world in which Trump, Putin, Xi, Erdogan, and others construct regimes that are authoritarian and nationalist. Fascism is possible in the United States and elsewhere if big business can be seduced by promises of riches in return for the institutional keys to democracy. Perhaps Foreign Affairs editors are right to leave this dark world out, for it would be very dark: nationalist wars with risks of escalation into global nuclear conflict, further digital militarization (even Terminator-style scenarios of smart military robots), and unchecked climate disasters.

The global challenges are quite large – and the six pieces do an outstanding job of presenting them. One must remain optimistic and engaged, hopeful that we can overcome the serious dangers of tribalism, nationalism, and new fascism. These "isms” of our time stand in the way of solving some of our biggest global problems, such as the risks of thermonuclear war and global climate catastrophe.

#### 3. Liberal order caps extinction risks

Yuval Noah Harari 18, Professor of History at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 9/26/18, “We need a post-liberal order now,” The Economist, <https://www.economist.com/open-future/2018/09/26/we-need-a-post-liberal-order-now>

The second thing to note about this vision of friendly fortresses is that it has been tried—and it failed spectacularly. All attempts to divide the world into clear-cut nations have so far resulted in war and genocide. When the heirs of Garibaldi, Mazzini and Mickiewicz managed to overthrow the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire, it proved impossible to find a clear line dividing Italians from Slovenes or Poles from Ukrainians.

This had set the stage for the second world war. The key problem with the network of fortresses is that each national fortress wants a bit more land, security and prosperity for itself at the expense of the neighbors, and without the help of universal values and global organisations, rival fortresses cannot agree on any common rules. Walled fortresses are seldom friendly.

But if you happen to live inside a particularly strong fortress, such as America or Russia, why should you care? Some nationalists indeed adopt a more extreme isolationist position. They don’t believe in either a global empire or in a global network of fortresses. Instead, they deny the necessity of any global order whatsoever. “Our fortress should just raise the drawbridges,” they say, “and the rest of the world can go to hell. We should refuse entry to foreign people, foreign ideas and foreign goods, and as long as our walls are stout and the guards are loyal, who cares what happens to the foreigners?”

Such extreme isolationism, however, is completely divorced from economic realities. Without a global trade network, all existing national economies will collapse—including that of North Korea. Many countries will not be able even to feed themselves without imports, and prices of almost all products will skyrocket. The made-in-China shirt I am wearing cost me about $5. If it had been produced by Israeli workers from Israeli-grown cotton using Israeli-made machines powered by non-existing Israeli oil, it may well have cost ten times as much. Nationalist leaders from Donald Trump to Vladimir Putin may therefore heap abuse on the global trade network, but none thinks seriously of taking their country completely out of that network. And we cannot have a global trade network without some global order that sets the rules of the game.

Even more importantly, whether people like it or not, humankind today faces three common problems that make a mockery of all national borders, and that can only be solved through global cooperation. These are nuclear war, climate change and technological disruption. You cannot build a wall against nuclear winter or against global warming, and no nation can regulate artificial intelligence (AI) or bioengineering single-handedly. It won’t be enough if only the European Union forbids producing killer robots or only America bans genetically-engineering human babies. Due to the immense potential of such disruptive technologies, if even one country decides to pursue these high-risk high-gain paths, other countries will be forced to follow its dangerous lead for fear of being left behind.

An AI arms race or a biotechnological arms race almost guarantees the worst outcome. Whoever wins the arms race, the loser will likely be humanity itself. For in an arms race, all regulations will collapse. Consider, for example, conducting genetic-engineering experiments on human babies. Every country will say: “We don’t want to conduct such experiments—we are the good guys. But how do we know our rivals are not doing it? We cannot afford to remain behind. So we must do it before them.”

Similarly, consider developing autonomous-weapon systems, that can decide for themselves whether to shoot and kill people. Again, every country will say: “This is a very dangerous technology, and it should be regulated carefully. But we don’t trust our rivals to regulate it, so we must develop it first”.

The only thing that can prevent such destructive arms races is greater trust between countries. This is not an impossible mission. If today the Germans promise the French: “Trust us, we aren’t developing killer robots in a secret laboratory under the Bavarian Alps,” the French are likely to believe the Germans, despite the terrible history of these two countries. We need to build such trust globally. We need to reach a point when Americans and Chinese can trust one another like the French and Germans.

Similarly, we need to create a global safety-net to protect humans against the economic shocks that AI is likely to cause. Automation will create immense new wealth in high-tech hubs such as Silicon Valley, while the worst effects will be felt in developing countries whose economies depend on cheap manual labor. There will be more jobs to software engineers in California, but fewer jobs to Mexican factory workers and truck drivers. We now have a global economy, but politics is still very national. Unless we find solutions on a global level to the disruptions caused by AI, entire countries might collapse, and the resulting chaos, violence and waves of immigration will destabilise the entire world.

This is the proper perspective to look at recent developments such as Brexit. In itself, Brexit isn’t necessarily a bad idea. But is this what Britain and the EU should be dealing with right now? How does Brexit help prevent nuclear war? How does Brexit help prevent climate change? How does Brexit help regulate artificial intelligence and bioengineering? Instead of helping, Brexit makes it harder to solve all of these problems. Every minute that Britain and the EU spend on Brexit is one less minute they spend on preventing climate change and on regulating AI.

In order to survive and flourish in the 21st century, humankind needs effective global cooperation, and so far the only viable blueprint for such cooperation is offered by liberalism. Nevertheless, governments all over the world are undermining the foundations of the liberal order, and the world is turning into a network of fortresses. The first to feel the impact are the weakest members of humanity, who find themselves without any fortress willing to protect them: refugees, illegal migrants, persecuted minorities. But if the walls keep rising, eventually the whole of humankind will feel the squeeze.

#### 4. Chinese global governance isn’t peaceful

Bradley A. Thayer 18, associate professor of political science at the University of Minnesota-Duluth, with; John Friend; 10/3/18, “The World According to China,” https://thediplomat.com/2018/10/the-world-according-to-china/

Inevitably as China becomes more powerful and influential in international relations, Beijing will fundamentally change the international system created by the United States and the Cold War. The key question for international politics is what kind of world does China seek to create by 2049 — the centenary of the People’s Republic of China (PRC). Will China sustain the present liberal system or forge another anchored on its ambitions, culture, and desires? Millennia of Chinese history strongly suggests the latter. In this essay, we illuminate China’s model of global governance and touch upon its derivative economic and political features.

Conceiving of what type of world China will create is significant for three reasons. First, it is critical for the United States to understand so that the full scope of China’s strategic ambitions and direction may be understood. Second, as China grows in power and influence, it is essential to comprehend what China will sustain of the present global order versus what it will replace. U.S. decision-makers should expect that the world China would like to create by 2049 will be fundamentally different. The economic order will be a curious mix of hyper-capitalism and neomercantilism. The political order will be authoritarian. Third, understanding China’s ambition and grand strategic objectives allows the United States to develop policies and undertake measures to thwart them. Whether the United States can maintain its position as the pre-eminent force for free and open societies in the face of a rising challenge from China is likely to be a defining element of international politics in the 21st century and is of immediate U.S. national security policy interest.

The world by 2049 will be defined by the realization of Chinese power. China will be the world’s greatest economic and political force, including alliances and global presence. While its power will make it the dominant state in international politics, the central issue is how China will use its power. Will China join the liberal world order or will it transform Western rules, norms, and institutions?
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China’s grand strategic vision is primacy — China will and should be the dominant force in international politics. China’s vision is defined by Xi Jinping’s phrase “One World, One Dream,” which is a modern form of tianxia, or “all under heaven.” This concept serves as the foundation of China’s imperial ideology — the Chinese conception of how the world should be ordered.

The concept of “all under heaven” is the genesis of the Chinese worldview with respect to how China ought to be ruled, its position in international politics, and the subordinate role required of other states. It implies, first, an ethnic Han polity, which is inherently authoritarian. Second, it requires that a single powerful monarch, the Chinese emperor (“Son of Heaven”) should rule the entire civilized world — which by definition should be unified under the emperor’s control so that disorder and chaos may be avoided, and reason and just rule may triumph.

The fundamental ideas and values that forged China’s political culture remain today. What China will want in 2049 dovetails with what China wants today or wanted in its imperial past. There is a profound continuity in the Chinese worldview, its imperial ideology, including why its political leaders sincerely believe its domination provides the best outcome for its denizens and for all states in international politics. For most of its history, China was the epitome of power and held a dominant position in East Asia. Its relationship with neighboring countries was based on a hierarchical tribute system that provided China will vast amounts of power, influence, and prestige. Thus, we can appreciate why a resurgent China with an emboldened leadership desires to recapture a modern form of this position.

China’s Economic Goals

In the economic realm, China is actively seeking to replace the liberal principles of the Washington Consensus with its own development model. A curious amalgamation of hyper-capitalism with neomercantilist policies, the “China Model” offers subsidized development to developing countries with no strings attached. This model is advanced as “value neutral,” as it does not require governments to adopt democratic principles or uphold basic human rights.

Beijing’s implementation of this model will follow a two-track process that has both short-term and long-term objectives. In the short term, China will work within the present international trade regime, support established norms, and continue to maneuver within this system to accomplish its foreign policy objectives, which are primarily dependent on maintaining economic development and trade. Since the economic reforms of the Deng Xiaoping era, China has accepted many of the norms and rules of the liberal world order, joining the World Trade Organization (WTO) for example, and, over time, become more involved in key international organizations, such as the United Nations. This initial embrace of multilateralism was a combination of choice and necessity, as China’s economic development was dependent upon global integration, expanding its political influence, and developing its soft power.

At the moment, Beijing is unable to overturn completely Western rules and institutions, as it does not have the capacity or incentive to transform the existing international order. Therefore, in the near term, China will continue to work within the Western-led multilateral institutions and tout its support for the established order. Beijing’s short-term strategy is to maintain the system that has made possible its economic growth and minimize resistance to its actions until its replacement is fully functioning. By not directly challenging the global economic order, Beijing is able to sustain the “peaceful rise” ruse and attract the strong support of many Western academics and policymakers who believe that China will never replace the system responsible for its success.

China will continue to embrace multilateralism and become more involved in international institutions like the WTO. However, while accomplishing these goals, Beijing will simultaneously develop Chinese-led economic institutions like the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) and the Belt and Road Initiative (BRI), which Chinese political elite argue uphold and deepen liberal values and principles.

In the long term, by the PRC’s centenary, as it becomes more powerful and the United States declines in influence, Beijing will push for reforms that promote hyper-capitalism and minimize liberal democratic principles within Western-led international institutions. As more countries join Chinese-led institutions, Beijing will be able to use its economic power as leverage to persuade — through a combination of sticks and carrots — Western and non-Western governments to support and adopt these reforms. Despite China’s rapid opening to international trade, Beijing will continue to pursue a dirigiste model and neomercantilist policies. In this regard, China’s involvement in multilateral institutions is purely strategic. Beijing seeks to mute threat perception and establish a network of economic relations that it can use as leverage and a means to advance its own foreign policy agenda. As China rises, Beijing’s call for hyper-capitalism will be overshadowed by its mercantilist tendencies and cultural chauvinism.

Employing neomercantilist tactics when convenient, Beijing has, on many occasions, used economic power to coerce and punish states that directly or indirectly challenge its authority, security interests, and foreign policies. For example, in response to the installation of the U.S. Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system in South Korea, Beijing strongly encouraged its citizens to boycott South Korean companies, such as Hyundai, AmorePacific, and Lotte, and implemented a ban on tour groups visiting the country, all of which significantly impacted the South Korean economy and forced Seoul to negotiate with Beijing.

By 2049, Western-led institutions will remain, but their liberal principles will be diluted by reforms required by Beijing. As China’s economic power increases and more countries in both the developed and developing world become dependent on Chinese trade and investment, Beijing will use its economic statecraft to pressure countries to downplay or abandon their democratic values and liberal policies. At same time, Chinese-created and led institutions will have weakened traditional institutions, as over the long term China will find it easier to advance its domination through its own institutions.

China’s Political Objectives

In the political domain, China seeks the triumph of authoritarianism in international politics. In the past, China’s view of international relations was based on hierarchy and status. Today, this hierarchical perception remains. Chinese paternalism shapes Beijing’s relations with countries perceived as inferior, be it China’s heavy-handedness in the South China Sea or its business practices in Africa and Latin America. Such behavior also suggests that China sees itself as the hegemon of Asia and, as a result, is sensitive to foreign influence in the region and quick to respond aggressively to territorial disputes with neighboring countries. China’s imperial ideology can be clearly seen in statements made by President Xi Jinping on the “Chinese Dream,” particularly his emphasis on “the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation” and developing “socialism with Chinese characteristics.” In fact, Xi’s consolidation of power within the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) following the 19th National Congress in October 2017, along with the comparison of “Xi Jinping Thought” with Deng’s and Mao’s thought among Chinese intellectuals and party officials, has many China watchers rightfully concerned that Xi is becoming too powerful.

While the theme of “national rejuvenation” has been used in one way or another by Chinese leaders since Sun Yat-sen, Xi is the first to export the Chinese dream narrative to a global level. On the whole, a common view in China is that this rejuvenation is simply recapturing China’s lost international status and power. Thus, it is not novel, but is for China rather a return to the proper order of international politics.

If Xi’s “Dream” is realized, we can envision a world where by the mid-21st century, democratic governments survive in the West, but Beijing’s political model will have the upper hand in the international system. As with the Cold War, the struggle is material — economic and military power matter — but will also and ineluctably be ideological. Certainly, its course will pose, and its outcome answer, an ideologically dispositive question: Will egalitarianism remain the dominant ideal in international politics, or will it cede leadership back to authoritarianism? However lamentable, due to the expansion of China’s power and influence, it is likely that authoritarian politics will be the norm without serious challenge from the West. It is probable that China will advance this new wave of authoritarianism to augment its legitimacy. Touting its superiority, Beijing will also advance arguments not dissimilar from “The End of History” arguments made in the West in the early 1990s following the collapse of the Soviet Union.

In contrast to the liberal democratic and free market principles of the Washington Consensus, Beijing’s political model is offering the developing world a regime-type neutral investment model based on “noninterference” in domestic affairs and the promise of “no strings attached” loans and other forms of financial assistance. This business model is part of China’s “charm offensive” and appears to be growing in popularity, as many around the world see the Chinese way of doing business as a better alternative to the structural adjustment programs of the International Monetary Fund or the push for democratic reform often associated with Western aid.

During the Cold War, the United States served as a global beacon for political elites who embraced certain values and ideas. Today, China is offering authoritarian values that are appealing to governments whose hold on power is threatened by U.S. principles such as the rule of law, free speech, democracy, and transparency and accountability in government.

By 2049, China will be ideationally self-confident and able to exert dominance more effectively in the economic, political, and military realms. Beijing will no longer integrate or negotiate but rather expect others to accept the China Order. Indeed, we are already witnessing the early stages of international politics under Chinese dominance. China’s ongoing development of military bases in the South China Sea is a clear violation of international law and its attempts to suppress free speech, particularly criticism of the CCP, outside its own borders speaks volumes to its goal of supplanting liberal values with authoritarianism.

#### 5. China will use power aggressively

Jennifer Lind 18, Associate Professor, Department of Government, Dartmouth College, March/April 2018, “Life in China's Asia,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 97, No. 2

It may be tempting to believe that China will be a relatively benign regional hegemon. Economic interdependence, one argument goes, should restrain Chinese aggression: because the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) rests on economic growth, which depends on trade, Beijing would maintain peaceful relations with its neighbors. Moreover, China claims to be a different sort of great power. Chinese officials and scholars regularly decry interventionism and reject the notion of "spheres of influence" as a Cold War relic. Chinese President Xi Jinping has said that his country has "never engaged in colonialism or aggression" thanks to its "peace-loving cultural tradition." In this view, life in China's Asia would not be so different from what it is today. But this is not how regional hegemons behave. Great powers typically dominate their regions in their quest for security. They develop and wield tremendous economic power. They build massive militaries, expel external rivals, and use regional institutions and cultural programs to entrench their influence. Because hegemons fear that neighboring countries will allow external rivals to establish a military foothold, they develop a profound interest in the domestic politics of their neighborhood, and even seek to spread their culture to draw other countries closer. China is already following the strategies of previous regional hegemons. It is using economic coercion to bend other countries to its will. It is building up its military to ward off challengers. It is intervening in other countries' domestic politics to get friendlier policies. And it is investing massively in educational and cultural programs to enhance its soft power. As Chinese power and ambition grow, such efforts will only increase. China's neighbors must start debating how comfortable they are with this future, and what costs they are willing to pay to shape or forestall it.