# Woodward R5 1N

## Offs

### Theory

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must respond to pre-round disclosure requests 30 minutes before the round about whether the aff will be new or has been previously read and disclosed on the NDCA LD 2021-2022 Highschool Debate Wiki. To clarify, this is not new affs bad, you just must tell me whether its new or not. Violation: You didn't – screenshots below. They also have a note saying to email for disclosure, so they recognize the abuse.Graphical user interface, application Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, text, application, email Description automatically generated

#### Vote neg for pre-round prep - A] it forces me to split my time investigating and trying to figure out what the aff is by emailing you and not focusing on the actual prep which makes it impossible for me to generate a coherent negative strategy which is a pre-requisite to a fair debate in the first place - B] it forces me to split my time prepping for the multiple different genres of affs that they have disclosed - uniquely in this case because they have both K and LARP affs which is impossible to do in just 30 minutes, especially when we don't know whether it will actually be any of those affs we prepped for.

#### Disclosure outweighs - it constrains the arguments that I could have made in the first place, so evaluation of other arguments are incoherent absenting taking into account the abuse that prevented me from engaging

#### Fairness is a voter in the context of disclosure – debate is a competitive game that requires judges voting for the better debater which requires a fair evaluation or else we don’t know if arguments are true

#### No RVIs – A] Logic - You don’t get to win for proving you were fair – B] Theory baiting good theory debaters would do things to make people read theory and then win off the RVIs.

#### Competing Interps – A] Can’t reasonably not disclose – B] The function of theory is a question of competing norms – C] Reasonability is subjective and a race to the bottom

#### Drop the Debater – A] I couldn’t engage in case so you can’t evaluate substance – B] sets a good precedent and norms on disclosure – C] dropping the arg on disclosure is incoherent

### K

#### Settler colonialism is an ongoing structure, not an event. As settlers came with the intention of making indigenous land their home, they enacted mass genocide and erasure to the indigenous people of the land. The erasing of Native history, life and culture are ongoing devastating impacts coming from the settler state that outweigh the affirmative. The affirmative actively participates in the settler colonial project of erasure---anything that does not start from the question of settler colonialism removes indigeneity from history. **Barker12**

—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 settler colonialism “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

#### Don’t be fooled by the aff’s claims to anti-capitalism—all they do is trade globalist capitalist exploitation for mercantilist capitalist exploitation. Private entities don’t need to appropriate themselves if they can rely on the colonial state to do it for them; the aff only dooms us to replicate the logic of the railroad, where the colonial state did the appropriating of indigenous lands to hand them over for financialization as a way to reinforce whiteness. Gal 21

The Interstellar Railroad, or Speculation and Shareholder Whiteness in the Space Economy Réka Patrícia Gál April 14, 2021

#### Indeed, Musk has carefully positioned his company as a space transportation company, and has explicitly compared the SpaceX project to building the Union-Pacific Railroad — for space (Robertson 2016). The colonial comparison is not surprising (Cowen 2020). Proponents of space colonization have long drawn parallels to the colonization of the Americas, enthusiastically representing frontier pioneering and imperialist expansionism as imperative to US American national identity (Billings 2007). The explicit comparison to North American railroad construction hints at a specific trend of space colonization advocacy that is focused on stimulating commercial space operations. The industrialist argument is that just as the construction of the transcontinental railroad was best undertaken by private entrepreneurs who were incentivized by the government with land grants and subsidies, the US American government should similarly aid private entrepreneurs in the establishment of the New Space industry (Mazlish 1965, Launius 2014, McCurdy 2019a). In fact, from the founding of SpaceX up to 2012, the additional government funding provided to SpaceX raised returns on investment by more than two percent--this is approximately the same return that a nineteenth century investor might have expected to gain if the railroad company they invested in received federal land grant subsidies (McCurdy 2019b, 48). Looking at the transcontinental railroad and current space colonial initiatives in parallel can therefore provide a helpful analytic for understanding, and struggling against, such a colonial expansion. What questions and conceptual understandings can thinking of commercial space travel alongside the transcontinental railroad generate? I am particularly interested in thinking this analogy through some of the concepts advanced by Manu Karuka in his recent monograph Empire’s Tracks (2019). Karuka argues that the construction of the transcontinental railroad was foundational to the development of the modern US colonial state, which grew in tandem with finance capitalism and the modern corporation. Karuka’s systematic analysis unveils two central concepts that are useful for understanding the outer spatial analogies. First, that the financial speculation accompanying the gold rush was foundational to the establishment of the settler society’s extractive social order. And second, that the logic of corporate shareholding has served, and continues to serve, as the core vehicle upholding the white supremacist social order. While SpaceX stocks are not publicly available yet, numerous venture capital firms have invested in the aerospace company, with some key investors being Peter Thiel’s Founders Fund, Google, and the Bank of America (McCurdy 2019a). A landscape of speculation enfolds over the lonesome weightlessness of outer space as these powerful companies are investing towards capitalizing on future shareholding profits. A future, which has been called into question by numerous people, because, as Shannon Stirone has put it simply: “Mars is a hellhole. [...] Mars will kill you.” Stirone explains that Mars has a very thin atmosphere and no magnetic field, which means that it has extremely high radiation, and no breathable air. All the while, the surface of the planet is −63 °C, and dust storms are extremely common. These concerns, however, continue to be ignored in favor of high-risk investment. The corporate expansion into outer space is coated in a language of equality – of providing equal access to the wonders of outer space for all. An example of this is the recent private mission into space entitled Inspiration4, which developed in cooperation with the online payments startup Shift4Payments, and is currently raffling a seat to a random winner. The lottery acts as aspirational evidence of equal opportunity: Musk claims that these private missions are necessary to eventually make it possible for “everyone” to go to space (Chang, 2021). But Musk’s vision of making space travel affordable through economies of scale can only be made possible by creating initial demand through aspirational marketing. Just as railroad companies, aided by government grants and loosened regulations, facilitated the westward expansion of European colonists over Indigenous lands, so ought the colonization of Mars create a pastoral utopia in which inspiration and creativity for all abound. Exactly how a trip to a Martian colony could be paid by anyone was revealed in recent Tweets by Musk in which he has reinvented indentured servitude for extraplanetary colonization (McKay 2020). Territorial expansion, based on financial speculation, facilitated by corporations and using unfree imported laborers is exactly what Karuka unveils about the logics of railroad colonialism. He explains, As investors became increasingly disconnected from the sources of their revenue, financial profits seemed to arise through agreements between individuals, seemingly separated from, even independent of, the sweat of specific bodies in specific places. With the maturation of the modern corporation in the wake of emancipation, investors imagined financial accumulation as autonomous from labor, whiteness as autonomous from blackness and indigeneity. (2019, 150) Here I want to hone in on Karuka’s key concept of shareholder whiteness. Karuka explains that slaveholders maintained their economic advantages after the emancipation of slaves by excluding Black people, the Chinese workers who constructed the railroad, and the Indigeous peoples whose lands they occupied, from corporate ownership. According to Karuka, “Racism is an effect, not a cause, of imperialism. [...] Whiteness is fiction, not a biological reality, [...] Finance capital and whiteness ripened through a historical elaboration of relationships between imperial corporations and colonial states, forging and sustaining continental imperialism” (Karuka 2019, 150). The extension into the cosmos has already been theorized by scholars as a way to allow for the unfettered continuation of capitalist accumulation, and the New Space companies of the last decade have repeatedly claimed humanity’s extension into the cosmos as an inevitable consequence of “progress” (Dickens 2007; Valentine 2012; Klinger 2017). With little left on Earth to be financialized, companies are turning outer space itself into an asset. I could hardly think of a better example of fictitious capital that would produce such profound alien-ation from the act of production. Whether we are thinking of asteroid mining, space settlements, or simply private space voyages, the shareholders are, and will continue to be, removed from production on our planet, but will in the event of space colonization also be separated from it by several atmospheric layers, hatches, pressurized rooms, and spacesuits. Karuka writes, “the future of the corporation presupposes the future of the colonial state, and the law of the corporation colonizes the future” (2019, 153), and his analysis of the role of the modern corporation in the establishment of the US colonial state proves to be an entirely-too fitting prediction of a future neoliberal space dystopia. The particular colonial expansion perpetrated through the railroad was achieved through “blending the economic and military functions of the state” (Karuka 2019, xiv). The policing of racial and territorial borders was at the heart of imperial expansion as the colonizing states guarded reservation borders as sites of containment. It also allowed the states to enforce the rules of colonial market relations on occupied Indigenous lands. To this day, the militaries of the US naval empire serve the vital functions of presenting their interests at sea. This produces another apt analogy when we consider the same mercantilist logic is being extended into space with the recent development of the United States Space Force, a new branch of the Armed Forces that is meant to facilitate, and ultimately guard, the supremacy of the United States in outer space. Rather than produce a new world or a vastly different future, interstellar-railroad-colonialism seems to aim, at best, to re-entrench and, at worst, to exacerbate the ongoing inequalities that exist on Earth. This is especially true for conditions produced in and through colonial relations. Space exploration is explicitly settler-colonial. It projects the same logic of terra nullius into outer space that was used as a justification for the appropriation and colonization of the North American lands that were inhabited by various Indigenous nations, while also reproducing existing colonial relations on Earth through the expansion of space colonization infrastructure. For example, the observatories, telescopes, and other space exploration related buildings continue to be erected on Indigenous lands all over Earth, from Hawaiʻi, through French Guiana all the way to Aolepān Aorōkin Ṃajeḷ (Marshall Islands) (Smiles 2020; Prescod-Weinstein et al. 2020; Durrani 2019). As his Tweet about indentured servitude in space shows, Musk is already counting on the extension of the (likely racialized) material exploitative practices from Earth to outer space. But this is also the one major difference between railroad colonialism and space colonization: while the colonial expansion in North America was articulated as the colonizing European’s ongoing fight against the sovereignty of the Indigenous peoples of Turtle Island, the fight over territory in outer space might not be fought against extraterrestrial natives. Instead, it will likely continue to be fought against the sovereignty of Indigenous peoples on Earth, and in space, against other spacefaring nations, such as China and India. As such, what remains open for me is to what extent shareholder whiteness remains the same, or transforms with this move of the corporation into outer space. Will whiteness remain the currency of the future, or will the shareholder privilege of the future turn towards something else, something new yet equally insidious? How does shareholder whiteness function under a global economy? And more importantly, what tools for resistance can we learn from those who struggled against colonial expansion and specifically, the transcontinental

#### The alternative is to make space for indigenous futurist reimagining of the relationship between the NDN and the state. It’s a prerequisite to any reconceptualization of land ownership and requires the capability to appropriate space making it mutually exclusive to the aff. The aff reinforces the settler view of relation to land with their flattened understanding of appropriation. Cornum 15.

https://thenewinquiry.com/the-space-ndns-star-map/

**For indigenous futurism**, technology is inextricable from the social. **Human societies are part of a network of wider relationships with objects**, animals, geological formations and so on. **To grasp our relationship with the non-human world here on Earth, we must also extend our understanding of how Earth relates to the entirety of the cosmos.** We live on just one among millions of planets, each an intricate and delicate system within a larger, increasing complex structure. For the indigenous futurist endeavor, striving to understand the ever-multiplying connections linking us to the beginning of the universe and its constant expansion also entails unraveling the intricate relations that make up our Earthly existence. Zainab Amadahy, who identifies as a person of mixed black, Cherokee and European ancestry, grounds her writing practice in illuminating and understanding networks of relationships: “I aspire to write in a way that views possible alternatives through the lens of a relationship framework, where I can demonstrate our connectivity to and interdependence with each other and the rest of our Relations.” **Her** 1992 novel ***The Moons of Palmares*** examines the relationships, both harmful and collaborative, between indigenous peoples and descendants of slaves in an outer space setting that merges histories of the Black Atlantic with the colonial frontier. In a provocative bit of plotting, she casts an indigenous character, Major Eaglefeather, as an oppressive foreign force in the lives of an outer space labor population that has shaped its society in remembrance of black slave resistance in North/South America and the Caribbean. The story **follows Major Eaglefeather’s decision to reject his ties to the corporate state and support a rebel group of laborers**. The name Palmares is taken from a real-world settlement founded by escaped slaves in 17th-century Brazil, which is also known to have incorporated indigenous peoples and some poor, disenfranchised whites. In a chronicle written in the late 17th century, these *quilombos* are described as networks of settlements that lived off the land and were supplemented by raids on the slave plantations where the inhabitants were formerly held**. It is said that in Palmares the king was called Gangasuma, a hybrid term meaning “great lord” composed of the Angolan or Bandu word *ganga* and the Tupi word *assu*. The word succinctly captures the mixture of cultures that banded together in Palmares to live together on the margins of a colonialist, slave-holding society. While Palmares was eventually destroyed in a military campaign, it lives on as a legend of slave rebellion and utopian possibility that Amadahy finds well suited for her outer space story about collaborative resistance to state power and harmful resource extraction processes. Outer space, perhaps because of its appeal to our sense of endless possibility, has become the imaginative site for re-envisioning how black, indigenous and other oppressed people can relate to each other outside of and despite the colonial gaze.** Amadahy’s work is crucial for a critical understanding of the space NDN. **The space NDN cannot allow him or herself to fall into the patterns of domination and kyriarchy that have for too long prevailed here on Earth as well as speculative narratives of outer space. Afrofuturists have looked to space as the site for black separatism and liberation. If the space NDN is truly committed to being responsible to all our relations, it is imperative for our futurist vision to be in solidarity with and service to our fellow Afrofuturist space travelers. Our collective refusal of colonial progress (namely, our destruction) means we must chart other ways to the future that lead us and other oppressed peoples to the worlds we deserve.** *The Moons of Palmares* works toward this end by revealing the strong connections between indigenous and black histories, narratives and ways of living. **Indigenous futurism is indebted to Afrofuturism: Both forms of futurism explore spaces and times outside the control of colonial powers and white supremacy.** These alternative conceptions of time reject the notion that all tradition is regressive by narrating futures intimately connected to the past. SF and specifically the site of outer space give writers and thinkers the imaginative room to envision political and cultural relationships and the future decolonizing movements they might nourish. This focus on relationship, especially as posited by Amadahy, also accounts for those forms of indigeneity that persist among peoples either stolen from their lands or whose lands have been stolen from them. As the writer Sydette Harry recently posted on Twitter, “Black people are displaced indigenous people.” However, because of the processes of forced relocation and slavery and continuing anti-black racism, black people are often denied claims to indigeneity. There is also a pernicious erasure of black NDNs in America and Canada. **In exploring outer space, black authors are also able to assert their own relationship to land both on Earth and in the cosmos.** The Black Land Project (BLP), while not an explicitly futurist organization, fosters the kind of relationships to land on Earth that futurist authors and thinkers envision in outer space. In a recent podcast, *Blacktracking through Afrofuturism*, BLP founder and director Mistinguette Smith discusses how walking over the routes of the Underground Railroad brought forth alternate dimensions and understandings of time outside the settler paradigm of ownership. These are aspects of relating to land that the Afrofuturist and the space NDN (identities which can exist in the same person) bring with them on their travels. This focus on relationship rather than a strict idea of location speaks to the way in which the space NDN can remain secure in their indigenous identity even while rocketing through dark skies far from their origins**.** This is not to demean the work of land protectors and defenders who risk serious repercussions for resisting corporate and state encroachment on indigenous territories. **The space NDN supports those who are able and choose to remain on the land, while also hoping to broaden understandings of indigeneity outside simple location**. **Locations of course are never simple. It is the settler who wishes to flatten the relation between place and people by claiming land through ownership. Projecting themselves forward into faraway lands and times, the space NDN reveals the myriad ways of relating to land beyond property.**

#### Thus, the ROTB is to challenge settler colonialism. I as a settler woman am in a unique position to challenge and un-forget the erasure of the past in order to try create a more positive future. Shotwell 16

Alexis Shotwell, “Against Purity: Living Ethically in Compromised Times”, University of Minnesota Press, 2016, LHP AM

To do this, **we need to revisit how we remember and reckon with this past, opening different possibilities for the present and future**. In the Canadian context, such reckoning perceives the continuity between then Prime Minis- ter Harper’s seemingly disjunctive statements: the apology and acknowledg- ment of Indian Residential Schools as a wrong, and the claim that Canada has no history of colonialism. Strangely, **these statements—one that seems to acknowledge colonialism, the other that disavows it—are *both* forms of dis- avowing colonialism as a patterned and continuing network of social relations**. Following Patrick Wolfe, **we can understand this “move” as an attempt to frame colonialism as a fixed event; he argues that instead we should understand colonialism as “a structure rather than an event,**” existing as a complex social formation across time (Wolfe 2006, 390). Events happened in the past, and they are finished; remembering them is a form of closure, nostalgia, or recapitulation. Practices of colonialism are written into the in- frastructure of the states founded through expropriation, and in this sense they ascend from the past as the infrastructure of the present. **Patterns of social relations, as structure not event, then predict the practices of the future. Remembering how these patterns came to be is a practice of opening ques- tions, defamiliarization, and (perhaps) refusal of the social relations that produced events of the past.** As Glen Sean Coulthard argues: In settler-colonial contexts—where there is no period marking a clear or for- mal transition from an authoritarian past to a democratic present—state- sanctioned approaches to reconciliation must ideologically manufacture such a transition by allocating the abuses of settler colonization to the dustbins of history, and/or purposely disentangle processes of reconciliation from ques- tions of settler-coloniality as such. . . . In such conditions, reconciliation takes on a temporal character as the individual and collective process of overcoming the subsequent *legacy* of past abuse, not the abusive colonial structure itself. (Coulthard 2014, 108–9) How might we think and act in more adequate ways as we stand in relation to shared pasts and presents? Historian of Indigenous struggles and revolutionary, Roxanne Dunbar- Ortiz formulates the beautiful concept of *unforgetting* as a part of resistance to colonialism. In this section, I dwell with conceptions of critical memory practices as a way to think about how white people can work with anticolo- nialism and decolonizing as praxis. For me, **the aspiration to this kind of practice has intimately to do with memory and with the process of under- standing the work of memory in colonial contexts. It is key to hold in mind that the stakes of memory and forgetting are not equal; while people, and white settlers in particular, benefit from forgetting the past that organizes the racist present, Indigenous people bear the weight of memory oppression.** As Patricia Monture-Angus writes, drawing on Paula Allen Gunn’s views on memory: “It must be remembered, especially by Aboriginal individuals, that the roots of our oppression lie in our collective loss of memory” (Monture- Angus 1995, 235). I’ll focus here on the question of decolonization as a chal- lenge to forgetting, which implies that this collective *loss* of memory could perhaps be understood as a theft of memory, a dispossession integral to the colonial process. Dunbar-Ortiz says: The definition of lying is what white South African anti-apartheid writer Andre Brink plays with in his book *An Act of Terror*. What’s the opposite of truth? We think immediately “the lie.” But in Greek, the opposite of truth is forgetting. This is a very subtle thing. **What is the action you take to tell the truth? It is un-forgetting. That is really meaningful to me. It’s not that the origin myth is a lie; it’s the process of forgetting that’s the real problem**. . . . **Alliances without un-forgetting at their core aren’t going to go anywhere in the long run.** So, it is a dilemma, but we have to find a way. (Dunbar-Ortiz 2008, 57) Unforgetting, on this view, is an activity, just as forgetting is an activity. Polit- ical forgetting names an epistemology (a way of knowing) and an ontology (a way of being). Epistemically, forgetting is a core piece of colonial practice. Charles Mills and others call this an *epistemology of ignorance*: just as what we know arises from political situations and choices, what we do not know is actively shaped and carries politics (Mills 2007; Sullivan and Tuana 2007). Ignorance is not just an absence of knowledge; it is a way to (not) know things. In our being, ontologically, we become who we are in part through what we know and what we are made (or made able) to forget. Unforgetting, following Dunbar-Ortiz, can be an important part of resistance. **A central feature of white settler colonial subjectivity is forgetting; we live whiteness in part as active ignorance and forgetting. In situations where facts of the matter are routinely brought to our attention, forgetting must be an active and ongoing thing. In general, I believe that systemic oppression is, in fact, present enough in our world that the kinds of ignorance and lack of knowledge running alongside oppression deserve explanation.** Consider that some people think that they “just don’t see race,” or that poverty doesn’t exist in their community, or that Indigenous people aren’t part of their national consciousness. **One way to understand what is at play here is through imagining a kind of benign ignorance—people just haven’t been taught the facts of the situation, and so they can’t be held responsible for not under- standing how race, poverty, indigeneity, and more, are present in their lives**. If this were the problem, just giving people more and better information would correct their knowledge problem. But we don’t just have a knowledge problem—we have a habit-of-being problem; the problem of whiteness is a problem of what we expect, our ways of being, bodily-ness, and how we understand ourselves as “placed” in time. Whiteness is a problem of being shaped to think that other people are the problem. Another way to under- stand this dynamic is to realize the very complex entanglement of practices and habits of ignorance, repression, and active disavowal that constitute an active settler process of not telling, not seeing, and not understanding the truth of the matter, which is a truth of being shaped as the legacy of the harms of the past. **We unforget, actively and resistantly, because forgetting is shaped by forces bigger than ourselves**. In their book about regulation of sexuality through state surveillance, Gary Kinsman and Patrizia Gentile say: “In part, capi- talism and oppression rule through what we call ‘the social organization of forgetting,’ which is based on the annihilation of our social and historical memories. . . . **We have been forced to forget where we have come from; our histories have never been recorded and passed down; and we are denied the social and historical literacy that allows us to remember and relive our past, and, therefore, to grasp our present”** (Kinsman and Gentile 2010, 21). We white people might, on some level, *like* living with annihilated social and historical memories—we might like to think that the present can be innocent of the past that produced it. We might like to think, though we’re ashamed to admit it, that we don’t need to tell or hear the painful stories of the actions that created the world we live in. That feeling, of wanting to be people un- moored from history, of endorsing the pretense that we have nothing to do with the past that constitutes our material conditions and our most intimate subjectivities, is a feeling that defines us. **The social organization of forget- ting means that our actual histories are lost, and it means that we have a feeling of acceptance and normalness about living with a lie instead of an unforgetting. How do we tell a resistant, anticolonial story without using colonial frameworks?** What would it mean to understand this history without fore- grounding a conception of individualized and disconnected history that may be completely unintelligible within Indigenous social and legal systems? How can we tell histories of residential schools without replicating another colonial trope, that of the innocent, pure, all-good natives corrupted by colonial education? That is, **how can we see the people forced to attend residential schools as victims of profound injustice, and also as people who manifested profound resistance, then and now? How can we understand the people who were forced to attend residential schools but who identify the experience as a positive part of their pasts? In other words: How can we tell the full complexity of this narrative in a way that foregrounds the needs and interests of people most affected by vectors of oppression and vulnerability— without reinscribing the very categories delimiting purity and impurity that were deployed to organize this form of colonization, and without inscribing an ontology of vulnerability as definitive of Indigenous being**? What would inhabiting the full complexity of that narrative do to settlers, white settles in particular? **When I, as a white settler woman living on stolen land, nar- rate these questions or take up and amplify other people’s engagement with questions like these, can I simultaneously take responsibility for whiteness and undo it? These are not meant to be rhetorical questions, but they are difficult to answer. They become even more difficult when the questions apply not just to one school, or to one system of forced schooling, but to an entire area now constituted as a country, Canada, and the entire network of relations thread- ing through it. And it is this entire network and this complex and dense history that the work of unforgetting would stand in relation to.** Recall that the TRC’s mission statement states: “The Truth and Reconciliation Com- mission will reveal the complete story of Canada’s residential school system, and lead the way to respect through reconciliation . . . for the child taken, for the parent left behind” (Truth and Reconciliation Commission 2012, 2). **Telling the complete story of Indian Residential Schools involves substan- tial struggle against a social organization of forgetting; in Canada, unlike in places in transitional contexts such as South Africa in the wake of apart- heid, there has not been widespread attention to the TRC process from white people and settlers generall**y. Also, and **this is the key categorical point, the process itself has been delimited. It did not involve a reckoning with the entire history of colonialism and its violence—**it addressed itself to the more historically and socially bounded wrong of residential schools. Residential schools have been a widespread colonial technology. In addition to Indian Residential Schools in the Canadian context, there were Indian Boarding Schools in the United States and the forced removal of Australian Aboriginal children, though they were held in more dispersed institutional housing and schooling situations.3

## Case

#### The evocation of common heritage of “mankind” always excludes those who are the constitutive excluded—mechanisms like the Moon treaty purport to be for the good of common humanity, but they in fact just reinforce the nation-state’s ability to make sovereign decisions over space. Cornum 18,

Cornum, Lou. “Event Horizon.” *Real Life Mag*, 12 Mar. 2018, https://reallifemag.com/event-horizon/.

The word *pioneer*, usually attached to innovation, is never too far from people like Jeff Bezos or Elon Musk or Peter Thiel. These men’s careers in tech startups, their origins in the digital commerce boom, and their pioneer identities were forged on the electronic frontier. Like pioneers of industry in the colonial expansion of the Americas, these men operate on the knife’s edge of sovereignty as it cuts a path for both state and capital to consolidate power. In space, these men see a chance to loosen further the bonds that still restrain the endless capital they’ve been chasing in their imagined rocket ships. Investors, architects of the financial and material future, have taken to using the term “NewSpace” to refer to the almost accessible ventures of asteroid mining, space shipping, spaceship travel, and other forms of space commerce. Still, there are fminor contractual obstacles. **Even at the void’s edge, there is a treaty.** A couple of treaties actually. **Out there the governments still rely on these dusty remnants of the dying beast of nation-state sovereignty and the apparatuses of international relations first created to aid and abet the global distribution of white men’s control. The Outer Space Treaty of 1967, which has a more precise formal name** — Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies — **may seem surprisingly benevolent. It is sometimes summarized as saying that *nobody can own space*. But while it outlaws national appropriation, it allows incorporation without the state.** In a demotion from the sensual feel of its phrasing, “celestial bodies” become the body politic, managed sites of bans and requirements. While the U.S. did sign the Outer Space Treaty of 1967, it did not sign the 1979 Moon Treaty**,**more formally known as the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies. The Moon Treaty, among other directives, bans any state from claiming sovereignty over any territory of celestial bodies; bans any ownership of any extraterrestrial property by any organization or person, unless that organization is international and governmental; and requires an international regime be set up to ensure safe and orderly development and management of the resources and sharing of the benefits from them. It also bans military activity such as weapons testing or the founding of extraterrestrial military bases (though it’s hard to see U.S. presence anywhere in the stars or on Earth as anything other than militaristic). **Evoking the common heritage of “mankind,” the Moon Treaty could appear a pie-in-the-sky attempt at more equitable relations to land than have been established on Earth since the advent of private property and national borders. But it is of course expressed only in the stop-gap measure of treaties that assign power to states, governments, and resource-management regimes. The power of the treaty is in its possible revoking. In making the decision to sign the treaty or not sign the treaty, the collectives state their unquestioned right to make decisions in space at all. Space is a place where old and new sovereignties, like asteroids desired for mining, are colliding or sometimes colluding. There is a line connecting the Dutch East India Company, the Hudson Bay Company, and SpaceX. These companies begin as corporate endeavors, but then as now the nation-state is sticky: It finds a way to adhere.** Take the case of Luxembourg, a polity that lives on tax loopholes (allowing large corporations to move money in and out of the nation with utmost secrecy and minimal charges) where, as Atossa Araxia Abrahamian [reports for the *Guardian*](https://www.theguardian.com/news/2017/sep/15/luxembourg-tax-haven-privatise-space), private space companies are finding their funding allies for financed trips to the moon, Mars, and the interstellar spots for satellites. The mixing of business and research mixes the money and power hungering of technocrats who don’t just want to own businesses but want people to see their businesses as the shareholders of humanity’s future.In middle school we didn’t have model U.N., but we did have model Earth. For field trips we’d be taken away to Biosphere 2, a site for space-colonization experiments built by Space Biosphere Ventures but owned by Columbia University by the time I visited. In these field trips to the desert outside a town auspiciously named Oracle, we walked around the display vivarium, always being reminded to call it biosphere *two*— biosphere *one* was the earth outside, the one we had momentarily left behind and one day might leave behind for good. That old planet was a past prototype. But the new prototype was itself already a defunct research facility. The closed-system experiment with human subjects had failed twice in the ’90s, and it now rests as one of the many dreams littering the desert of a new world.When a world is new, it creates alongside a space held for the older worlds. This is the drama between what can be brought from before and what will be made anew. It is why Aeneas carried his dying father Anchises on his shoulders out of Troy on his way to found Rome. The traveler always brings baggage. Jeff Bezos would like to be the one who carries that baggage to space or controls the robots and poorly paid temporary laborers who accomplish the carrying. In this supposedly new space, the regimes of inequality will be quite familiar. The space-goers insist it is something called humanity, with the ingrained hierarchical legacies of this category, that will be going.Leaders in industry who have always wanted to be world leaders are now positioning themselves as leaders of outer worlds. Elon Musk makes union busting seem like a cosmic necessity for the continuation of human life. The material and subsequent cultural valorization of certain kinds of work in the tech industry, wherein the “great minds” make all the money and those who maintain the machinery of day-to-day existence are treated like the shit they’re supposed to take, does not end at the stratosphere.Even the more lofty moral considerations of outer-space ethics (e.g., is terraforming ever morally acceptable?) often ignore their fundamental basis in deathly processes still very much situated on Earth. Any outer-space endeavor today or in the near future will be an extension of the life-destroying capacities of capitalists and their colonial countries. On the [Deep Space Industries page](https://deepspaceindustries.com/mining/) for asteroid mining, the exploitation and extraction of minerals is heralded as “an unlimited future for all mankind**.” The endless extension of capitalist accumulation comes with an extension of this delusion of “all mankind.” As if all such projects, the project of humanity itself, has not always been an exclusionary one.** SETI may appear to inhabit a different realm of speculation than that of the grandstanding services-and-commodities pioneers. But its project also follows a willful ignorance about human history and the exclusions that make humanity as a class possible. SETI proponents, much like Musk and his ilk, view themselves at the forefront of a new breakthrough not necessarily of capital but of knowledge. Their sites of expansion are not centered so much on the territories capital requires in order to enclose, privatize, and extract until depletion (though they can be intimately connected, as in the development of the university and research centers as global actors of dispossession), but on sites of encounter. Outer-space commerce and funded extraterrestrial contact-seekers operate on and reinforce damaging notions of land, life, and the future that actually hinder the survival of most Earth dwellers rather than provide anything like meaningful hope. Stories of contact are only ever understood as colonial stories. Every inquiry of future contact with extraterrestrial life, from academic and government-funded to amateur and whimsical, relies on the same stale comparisons of colonial conquest. Columbus, of course; Captain James Cook, often. Every episode of the podcast *Making New Worlds: Why Are We Going?*features historical authorities commenting on colonial situations of the past and comparing them to hypothetical situations with extraterrestrials. The topics convened by those who are granted the authority to speak on them are conducted under the tyranny of certain givens, the most persistent and damning of them being contact as conquest.

#### International law’s origins are based on the racist refusal to acknowledge Native sovereignty. Treaty authority is predicated on the nonexistence of indigenous governance and seeks to reconcile Native indifference through genocidal means. Scott 18, (35s)

(Xavier Scott, Department of Philosophy, York University, Repairing Broken Relations by Repairing Broken Treaties: Theorizing Post-Colonial States in Settler Colonies, Studies in Social Justice, Volume 12, Issue 2, 388-405, 2018, JKS)

The divisibility of sovereignty in the case of non-Europeans allowed colonial states to grant them partial recognition in the form of quasi-sovereignty, thereby enabling the local people to enter into treaties that they could be punished for violating (through just war doctrine) but which could be unilaterally broken by the colonial power once they were no longer politically expedient. Since all the nations of the world are part of a single international community, no country has the right to invade any other. Yet that community was not founded on universal principles, but was based on a European consensus. Since recognition was the basis for membership in the “international community” and the original members of the jus gentium were all European (in practice, if not in theory), the Westphalian system would seem to promote conquest and colonialism abroad, even as it promoted mutual recognition within Europe. The legacy of the Westphalian peace has been a system that simultaneously maintains the historical legality of colonialism, while rejecting it as a principle of justice. The origins of international law were inherently unjust and based on a racist refusal to acknowledge Indigenous sovereignty in its entirety. However, in recognizing the moral and legal chicanery that was required to deny Indigenous sovereignty, we can lay the groundwork for understanding the sovereign violence that European powers committed and how that was then tied to the numerous forms of injustice committed afterwards. Not only did Indigenous peoples have political societies, but European sovereigns and jurists regularly recognized their sovereignty by signing over 800 treaties with different Indigenous communities (Kickingbird, 1995). Siegfried Wiessner (1995) divides the treaty-making conventions between the United States and Indigenous communities into two time periods – prior to and following the end of the War of 1812. Prior to this date, treaties were concluded on a relatively equal basis. They fully recognized the Indigenous governance structures and were ratified by the U.S. Senate using the language of international law. Once the threat of other colonial powers was over, treaties became increasingly used “to regularize and channel the removal of Indians from their traditional vast hunting and fishing grounds to ever smaller, ever more barren areas of land” (Wiessner, 1995, p. 577). The War of 1812 marks a switch from the nation-to-nation relationships that characterized earlier agreements, to a new species of treaty which deprived Indigenous communities of nationhood. I call the means by which colonial states appropriated Indigenous sovereignty “theft,” since it deprived Indigenous peoples of their right to selfdetermination and full use of their traditional territories. Moreover, the quasisovereignty that was granted to Indigenous peoples made the destruction of their communities a requirement to establish the legitimacy of the colonial power’s occupation. Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel argue that contemporary settlers are no longer trying to eradicate Indigenous peoples as bodies, but rather “as peoples through the erasure of the histories and geographies that provide the foundation for Indigenous cultural identities and sense of self” (2005, p. 598; emphasis in original). This is both a continuation of the desire to appropriate Indigenous land and an attempt to foreclose the possibility that land that has already been annexed by colonists be returned. Indigenous sovereignty in its current form in the British colonial states continues to act as a form of “quasi-sovereignty” the goal and legacy of which are the assimilation and destruction of Indigenous peoples. The Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (2015) has outlined the crimes the Canadian government committed against Indigenous peoples. While the summary of their findings focuses on the cultural genocide the Canadian state engaged in through residential schools, it acknowledges the physical and biological genocides engaged in by the state as well. It states: Canada asserted control over Aboriginal land. In some locations, Canada negotiated Treaties with First Nations; in others, the land was simply occupied or seized. The negotiation of Treaties, while seemingly honourable and legal, was often marked by fraud and coercion, and Canada was, and remains, slow to implement their provisions and intent. (Truth & Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015, p. 1) Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd (2008) issued an apology for the “Stolen Generation,” which took Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children from their families. The U.S. issued its apology to Indigenous peoples, hidden in section 8113 of a 2010 Defense Appropriations Act. It acknowledges “that there have been years of official depredations, illconceived policies, and the breaking of covenants by the Federal Government regarding Indian tribes” and also “many instances of violence, maltreatment, and neglect inflicted on Native Peoples by citizens of the United States” (111th Congress, 2009, s.8113). All three of these apologies profess a desire to “remove a stain from its past” (Truth & Reconciliation Commission of Canada, 2015, p. 237), for “the nation to turn a new page” (Rudd, 2008), and look towards a future “where all the people of this land live reconciled as brothers and sisters” (111th Congress, 2009, s.8113). Yet the Australian apology made no reference to reparations, the American apology contains a disclaimer that nothing in it is meant to “serve as any settlement against the United States” (111th Congress, 2009, s.8113), and while Canada has attached its apology to court mandated reparations payments, it has failed to reform its relationship with Indigenous peoples by (for example) reforming the 1876 Indian Act. The existence of sovereignty in a colonial context is predicated on the nonsovereignty of Indigenous peoples. At best, they are granted a form of “quasisovereignty” that is not taken seriously by the international state system and is generally considered to be a temporary stage in the integration of Indigenous peoples into the colonial state.5 The quasi-status of their sovereignty is not a step on the path towards full sovereignty, but towards destruction and the seamless transfer of sovereignty from them to the colonial state. In their critique of the literature on post-colonial theory and antiracist work, Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua ask, “what does it mean to look at Canada as colonized space?” (2005, p. 123). Because settler states are founded on policies that combine extermination and assimilation, the continued existence of Indigenous peoples as peoples depends on the full recognition of their inherent sovereignty. For this reason: To speak of Indigenous nationhood is to speak of land as Indigenous, in ways that are neither rhetorical nor metaphorical. Neither Canada, nor the United States – or the settler states of “Latin” America for that matter – which claim sovereignty over the territory they occupy, have a legitimate basis to anchor their absorption of huge portions of that territory. (Lawrence & Dua, 2005, p. 124) To claim respect for Indigenous sovereignty, therefore, is to deny the legal legitimacy of Settler colonies. This is because of the territoriality and legal supremacy claims of sovereign states. While the development of international law has served to strip Indigenous peoples of their traditional lands, it also contains a number of mechanisms that have been used in other contexts of occupation, violence, and genocide. First, the principle of pacta sunt servanda is the cornerstone of international law (Uribe, 2010; Wiessner 1995) – states are required to abide by their word. The fact that colonial powers broke their treaties with Indigenous governments ought not to mean that it is thereby nullified, but rather that “there may be legal consequences” (Kickingbird, 1995, p. 603). Furthermore, the principle of sovereignty contains a right to reassert authority when territory is unjustly annexed. When a state’s sovereignty is violated, international law calls for its restoration. Following Kirke Kickingbird, I believe that “treaties form the backdrop of the past, confirm rights in the present and provide the basic definition for the evolving future” (1995, p. 605). Only by respecting the traditional rights of Indigenous peoples – including rights to their territories – can colonial states repair the sovereign wrong done in the abrogation of their duty to stand by their treaties.