## 1

#### Interpretation: debaters must include the URL in citations for their evidence.

Violation: they didn’t – examples include their Corbett 20, starr 15, and Bostrom 12 cards

#### Standards:

#### [1] NSDA rules – the unified manual says to include the URL.

NSDA 21 National Speech and Debate Association, “High School Unified Manual,” 1 September 2021, National Speech and Debate Association, accessed 11 September 2021, pg. 30, <https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/High-School-Unified-Manual-2021-2022.pdf> ~ST~

Written source citation. To the extent provided by the original source, a written source citation must include:

1. Full name of primary author and/or editor

2. Publication date

3. Source

4. Title of article

5. Date accessed for digital evidence

6. Full URL, if applicable

7. Author qualifications

8. Page number(s)

#### That’s a voter – if we can choose what rules to break, I can make speeches however long I want, which is a side constraint to substance. Also proves the shell is reasonable and predictable because it’s by far the most common standard.

#### [2] Evidence ethics – no way to check whether their quote exists because we can’t find it on the internet – they can just make up whatever “evidence” they want, and there’s not enough time for us to verify that it is actually legit evidence. Pasting into a search engine doesn’t solve – a) Lots of cards used to be on the web but no longer exist b) difficult to find the correct version or one without a paywall.

#### That’s a voter – a) debate is meaningless if we’re academically dishonest and have no argument credibility, b) uncredible evidence means we don’t know if their claims are true, which also serves as a substantive indict, and c) debate should prepare for the real world, in which small ev ethics violations are punished severely – large repercussions the control internal link to other impacts.

#### Also links to inclusion – small school debaters tend to use cards from the wiki. Bad citations negatively impact their research. That’s a voter because inclusion is a prereq to debate.

#### DTD – a) in real life, you don’t get a quote cut out of your essay; you get a 0 on it – it’s best to teach good norms now, and b) deters future abuse.

#### Competing interps – a) reasonability is arbitrary, b) collapses because brightlines concede offense-defense paradigm, c) only CI prevents abuse since it can set norms, not decide rounds on a case-by-case basis.

#### No RVIs – a) you don’t win for being academically honest, b) people will bait theory to win on the RVI, which causes abuse.

## 2

#### The labor movement is built on the exploitation of indigenous populations. The aff’s “right to strike” only seeks to benefit the settler labor movement. Settler labor movements fight for higher wages and living standards while simultaneously exploiting indigenous labor and excluding indigenous workers from the labor market. The collective dispossession of the indigenous population ties the settler community together through settler quietism. The aff’s foundational assumptions perpetuate the destruction of Native life and governance.

Englert 20 [Englert, S. Institute for Area Studies, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands (2020), Settlers, Workers, and the Logic of Accumulation by Dispossession. Antipode, 52: 1647-1666. <https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12659>] AX

Dispossession – deprive of land

In order to reflect on the particular nature of accumulation by dispossession within a settler colonial context, another issue should be raised: that of the internal social relations within settler colonial societies. Indeed, the most striking aspect of settler colonial societies is the development of a colonial polity in which settlers live, produce, and reproduce themselves socially. They do so on the back of the dispossession of indigenous populations through which they acquire land, resources, and, depending on the context, labour. This—perhaps obvious—characteristic leads to the development of internal class relations and conflicts, alongside confrontations between settlers and indigenous peoples. The history of settler colonialism underscores the conspicuous absence of involvement by settler working classes (as opposed to individuals or limited networks) in mass, sustained challenges against the process of settlement and indigenous dispossession.3 In fact, more often than not, settler labour movements fought for the intensification of settler expansion and racial segregation (see “An Alternative Reading: Settler Colonies and the Exploitation of the Native” above), through colour bars, boycott campaigns and demands for expulsion. In the process, bitter confrontations emerged between settler labour and capital, when the latter [and] attempted to increase its profit margins through the exploitation of indigenous labour—for example in the context of the white labour movements in Australia and South Africa.4 Yet these conflicts can be resolved, especially while the settler colony continues to expand, by intensifying the dispossession of indigenous populations in order to improve the material conditions of settler workers (see “Case Studies” below). Here, the question of accumulation by dispossession returns to the fore. If settler workers are exploited as workers within the settler colony, they remain settlers. As such they participate in the processes of accumulation by dispossession through the occupation of lands, the elimination or exploitation of indigenous peoples, and the extraction of expropriated resources. For example, at a very basic level, their houses, workplaces, and basic infrastructure such as roads, railways, etc., are all premised on the capture and control of indigenous land. Settler workers are both exploited by settler bosses and their co-conspirators in the dispossession of indigenous peoples. As such, class struggle within a settler society has a dual character: it is waged over the distribution of wealth extracted from their labour as well as over the colonial booty. In the case of Zionism in Palestine, the current associated with the publication Matzpen (“Compass”) developed a class analysis of Israeli society. They came to the conclusion that because the Israeli economy was heavily subsidised from the outside (first primarily by Britain, then by the US) and that this subsidy was not simply going into private hands but was used by the Labour Zionist bureaucracy to organise the development of the Israeli economy and infrastructure, class antagonisms were diverted within its society. Hangebi et al. ([2012](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0014):83) wrote: The Jewish worker in Israel does not receive his share in cash, but he gets it in terms of new and relatively inexpensive housing, which could not have been constructed by raising capital locally; he gets it in industrial employment, which could not have been started or kept going without external subsidies; and he gets it in terms of a general standard of living, which does not correspond to the output of that society … In this way the struggle between the Israeli working class and its employers, both bureaucrats and capitalists, is fought not only over the surplus value produced by the worker but also over the share each group receives from this external source of subsidies. If this analysis was essentially correct, it underplayed, however, the consequences of an important aspect of Israeli wealth creation (which Matzpen otherwise recognised): the Israeli state, its infrastructure, and its economy were made possible by colonial expansion, land confiscation, the expulsion of Palestinians and the expropriation of their wealth and property. Affordable housing, for example, an issue discussed further below, was not only possible because of the subsidies the Israeli state received from abroad. It was possible because the land on which new houses were built, as well as existing Palestinian houses, had been confiscated by the Israeli army, Palestinians had been expelled in their hundreds of thousands, and the spoils were re-distributed amongst settlers. It was—and remains—the collective dispossession of the indigenous population by the Israeli population as a whole, which ties the settler community together, despite internal class, ethnic, and political divisions. The settler class struggle is fought over the distribution of wealth extracted from settler labour power as well as over the share each group receives from the process of accumulation by dispossession. This dual class and colonial relationship helps explain the relative absence of settler workers’ resistance against settler colonial expansion or alliances with Indigenous peoples.[5](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-note-1005_77) This tendency can be understood as “settler quietism”: even if working-class settlers are exploited by their ruling classes, overthrowing the settler state would mean overthrowing a system in which they share, however unequally, in the distribution of the colonial loot. Participating in the process of dispossession and fighting for a greater share of the pie leads to more important and immediate material gains. It also follows, as many anti-colonial thinkers and activists, not least among them Fanon ([2001](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0011)) in the Wretched of the Earth, have argued that indigenous people face the settler population as a whole in their struggle for de-colonisation. This is not to say that individual settlers or specific settler organisations cannot or have not supported struggles for decolonisation. It is however to point out that this is not the case for the majority of the settler working class, while it continues to depend on the continued dispossession of the natives for the quality of its living standards. Whether the settler colony is organised on the basis of an eliminatory or an exploitative model, what remains constant is that the entirety of the settler polity will participate in the process of accumulation by dispossession, and that the different settler classes will struggle both against the natives to impose and maintain this dispossession, as well as amongst themselves in order to determine the nature of its internal distribution. More than that, the specific structural forms of settler rule over the indigenous population is best understood as the outcome of struggle, both between settler classes and between settlers and indigenous populations. This paper now turns to two brief case studies demonstrating this process in the context of Zionism in Palestine. The specificity of Zionism in the history of settler colonialism, its lack of a colonial metropolis, had real consequences for the Zionists in Palestine. Firstly, it could not impose—at first—its control over the land through military force. Secondly it could not organise the transfer of populations to the colony in the same way a state could. In the words of Shafir ([1996](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0041):155): “Zionism, then, was a colonisation movement which simultaneously had to secure land for its settlers and settlers for its land”. The dual need for land and labour was at the heart of many political developments in the Yishuv. If the question of land was resolved first through acquisition from largely absentee land owners and then (and most extensively) through military violence, the question of immigration came close several times to bringing the whole colonial project to its knees, as the European Jewish population tended to reject Zionism as a political response to the poverty and discrimination they faced. Two distinct political responses emerged within the early settler population. On the one hand, the Jewish farmers and their sponsors hoped to develop a cash crop producing agricultural sector focused on export to Europe and the exploitation of cheap Palestinian workers. This vision was based, as demonstrated by Shafir ([1996](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0041)), on the model of other European projects—especially the French settler colonies of North Africa. On the other hand, the nascent Labour Zionist movement demanded better wages and working conditions for Jewish workers in Palestine, which they argued would be the only way to attract and retain new settlers. This, they claimed, necessitated full separation between the Jewish and Palestinian sectors, removing thereby the “unfair competition” of the cheaper indigenous labour force. This led to the development of a series of new Labour Zionist institutions to organise this “Conquest of Hebrew Labour”, by organising strikes, pickets, and boycotts of Jewish owned businesses that employed Palestinian workers or sold products made by them. The Kibbutzim, the Histadrut,[6](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-note-1006_81) and the early Zionist militias were all born out of the process of organising this campaign (Lockman [1996](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0024)). For example, the Histadrut’s constitution, passed at its founding congress, made clear that it was a Zionist body committed to the project of settlement through the development of an exclusively Jewish society. It stated that the Histadrut’s goal was to: … unite all the workers and labourers in the country who live by their own labour without exploiting the labour of others, in order to arrange for all settlement, economic and also cultural affairs of all the workers in the country, so as to build a society of Jewish labour in Eretz Yisra’el. (quoted in Lockman 1996:68) The similarity between the logic of this statement and that of the white South African strikers mentioned above is remarkable. This struggle—waged against Palestinian workers and Jewish farmers—led to a partial victory for the Labour Zionist movement (Lockman [2012](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659#anti12659-bib-0025)). Key industries, such as construction and agriculture, were taken over by Labour Zionist institutions such as Solal Boneh and the Kibbutzim. At the same time, Jewish representation in colonial institutions was increased through collaboration with the British Mandate authorities especially in the context of crushing the Arab Revolt of 1936-1939. The Labour Zionists took over the Yishuv’s political leadership and created a dominant Jewish sector, without however being able to establish a fully segregated one. It did set in motion the logic of separation as well as laying the infrastructure for a Jewish state, which would be made a reality by its militias’ military violence and mass expulsion of Palestinians during the Nakba. This case study shows that the Labour Zionist movement developed on the basis of opposing Jewish farmers as well as Palestinian workers, a political focus that also shaped its key institutions. The campaign for Hebrew Labour also demonstrates that the “elimination of the native” in the settler colonial context is not a given, as in the Wolfe-an framework, but the outcome of a specific set of struggles that pit both the indigenous population against the settlers, as well as different settler classes against one another.

#### Their performative use of extinction impacts are just rhetorical tropes to divert attention away radical decolonization and reinscribes a settler will to innocence.

Dalley 16 Hamish, Professor of Ethnic Studies at Daemen College, “The deaths of settler colonialism: extinction as a metaphor of decolonization in contemporary settler literature”, Settler Colonial Studies, October 4, 2016, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2016.1238160>, July 7, 2017

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 formations have been more resistant to change than settler colonialism. With a few exceptions (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 political 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 settlercolonial 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, superiority, 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 literature, 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 historio-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’ 9 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 colonialism. 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 inhabitation but his knowledge comes freighted with an expected sense of biological superiority, 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 genocide 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 imminent 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 argument 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 perspective is offered by Veracini, who suggests that progressive change to settler-colonial relationships will only happen if narratives can be found that make decolonization thinkable.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, extinction 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 asequivalent 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.

#### The impact is twofold 1) Psychological violence due to the denial of cultural practices 2) The settler colonial mindset is the root cause of indigenous and black oppression

Klutse 18 Olivia Klutse Seattle University, 2018 “Repatriation and Reparations: Land-Based Indigenous and Black Futurity”, <https://scholarworks.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1008&context=ura> AX

Settler colonialism, capitalism, and white supremacy are foundational to one another. Their exploitations cross-reference one another; the construction of each warrants the sustained presence of the other because they all emerged in tandem. They are structured to support one another, but they affect their subjects whose exploitation they subsist off of differently particularly in terms of race and Indigeneity. Hence, Black and Indigenous people in the United States and Canada experience largely distinct, yet interconnected struggles that originate from the same triad of structural oppression. Settler Colonialism, Capitalism, and Indigeneity. Beyond its blatant functions of land theft and occupation, settler colonialism operates covertly to produce a myriad of detrimental effects on Indigenous people. For instance, the traumatic generational longevity of colonialism characterizes Indigenous people’s present-day interactions with the settler state: “All Indigenous people’s personal interfaces with the state are channeled through and shaped by the collective relationship that their nation has, historically, and currently, with the colonial regime” (Alfred 50:2009). The settler state forcibly mediates Indigenous people’s interactions in order to reinscribe patterns of “marginalization” and “forced acculturation” (Alfred 50:2009). By positioning interactions with the state as inescapable, settler colonialism produces detrimental psychological effects on Indigenous people: This is a major effect of colonization: denial of access to land-based cultural practices leading to a loss of freedom on both the individual and collective levels equating to the psychological effect of anomie, or the state of profound alienation that results from experiencing serious cultural dissolution, which is then the direct cause of serious substance abuse problems, suicide, and interpersonal violence (Alfred 49:2009). The settler colonial foundation of land theft and subsequent occupation, in addition to psychological manipulation, shifts Indigenous relationships with land by propagating itself and the economic system that enables it--capitalism--as the singular framework by which to conceive of relationship to land (Alfred 48:2009). Capitalism and settler colonialism position themselves as the primary modalities through which survival is possible but are inherently structured to eradicate Indigeneity. Moreover, the eradication of Indigeneity is a function of white supremacy, because the eventual assimilation of Indigenous people into whiteness fortifies the settler colonial existence. Settler Colonialism, Capitalism, and (Anti)-Blackness. Historically, white supremacy has sought to eliminate Indigeneity to justify the presence of settlers but has racialized Black people in an opposite way. In early United States and Canada settler societies, the logic of anti Blackness strived to multiply the number of people considered Black in order to grow the pool of available slave labor. The structure and sentiment of anti-Blackness that resulted from Black people’s subjugation has endured. However, although Black people’s presence in North America--particularly those descended from slaves--is often solely attributed to white supremacy, it is also a tangential consequence of settler colonialism. Most notably, settler colonialism used the logic of white supremacy as means to forcibly migrate and racialize Black people as Black to justify exploiting their bodies for labor and to occupy Indigenous land: “The reality then is that Black peoples have not been quintessential “settlers” in the White supremacist usage of the word; nevertheless, they have, as free people, been involved in some form of settlement process” (Amadahy and Lawrence 107:2009). Therefore, the logic of settler colonialism forcefully produced mass Black displacement and subjugation, and non-consensually implicates Black people in the occupation of Indigenous land.

#### Thus the alternative is generative refusal – a simultaneous affirmation of indigenous sovereignty and a political force to generate action

Wrightson 20 KELSEY R. WRIGHTSON PhD in Political Science at the University of British Columbia, She is continuing to research Indigenous peoples' arts and practices of sovereignty. November 2 2020“Generative Refusal: Creative Practice and Relational Indigenous Sovereignty” <https://www.exeley.com/borderlands/pdf/10.21307/borderlands-2020-013> AX

In Dancing on our Turtle’s Back, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2011, p. 32) pushes back against understanding Indigenous resistance as ‘antagonism’ but instead the desire to move towards resurgent new forms. She says ‘I have spent enough time taking down the master’s house, and now I want most of my energy to go into visioning and building our new house’. From this moment of refusal, resistance then is both generative and imaginative, visioning and building rather than dismantling. In Stó:Lō, scholar Dylan Robinson’s analysis of Indigenous soundscapes, he argues that critical sovereign listening ‘understands that in entering Indigenous sound territories as guests, we will be unable to hear Indigenous sovereignty, at the same time that Indigenous peoples affirm sovereignty of their lands through the felt history of song’ (Robinson, 2020, p. 53). This is a vital decoupling of the practice of Indigenous sovereignty from the perceptions of those subject to Indigenous sovereignty as guests or settlers on sovereign territories. Robinson states that ‘sovereign speech does not necessarily provoke specific forms of sovereign listening … by decoupling the deterministic relationship between sovereign object and reception, we can gain a more nuanced understanding of Indigenous and settler forms of sensory experience’ (Robinson, 2020, p. 63). Decoupling acts from reception offers the space for understanding Indigenous sovereignty as deeply relational, but not requiring recognition. Audra Simpson argues, ‘just because the settler state cannot hear or comprehend the articulations of Indigenous sovereignty, does not mean that they are not happening’ (A Simpson, 2000, p. 114). Indigenous practices of sovereignty need not be recognized and affirmed by the settler state in its juridical or normative forms to nevertheless be a manifestation of Indigenous sovereignty. Robinson describes the colonial practice of ‘hungry listening’, or listening for settler consumption. In resistance, sovereign practices of listening refuse that ear, sometimes through spatializing sovereignty to create ‘irreconcilable spaces’ that ‘unwelcome non-Indigenous desire’ (Robinson, 2020, p. 236). Audra Simpson describes ‘refusal’ as ‘a political and ethical stance that stands in stark contrast to the desire to have one’s distinctiveness as a culture, as a people, recognized. Refusal comes with the requirement of having one’s political sovereignty acknowledged and upheld, and raises the question of legitimacy for those who are usually in the position of recognizing’ (Simpson, 2014, p. 11). Simpson identifies here the dual nature of a politics of refusal, simultaneously enacting a new reality while offering a critique of the assumed sovereignty of the settler colonial state. In turning away, the practice of refusal