# 1

#### Our Interpretation is the affirmative should instrumentally defend the resolution. To clarify, you don’t need to defend that a particular actor takes the action, just defend that the resolution is implemented – hold the line, CX and the 1AC prove there’s no I-meet – anything new in the 1AR is either extra-T since it includes the non-topical parts of the Aff or effects-T since it’s a future result of the advocacy which both link to our offense.

#### “Resolved” means to enact by law.

Words & Phrases ’64

(Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### [3] Standards to Prefer:

#### First - Fairness – radically re-contextualizing the resolution lets them defend any method tangentially related to the topic exploding Limits, which erases neg ground via perms and renders research burdens untenable by eviscerating predictable limits. Procedural questions come first – debate is a game and it makes no sense to skew a competitive activity as it requires effective negation which incentivizes argument refinement, but skewed burdens deck pedagogical engagement.

#### Second - Implementation Education – Nitty gritty debates about Impelmentation Education are key to actualize revolutionary movements – the Aff’s model aligns w/ liberal leftist politics of complacency that criticizes but never actualizes.

Chandler 10 (David Chandler is Professor of International Relations at the Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Westminster – This card internally quotes Jodi Dean, Professor of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, 'No Communicating Left' (review article), Radical Philosophy, No. 160 (March/April 2010), pp.53-55. ISSN 0300 211X) //Elmer  
Dean pulls few punches in her devastating critique of the American left for its complacency, its limited capacity, and even its lack of awareness of the need to offer a stand of political resistance to power. This is how she concludes her book: The eight years of the Bush administration were a diversion. Intoxicated with a sense of purpose, we could oppose war, torture, indefinite detention, warrantless wiretapping, a seemingly endless series of real crimes… such opposition keeps us feeling like we matter… We have an ethical sense. But **we lack a coherent politics**. (p.175) Dean highlights clearly the disintegration of the collective left and its simulacra in the individuated life-style politics of today’s depoliticized radicalism, where it appears that particular individual demands and identities are to be respected but there is no possibility of universalising them into a collective challenge to the system: no possibility of a left which stands for something beyond itself. She argues that, rather than confront this problem, the left take refuge in the fantasy that technology will overcome their inability to engage and that the circulation of ideas and information on the internet will construct the collectivities and communities of interest, which are lacking in reality. For Dean, this ‘technology fetishism’ marks the left’s failure: its ‘abandonment of workers and the poor; its retreat from the state and repudiation of collective action; and its acceptance of the neoliberal economy as the “only game in town”’ (p.33). In fact, she uncovers the gaping hole at the heart of the left, highlighting that radicalism appears to be based less on changing the world than on the articulation of an alternative oppositionalist identity: a non-strategic, non-instrumental, articulation of a protest against power. In a nutshell, the left are too busy providing alternative voices, spaces and forums to think about engaging with mass society in an organised, collective, attempt to achieve societal transformation. For Dean, this is fake or hollow political activity, pursued more for its own sake than for future political ends. This is a politics of ethical distancing, of selfflattery and narcissism, which excuses or even celebrates the self-marginalization of the left: as either the result of the overwhelming capacity of neoliberal power to act, to control, and to regulate; or as the result of the apathy, stupidity, or laziness of the masses - or the ‘sheeple’ (p.171) - for their failure to join the radical cause. Dean suggests that the left needs to rethink its values and approaches and her book is intended to be a wake-up call to abandon narcissistic complacency. In doing this, she highlights a range of problems connected around the thematic of the left’s defence of democracy in an age of communicative capitalism. She argues that the left’s focus on extending or defending democracy by asserting their role in giving voice and creating spaces merely reproduces the domination of communicative capitalism, where there is no shared space of debate and disagreement but the proliferation of mediums and messages without the responsibility to develop and defend positions or to engage and no external measure of accountability. Communicative capitalism is held to thrive on this fragmented, atomizing, and individuated, framework of communication, which gives the impression of a shared discourse, community, or movement but leaves reality just as it is, with neoliberal frameworks of domination, inequality, and destruction continuing unopposed (pp.162-75).

#### Third – SSD – their model that allows them to side-step the topic on both the Aff and Neg hurts debate as a site of role experimentation – choosing to individually engage both sides solves argument refinement and self-reflexivity breeding constantly evolving methodology which is key to activist resistance BUT side-stepping it ingrains ideological dogmatism by imposing artificial lines in the sand for what not to experiment replicating imperial ideologies about exclusion.

Mitchell et Al 7, Mitchell, Gordon, et al. "Debate as a weapon of mass destruction." Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies 4.2 (2007): 221-225. (Professor of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh)//Elmer

Second, while the pedagogical benefits of **switch-side debating for participants are compelling**,10 some worry that the technique may perversely and unwittingly serve the ends of an aggressively militaristic foreign policy. In the context of the 1954 controversy, Ronald Walter Greene and Darrin Hicks suggest that the articulation of the debate community as a zone of dissent against McCarthyist tendencies developed into a larger and somewhat uncritical affirmation of switch-side debate as a ‘‘technology’’ of liberal participatory democracy. This technology is part and parcel of the post-McCarthy ethical citizen, prepared to discuss issues from multiple viewpoints. The problem for Greene and Hicks is that this notion of citizenship becomes tied to a normative conception of American democracy that justifies imperialism. They write, ‘‘The production and management of this field of governance allows liberalism to trade in cultural technologies in the global cosmopolitan marketplace at the same time as it creates a field of intervention to transform and change the world one subject (regime) at a time.’’11 Here, Greene and Hicks argue that this new conception of liberal governance, which epitomizes the ethical citizen as an individual trained in the switch-side technique, serves as a normative tool for judging other polities and justifying forcible regime change. One need look only to the Bush administration’s framing of war as an instrument of democracy promotion to grasp how the switch-side technique can be appropriated as a justification for violence. It is our position, however, that rather than acting as a cultural technology expanding American exceptionalism, switch-side debating originates from a civic attitude that serves as a bulwark against fundamentalism of all stripes. Several prominent voices reshaping the national dialogue on homeland security have come from the academic debate community and draw on its animating **spirit of critical inquiry**. For example, Georgetown University law professor **Neal Katyal** served as lead plaintiff’s counsel in Hamdan, which **challenged post-9/11 enemy combat definitions**. 12 The foundation for Katyal’s winning argument in Hamdan was laid some four years before, when he collaborated with former intercollegiate debate champion Laurence Tribe on an influential Yale Law Journal addressing a similar topic.13 Tribe won the National Debate Tournament in 1961 while competing as an undergraduate debater for Harvard University. Thirty years later, Katyal represented Dartmouth College at the same tournament and finished third. The imprint of this debate training is evident in Tribe and Katyal’s contemporary public interventions, which are characterized by meticulous research, sound argumentation, and a staunch commitment to democratic principles. Katyal’s reflection on his early days of debating at Loyola High School in Chicago’s North Shore provides a vivid illustration. ‘‘I came in as a shy freshman with dreams of going to medical school. Then Loyola’s debate team opened my eyes to a different world: one of argumentation and policy.’’ As Katyal recounts, ‘‘the most important preparation for my career came from my experiences as a member of Loyola’s debate team.’’14 The success of former debaters like Katyal, Tribe, and others in challenging the dominant dialogue on homeland security points to the efficacy of academic debate as a training ground for future advocates of progressive change. Moreover, a robust understanding of the switch-side technique and the classical liberalism which underpins it would help prevent misappropriation of the technique to bolster suspect homeland security policies. For buried within an inner-city debater’s files is a secret **threat to absolutism**: the refusal to be classified as ‘‘**with us or against us**,’’ the **embracing of intellectual experimentation** in an age of orthodoxy, **and reflexivity** in the face of fundamentalism. But by now, the irony of our story should be apparent\***the more effectively academic debating practice can be focused toward these ends, the greater the proclivity of McCarthy’s ideological heirs to brand the activity as a ‘‘weapon of mass destruction**.’’ immediately tyrannical, far more immediately damaging to either liberal or participatory democracy, than the ritualized requirements that students occasionally take the opposite side of what they believe. Third, as I have suggested and will continue to suggest, while a debate project requiring participants to understand and often "speak for" opposing points of view may carry a great deal of liberal baggage, it is at its core a project more ethically deliberative than institutionally liberal. Where Hicks and Greene see debate producing "the liberal citizen-subject," I see debate at least having the potential to produce "the deliberative human being." The fact that some academic debaters are recruited by the CSIS and the CIA does not undermine this thesis. Absent healthy debate programs, these think-tanks and **government agencies would still recruit** what they saw as the best and brightest students. And absent a debate community that rewards anti-institutional political rhetoric as much as liberal rhetoric, those students would have little-to-no chance of being exposed to truly **oppositional ideas.** Moreover, if we allow ourselves to believe that it is "culturally imperialist" to help other peoples build institutions of debate and deliberation, we not only **ignore living political struggles t**hat occur in every culture, **but we fall victim to a dangerous ethnocentrism** in holding that "they do not value deliberation like we do." If the argument is that our participation in fostering debate communities abroad greases the wheels of globalization, the correct response, in debate terminology, is that such globalization is non-unique, inevitable, and there is only a risk that collaborating across cultures in public debate and deliberation will foster resistance to domination—just as debate accomplishes wherever it goes. Indeed, Andy Wallace, in a recent article, suggests that Islamic fundamentalism is a byproduct of the colonization of the lifeworld of the Middle East; if this is true, then one solution would be to foster cross-cultural deliberation among people on both sides of the cultural divide willing to question their own preconceptions of the social good. Hicks and Greene might be correct insofar as elites in various cultures can either forbid or reappropriate deliberation, but for those outside of that institutional power, **democratic discussion would have a positively subversive effect**.

#### TVA – [the plan but with implementation – it works because space opens up as an area for Black bodies because capitalist appropriation isn’t allowed]

#### TVA is terminal defense – proves our models aren’t mutually exclusive - any response to the substance of the TVA is offense for us because it proves our model allows for clear contestation. Form over Content doesn’t take it out since we don’t restrict Form, just the substantive burden of the Aff.

#### Prefer Competing Interpretations – reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom. This means reject Aff Impact Turns predicated on their theory since we weren’t able to adequately prepare for it.

# 2

#### Indigeneity can’t be theorized through racial identity (that’s CX – theyre all in relation to each other )– settler colonialism transcends their analysis of racial violence – their claims that blackness structures the world reduces spatial violence to bodily identity – that allows for the erasure of land claims and reconstructs the settler system.

Rifkin 9 [Mark, Professor at the University of North Carolina, “Indigenizing Agamben: Rethinking Sovereignty in Light of the "Peculiar" Status of Native Peoples”, Cultural Critique, Number 73, Fall 2009, pp. 88-124, July 14, 2017] KLu

In using Agamben’s work to address U.S. Indian policy, though, it needs to be reworked. In particular, his emphasis on biopolitics tends to come at the expense of a discussion of geopolitics, the production of race supplanting the production of space as a way of envisioning the work of the sovereignty he critiques, and while his concept of the exception has been immensely influential in contemporary scholar- ship and cultural criticism, such accounts largely have left aside discussion of Indigenous peoples. Attending to Native peoples’ position within settler-state sovereignties requires investigating and adjusting three aspects of Agamben’s thinking: the persistent inside/outside tropology he uses to address the exception, specifically the ways it serves as a metaphor divorced from territoriality; the notion of “bare life” as the basis of the exception, especially the individualizing ways that he uses that concept; and the implicit depiction of sovereignty as a self-confident exercise of authority free from anxiety over the legitimacy of state actions.5 Such revision allows for a reconsideration of the “zone of indistinction” produced by and within sovereignty, opening up analysis of the ways settler-states regulate not only proper kinds of embodiment (“bare life”) but also legitimate modes of collectivity and occupancy—what I will call bare habitance.¶ If the “overriding sovereignty” of the United States is predicated on the creation of a state of exception, then the struggle for sovereignty by Native peoples can be envisioned as less about control of particular policy domains than of metapolitical authority—the ability to define the content and scope of “law” and “politics.” Such a shift draws attention away from critiques of the particular rhetorics used to justify the state’s plenary power and toward a macrological effort to contest the “overriding” assertion of a right to exert control over Native polities. My argument, then, explores the limits of forms of analysis organized around the critique of the settler-state’s employment of racialized discourses of savagery and the emphasis on cultural distinctions between Euramerican and Indigenous modes of governance. Both of these strategies within Indigenous political theory treat sovereignty as a particular kind of political content that can be juxtaposed with a substantively different—more Native-friendly or Indigenous-centered—content, but by contrast, I suggest that discourses of racial difference and equality as well as of cultural recognition are deployed by the state in ways that reaffirm its geopolitical self-evidence and its authority to determine what issues, processes, and statuses will count as meaningful within the political system. While arguments about Euramerican racism and the disjunctions be- tween Native traditions and imposed structures of governance can be quite powerful in challenging aspects of settler-state policy, they cannot account for the structuring violence performed by the figure of sovereignty. Drawing on Agamben, I will argue that “sovereignty” functions as a placeholder that has no determinate content.6 The state has been described as an entity that exercises a monopoly on the legitimate exercise of violence, and what I am suggesting is that the state of exception produced through Indian policy creates a monopoly on the legitimate exercise of legitimacy, an exclusive uncontestable right to define what will count as a viable legal or political form(ul)ation. That fundamentally circular and self-validating, as well as anxious and fraught, performance grounds the legitimacy of state rule on nothing more than the axiomatic negation of Native peoples’ authority to determine or adjudicate for themselves the normative principles by which they will be governed. Through Agamben’s theory of the exception, then, I will explore how the supposedly underlying sovereignty of the U.S. settler-state is a retrospective projection generated by, and dependent on, the “peculiar”-ization of Native peoples.

#### The 1AC’s analysis of race/gender is incomplete without an analysis of settler colonialism – violence occurs not only in relation to the body, but also to geopolitical factors – inability to focus on land relations confines redness solely to the body, allowing for the erasure of land claims.

Glenn 15 [Evelyn Nakano, Professor at the University of California Berkeley, “Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation” Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 2015, Vol. 1(1) 52–72, <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/2332649214560440>, July 7, 2017] KLu

Summary and Conclusions The most widely used sociological frameworks for theorizing race relations in the United States have focused on generating analyses that encompass not just anti-black racism but also anti-Latino and antiAsian American racisms. What these frameworks share is an appreciation that racial hierarchy and inequality are not simply the products of individual beliefs and attitudes but are built into American social structure and that whites have historically benefited from racial inequality. I have found each of the major frameworks, internal colonialism, racial formation, and racialized social systems, useful in my own work in comparative race and gender studies. However, what these theories do not explicitly consider is whether and in what ways U.S. national and regional racial systems may be unique and/or idiosyncratic because they have grown out of distinct material, social, and cultural circumstances, in this case, U.S. settler colonialism. I have offered the concept of “settler colonialism as structure,” as a framework that encourages and facilitates comparativity within and across regions and time. I believe that a settler colonial structural analysis reveals the underlying systems of beliefs, practices, and institutional systems that undergird and link the racialization and management of Native Americans, blacks, Mexicans and other Latinos, and Chinese and other Asian Americans that I have described herein. What are these underlying systems/structures? First, the defining characteristic of settler colonialism is its intention to acquire and occupy land on which to settle permanently, instead of merely to exploit resources. In order to realize this goal, the indigenous people who occupy the land have to be eliminated. Thus, one logic of settler colonial policy has been the ultimate erasure of Native Americans. This goal was pursued through various forms of genocide, ranging from military violence to biological and cultural assimilation. British settler colonialism in what became the United States was particularly effective because it promoted family settlement right from the beginning. Thus, the growth of the settler population and its westward movement was continuous and relentless. Settler ideology justified elimination via the belief that the savage, heathen, uncivilized indigenes were not making productive use of the land or its resources. Thus, they inevitably had to give way to enlightened and civilized Europeans. The difference between indigenes and settlers was simultaneously racialized and gendered. While racializing Native ways of life and Native Americans as “other,” settlers developed their selfidentities as “white,” equating civilization and democracy with whiteness. Indian masculinity was viewed as primitive and violent, while Indian women were viewed as lacking feminine modesty and restraint. With independence from the metropole, the founders imagined the new nation as a white republic governed by and for white men. Second, in order to realize a profitable return from the land, settlers sought to intensively cultivate it for agriculture, extract resources, and build the infrastructure for both cultivation and extraction. For this purpose, especially on large-scale holdings that were available in the New World, extensive labor power was needed. As we have seen, settlers in all regions enslaved Native Americans, and the transnational trade in Native slaves helped to finance the building of Southern plantations. However, in the long run, settlers could not amass a large enough Indigenous slave workforce both because indigenes died in large numbers from European diseases and because they could sometimes escape and then survive in the wilderness. Settlers thus turned to African slave labor. Slave labor power could generate profit for the owner in a variety of ways: by performing field labor, processing raw materials, and producing goods for use or sale and by being leased out to others to earn money for the owner. What linked land taking from indigenes and black chattel slavery was a private property regime that converted people, ideas, and things into property that could be bought, owned, and sold. The purchase, ownership, and sale of property, whether inanimate or human, were regularized by property law or in the case of chattel slaves, by slave law. Generally, ownership entails the right to do whatever one wants with one’s property—to sell, lend, or rent it and to seize the profits extracted from its use. The elimination of Native Americans and the enslavement of blacks form two nodes that have anchored U.S. racial formation. Redness has been made to disappear, such that contemporary Native Americans have become largely invisible in white consciousness. In contrast, blackness has been made hypervisible, and blacks are constantly present as an imagined threat to whites and the settler colonial social order. As pointed out earlier, Indianness is thought to be diluted and then to disappear through miscegenation, while blackness is thought to be continually reproduced even through generations of miscegenation. In this respect as well as others, the racialization of blacks—the irredeemability and dehumanization of blacks—has been incommensurable with the racialization of other groups. Nonetheless, the racialization of certain (in Lorenzo Veracini’s term) exogenous others has been a prominent feature of settler colonial societies. In the United States, some groups have been recruited and/or tracked into hard labor and super-exploited because they can be induced to work by need and kept in place by restricted mobility. For a nation that purports to stand for freedom, opportunity, and equality, the United States has had a long history of imposing coercive labor regimes, social segregation, and restricted mobility on many of its residents. Racializing certain groups as insufficiently human serves to justify subjecting them to oppression, subordination, and super-exploitation. Thus, conditions of compelled labor short of chattel slavery—contract labor, sharecropping, payment in scrip, wages paid only after completion of a long period of work—were legally allowed and commonly imposed on racialized others even after the abolition of slavery. These practices were designed to immobilize and disable workers’ ability to survive by other means and thereby tie down theoretically free workers. These forms of coercion might be labeled de facto slavery because they do not involve ownership of the person and the enforcement of slave law. The experiences of national and local policies toward Mexicans and Chinese were examined herein to help illuminate the linked processes of racialization and super-exploitation in U.S. settler colonialism. Racialization has been integral to resolving the contradiction between settler ideologies of freedom, equality, and progress and the unfreedom, inequality, and denial of mobility and citizenship rights to Mexican Americans in the Southwest and Chinese Americans in the Far West. The various technologies of control and management (segregation, cultural erasure, terrorism, expulsion, and legal exclusion) served the interests of capitalism by enabling landowners, plantation owners, and railroad companies to super-exploit these exogenous others. At the same time, racialization of “others” enabled white workers to reap a psychic reward, the so-called “wages of whiteness” to succor the wounds inflicted by class inferiority. The case studies of Mexican Americans and Chinese Americans further illustrate the importance of paying attention to both the specificities and differences and the connections and commonalities among and between the experiences of various racialized others. Some of the major technologies for control and management of racialized groups were similar, most prominently the use of terrorism. It could be argued that the continuous history of genocide against Native Americans helped to normalize the use of extreme violence against non-white “others.” Extreme violence was rationalized as necessary to ensure settler security. As described, not only blacks, but also Mexicans and Chinese were subjected to extreme and disproportionate violence that might well be characterized as ethnic cleansing. And, as in the case of the denial of the founding violence against Native Americans, white settler culture either denied or forgot its violence toward Mexicans and Chinese by magnifying the threat they posed not only to individual whites but also to the nation. The technology of erasure through cultural assimilation practiced on Native Americans was also employed on Mexican Americans. In both cases, schooling was intended to prepare girls and boys for gender-appropriate domestic and vocational skills. The speaking of children’s natal languages was punished, and mainstream (white/ Anglo) ways of living were valorized. Education was also intended to teach racialized children “their place” in American society, that is, to accept and be satisfied with a limited future. The technologies unique to Mexicans and Chinese were those of mass deportation and legal exclusion. Native Americans could be and were removed to remote reservations in the United States and in a few instances driven across the Southern border into Mexico, but they were not legally deported. Removal of freed blacks and resettling them in Africa was tried after the Civil War, but the number of those removed was only a small proportion of the population. Whites in the South were able to re-impose a white supremacist order that could control and super-exploit black labor. However, once the transcontinental railroad was completed, Chinese labor was not strictly necessary in the West, and moreover, as immigrants, the Chinese could more easily be subjected to expulsion and exclusion. In fact, the Chinese were the first immigrant group subject to exclusion, first through the Page Act of 1875 and the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 and then through the Immigration Act of 1924 that extended exclusion to cover other Asian peoples.As described earlier, for nearly a century after the U.S. takeover of the Southwest, Mexican nationals and Mexican Americans were able to cross back and forth across the southern border more or less freely. However, this situation began to change during the 1920s with the establishment of the U.S. Border Patrol. Because of high unemployment during the Great Depression, Mexican Americans became the first group subject to mass deportation. A second large-scale deportation occurred during another period of unemployment in the 1950s under Operation Wetback. The first decades of the twenty-first century saw the creation and establishment of a vast federal machinery for “safeguarding” our borders, ostensibly to battle terrorism. This machinery has been wielded primarily against Mexicans, who are viewed as constituting a different kind of threat, a menace to “mainstream” American (white) culture. Thus, the majority of deportees continues to be immigrants from Mexico. Throughout my historical analyses of settler colonial structures and practices as they developed in relation to Indigenous peoples, blacks, Mexicans, and Chinese, I have tried to apply an intersectional lens that views race and gender as co-formations. The bulk of the discussion has perhaps focused greater attention on race and racialization; however, gender has been present throughout the text. I pointed out that the settler project constructed various racialized gender and gendered racial dualisms. The white race was masculinized in relation to feminized black, red, or yellow races. Settler ideology also defined appropriate gender relations within the settler family and community, variously using Indian, black, and “others” as negative foils. White settler society understood extreme gender differentiation as a mark of civilization and thus attempted to shape white womanhood toward domesticity and dependency. Importantly, white women were viewed as needing to be protected by white men, particularly from the dangers posed by the primitive or perverse male sexuality of Natives, slaves, and exogenous others. Thus, for example, lurid tales of Indian capture of white women and their rescue by white soldiers circulated widely in settler culture. Meanwhile, Indian, black, and exogenous women were viewed variously as shameless, docile, alluring, or unfeminine because they did “men’s work.” Settler colonialism also had different effects on men and women from subjugated groups as shown in several instances discussed in the main text. For example, it was mentioned that Indian women were more likely to be enslaved, while adult Indian men were more likely to be killed. Relatedly, Indian women were also more likely to be brought into settler households to be sex slaves and domestic servants. As for the Chinese, although male laborers were eventually subject to exclusion, women had been legally excluded earlier and more stringently on the assumption that all Chinese women attempting to enter were prostitutes. In contrast, Mexican women were sometimes viewed more favorably than Mexican men and were thought to be appropriate wives for Anglo men. As for enslaved blacks, women were subjected to gender-specific violence such as rape but not exempted from the same kinds of physical punishment and heavy field labor to which slave men were subjected. I will now briefly consider the implications of the present analysis in relation to anti-racist politics. Given that many different groups have been victimized by racial violence, exclusion, and dehumanization, coalitions among racialized minorities are desirable and necessary. I suggest that coalitions are best built by recognizing the specific histories of racialized minorities other than our own. Our understandings ideally should reckon with (a) commonalities, (b) relations and connections, and (c) differences. All of these are highlighted by this settler colonial analysis. Many commonalities have emerged from the case analyses, including experiences of genocide and terrorism that have been inflicted, justified, and “forgotten” or deemphasized by settler society. Also having emerged are relations/connections in the experiences of different groups that complicate their positionality vis-à- vis one another. Thus, for example, the analysis might lead us to ask whether and in what ways racialized minorities might position themselves in relation to the territorial dispossession of Native Americans. Finally, some significant differences have emerged; for example, only blacks were subjected to chattel slavery, which is a condition of social death and subjection by slave law that even those who worked under conditions of extreme coercion did not share. A final thought: in this article I have suggested that a settler colonialism framework for analyzing and understanding race and gender in America will have certain advantages over other frameworks, most specifically in the strength of its historicity and in a fuller incorporation of the role of Native Americans in how racism and gender oppression have developed and continue to operate. A question with which I have not dealt is to what extent can a settler colonial framework relate to and interact with other frameworks such as internal colonialism, racial formation, and racialized social systems. My belief is that there are significant insights and analytical methods offered by each of the frameworks and that the addition of settler colonialism to the mix may help us to work toward a higher level theoretical model that can be widely used by social scientists both in the United States and internationally. I suggest that a fruitful next task will be for us to explore and discuss the connections and relationships among the various frameworks, with a new awareness of the distinct historical, social, and cultural understandings brought to our table by the settler colonialism framework.

#### Thus the alternative is one of refusal, a reshifting of posthumanist discource to interrupt settler communicative spheres like debate

King 2017 (Tiffany, Assistant Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies at the Georgia State University “Humans Involved: Lurking in the Lines of Posthumanist Flight” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3, No. 1, pp. 163-170)

Native feminist politics of decolonial refusal and Black feminist abolitionist politics of skepticism informed by a misandry and misanthropic distrust of and animus toward the (over)representation of man/men as the human diverge from the polite, communicative acts of the public sphere, much like the politics of the “feminist killjoy.”4 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: I use “misandry” (hatred of men) and “misanthropic” (distrust or deep skepticism about humankind or humanity) to illustrate how Sylvia Wynter and other Black scholars attend to the ways that the human— and **investments in the human—and its revised forms or genres of the human as woman/feminist still reproduce violent exclusions that make the death of Black and Native people viable and in-evitable**. In other words, **neither men nor women (as humans) can absorb Black females/males/children/LGBT and trans people into their collective folds. Both the hatred of “misandry” and the distrust and pessimism of “misanthropy” are appropriate methods to describe the inflection of the critique levied by Wynter and the other Black scholars examined in this article**. END FOOTNOTE] Throughout this article, I deploy the term “feminist” both ambivalently and strategically to mark and distinguish the scholarly tradition created by Black and Native women, queer, trans, and other people marginalized within these respective communities and their anticolonial and abolitionist movements.5 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See Sylvia Wynter’s afterword, “Beyond Miranda’s Meanings: Un/silencing the ‘Demonic Ground’ of Caliban’s ‘Woman,’” in Out of the Kumbla: Caribbean Women and Literature, ed. Carole Boyce Davies (Chicago, Ill.: Africa World Press, 1990) 355– 72. Wynter warns Black women in the United States and the Caribbean that they need not uncritically embrace womanism as a political position, which can effectively oppose the elisions, racism, and false universalism of white feminism. “Feminism” as well as “womanism” are bounded and exclusive terms that do not effectively throw the category of the human into continual flux. END FOOTENOTE], Until a more useful and legible term emerges, I will use “feminist” to mark the practices of refusal and skepticism (misandry/misanthropy) as ones that largely exist outside more masculinist traditions within Indigenous/Native studies and Black studies**. “Decolonial refusal” and “abolitionist skepticism” depart from the kinds of masculinist anticolonial traditions that attempt to reason Native/ Black man to White Man within humanist logic in at least two significant ways**. First, **neither participate in the communicative acts of the humanist public sphere from within the terms of the debate**. Further, they do not play by the rules.6 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See the critiques of the anticolonial tradition within Caribbean philosophy articulated by Shona Jackson in her book Creole Indigeneity (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012). Jackson argues that **anticolonial Caribbean masculinist philosophy tends to argue from inside the logic of Western philosophy in order to counter it.** For instance, in a valorization of the laborer as human and inheritor of the nation-state, Caribbean philosophy tends to reproduce the Hegelian telos of labor as a humanizing agent for the slave, which inadvertently makes the slave a subordinate human and effectively erases the ostensibly “nonlaboring” humanity of Indigenous peoples in the Anglophone Caribbean. END FOOTENOTE] Specifically, the Native and Black “feminist” politics discussed throughout launch a critique of both the logic of the discussion about the human and identity as well as the mode of communication. In fact, **practices of refusal and skepticism interrupt and flout codes of civil and collegial discursive protocol to focus on and illumine the violence that structures the posthumanist discourse.** Attending to the comportment, tone, and intensity of an engagement is just as important as focusing on its content. **The** particular **manner in which Black and Native feminists push back against violence is important**. **The force**, break with decorum, and style **in which Black and Native feminists confront discursive violence can change the nature of future encounters**. Given that Black women who confront the logics of “nonrepresentational theory” are really confronting genocide and the white, whimsical disavowal of Black and Native negation on the way to subjectlessness, it is understandable that there is an equally discordant response. **Refusal and skepticism are modes of engagement that are uncooperative and force an impasse in a discursive exchange.** This article tracks how traditions of “**decolonial refusal**” and “abolitionist skepticism” that emerge from Native/Indigenous and Black studies **expose the limits and violence of contemporary nonidentitarian and nonrepresentational impulses within white “critical” theory.** Further, this article asks whether Western forms of nonrepresentational (subjectless and nonidentitarian) theory can truly transcend the human through self- critique, self-abnegation, and masochism alone. External pressure, specifically the kind of pressure that “decolonial **refusal**” and “abolitionist skepticism” as forms of resistance that **enact outright rejection of or view “posthumanist” attempts with a “hermeneutics of suspicion,**”7 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See the work of Black feminists such as Susana M. Morris, author of Close Kin and Distant Relatives: The Paradox of Respectability in Black Women’s Literature (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2014), as well as womanist theologians who appropriate the phrase “hermeneutics of suspicion” as coined by Paul Ricoeur to describe the reading and interpretive practices of Black woman who are distrustful of traditional tropes about heteronormativity or conventional ways of thinking about what is natural and normal. Further, in Morris’s case, as well as within the tradition of Black women of faith and theologians, canonical and biblical texts are interpreted through a lens that acknowledges white supremacy and misogyny, and critically challenges racism and sexism (or kyriarchy in Morris’s case). Within Black feminist and womanist traditions, it is a position that can recognize the limitations of text and that refuses to accept the doctrine, theories, or message of an ideology wholesale. END FOOTENOTE**] is needed in order to truly address the recurrent problem of the violence of the human in continental theory.** While this article does not directly stake a claim in embracing or rejecting identity per se, it does take up the category of the human. **Because the category of the human is modified by identity in ways that position certain people** (white, male, able- bodied) within greater or lesser proximity to humanness, **identity is already taken up in this discussion**. Conversations about the human are very much tethered to conversations about identity. In the final section, the article will explore how Black and Native/Indigenous absorption into the category of the human would disfigure the category of the human beyond recognition. **Engaging how forms of Native decolonization and Black abolition scrutinize the violently exclusive means in which the human has been written and conceived is generative because it sets some workable terms of engagement for interrogating Western and mainstream claims to and disavowals of identity**. Rather than answer how Native decolonization and Black abolition construe the human or identity, the article examines how Native and Black feminists use refusal and misandry to question the very systems, institutions, and order of knowledge that secure humanity as an exclusive experience and bound identity in violent ways. I consider the practices and postures of refusal assumed by Native/Indigenous scholars such as Audra Simpson, Eve Tuck, Jodi Byrd, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith to be particularly instructive for exposing the violence of ostensibly nonrepresentational Deleuzoguattarian rhizomes and lines of flight. While reparative readings and “working with what is productive” about Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s work is certainly a part of the Native feminist scholarly tradition, this article focuses on the underexamined ways that Native feminists refuse to entertain certain logics and foundations that actually structure Deleuzoguattarian thought.8 [I thank one of the reviewers, who reminded me that Native feminist thought’s engagement with continental theory, specifically the work of Deleuze and Guattari, can be likened more to “constellations” as it takes up Deleuzoguattarian thought rather than a single point that always departs from a place of refusal. END FOOTENOTE] Further, I discuss **“decolonial refusal**” in relation to how Black scholars like Sylvia Wynter, Zakiyyah Iman Jackson, and Amber Jamilla Musser work within a Black feminist tradition animated **by a kind of skepticism or suspicion capable of ferreting out the trace of the white liberal human within (self-)professed subjectless, futureless, and nonrepresentational white theoretical traditions.** In other words, in the work of Sylvia Wynter**, one senses a general suspicion and deep distrust of the ability of Western theory— specifically its attempt at self- critique and self- correction in the name of justice for humanity— to revise its cognitive orders to work itself out of its current “closed system,” which reproduces exclusion and structural oppositions based on the negation of the other**.9 [INSERT FOOTENOTE: See Katherine McKittrick, “Diachronic Loops/Deadweight Tonnage/Bad Made Measure,” Cultural Geographies 23, no. 1 (2016): 3– 18, doi:10.1177/14744740156 12716, for an exemplary explication of how Sylvia Wynter uses the decolonial scholarship of an “autopoiesis.” END FOOTENOTE] Wynter’s study of decolonial theory and its elaboration of autopoiesis informs her understanding of how the human and its overrepresentation as man emerges. Recognizing that humans (of various genres) write themselves through a “self- perpetuating and self- referencing closed belief system” that often prevents them from seeing or noticing “the process of recursion,” Wynter works to expose these blind spots.10 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See McKittrick, “Diachronic Loops,” in which the author cites the importance of the work of H. Maturana and F. Varela, Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living (London: D. Reidel, 1972), for the study of the human’s process of self- writing. END FOOTNOTE] Wynter understands that **one of the limitations of Western liberal thought is that it cannot see itself in the process of writing itself.** I observe a similar kind of cynicism about the way the academic left invokes “post humanism” in the work of Jackson and Musser. Musser in particular questions the capacity of queer theories to turn to sensations like masochism within the field of affect studies to overcome the subject. Further, Jackson’s and Musser’s work is skeptical that white transcendence can happen on its own terms or rely solely on its own processes of self-critique and self- correction. I read Jackson’s and Musser’s work as distrustful of the ability for “posthumanism” to be accountable to Black and Indigenous peoples or for affect theory on its own to not replicate and reinforce the subjugation of the other as it moves toward self- annihilation. Both the human and the post human are causes for suspicion within Black studies. Like Wynter, the field of Black studies has consistently made the liberal human an object of study and scrutiny, particularly the nefarious manner in which it violently produces Black existence as other than and at times nonhuman. Wynter’s empirical method of tracking the internal epistemic crises and revolutions of Europe from the outside has functioned as a model for one way that Black studies can unfurl a critique of the human as well as Western modes of thought. I use the terms “misanthropy” and “misandry” in this article to evoke how Black studies has remained attentive to, wary about, and deeply distrustful of the human condition, humankind, and the humanas-man/men in the case of Black “feminists.” Both Black studies’ distrust of the “human” and Black feminism’s distrust of humanism in its version as man/men (which at times seeks to incorporate Black men) relentlessly scrutinize how the category of the human and in this case the “posthuman” reproduce Black death. I link misandry (skepticism of humankind-as-man) to the kind of skepticism and “hermeneutics of suspicion” that Black feminist scholars like Wynter, Jackson, and Musser at times apply to their reading and engagement with revisions to or expansions of the category of the human, posthuman discourses, and nonrepresentational theory In this article, I connect discursive performance of skepticism to embodied and affective responses I have witnessed in the academy that challenge the sanctioned modes of protocol, politesse, and decorum in the university. For example, Wynter assumes a critically disinterested posture as she gazes empirically on and examines intra-European epistemic shifts over time. Paget Henry has described Wynter as an anthropologist of the Occident, as Europe becomes an object of study rather than the center of thought and humanity.11 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Paget Henry, Caliban’s Reason: Introducing Afro-Caribbean Philosophy (New York: Routledge, 2002), 19. END FOOTENOTE] Throughout the body of Wynter’s work, she seems to be more interested in drawing our attention to the capacity of European orders of knowledge to shift over time— or their fragility— than in celebrating the progress that European systems of knowledge have claimed to make. Wynter’s tracking is just a tracking and not a celebration of the progress narrative that Western civilization tells about itself and its capacity to define, refine, and recognize new kinds of humanity over time. This comportment of critical disinterest is often read as an affront to the codes and customs of scholarly discourse and dialogue in the academic community, particularly when it is in response to the white thinkers of the Western cannon. **Decolonial refusal and abolitionist skepticism respond to how perverse and reprehensible it is to ask Indigenous and Black people who cannot seem to escape death to move beyond the human or the desire to be human**. In fact, Black and **Indigenous people have never been fully folded into the category of the human**. As Zakiyyah Iman Jackson has argued**, It has largely gone unnoticed by posthumanists that their queries into ontology often find their homologous (even anticipatory) appearance in decolonial philosophies that confront slavery and colonialism’s inextricability from the Enlightenment humanism they are trying to displace. Perhaps this foresight on the part of decolonial theory is rather unsurprising considering that exigencies of race have crucially anticipated and shaped discourses governing the non- human** (animal, technology, object, and plant).12 [Zakkiyah Iman Jackson, “Review: Animal: New Directions in the Theorization of Race and Posthumanism,” Feminist Studies 39, no. 3 (2013): 681. END FOOTENOTE] A crucial point that Jackson emphasizes is that Black and Indigenous studies, particularly decolonial studies, has already grappled with and anticipated the late twentieth century impulses inspired by Leo Bersani and Lee Edelman to annihilate the self and jettison the future. **Indigenous and Black “sex**” (as activity, reproduction, pleasure, world-building, and not-human sexuality) **are already subsumed by death**. For some reason, white critical theory cannot seem to fathom that self- annihilation is something white people need to figure out by themselves. In other words, “they can have that.”13 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: This is a colloquialism or form of vernacular often used by Blacks and People of Color to express that they disagree with something and more specifically reject an idea and will leave that to the people whom it concerns to deal with. END FOOTNOTE] Within Native feminist theorizing, ethnographic refusal can be traced to Audra Simpson’s 2007 article, “On Ethnographic Refusal.” In this seminal work, Simpson reflects on and gains inspiration from the tradition of refusal practiced by the people of Kahnawake.14 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Simpson’s ethnographic work specifically focuses on the Kahnawake Mohawk who reside in a reservation in the territory is now referred to as southwest Quebec. END FOOTNOTE] **Simpson shares that** **Kahnawake refusals are at the core and spirit of her own ethnographic and ethical practices of refusal.** I was interested in the larger picture, in the discursive, material and moral territory that was simultaneously historical and contemporary (this “national” space) and the ways in which Kahnawakero:non, **the “people of Kahnawake,” had refused the authority of the state at almost every turn.** The ways in which their formation of the initial membership code (now replaced by a lineage code and board of elders to implement the code and determine cases) was refused; the ways in which their interactions with border guards at the international boundary line were predicated upon a refusal; how refusal worked in everyday encounters to enunciate repeatedly to ourselves and to outsiders that “this is who we are, this is who you are, these are my rights.”15 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Audra Simpson, “On Ethnographic Refusal: Indigeneity, ‘Voice’ and Colonial Citizenship,” Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue, no. 9 (December 2007): 73. END FOOTNOTE] Because Simpson was concerned with applying the political and everyday modes of Kahnawake refusal, she attended to the “collective limit” established by her and her Kahnawake participants. 16 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 77. END FOOTNOTE] The collective limit was relationally and ethically determined by what was shared but more importantly by what was not shared. Simpson’s ability to discern the collective limit could only be achieved through a form of relational knowledge production that regards and cares for the other. Simpson recounts how one of her participants forced her to recognize a collective limit. Approaching and then arriving at the limit, Simpson experiences the following: And although I pushed him, hoping that there might be something explicit said from the space of his exclusion— or more explicit than he gave me— it was enough that he said what he said. “Enough” is certainly enough. “Enough,” I realised, was when I reached the limit of my own return and our collective arrival. Can I do this and still come home; what am I revealing here and why? Where will this get us? Who benefits from this and why? And “enough” was when they shut down (or told me to turn off the recorder), or told me outright funny things like “nobody seems to know”— when everybody does know and talks about it all the time. Dominion then has to be exercised over these representations, and that was determined when enough was said. The ethnographic limit then, was reached not just when it would cause harm (or extreme discomfort)— the limit was arrived at when the representation would bite all of us and compromise the representational territory that we have gained for ourselves in the past 100 years.17 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 78. END FOOTNOTE] Extending her discussion of ethnographic refusal beyond the bounds of ethnographic concerns, Simpson also ponders whether this enactment of refusal can be applied to theoretical work. Simpson outright poses a question: “What is theoretically generative about these refusals?”18 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid. END FOOTNOTE] The question that Simpson asks in 2007 is clarified by Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang in the 2014 essay “R- Words: Refusing Research.” **Arguing that modes of refusal extended into the theoretical and methodological terrains of knowledge production are productive and necessary,** Tuck and Yang state: For the purposes of our discussion, the most important insight to draw from Simpson’s article is her emphasis that **refusals are not subtractive, but are theoretically generative, expansive. Refusal is not just a “no,” but a redirection to ideas otherwise unacknowledged or unquestioned.** Unlike a settler colonial configuration of knowledge that is petulantly exasperated and resentful of limits, **a methodology of refusal regards limits on knowledge as productive, as indeed a good thing**.19 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “R- Words: Refusing Research,” in Humanizing Research: Decolonizing Qualitative Inquiry with Youth and Communities (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE, 2014), 239. END FOOTNOTE] In line with Simpson’s intervention, Tuck and Yang posit that “refusal itself could be developed into both method and theory.”20 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 242. END FOOTNOTE] For Tuck and Yang, a generative practice of refusal and a decolonial and abolitionist tradition is making Western thought “turn back upon itself as settler colonial knowledge, as opposed to universal, liberal, or neutral knowledge without horizon.”21 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 243. END FOOTNOTE] In fact, the coauthors suggest “making the settler colonial metanarrative the object of . . . research.”22 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 244. END FOOTNOTE] What this move effectively does is question the uninterrogated assumptions and exposes the violent particularities of the metanarrative. **Scrutiny as a practice of refusal also slows down or perhaps halts the momentum of the machinery that allows, as Tuck and Yang argue, “knowledge to facilitate interdictions on Indigenous and Black life**.”23 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Ibid., 244. END FOOTNOTE] Taking a cue from Simpson and Tuck and Yang, I turn to Tuck’s 2010 critique of Deleuze’s notion of “desire” as an example of the theoretical practice of refusal, which Simpson wonders about and which Tuck and Yang elaborated on in 2014. Eve Tuck’s 2010 article “Breaking Up with Deleuze” refuses Deleuze’s understanding and imposition of his definition of desire for Native studies and Native resurgence in particular. Tuck refuses the Deleuzoguattarian nomadic due to its totalizing moves and specifically its evasion and refusal of Native and alternative notions of refusal that emerge from Native struggles for survival.24 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: Eve Tuck, “Breaking Up with Deleuze: Desire and Valuing the Irreconcilable,” International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education 23, no. 5 (2010): 635– 50. END FOOTNOTE] For Tuck, paying attention to “the continuity of ancestors,” or genealogies, in Native and in all modes of knowledge production is imperative. For Indigenous and Native studies, it reverses the erasure enacted by continental European and settler-colonial theory, which uses a tradition of ongoing genocide to annihilate Native thinkers and subsequently their epistemologies and theories. Prior to Byrd’s indictment of Deleuzoguattarian laudatory accounts of America’s terrain of “Indians without Ancestry,” Tuck reroutes us back to ancestral and genealogical thinking as a way of asserting Indigenous presence and its epistemological systems and traditions, devoid of Cartesian boundary- making impulses and desires. Tuck’s work also prepares us in 2010 for the critique that Byrd levies in 2011, which exposes the traditions, roots, and genealogies of Western poststructuralist theory. Such theory created the conditions of possibility and emergence for Deleuzoguattarian genocidal forms of rhizomatic and nonrepresentational thought. Black Caribbean feminist Michelle V. Rowley argues we need to especially attend to a theory’s “politics and conditions of emergence.”25 [INSERT FOOTNOTE: See Michelle V. Rowley, “The Idea of Ancestry: Of Feminist Genealogies and Many Other Things,” in Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives, 3rd ed., ed. Carole R. McCann and Syeung Kyung Kim (New York: Routledge, 2013), 810– 81, where Rowley argues that transnational feminisms need to attend to how the white feminist wave as a metaphor and theory emerges, disciplines are thought, and more importantly how “its wins” are gained through the exploitation and suffering of women from the Global South. Rowley describes this work as attending to the “politics and conditions of emergence” of feminist metaphors and theories. END FOOTNOTE] In other words, we need to consider on whose backs or through whose blood a theory developed and then circulated while hiding its own violence.

#### The role of the ballot is to center indigenous scholarship and research. Indigenous theories must come before settler frameworks. We need to hold colonizers accountable to open the space up for new narratives and disrupt colonial institutions.

Carlson ‘16 [Elizabeth Carlson, Oct 21 2016, Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies, Settler Colonial Studies, 7:4, 496-517, DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241213] [SS]

Macoun and Strakosch contend that ‘most settlers who use [settler colonial theory] are concerned to disturb rather than re-enact colonial hierarchies, and seek to contribute to Indigenous political struggles’.40 The particular research project out of which this article arises, focuses on the ways experienced white settler anti-colonial, decolonial, or solidarity activists have worked to disrupt and subvert settler colonialism within themselves, their organizations, their relationships, their pedagogies, their connections with land, their com- munities, and sometimes also in the Canadian government, with a goal of inspiring others to engage in or deepen such work, and of contributing to social change. As has been noted, **in subverting settler colonialism, the role of white settler academics is at the periphery, making space for Indigenous resurgence and knowledges, and pushing back against colonial institutions,** structures, practices, mentalities, and land theft. In order to do this, anti-colonial settler scholars can sit on departmental and university committees, supporting anti-colonial and anti-oppressive ethical choices to push for changes in Euro- centric and colonial curricula, narratives, policies, and structures**. We can seek to disrupt rather than enact colonial values and practices, and engage in anti-colonial actions within the academy.** This also applies to our writing: Settler scholars seeking to challenge colonial power relations should be doubly attentive to the operation of [colonial] narratives, and the way that we as individual scholars perform and deploy academic authority. For us, this has involved the need to interrogate our work – along with other settler cultural productions.41 **When settler scholars subvert colonialism in the academy, the ethics of their work are improved, and potentially more space is made for Indigenous scholars who wish to main- tain their own values in the academy.** Arlo Kempf says that ‘where anticolonialism is a tool used to invoke resistance for the colo- nized, it is a tool used to invoke accountability for the colonizer’.**42 Relational accountability should be a cornerstone of settler colonial studies.** I believe settler colonial studies and scholars should ethically and overtly place themselves in relationship to the centuries of Indigenous oral, and later academic scholarship that conceptualizes and resists settler colonialism without necessarily using the term: SCT may be revelatory to many settler scholars, but Indigenous people have been speaking for a long time about colonial continuities based on their lived experiences. Some SCTs have sought to connect with these discussions and to foreground Indigenous resistance, survival and agency. Others, however, seem to use SCT as a pathway to explain the colonial encounter without engaging with Indigenous people and experiences – either on the grounds that this structural analysis already conceptually explains Indigenous experience, or because Indigen- ous resistance is rendered invisible.43 Ethical settler colonial theory (SCT) would recognize the foundational role Indigenous scholarship has in critiques of settler colonialism. It would acknowledge the limitations of settler scholars in articulating settler colonialism without dialogue with Indigenous peoples, and take as its norm making this dialogue evident. In my view, **it is critical that we not view settler colonial studies as a new or unique field being established, which would enact a discovery narrative and contribute to Indigenous  erasure, but rather take a longer and broader view**. Indigenous oral and academic scholars are indeed the originators of this work. This space is not empty. Of course, powerful forces of socialization and discipline impact scholars in the academy. **There is much pressure to claim unique space**, to establish a name for ourselves, and to make academic discoveries. I am suggesting that **settler colonial studies and anti-colonial scholars resist these hegemo- nic pressures and maintain a higher anti-colonial ethic.** As has been argued, ‘**the theory itself places ethical demands on us as settlers, including the demand that we actively refuse its potential to re-empower our own academic voices and to marginalize Indigen- ous resistance’**.44 As settler scholars, we can reposition our work relationally and contextually with humi- lity and accountability. **We can centre Indigenous resistance, knowledges, and scholarship in our work, and contextualize our work in Indigenous sovereignty.** We can view oral Indi- genous scholarship as legitimate scholarly sources. We can acknowledge explicitly and often the Indigenous traditions of resistance and scholarship that have taught us and pro- vided the foundations for our work. **If our work has no foundation of Indigenous scholar- ship and mentorship, I believe our contributions to settler colonial studies are even more deeply problematic.** I embody the principle of relational and epistemic accountability by acknowledging here that my interest in the larger study out of which the anti-colonial research method- ology is based was inspired by a lifetime of influences. In particular, my work in this area has been influenced by years of guidance from a number of Indigenous and African-Amer- ican mentors including Nicholas Cooper-Lewter, Nii Gaani Aki Inini (Dave Courchene Jr), Zoongigaabowitmiskoakikwe, and my late brother Byron Matwewinin.45 I entered into dis- cussions with Indigenous scholars, friends, and Elders (in particular, Zoongigaabowitmis- koakikwe, Michael Hart, Leona Star-Manoakeesick, and Gladys Rowe),46 observing their protocols of gifts and offerings for the feedback I was requesting, depending on the context. In addition, my reading of Indigenous scholarship located the study as a response to a call by Indigenous scholars that settler peoples engage in decolonization processes and work. Throughout the research and writing process I made it a point to attend Indi- genous-led community events and gatherings to stay connected to community and con- tinue to learn. When I met with Leona Star-Manoakeesick, we discussed how Ownership, Control, Access, Possession research principles might relate to my research.47 Leona challenged me to think about who constitutes the community that relates to my research as a begin- ning step, and shared that accountability to Indigenous peoples would also mean account- ability to the land. Her input greatly influenced the methodology principles and practices. As I achieved greater clarity about the study, I engaged in formal consultations with a number of other Indigenous scholars, knowledge keepers, and/or activists. Chickadee Richard, Belinda Vandenbroek, Don Robinson, Aimée Craft, Louis Sorin, and Manito Mukwa (Troy Fontaine),48 provided guidance, input, and encouragement regarding the initial research design and process, much of which shifted and strengthened my initial thoughts and was readily integrated into the research. I was gifted key insights and values on which to build the research, and meaningful ideas for interview questions and interview participants. During the initial phases of the research, I was inspired by scho- larship that urges settler peoples on Indigenous lands who wish to identify themselves in the context of Indigenous sovereignty to learn and use words that local Indigenous peoples use for them.49 A number of individuals helped me in my quest to learn about Anishinaabemowin conceptions of white people – Nii Gaani Aki Inini (Dave Courchene), Rose Roulette, Niizhosake (Sherry Copenace), Daabaasanaquwat ‘Lowcloud’ (Peter Atkin- son), Byron Matwewinin, and Pebaamibines.50 **I further sought to embody relational accountability by centring Indigenous scholarship and literatures in my research proposal and literature review.** Aspects of the data analysis process were shared with a smaller group of Indigenous scholars (Leona Star-Manoakeesick, Aimée Craft, and Dawnis Kennedy),51 who provided feedback which shaped the analysis and the writing of the research report. Towards the end of the research process, I organized a research feast, which is described further below. **Relational accountability was embodied by sharing the research with the community and receiving feedback from it.**

# 3

#### Counterplan: The appropriation of outer space by private entities except for Viasat is unjust.

The counterplan solves better – it’s a space for Black and Indigenous bodies within space. It allows for a more concrete inclusion of Natives and Black ppl in space

#### Viasat boosts Indigenous economies.

SBS 1/12

[Indigenous Australians to lead space industry at new Alice Springs earth ground station, <https://www.sbs.com.au/news/indigenous-australians-to-lead-space-industry-at-new-alice-springs-earth-ground-station/b35811cc-1ecb-4a90-9be2-d6c1f4486e3b>, Jan 12 2022, SBS News] [SS]

**A** multi-million-dollar **earth ground station** will be built in the Northern Territory's Alice Springs, **set to be the first development of its kind on Aboriginal-owned land in Australia**. **Indigenous Australians will become leading participants in the global satellite and space industry,** **with the** Real-Time Earth (RTE) **facility expected to bring new jobs and economic opportunities to** remote **Australia**. Global communications company **Viasat** Inc. has **partnered with Aboriginal not-for-profit science and tech**nology **company** Centre for Appropriate Technology Ltd (CfAT**) to deliver the project, financed by Indigenous Business Australia.** It will be used **to track** the next generation of low earth orbiting **satellites for** earth observation used for scientific research, **environmental monitoring, and commercial applications**. CfAT chairperson Peter Renehan said **the facility "puts Aboriginal people at the forefront of Australia’s growing space sector**". "This state-of-the-art development will provide a positive contribution to the local economy **through employment opportunities** for local businesses during each phase of construction **as well as ongoing jobs for local Aboriginal people** once operational," she said. "CfAT exists to provide people in regional and remote Australia with options for maintaining their relationship with country. "**We** do this by **providing technologically innovative solutions to infrastructure challenges** with digital connectivity as a core focus of the companies work." A KPMG report Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people own or have controlling interests in about 40 per cent of the Australian land mass under various forms of title and legislation. Indigenous Business Australia Chairperson Eddie Fry said the new earth ground station was important for both the Australian space industry and the Indigenous community. "**Aboriginal** and Torres Strait Islander **people own or control significant areas of land** in remote areas **where there is limited economic potential**," he said. "**This** first of its kind development on Aboriginal land **gives** the community both **economic and social returns**." He added Alice Springs was an optimal environment for this type of technology due to a large number of cloud-free days, limited radio interference and access to fibre network on the grounds. Indigenous Australians Minister Ken Wyatt said developments such as this showcased how Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people could continue leading roles in our nation’s innovation. "**Indigenous Australians hold a powerful economic force through their connections with land, culture and community,**” he said. "**This** exciting project **is a prime example of the power of country to help deliver commercial returns through technology, employment and career opportunities."**

#### Indigenous led socities solve capitalism and Western neoliberalism.

Swiderska ‘21

[Here's why Indigenous economics is the key to saving nature, <https://www.iied.org/heres-why-indigenous-economics-key-saving-nature>, Krystyna Swiderska, April 13 2021] [SS]

**Western economics is** not only **destroying the environment**. It is also destroying Indigenous peoples’ holistic development models that ensure balance with nature, and provide alternative paradigms for sustainable development. For many of the world’s 476 million Indigenous peoples, balance and reciprocity (PDF) with nature are fundamental principles that guide all aspects of life**. Rather than privileging human economic goals** and pursuing nature conservation separately, many **Indigenous societies seek to achieve ‘holistic wellbeing’** or ‘Buen Vivir’, which means the wellbeing of both people and nature together. Take the Quechua and Aymara people in Peru, for example, who make up nearly a fifth of Peru’s population. According to their Andean cosmovision, the world is divided into three communities or ‘ayllus’: i) the wild or natural world, ii) the human and domesticated world, and iii) the sacred world. To achieve wellbeing (‘Sumaq Causay’), these three communities must be in balance, which requires reciprocity between them (‘ayni’). These Andean concepts come from the Incas, the largest pre-Columbian empire, and are still very much alive in the Andes. So too are barter markets (PDF), which provide people at different altitudes with access to essential nutrients and help sustain rich Andean biodiversity. Balance with nature, reciprocity and solidarity (the obligation to help those in need) are key principles embedded in many Indigenous cultures across the world, from the Americas, to China, India and Kenya. **These Indigenous economies** (PDF) **promote sufficiency rather than infinite growth**, and equity and redistribution of wealth rather than accumulation. Many **subsistence economies are also characterised by circular agriculture models, which minimise waste** and carbon emissions. The separation of people and nature threatens both In Peru and across the world, the nature- and **people-friendly informal economies of Indigenous peoples are steadily being eroded by Western**, neo-liberal economic **policies** that separate people and nature, and view Indigenous cultures and subsistence economies as ‘backward’ and in need of modernisation. Ironically, the same **Indigenous economies** that **have conserved and enhanced biodiversity for millennia are now threatened by environmental policies that often fail to recognise the value of Indigenous knowledge**, thus contributing to its erosion. Most of the world’s remaining biodiversity is located on lands owned or managed by Indigenous peoples. A global scientific assessment (PDF) by the Intergovernmental Panel on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) found that “nature is generally declining less rapidly in Indigenous peoples’ lands than in other lands”. However, the IPBES assessment also found **nature managed by Indigenous peoples and local communities** (IPLCs**) is under** increasing **pressure,** as is the knowledge of how to manage it. Areas managed by IPLCs “are facing growing resource extraction, commodity production, mining and transport and energy infrastructure”. Negative impacts from all these pressures include “continued loss of subsistence and traditional livelihoods” and impacts on “health and wellbeing from pollution and water insecurity”. These impacts “also challenge the transmission of Indigenous and local knowledge” and “the ability of indigenous peoples and local communities to conserve and sustainably manage wild and domesticated biodiversity that are also relevant to broader society”. **Mainstream economic activities on Indigenous lands have rarely benefited Indigenous Peoples**, who make up 6% of the world’s population but 19% of the extreme poor. In fact, their situation has often deteriorated (PDF), due to loss of land and natural resources, and the weakening of cultural ties and social cohesion. Integration with market economies has led to social tension and conflict, limited opportunities for meaningful employment, low returns for producers and a shift towards consumerist lifestyles. The dominant approach to nature conservation through protected areas also reflects a Western worldview that separates people and nature, often excluding Indigenous people to protect biodiversity. Many state-run protected areas have resulted in negative social impacts, are losing biodiversity and are not effectively or equitably managed, as IPBES found (PDF). Bridging the divide Clearly, alternative development and **conservation models that bridge the nature-people divide are urgently needed** to achieve the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. Indigenous Peoples’ holistic worldviews provide alternative development paradigms, which benefit both people and nature. For example, Indigenous Peoples’ ‘mixed economies’, which combine subsistence and market activities, sustain Indigenous values that underpin biodiversity conservation, while contributing to nutrition, health, wellbeing and climate resilience, and generating income. Local markets and short value chains are often prioritised, rather than global export markets. **Indigenous Peoples have started to shape new community enterprise models that assert control over their territories and promote Indigenous traditions of sustainability and enterprise for the common good**. **These Indigenous enterprises have delivered multiple benefits** for livelihoods, culture, social capital and biodiversity conservation. For example, in the Potato Park in Peru, a Biocultural Heritage Territory governed by six Quechua communities, collective micro-enterprises (for gastronomy, agro-ecotourism, crafts, herbal teas and so on) are guided by Andean principles and holistic wellbeing goals. Ten per cent of the revenues from each micro-enterprise is invested in a communal fund and redistributed annually to reward biocultural heritage stewards and help those in need. Thanks to their ancestral Indigenous knowledge, linked with science, the Potato Park communities have ensured food security despite severe climate change impacts and the COVID-19 pandemic. During the pandemic, the communities donated a ton of potatoes to hungry people in Cusco, in line with the principle of solidarity. The social ties and mutual care and solidarity that Indigenous communities have displayed in the pandemic, highlights the type of social relations that are core to resilient economies and an inclusive green recovery. The concept of 'biocultural heritage', which is derived from Indigenous Peoples’ holistic worldviews and traditions, recognises the inextricable linkages between nature, culture and development. The way forward A new narrative is needed which recognises the highly progressive and dynamic nature of Indigenous knowledge and economic systems that put nature and equity at the heart of development. **Indigenous Peoples have a leading role to play in shaping alternative paradigms to mainstream economic models that are destroying the environment and traditional cultures. Achieving the Sustainable Development** Goals **(SDGs),** **and undoing years of racial injustice** that lie at the root of poverty and inequality**, requires structural reform** across economic and environment sectors, from local to global levels**, to put Indigenous Peoples at the heart of decision-making**. This year provides an opportunity for governments and political leaders to demonstrate real commitment to achieving the SDGs and leaving no one behind. It is not too late to reform the leadership structure for the UN Food Systems Summit in September 2021, so that representatives of poor, hungry, marginalised and Indigenous Peoples play a leading role. Or to reform the proposed post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (PDF), to be agreed at the biodiversity convention COP15 in October, so that the knowledge and leadership of Indigenous Peoples and local communities is integrated across the targets. Indigenous Peoples have answers for many of the world’s most intractable challenges: inequality, ecocide, climate change. We cannot address these challenges without their wisdom and leadership.

# Case

#### NONBLACK PEOPLE SHOULD NOT BE READING affs based on Black suffering TO WIN ROUNDS. That’s an independent voter for accessibility which outweighs since it’s a prerequisite to debate.

Black Debate Community 19 Zion Dixon, Joshua Porter and Quinn Hughes December 29, 2019 “ON NON-BLACK AFROPESSIMISM” - [THE DRINKING GOURD](https://thedrinkinggourd.home.blog/): BLACKNESS, DEBATE AND POLITICS, AT THE END OF THE WORLD <https://thedrinkinggourd.home.blog/> Niggas Academy ZD

“Debate is a game!” “Debate is a game!” “Debate is a game!” How many times are you non-Black people going to use this excuse for your actions? How many times does a Black debater or judge need to tell you this is triggering before you stop? How many times will we have to call you out before you are held accountable? Even better. Why are judges more compelled to hear non-Black people make the same arguments we do? Is it that hard to resist reducing Black flesh to nothingness? You know what? I am just going to say it. You will not like it. You may not even listen. I cannot be silent about this any longer. WE cannot be quiet about this anymore. NON-BLACK PEOPLE SHOULD NOT BE READING AFRO PESSIMISM. Even better, stop using Black suffering and the reality of anti-Blackness to win high school debate rounds. There I said it. If only it were that simple. If only I could be assured you would listen. Non-Black afro pessimism is problematic because our authors take an ontological stance on Blackness. Reading positions centered around Black suffering, oppression, and violence for ballots is disgusting. We have a different relation to the literature and arguments; when I do it, I am confronting the reality of my life. When you do it, your relationship to the positions is entirely different. How do you even relate to it? Stop saying, “oh, debate is a game”. That will not cut it anymore. We are talking about real lives and feelings, and non-Black debaters will never understand the weight of that. We are coping with the reality of an anti-Black world. You guys just think it must suck to be Black. Our authors make claims that Blackness is nonhuman, an object, nonbeing, nothing, outside of this world, a nigger. You people read these cards without taking the time to let it sink in that you might as well call us niggers. The logic of reducing Blackness to an object is all the same. Do you ever think debate might be more than a game to some people? Of course, you don’t. You guys don’t care about us. As a non-Black debater, your relationship to afro pessimism will always be theoretical, redundant, and objectifying. non-Black debaters can read arguments about the topics relationship to Black people, but you cannot reduce Blackness to ontological nothingness. Black people in the debate community talk about this quite often. non-Black debaters will never know how we feel about them reading these positions. We know that. Just respect that.

#### Solely Black expansion into space that does not include indigenous bodies inevitably destroys indigenous spiritual connections to Sky Country – theoretical frames that understand the earth and sky as fundamentally separate ignore the intimate connections between bodies that govern space.

**Mitchell et al 20** – Bawaka Country including A. Mitchell S. Wright S. Suchet-Pearson K. Lloyd L. Burarrwanga R. Ganambarr M. Ganambarr-Stubbs B. Ganambarr D. Maymuru R. Maymuru (this is a lot of authors; you can find qualifications on your own lol)

Mitchell, Audra et. Al. “Dukarr lakarama: Listening to Guwak, talking back to space colonization” Political Geography, Volume 81, August 2020 // sam

“There already are spirits up there, a spiritual story”, Rrawun says, “Guwak, the bird, it is someone’s spirit when someone passes away … When we talk about space, there are people already there”. The songspiral tells us that when Guwak flies with the spirit of a deceased person to Sky Country, that person joins ancestors and kin who dwell there and care for it. Rrawun explains further: “already a person who is related to us lives there for me, my burrku, is given to me as my identity and my authority … I will go there my place of belonging, the place of spirits to again join with my ancestors”. One’s identity and kinship, in other words, are linked not only to relations on earth but also to the relatives dwelling in Sky Country. The inhabitation of Sky Country by ancestors and other kin is common sense within the Guwak songspiral and the broader cosmology it sits within. Yolŋu people are not alone in this knowledge. For example, on Stradbroke Island, Queensland, a man called Mirabooka was placed in the sky by the ‘good spirit’ Biami in order to look after the people of the Earth, and he remains spread across the sky in the form of a constellation (Bhathal, 2006). Kamilaroi people have a communicative relationship with a giant emu whose body is composed of stars and the dark space between them that travels across the sky (Fuller et al., 2014). The Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee peoples of Turtle Island are both descended from Ancestors who came to earth from sky worlds. In fact, the name ‘Anishinaabe’ refers to the fall of the first human from the sky to earth; while the Haudenosaunee descended from Sky Woman, the progenitor of all humans, who fell from a hole in the sky, pregnant with the first humans, and co-created earth with the animals (Johnston, 2010; Watts, 2013). All of these communities recognize and maintain kinship relations with beings (human and nonhuman) who dwell in what Yolŋu recognize as Sky Country (see Krupp, 1999). Activities that alter Sky Country damage the dwelling places of kin and disrupt their relations with people and other beings on earth. Disruptions such as these have had intensely unjust legal implications – for example for Indigenous people in Australia and Canada who have to prove continuity of inhabitation as understood by colonial law, in order to make native title claims (Borrows, 2010; Moreton-Robinson, 2015). Sky Country is, and always has been, continuously inhabited. The way the songspiral is sung confirms kinship structures and shared responsibility to care for Sky Country (Gaw’wu Group of Women et al., 2019). As Rrawun explains, he is responsible for part of the song as it maps onto specific places, but the duty of singing it is shared by others: My song in reality, in Yolŋu will stop at Jaraku, … that is where the song stops, the other clan will take over the story. In Yolŋu way we always share, we don’t own things, nature owns us. We don’t say to a particular animal we own you … Similar to when we sing, the exchanging of the song, half way they will swap over and show the other clan’s song, it’s about sharing, respect, deep understanding of the land, the skies and the universe. Rrawun’s words make clear that Yolŋu people and their kin co-create Sky Country. This does not translate into Western ideas of ownership – least of all those that suggest exclusive control over access, such as the SPACE Act. Instead, Sky Country is governed through plural, overlapping (perhaps sometimes conflictual) layers of responsibility and care undertaken by multiple more-than-human communities. Singing the songspiral is a crucial part of maintaining the negotiations between these communities. Waŋanydja ŋayi yurru dhawalnha ŋupan wanhaka wa€ŋa, yurru ŋayinydja Guwakdja ŋathili yana marŋgi nhalili € ŋayi yurru butthun. Guwak speaks and her echoes reach the lands and the sea of Muŋurru, and from there go up to the skies; she already knows to where she will fly. When Guwak speaks, her cries are heard, not only on earth but also across Sky Country. As Rrawun offers, “The Guwak calls when you arrive at your destination in the River of Stars. It is heard in the stars and the echo is heard in the sea of stars”. In this way, the songspiral tells us that Guwak, and Sky Country communicate and are heard by one another. They have sentience and agency, actively co-constitute one another and communicate through ceremony, song and journeys. Sky Country and the beings that inhabit it are kin. For instance, Djawundil and Ritjilili explain that ŋalindi (the moon) has a moiety – “it has a family, is kin … everyone is related to the moon” (see Burarrwanga et al., 2013). In other words, the more-than-human beings that co-constitute Sky Country are entwined in kinship structures and are part of the web of responsibilities and obligations that shape these structures. This is at odds with the understanding of those NewSpace entrepreneurs who argue that outer space has no ethical standing. Guwak has strong and intimate relationships with Sky Country, having made this journey through and as time/space innumerable times (Bawaka Country incl et al., 2016). Guwak recognizes these places and calls out to them, and they return the call. But what if Guwak cries out and the echoes do not reach the rivers or the seas? What if that Country is no longer there, or if it is damaged beyond recognition? Indeed, the destruction or transformation of Sky Country by space colonization could have detrimental effects on the songspiral, and on the relations it (re)makes. Banbapuy states that these actions would damage the songspirals themselves, and violate the Rom they embody. It might also fundamentally alter the relationships between Yolŋu people and their kin in Sky Country. As Banbapuy tells us, “songlines are there forever. Songlines remain. But in future [after space colonization, we] would be singing about the moon that existed before, but there is nothing there”. Djawundil worries about what would happen to the songspirals if the beings they connect to – the moon, stars, sun, Milky way and so on – were destroyed or tampered with. “I think it would mean danger,” she says, “singing about something that existed before but now it is gone”. The disruption of Sky Country and the songspirals that sing it into being, may not destroy the songspirals entirely – they have always been, and will always be – but the results would be unpredictable. The fact that songspirals are eternal does not justify activities that might damage them, particularly as the results are unknowable. As Sarah observes, this would be akin to arguing that, because a deceased loved one can live on in your heart, it is acceptable to murder that person. In short, permanence of the songspirals does not justify or excuse colonial violence. Bala ŋayi Guwakthu dhakay ŋakulana € watana guyŋarrnha. Guwak feels the cold wind, the south wind, Madirriny. Bala ŋarra yurru ŋurrungunydja marrtji ŋunha wata ŋupan watamirri rirrakay dupthurruna ŋathili € Milŋiyalili, ga Muŋurrulili. From here I will first go to the place from where the cold wind blows, to the stony Country, and speak where my voice will reach space, the River of Stars, Milŋiyawuy, and the sea of Muŋurru. Many advocates of space exploitation argue that their projects would help to protect earth by externalizing dirty industries such as mineral mining to space. But Banbapuy tells us that “there is no difference between the land and the sky. If they mine the land, they are mining the sky”. The reverse is also true: they are all part of Country. In Yolŋu cosmology, there is no clear separation between earth and Sky Country – they are continuous, threaded together by the songspirals that sing them into being. As Banbapuy reminds us, songspirals go all the way deep into the earth, to the depths of the ocean, and out beyond the realm that Western sciences designate as space. What Western thinkers define as Bawaka Country including climate and weather are as much a part of Sky Country as are the stars. Because they are continuous and entwined – literally co-respondent to one another – what happens in Sky Country affects earth, and vice versa. We can see this profound connection as the wind blows from earth all the way to milŋiyawuy, the Milky Way, and the River of Stars and back to the Muŋurru, the sea of stars. Importantly, the flow of continuity is reciprocal – as Ritjilili and Djawundil say, just as the songspirals extend from the center of the earth beyond the sky, “the stars and light shine down to light the rivers here on earth”. Banbapuy describes how the call of Guwak is heard simultaneously between Sea, Earth and Sky Country. “The sound goes up to the River [of Stars] and the echoes are heard in the sea, it bounces from the river to the sea. The echoes get heard by people still living”. Fuller and his colleagues write of resonant knowledge shared by Kamilaroi collaborators, for whom “everything up in the sky was once down on Earth, and the sky and the Earth reversed” (Fuller et al., 2014:23). Within that cosmology, constellations and star formations, including the Milky Way and Southern Cross, not only correspond to places on Earth but are entangled with them, such that what happens in either sphere affects the other – that is, “what’s up there is down here” (Fuller et al., 2014:23). A story shared by Banbapuy, describes the islands of Nalkuma, Murrmurrnga, Wakuwala, Gaywndji, to which the deceased travel, as existing simultaneously in Sky and Sea Country. As Banbapuy explains, “when you are alive you can paddle to the island [in the ocean], when you die you go to [the island in] Sky Country. Before Dad died he went to the island Nalkuma – he lay there – when he was sick – we took him there by helicopter, then he went back home and passed away”. Since these islands exist simultaneously in Sea and Sky Country, to visit one is to visit the other. So, not only is there constant communication and interchange between Sea and Sky Country, but they are connected, inseparably sensitive to each other. Just as the preceding verses of the songspiral tell us that the colonization and exploitation of Sky Country might rupture profound, co-constitutive relationships, this verse shows that the disruption of Sky Country would be reflected in the places on earth to which it corresponds. Reflecting on his grandfather’s maps (see above), Rrawun explains how the stars can be used to find one’s way around Country: When they are lost somewhere they will follow the stars. They will follow stars and also they will follow the wind; if you are lost somewhere in the bush if you see a tree or leaves blowing from the east you will know that I am in this area and that my family is this way and I will follow this in the day time. That’s why ancestors gave everything for our survival technique, so we can survive through that. It is only because of the co-respondence between earth, stars, wind and other beings that people with the right knowledge are able to interpret their connections, intimately know and be intimately known by Country. The model of a separate earth and space erases these relationships and may compromise their continuity by underwriting the disruption of Sky Country. The damage that occurs through the breaking of protocols and the damaging of relationships occurs in ways both known/knowable and unknown/unknowable. There is the clearing of sites on earth, the ’space junk’ orbiting earth (Gorman, 2005), the mis-communications and changing seasonal messages that come when the sky speaks differently, and the deep, lingering ramifications that occur from Law not followed. There is also damage done to the protocols and Laws of more-than-humans, many of which live beyond human understanding. And the ways that futurities/pasts/presents predicated on Indigenous absence, on possession and accumulation, and on the disrespect of protocols will always continue to re-create wrongs. Rrawun also expresses concern over the disruption of the links between Sky Country and Sea and Land Country if they are traversed by those who do not have sufficient knowledge. He asks what might happen if substances from Sky Country were brought back to Country on earth and sea: Say if you travelled 1 million miles up there and then you come back, bring back all the toxic and all the radiation back here on earth, and then go back to space. And could be taking dangerous toxic air waves and spread like viruses. Guwak knows how to travel to Sky Country and back without disrupting or displacing. But would-be space colonizers may not, and may inadvertently bring about cascades of destruction through their ignorance. This is another reason why it is so important to understand how deeply connected Sky Country is with Country on earth. Ŋunhili yukurrana nhina miyalk Nyapililŋu. There lives a sprit woman, Nyapililŋu. Guwak waŋana dhuwala ŋarra yurru marr ganana Dhithi, Gunbalka Rakila. I will leave this place, the essence of my people, with the seep name Dhithi, leave the stony Country, Gunbalka Rakila, from where the string came. Ŋunha ŋupan guyaŋirri watamirri Wurrtjinmirri Dharrpayina. I will chase and remember and fly towards to the Country from where the wind blows, to where it directs me to Maŋgalili Country, nation of Wurrtjinmirri, Dharrpayina, deep clan names for Maŋgalili. Bala butthurrunana warryurrunana burrkundja. I take and pull the string and together we will fly; entwined, we will start the journey, guided, directed by the Milky Way, we fly the universe After the string is finished, after the identification is finished, Guwak will cry to claim that body’s spirit. It’s time to put that body’s spirit into the string. Entwining5 the spirit into the string and flying together where the wind blows from. Starting to journey to the universe. (Banbapuy) As the echoes heard in the songspiral are echoes of Guwak, they are heard for the first time and every time. Guwak has been there all the time – and Guwak has been travelling through Sky Country forever – just as the songspiral has always been sung. But there is also an ethical requirement, an obligation and responsibility to keep singing it, to make sure that it is sung forever. The process of sharing Guwak is a process of intergenerational learning through which Rrawun (and hopefully others) will continue to learn and share the songspiral and carry out this responsibility. To gain permission to share Guwak with us for this paper and our new book, Rrawun spoke to old man Balaka Maymuru, his other eldest brother from an elder brother. Balaka said, “Do it. Because if I pass away, there will be no one else to share the Guwak”. Rrawun is worried that Balaka is getting sick, so he needs all his sons and daughters to wake up and learn the songspirals – “to ensure that our stories are not taken away”. By sharing the songspiral, Rrawun is carrying on the work of his grandfather, one of the first men in the community to open up an art gallery and invite ŋapaki € to participate in ceremonies in the 1970s. This was part of his grandfather’s vision of sharing knowledge through the generations. It is crucial that young men also sing Guwak, keeping it alive in contemporary song. Indeed, Rrawun wrote a song about Guwak and Milngiyawuy, the River of Stars, with his rock band, East Journey. This process of spiraling in, through and as time blurs any neat separations between then and now, between this moment and the eternity of the songspiral, and across generations. Rrawun sees this as part of the work of ensuring continuity: It is the same thing, we are using the same pathway in a different context. Like right now, we are discussing about how great the universe is. We are learning together. We are trying to discover, while we are alive, we are saying, what is going to happen when we pass away. We are all doing that. We are getting the songs, putting the songs in our souls and we will journey with that until later on, the time when we pass away, we will journey, begin the songs and stories, following the songs and stories until we get there, we will know ahh, this is what we were doing. Same thing, I know that song, I am going to put it into contemporary to show what the song talks about. Same thing with life. I know this story, this song, I am going to exercise and maintain it to reach the spiritual world, in a right path. This ethical obligation to make sure that Guwak is sung forever is an important way of taking care of the cosmos, and the kin who dwell throughout it. As Rrawun explains: Guwak is someone’s spirit when someone passes away. The spirit waits until Guwak calls out. It’s like opening the gates to the heavens, to the universe, for the spirit who is carrying the string. It is another way to tell people to look after the universe. When we talk about space, there are people already there. Already. You don’t see but if you believe, it gets passed on. Each time the ceremony is carried out, the songs are sung, the dances danced and Guwak’s flight repeated, Sky Country is remade. Indeed, Sky Country needs to be sung, danced and journeyed into becoming; it is coconstituted by these acts. The songs and ceremonies that re-create Sky Country will, as Rrawun says, continue to exist as long as Yolŋu sing songspirals. In sharing Guwak with you, we hope to learn and remind ourselves and others of our obligations to Sky Country, and how plans to disrupt it might break these bonds.

#### Not only does the aff plan do nothing, it legitimates the fiction that the actions of a coopted settler-colonial state are in fact for the people, while the state continues to make the private sector do its dirty work on command. Klinger 18

Klinger, J. M. (2018). *Rare earth frontiers: From terrestrial subsoils to lunar landscapes*. Cornell University Press.

On November 24, 2015, US president Barack Obama signed the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship Act, which grants US citizens the legal right to claim outer space resources and to bring civil suits against enti- ties that pose “harmful interference” to the exercise of private property rights in outer space. Chapter 513, section 51303 states: “A United States citizen engaged in commercial recovery of an asteroid resource or a space resource under this chapter shall be entitled to any asteroid resource or space resource obtained, includ- ing to possess, own, transport, use, and sell the asteroid resource obtained in ac- cordance with applicable law, including the international obligations of the United States.” This legislation, which passed with bipartisan support,24 is an oblique attack on the reigning res communis regime espoused in the OST and the Moon Treaty. By granting US citizens property rights, primarily over asteroid resources and secondarily over “space” resources, the legislation attempts to present itself as consistent with the very international treaty obligations it undermines. It is physically impossible to mine rare earths for profit on the Moon or on any other body in outer space in a manner that is consistent with the provisions of the OST. **Mining obliterates a given landscape, while profiteering requires exclusive access. This is precisely why mining is so useful for extending territorial control to historically elusive places: because it quite simply, brutally, and unam- biguously eliminates the possibility for other uses of the site in question.** If it is a US company, rather than a US public venture, that establishes an exclusive min- ing site in outer space, the geopolitical ambitions of the United States would, in theory, be served either way. **In this case, the private sector can do the dirty work25 of fulfilling the state’s geopolitical agenda while the public sector provides protections and guarantees to the private sector.** But in fact, **a distinction between the public and private sector obscures more than it clarifies.** After all, many of the new space industries were founded by former state space agency personnel, and many of the most effective advocates for the privatization of space have backgrounds in both finance and government. **State promotion of the private sector in pursuit of lunar mining closely resembles the cases reviewed in the previous two chapters, wherein the private sector was selectively enlisted to execute the territorial agenda of the state.** In this case, **the national government provides force and backing to a risky and illegal venture in exchange for anticipated geopolitical advantages**. This is where critical geopolitics helps us see further than conventional geopolitics. Conventional geopolitics would hold that this is simply twenty-first- century statecraft instrumentalizing the private sector to further national inter- ests. For the moment, this particular contrivance of a public-private divide is conceived as enabling US actors on all sides to maximize benefits and dodge in- ternational treaty obligations while they territorialize the Moon. The flaw in this reasoning is the assumption that all interests are wedded to the US national interest, so the newly empowered private sector is imagined as acting as an extension of government interests. But there is no such guarantee. Critical geopolitics, by contrast, challenges fixed notions of the state and therefore fixed notions of public and private sector interests. Private sector firms, newly em- powered by the US government to sue any entity that damages their private interests in outer space, are free to contract with any paying customer regardless of their national origin or the integrity of their enterprise. With the case of the Moon, the stakes of the state’s investment in private sec- tor mining differ from those discussed in previous chapters. It is not just a matter of pursuing profit and geopolitical control, but of maintaining the status quo of the global political economy. Under the terms of the OST—to which all state ac- tors advancing space mining are party—any mineral extracted from the Moon would have to be distributed in a way that is “to the benefit of all peoples” on Earth. To pursue lunar mining in compliance with the OST would fundamentally change the global political economy of resource production and consumption from profiteering to sharing. There is no having it both ways—the terms of the OST have made it thus. Any state or nonstate entity doing otherwise would clearly be operating with impunity regardless of the verbal gymnastics involved in legislative attempts at the national scale to sidestep these agreements. But by insisting on a false premise of legal ambiguity at best and “chaos” at worst (Whit- tington 2013), **private sector actors can do the dirty work of the state, until such time that international treaties are supplanted or other parties acquiesce to violation as the new norm.** For a particular government to assert the right of its citizenry to mine resources in any particular place, and to secure for that citizenry the right to pursue puni- tive legal action against any entities who interfere with the exercise of their prop- erty rights is, by definition, an assertion of sovereignty over those places, whether they are scattered across multiple celestial bodies or consolidated in one place, such as on the Moon. Such claims directly and unambiguously contradict existing international treaty obligations of the United States. The SPACE Act attempts to evade this by concluding with a Disclaimer of Extraterritorial Sovereignty, elabo- rated in Section 403: “It is the sense of Congress that by the enactment of this Act, the United States does not thereby assert sovereignty or sovereign or exclusive rights or jurisdiction over, or the ownership of, any celestial body.” The United States need not assert sovereignty over an entire celestial body in order to claim a particular territory therein. After all, that is how the political ge- ography of Earth is organized: no single state controls the entirety of the celestial body we call home, but that does not negate the sovereignty of 192 national gov- ernments over their respective territories. The verbal gymnastics of the SPACE Act do not succeed in side-stepping the OST’s prohibition of assertions of national sovereignty “by means of use or occupation, or by any other means” (UN 1967, Article II). None of this is to suggest that a coherent agenda exists between the state and the private sector. Advocates of privatized space exploitation have multiple per- spectives on the role of the state. Some denigrate civilian space exploration as too slow (Wingo, Spudis, and Woodcock 2009) and bogged down in bureaucracy, which inhibits the fantastic innovation potential of the private sector (Jones 2013). Others see the state as critical to securing their investments. Of the signing of the SPACE act of 2015, Eric Anderson, cofounder and cochairman of Planetary Re- sources, Inc. gushed: “This is the single greatest recognition of property rights in history. This legislation establishes the same supportive framework that created the great economies of history, and will encourage the sustained development of space” (quoted in Navarro 2015). Regardless of their perspective, **private sector interlocutors are working toward capturing maximum possible support** and minimal regulatory intervention **from the public sector**. This effectively translates into massive transfers of public wealth to private hands while reducing oversight mechanisms concerning the use of that wealth. This coheres with the extensively theorized relationship between the “re- treat of the state” and the “financialization of everything” under contemporary neoliberalism. But as with other cases examined in this book, this is not simply a case of deregulation, but also of reregulation. **The proliferation of commercial space agencies represents not a retreat of the state per se, but rather a reconfiguration of state functions to support a program of redistributing public assets into the private sector in the name of beating a bogeyman from the East.** Indeed, the most vocifer- ous political, public, and legal opinion holds that the private sector should lead the way, and that “**the** **government should focus on its role as enabler**” (Whitehorn 2005). This is overwhelmingly compatible with the US government’s approach since the end of the Cold War (United States House of Representatives 1998).

#### The Aff starts from a position of philosophical abstraction which makes Debate less relevant for people of color that prevents revolutionary analysis.

hooks 90, bell. "Postmodern blackness." Postmodern Culture 1.1 (1990). (black feminist and author)//Elmer

**It is** sadly **ironic** that the **contemporary discourse** which talks the most about heterogeneity, the decentered subject, declaring breakthroughs **that allow recognition of otherness**, **still directs its critical voice primarily to a specialized audience**, one that **shares** a **common language rooted in** the very **master narratives** it claims to challenge. **If radical** postmodernist **thinking** **is to have a** **transformative impact** then a critical break with the notion of "authority" as "mastery over" **must not simply be a rhetorical device, it must be reflected in habits of being**, including styles of writing as well as chosen subject matter. Third-world **scholars**, especially elites, and white critics **who** **passively absorb** white supremacist **thinking**, and therefore never notice or look at black people on the streets, at their jobs, who render us invisible with their gaze in all areas of daily life, **are not likely to produce liberatory theory that will challenge racist domination**, or to promote a breakdown in traditional ways of seeing and thinking about reality, ways of constructing aesthetic theory and practice. From a different standpoint Robert Storr makes a similar critique in the global issue of \_Art in America\_ when he asserts: To be sure, much postmodernist critical inquiry has centered precisely on the issues of "difference" and "otherness." On the **purely theoretical plane** the exploration of these concepts has produced some important results, but in the absence of any sustained research into what artists of color and others outside the mainstream might be up to, such discussions **become rootless instead of radical**. Endless second guessing about the latent imperialism of intruding upon other cultures only compounded matters, preventing or excusing these theorists from investigating what black, Hispanic, Asian and Native American artists were actually doing. Without adequate concrete knowledge of and contact with the non-white "other," white theorists may move in discursive theoretical directions that are threatening to and potentially disruptive of that critical practice which would support radical liberation struggle.

#### Imperfect theorizing does not justify lack of action – saying we should not reduce the material harm of minorities is violent paternalism.

Delgado 13 — Richard Delgado, John J. Sparkman Chair of Law at the University of Alabama, holds a J.D. from the University of California-Berkeley, 2013 (“The Ethereal Scholar: Does Critical Legal Studies Have What Minorities Want?,” *Arguing About Law*, Edited by Aileen Kavanagh and John Oberdiek, Published by Routledge, ISBN 1135029148, p. 589)//Elmer

2. The CLS critique of piecemeal reform **Critical scholars reject** the idea of **piecemeal reform.** Incremental change, they argue, merely postpones the wholesale reformation that must occur to create a decent society.38 Even worse, an unfair social system survives by using piecemeal reform to disguise and legitimize oppression.39 Those who control the system weaken resistance by pointing to the occasional concession to, or periodic court victory of, a black plaintiff or worker as evidence that the system is fair and just.40 In fact, Crits believe that teaching the common law or using the case method in law school is a disguised means of preaching incrementalism and thereby maintaining the current power structure.41 To avoid this, CLS scholars urge law professors to abandon the case method, give up the effort to find rationality and order in the case law, and teach in an unabashedly political fashion.42 The CLS **critique** of piecemeal reform **is** familiar, **imperialistic and wrong**. **Minorities know** from bitter experience **that** occasional court **victories do not mean the Promised Land** is at hand.43 The critique is imperialistic in that it tells minorities and other oppressed peoples how they should interpret events affecting them.44 **A court order directing** a housing authority to disburse **funds** **for** **heating in** subsidized **housing** **may postpone the revolution**, or it may not. **In the meantime**, **the order keeps a number of poor families warm**. This may mean more to them than it does to a comfortable academic working in a warm office. **It smacks of paternalism to assert that the possibility of revolution later outweighs the certainty of heat now**, unless there is evidence for that possibility. The Crits do not offer such evidence. Indeed, some incremental changes may bring revolutionary changes closer, not push them further away. Not all small reforms induce complacency; some may whet the appetite for further combat. The welfare family may hold a tenants’ union meeting in their heated living room. CLS scholars’ critique of piecemeal reform often misses these possibilities, and neglects the question of whether total change, when it comes, will be what we want.

#### Defining space as “mass exploitation” substitutes the colonizer’s vision of space for the Black vision---instead, Blackness should validate space on its own terms, an act of reclamation

**Morgan, 18** – Professor, Santa Clara Department of English, specializes in African-American literature in the 20th and 21st centuries Dr. Danielle Fuentes Morgan, “Looking Forward, Looking Back: Afrofuturism and Black Histories in Neo-Slave Narration,” Journal of Science Fiction. Volume 2, Issue 3, July 2018

Remembering Otherwise and Fluidity of Time Both The Slave and Kindred begin with a prologue spoken in the voice of the black protagonist. This convention is especially significant because it revamps and reimagines the traditional “preface to blackness” found in slave narratives where the story is validated through the words of a white abolitionist who speaks to the legitimacy of the text and the decency of its author. In The Slave and Kindred, however, the expected “preface to blackness” becomes “blackness as preface.” Blackness now has the opportunity to stand alone and validate itself – it need not be situated in anything other than itself. Likewise, Baraka and Butler implicate their readers as they wonder how personal slavery must be for its impact to be recognized in the present. Dana ultimately kills Rufus as he – no longer the little boy she nurtured, helped to raise, and saved countless times – attempts to rape her on her last trip to antebellum Maryland. As he falls on her while she suddenly travels back to 1976, her arm is caught within the plaster of her own home as it rematerializes. She is literally and figuratively forever scarred by her engagement with slavery – the weight of slavery and the slave master lingering forever as acute trauma – and she struggles to understand what she has experienced. As she and Kevin travel to Maryland in their present day to research her ancestry, she nervously ponders why she is interested. Kevin gently posits, “You probably needed to come for the same reason I did… To try to understand. To touch solid evidence that those people existed. To reassure yourself that you’re sane” (Butler, 1976, p. 264). His assertion holds echoes of the white male supremacy he has come to more overtly embody – the idea that Dana, who will bear a lost arm as remnants of her time in the antebellum period, needs concrete evidence is not only absurd but damning evidence of his inability to empathize with Dana’s experience in any effectual way. He finishes both his statement and the novel itself by saying, “And now that the boy is dead, we have some chance of staying that way” (Butler, 1976, p. 264). This is certainly a statement about slavery, but also a statement about living in a society with slavery couched in its past. It is telling that the novel ends with Kevin’s certainty that they may now remain sane because Rufus’s death seems to insure that Dana won’t be summoned back against her will. Yet Dana never articulates this same comfort in predicted sanity, or even the possibility of sanity. As a black woman, she has been forever changed by slavery. Her scars are notable and distracting – what further “evidence” might she need? While Kevin bears a scar on his forehead, Dana loses an arm, retains the scars from whippings on her back, and suffers from Post Traumatic Slave Syndrome in the most literal sense. For Kevin, this is mere inconvenience. He forgets that in their 20th century context, “the boy” has always been dead, and they’ve still had no chance of moving past this racialized trauma, on either ancestral or national levels, whether they physically return to the present or not. Ultimately, the Afrofuturist mode reasserts humanity through neo-slave narratology by depicting a not-so-distant past that isn’t, in fact, even past. The connection to slavery and the necessity of remembering it, and remembering it otherwise, grows more insistent and more acute as a response to the neoliberal impulse to be rid of race, thereby somehow eradicating racism – as if it is race, rather than racism, that merits our condemnation. Afrofuturism posits the permanence of race while refusing race itself as an inherent social ill. Instead, it acknowledges racism as an inherent evil and opens up space for black autonomy that pushes the boundaries of the present day parameters of racialization. For this reason, the slave remains a necessary context for considering black personhood in a variety of evolving art forms. I am reminded here of Janelle Monáe’s album and subsequent performances as The Electric Lady (2013), the pure embodiment of black liberatory spirit in both human and mechanical form. Grace D. Gipson (2016) argues that when Monáe takes on the persona of Cindi Mayweather, an android sent from the distant future to our near future to emancipate the citizens from a society without love – because aren’t these conversations about emancipation and liberation and liberatory love tantamount to the black experience itself? – it is the Afrofuturist mode itself that allows her “to present new and innovative perspectives and pose questions that are not typically addressed in canonical works” (p. 92). In Monáe’s articulation, futurity closely resembles the past and present, where there is no utopic sense of post-racialization or inherent equality. Ultimately, the figure of the android stands in for new neoliberal ways to marginalize beyond overt declarations of race and racism and new realms for the Other to emerge; it also represents new possibilities for revolution and freedom in the changing same of black identity. Indeed, this Afrofuturist mode opens up a space for Monáe to imagine, like Baraka, how the articulated black self might beget revolution and, like Butler, what it might mean to embrace intersectional narratives and dwell in the interstices of blackness and womanhood as revolution begins. Saidiya Hartman (1997) argues convincingly that after emancipation, On one hand, the constraints of race were formally negated by the stipulation of sovereign individuality and abstract equality, and on the other, racial discriminations and predilections were cherished and protected as beyond the scope of law. Even more unsettling was the instrumental role of equality in constructing a measure of man or descending scale of humanity that legitimated and naturalized subordination (p. 121). With abolition, American society ostensibly embraced notions of comparative and tacit equality while systematically marginalizing blackness and criminalizing black bodies. As society moved further away from the chattel system, the roots of this marginalization were lost and replaced by a comfortable cultural amnesia that instead suggests that a distantly sympathetic perspective will suffice in consideration of slavery – no one is accountable, no one presently benefits, and no one need consider any lasting ramifications or significance. These works seek to redeem traditionally marginalized blackness through an Afrofuturistic mode that overtly parallels slavery with black experiences in the 20th century and beyond – in this way, they emphasize that slaves resisted and had a sense of black pride that is often overlooked contemporarily. Through their utilization of the past and weighty consideration of the present, both authors are attempting to elevate the overlooked humanity of African Americans by connecting the black experience through the centuries. In this way, when these neo-slave narratives are engaged through Afrofuturism, they reestablish slavery not as an overdetermining facet of black life, but instead as an inescapable reality of black existence within the national imaginary. Indeed, as these works demonstrate, there can be no black futurity without necessarily acknowledging slavery’s impact and continued reach.

#### Outright refusal of space forecloses alternative, non antiblack futures---the alternative refuses the 1AC’s refusal as a gesture towards afrofuturist uses of space are an act of reclamation that creates alternate spaces for Black life within antiblack structures

**Hamilton, 17** - An assistant professor at Fort Valley State University. Her research interests include Afrofuturism and feminism as they relate to art history

Elizabeth C. Hamilton, “Afrofuturism and the Technologies of Survival.” African Arts, Volume 50, Number 4, Winter 2017. Pp. 18-23.<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/677241/pdf> brackets for gendered language

Situating the Afronaut in contemporary art and Afrofuturism is very much about ­finding safe spaces for black life. It is about exploring and protecting and preparing the body for hostile environments. In an Afrofuturist vision that stakes out black space in the future, black life is often obscured and simultaneously endangered. This obscurity is the result of the overdetermination of the past on black future spaces, namely the baggage of colonialism and apartheid, slavery and Jim Crow, and legacies of displacement. through the image of the Afronaut, artists are making defi­nitive statements about current situations of liberation, freedom, and oppression, while simultaneously referencing the past and staking a place for black life in the future. Tegan Bristow, interestingly, situates the Afrofuturist legacy within the trajectory of “the black man in space” (Bristow 2012). Several other theorists, such as J. Grith Rollefson, also adopt this trajectory, acknowledging Sun Ra and Parliament Funkadelic (P-Funk) as the progenitors of Afrofuturist thought. Bristow notes that “by placing the black [people] ~~man~~ in space, out of the reach of racial stereotypes, Afrofuturism allows for a critique of both Western culture and technoculture” (Bristow 2012:26). I do not want to reduce Bristow’s article to just “the black man in space.” She also makes interesting claims about the relationship Afrofuturism has to art in Africa, but notes its potential to be global and not centered on the West. She points out the centrism of the United States in theories of Afrofuturism. She is correct in this assessment, but it is not because Afrofuturism doesn’t apply to the arts of Africa. Addressing technoculture broadly and technology as a medium especially in music, Bristow notes the potential for a global theory that reects the hybridity of African experience as well as the opportunity to decentralize identity and the totalizing views of African culture. Afrofuturist thinkers, such as Kodwo Eshun and Alondra Nelson, have indicated the overwhelming tendency of Western visions of Africa to indicate impending doom and disaster. e tendency has also been to disqualify Africa from claims of technological invention and innovation in favor of a discourse of tradition. Elsewhere I wrote about how this tendency has more to do with the validity and prosperity of art markets as they trac in authenticity and tradition (almost fetishizing the possibility) and the stubborn persistence of imposing a chronologically driven canon upon African art. I would like to address technology as a subject recurring in the various costumes of the Afronaut depicted across the Diaspora in various media and formats. J. Grith Rollefson argues that “Afrofuturism is most prominent in music … because a number of its artists have continually highlighted the mythic qualities of both historical tropes of magic and futuristic narratives of science through the seemingly paradoxical ­gure of the soulful spaceman” (2008:86–87). He thereby centers the “soulful spaceman” as icon in Afrofuturism. The “black man in space” is a signi­cant symbol and signal ubiquitous in music of the 1970s, but is making a resurgence in the twenty-­rst century as the Afronaut in contemporary art of Africa and the African Diaspora. I contend that this resurgence is a response to current oppressive conditions, such as extrajudicial killings of black people in the United States and continued human rights disparities based on race elsewhere in the world. Artists are asking through these works containing Afronauts: What are the technologies of survival? e artists parallel these images of technologies with black people’s predicament in a white supremacist society. e word “Afronaut” is a neologism, so it is dicult to pin down its roots or know when and where it was ­rst used. For the purposes of this research, the Afronaut is a person of African descent who travels through outer space. e term seems to have gained popularity with the advent of African space programs, like the one in Zambia in the 1960s (De Middel 2012). As the race for space by countries like Nigeria continues and the ­rst South African-born astronaut will be launched into space, the term gets more popular, fascinatingly, through artists’ imaginings of the Afronaut (Monks 2016, “Mandla Maseko” 2014). Several artists, such as Daniel Kojo Schrade, Gerald Machona, and Robert Pruitt, have adopted the term “Afronaut” to describe the subjects in their projects, while others have applied the label loosely to those subjects in art that convey the theme of space travel. I made this determination from the most obvious accoutrement—space suits, helmets, boots, rockets, ships—which are ubiquitous in the work I examine. ere is also a conscious naming of the artwork that classi­es the subjects as Afronauts (Nick Cave’s and Yinka Shonibare’s work is less obvious in this sense). Afronaut is an obvious play on astronaut that reveals the ethnic identity of the space traveler. ere are deeper implications, which also indicate an eternal tension between African identity and technological stasis. In a linguistic sense, the Afronaut is a tense construction, an oxymoron in a sense: afro–naut, when taken in consideration with stereotypical notions of African-ness and technological advancement. Alondra Nelson (2002) indicates this in her now-canonical Social Text issue about Afrofuturism. is tension between blackness and technology is also evident in the conversation between Mark Dery, Tricia Rose, Greg Tate and Samuel Delaney (Dery 1993). Whereas Dery believes that black artists will shun technology, Rose, Tate, and Delaney challenge this assumption. Elsewhere, I have written that Afrofuturism is the injection of futurity, fantasy, and technology in the arts of Africa and the African Diaspora (Hamilton 2013). is de­nition has expanded tremendously, as contemporary situations in art and contemporary events are in constant ux. Presently, I defi­ne Afrofuturism as a mechanism for understanding the real world situations of oppression in the contemporary world in the context of the ever-present past, while charting the future situation through the arts. My prior de­nition was bogged in recovery and optimism; I am open to the possibility that neither of these exist as options. To understand Afrofuturism as a mechanism, I developed a visual, a casual graph, that addressed the interdependence of certain terms to Afrofuturist thought in the visual arts (Fig. 1). In this graphic, Afrofuturism as a mechanism relies on not just the injection of futurity, fantasy, and technology, but also an ever-present orientation toward black liberation that draws its strength from liberation movements in the past. ere is a tendency to romanticize here, though. Other characteristics that keep Afrofuturistic visual arts grounded are the reliance on the material (materiality), the manipulation of temporality, and the impetus for artists to demonstrate all sorts of transformations. e former de­nition is still relevant. However, an expansion is needed to accommodate the moving target that visual speculation and visual science ­ction narratives encompass. By its very nature, these types of narratives—whether in cinematic, literary, or visual art—progress, evolve, and artists are constantly innovating. An insistence on materiality, rather than a nebulous reliance on concept, is remarkable in Afrofuturist works. e material does not by any means subordinate the subject, but it is signi­- cant to the understanding of each work of art. e transformative nature of Afrofuturist art addresses not only the subject, but also the audience. Afrofuturist art is a mechanism for understanding and making meaning for audiences—transforming them in the process is its goal. e artwork I examine is overwhelmingly ­gural; therefore, the subjects are always going through profound physical changes that have some eect on their spiritual or mental states. Temporality is in constant ux with time travelers and artists as temporal interlopers. As temporal interlopers, artists are constantly making useful space for the past to make a stake in the present or the future. From the time the notion of Afrofuturism was ­rst conceptualized—by Mark Dery in 1993 and expounded upon a decade later by Alondra Nelson—the situation of the alien and the outsider have played prominently. Afrofuturism seemed like the natural way to discuss the ri‑ that black people felt with the dominant culture in the United States. However, theorizing about Africa was le‑ by the wayside even though the interfaces are fruitful and ripe for the picking. e art of Yinka Shonibare, Nick Cave, and Gerald Machona demonstrates trends of the Afronaut across the diaspora as well as the overlaps of experiences of people of African descent across the globe. They expand the idea of the black man in space with the notion that we are already in alien environments. e three artists discussed here are male, and the overwhelmingly masculine ­gures they create are worth noting, considering that the black female body is also in danger in a white supremacist society. eir ­gurative works of various media adorn the black human ­gure in the technologies that are needed to survive, but the absence of the woman in space as Afronaut is a glaring omission in the artworks discussed in this paper. Yinka Shonibare is a British-Nigerian artist whose conceptual project relies on the duplicitous messages communicated through fabrics deemed “African” by European textile merchants. Speci­cally, Dutch wax print fabric is brightly colored, elaborately designed cotton marketed to countries in Africa. It has been adopted as an exemplar of African culture, even though it has no origins in the countries to which it is marketed. is duplicity is what interests Shonibare and why he uses Dutch wax print fabrics, as they are ubiquitous in his oeuvre of (usually) headless human forms. e fabric communicates the constructed-ness of identity and cultural heritage and its inherent diculties in “pinning down” origins in a global society. With the fabric, Shonibare is able to address important issues about creativity and identity (speci­cally African) and the notions of authenticity that o‑en bog down understanding of African art and ideas of belonging that plague the diasporic, nomadic artist. Shonibare’s biographers have addressed the idea of the alien in Shonibare’s work, but this seems awkward to me. is is where the astronaut, the particularity of the Afronaut especially, comes into play. Shonibare’s diverse media and ways of working in his Afronaut works are very much about mediating the spatial, not so much the temporal. Human subjects in astronaut accoutrement are not traveling though deep space; they are navigating Earth utilizing the technologies of survival needed to engage the problems associated with immigration, exile, colonialism, and the attendant xenophobia and racism. Shuttling between Britain and Nigeria is not necessarily alien when one considers the spatial slippages resulting from the legacies of colonialism. Place is rather arbitrary considering those legacies of conquest. e made-up, politically imposed boundaries make and mark identities in the same arbitrary ways that the Dutch wax print makes something authentically African. But the boundaries are signi­cant, nonetheless, and have real-life consequences, especially for refugees and migrants, those vulnerable to the spatial slippages and violence that results. e violence does manifest itself through racist and xenophobic policies that create outsiders and noncitizens. Consequently, I believe the Afronaut is a more cogent symbol than the alien for communicating the situation of the refugee and the migrant. Shonibare’s installations depicting astronauts demonstrate the strength of this symbol. e ­gure of the Afronaut seems to begin in Shonibare’s work at the turn of the century. Into the new millennium, Shonibare began a conversation about futurity, fantasy, and technology that is in concert with space exploration. e ­gures are all costumed in African wax print fabric, helmets, and space boots. Various accoutrement for travel makes each installation distinct. Cloud 9 (2000)1 consists of a mannequin in an astronaut’s costume made of Dutch wax print fabric. e ­gure stands beside a ag made from a dierent print of Dutch wax print fabric. e installation photograph is reminiscent of Neil Armstrong’s “conquest” of the moon. e image also brings to mind themes of conquest and colonization on Earth, speci­cally on the African continent. Vacation (2002)2 depicts a family of astronauts, two adults and two children, who are attached to what appears to be oxygen packs. ey wear helmets and boots also. eir helmets are all oriented towards the ground, as if they are searching for something. e title denotes a leisure activity, but the astronaut suits and the searching complicate the assumptions of leisure. One child is seemingly separated from the rest of the family and his suit fabric is dierent. Perhaps this installation demonstrates Shonibare’s own anxieties about being a cosmopolitan nomad— someone who traverses continents eortlessly, but whose identity requires more eort to “pin” down. But pinning down isn’t the goal for Shonibare. e opposite seems to be true. roughout his body of work he is interested in the uidity of identity and the sometimes dubious implications of ethnic content in his work. e astronaut ­gures are no dierent, but they speak to the sustained feeling of isolation and otherness that people of color feel when traversing white spaces. e environments are sometimes hostile; so, the technologies that they wear are a necessity. Space Walk (2002)3 demonstrates the drive for survival in a hostile and alien environment. Shonibare’s artistic process diers in this installation, because he designed and created the silkscreened fabric himself as an artist in residence at the Fabric Workshop and Museum in Philadelphia. e installation includes two figures dressed in the trademark fabrics of Shonibare’s oeuvre. e fabric features vocal artists native to Philadelphia and responsible for the so-called Philly Sound. e ­gures are suspended from the ceiling along with a half-size replica of the Apollo 13 shuttle, which is made from ­berglass and wood. e ­gures wear backpacks, helmets, and boots. eir suits are attached to the replica of the space ship with tubes covered in the colorful fabric. Refugee Astronaut (2012)4 features a single ­gure dressed in a Dutch wax print astronaut’s suit. A net full of survival items burden this astronaut’s back. Pans, ropes, and a lantern are visible through the net. e items tell the story of an itinerant astronaut, who has yet to ­nd home. Instead, he travels with his most important belongings from place to place. e tubes that are connected to the spaceship in Space Walk are connected back into the astronaut’s suit in Refugee Astronaut. e latter installation emphasizes a sense of homelessness with the placement of the tubes and a notable lack of the mothership that we see in the former installation. A cool sky blue dominates the costume that is interspersed with ­ery orange and red forms. e contrast brings to mind the conicting situations of actual refugees. All of these astronaut-themed installations point to Afrofuturism and technologies of survival for people of color in Europe in the United States. Nick Cave is a multimedia artist from the United States who made his ­rst Soundsuit in 1992 in response to the Rodney King beating. King was an unarmed citizen whose brutal and sustained beating during a trac stop by the Los Angeles Police Department was caught on videotape and disseminated to the media, causing a public outcry that led to a trial and subsequent acquittal of the oending ocers. Cave’s feelings of vulnerability as a black man in a white supremacist society guided the construction of a protective apparatus that he called a Soundsuit for its kinetic and sonic qualities. e Soundsuit is an Afrofuturist project that adopts the themes of fantasy to create safe spaces for black bodies. Moreover, the performers in the suits function like the Afronaut, who need a protective layer in a hostile environment. In a world where black people can be beaten, and even killed, without legal retribution, Cave desired “a kind of outerwear to protect (his) spirit,” he says.5 e ­rst Soundsuit was made from detritus to reect the ways that black people and their true identities are discarded and dismissed through racial pro­ling. e collection of found objects are assembled to form a suit of armor that protects against the outside world and its racism. For over two decades, Cave has continued to make the Soundsuits and they continue to maintain their relevance to current events in the United States. Cave’s Soundsuits have been compared to synthesized versions of African masquerade performances. e Soundsuits do not just function visually, but have kinetic and sonic functions that support this claim. When they are worn, they are activated in ways that harness “the power within the black male, that intimidation and scariness” in addition to preliminary protective function.6 Although this quote from Cave emphasizes the masculinity of the Soundsuit’s function, history demonstrates that women are also vulnerable and are in need of a similar harnessing of power. In some ways, that intimidation and scariness becomes its own performer and takes on a life of its own in narratives about black people in interactions with police. e fantastical nature of the costumes mimics the imaginary nature of the presumed deviance and violence of black people. While his messages and meanings remain consistent, Cave’s materials and messages have changed throughout his history as an artist. e labor-intensive process of assembling found objects to create Soundsuits is now the work of multiple assistants who commit Cave’s visions to reality. How he ­nds objects has also changed. e objects are not simply discarded, but also constructed by artisans and bought from thri‑ shops. is alters the process of ­nding and repurposing discarded items. Cave claims that through the objects that he carefully chooses for his Soundsuits the viewer can come to an understanding of the world and how to navigate it through her relationship to memory. is mnemonic process is evident in Cave’s Soundsuit for Trayvon Martin, titled TM 13 (Fig. 2). Martin was a teenager murdered by George Zimmerman a‑er visiting a store to buy a so‑ drink and candy. Zimmerman was acting under the auspices of the neighborhood watch and was subsequently acquitted with the aid of Florida’s Stand Your Ground Law, which allows armed citizens judicial leniency for self defense. e acquittal led to the rallying cry and movement: “Black Lives Matter.” In Cave’s imagining of a Soundsuit for Martin, the body is shrouded in a protective net that is made of brightly colored beads that mimic and recall the Skittles that Martin never got to enjoy that fateful night. ough obscured by the beaded net, the costume underneath is equally compelling7 : a black mannequin wears sneakers, a hoodie, and jeans. Surrounding the mannequin are plastic yard decorations, typically used at Christmas and Halloween—a cherubic-looking Santa Claus and a costumed teddy bear. ese playful ­gures recall the innocence lost and the clothing reects a sort of vulnerability. Cave refers to the holiday ­gures as guardians. e net of beads in gold with red, black, and green, the colors of the black liberation ag. e net encases the body—traps it, yet protects it. rough the Soundsuits, Cave’s Afrofuturist project imagined a technology of survival that is performative and meditative on the materials that he chooses. Gerald Machona’s Vabvakure (People from Far Away) (2013) is both a short ­lm and installation. Machona is a Zimbabweborn artist commenting on the collapse of Zimbabwe and the subsequent upheaval and migration of people into South Africa. With the works, Machona comments on the nature of migration and refugee status in South Africa for people from Zimbabwe. e life-size Ndiri Afronaut (I am an Afronaut) (2012), which is performed in the short ­lm, is made from decommissioned Zimbabwean dollars, foam padding, fabric, wood, Perspex, rubber, plastic tubing, nylon thread, and gold leaf. e migration was not without diculties, however. South Africans rejected the Zimbabwean refugees and created a racial and social hierarchy similar to apartheid.8 Vabvakure opens with a discombobulated Afronaut, trying to compose himself a‑er landing in a desert.9 His costume is disheveled—tubes are loose and a space boot is strewn to the side. He dizzily moves around and then begins to dance. As if remaking a scene from Neil Armstrong’s famous lunar landing, the Afronaut plants his ag, which resembles the ag of Zimbabwe, but Machona’s ag is metallic and has the same decommissioned Zimbabwean dollars as the astronaut suit. e Afronaut then ventures away from the landing site, which he has claimed with his ag. e suit functions as the Afronaut’s protection, but it also represents economic instability and, consequently, vulnerability in a foreign environment. e Afronaut’s intentions in the new place are its conquest despite that vulnerability communicated through the defunct currency. Next, the Afronaut ­nds a plant specimen and puts it into a vessel. e plant is obviously alien and arti­cial and looks to be made of the same currency as the other items. e Afronaut ends up at an ATM, which is strange considering that his suit is made of money, but it emphasizes that the currency that comprises the suit is defunct. In the next scene, the Afronaut is carrying the plant specimen down the street. He arrives in front of a crowded store, where people stare, and he retrieves a shopping cart and places his plant specimen in it. e camera focuses on the uprooted plant in an alien environment as the Afronaut pushes it through the store. People stare and one can only compare the two—the plant and the Afronaut traversing the land as outsiders. e Afronaut retrieves water from the store shelves, people point and stare, and then he heads to the cashier to pay for his purchase. He leaves the grocery store and stops in front of a fast food restaurant. At this point, the Afronaut opens the vessel of the plant specimen and pours in the water that he just purchased. He closes the vessel and places the plant specimen in his backpack. e Afronaut nourishes and protects the plant in ways that underscore its displacement. In this way, the specimen and the Afronaut are parallel. To end the ­lm, Machona emphasizes the performative nature of the ­lm, by focusing on the audience screening and viewing the Afronauts costumes in the next scenes. Groups of people stoop over the suits, discussing them, and pointing, and touching and even trying to get into them. e technologies of survival in Machona’s work are in response to the abject violence against Zimbabweans who ed to South Africa, which came to a head in 2008, but persist presently. What are these artists saying about the black body in their work? That it is fragile, permeable, and under attack. It is fungible and open to meanings that may destroy it. THrough Afrofuturism, the technologies of survival mitigate these dangers as the black body navigates space. The body and the attendant identity is in orbit, but not always freely navigating the space.

#### Settler colonialism is the foundation of hyperreality – the simulacrum of the ‘Red Man’ provides the tools to create and erase truths like indigenous histories – K first

Graham 16 Matthew C. Graham, February 2016, “Heralding the Other: Sousa, Simulacra, and Settler Colonialism,” Action, Criticism, & Theory for Music Education Journal Volume 15 Number 2, <http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Graham15_2.pdf>

Settler Colonialism as a Structure Settler colonialism is a specific colonial configuration in which a substantial population immigrates into a foreign territory. This invasion (Wolfe 2006) is not intended as a finite, temporary occupation, but rather a permanent settlement. Although colonizing forces often leverage the political and military might of an imperial state or homeland (and, for a time, might retain allegiances to that authority), the legitimacy of the occupation is ultimately justified from within the settler colony. Whereas external modes of colonialization maintain a strong distinction between homeland and colony, settler colonialism operates through the reconfiguration of the latter into the former [colony into the homeland] (Veracini 2013). This metamorphosis is never totalizing or complete; it must be continually maintained and enforced. Thus, settler colonialism is not an event but an omnipresent, oppressive social structure (Wolfe 1999, 2006; Glenn 2015). Tuck and Yang (2012) offer a framework for understanding settler colonialism in the United States as a process entangling three groups; (1) the settler colonialists of Western European descent, (2) the indigenous people whose presence on the land precedes the settler colonialist, and (3) the African “chattel slave” forced laborers (6). In this framework, the ongoing processes of disenfranchising indigenous people and exploiting black labor are necessary for the realization of the settler colonist’s capitalist interests. Settler colonialism can be seen in specific events (such as the massacre at Wounded Knee and the Dred Scott case) and legal institutions (like slavery and the reservation system). Examining only discrete and overt manifestations, however, obfuscates the presuppositions through which the above atrocities could be justified. Therefore, we must examine the unspoken assumptions that allowed for the perpetration of these historic events as well as perpetuates current expressions of settler colonialism. The generic depictions of indigenous people, settlers of European descent, and African slaves and their descendants are prime examples of such presuppositions. Traditionally, these discursively assumed norms have been termed “stereotypes” (e.g. Stedman 1982; Mindiola, Niemann, and Rodriguez 2009); however, it has been argued that stereotypes are exaggerations of extant features and, thus, are grounded in reality and experience (Judd and Park 1993). Within settler colonialism, this is not true; these depictions emerge not from experience but out of a need for mechanisms to maintain a specific societal configuration. Baudrillard’s notion of simulacra offers a way to think about these depictions within settler colonialism, independent of the groups to whom the representations purport to correspond. Stereotypes and Simulacra The simulacrum is never that which conceals the truth—it is the truth which conceals that there is none. The simulacrum is true. (Ecclesiastes1, in Baudrillard 1994, 1) The eminent French philosopher Jean Baudrillard offers the simulacrum (and its plural, simulacra) as that which purports to serve as a representation of the real (or at least that-which-is-real in abstraction) but in fact precedes it, functioning without relationship to reality. It is the evocation of an ideal type, a caricaturized generalization whose authenticity is derived solely from the discursive regimes inside of which it is embedded. It is the ascription of a category that does not exist, hailed into existence by and as the simulacrum (Baudrillard 1994). The philosophic conception of “simulacra” can be traced to Plato’s dialogues (Childers and Hentzi 1995). In Sophist, Plato cites the practice of exaggerating certain features within an artistic composition in order for the overall work to appear correct to the viewer. In order for the mammoth statues of antiquity (such as the Statue of Zeus at Olympia) to seem proportionate to an observer at its base, features such as the upper torso and head had to be shaped disproportionately large in comparison to the overall structure. The veracity of this representation corresponds to artist’s conception of the intended audience’s engagement with the work rather than to reality. Plato differentiates this corrupt representation from the authentic image: the simulacrum from an accurate reproduction of the real. Plato likened this artistic practice to the philosophic tendency to distorting the truth in order to substantiate the validity of an example (Plato 2001). Thus, it is the Platonic task to adjudicate representations as either “good” or “bad” (Deleuze 1983). The key distinction between Baudrillard’s application of the term simulacrum and its Platonic heritage stems from the relation of the image to reality. In the Platonic sense, a simulacrum is a distortion or perversion of reality but retains connections to the real. The question of authenticity is connected to considerations of intentionality and positionality; the distorted truth of the simulacrum is a result of the artist relating the object to its intended viewer rather than authentically reproducing the object. Conversely, Baudrillard contends that the simulacrum itself becomes true through the societal function it fulfills. A simulacrum is not a perversion of reality but rather a “truth" in its own right: not real, but true. The use of Baudrillard’s notion of the simulacrum to examine how indigenous peoples, settlers of European descent, and African slaves and their descendants are portrayed in Dwellers of the Western World has two key benefits. First, considering these portrayals as simulacra decenters the representation from reality; the simulacrum of each group can be considered as independent from individuals within the group. Second, untethering representation from reality and examining these portrayals as simulacra invites consideration of not what the depiction means, but rather, how the representation works; it stimulates a consideration of the discursive function of the representation. Thus, the use of the Baudrillard’s concept of simulacra in the following analysis is not an interrogation of John Philip Sousa’s intention nor an examination of the intrinsic meaning of Dwellers of the Western World. Instead, this analysis examines how the portrayal of indigenous people, settlers of European descent, and African slaves and their descendants discursively function to perpetuate the structure of settler colonialism, both historical and present. Settler Colonialism in Dwellers of the Western World Before analyzing the racial discourses that can be read through Dwellers of the Western World, it is imperative that we attend to the gendered nature of these representations. The evocation of simulacra as masculine in each of the three movements (The Red Man, The White Man, and The Black Man) “promotes male privilege by being male dominated, male identified, and male centered” (Johnson 1997, 5). This is not surprising as “colonization has always been a gendered process” (Lawrence 2003, 5); however, it highlights the intersectionality of the concurrent processes of racialization and gendering. One key way in which settler colonialism operates is through the establishment of normative gender roles. The heteropatriarchal organization of the “traditional family,” the policing of heteronormative sexuality, and the imposition of male-centric inheritance laws all operate to fracture indigenous identity through a denial of indigenous ontologies (Arvin, Tuck, and Morrill 2013). Thus, the evocation of each group within the composition in masculine terms is a key and core aspect of how Dwellers of the Western World preserves and perpetuates settler colonialism. In the following discursive analysis of Dwellers of the Western World, the examination of each movement begins with a brief exposition regarding the societal function the simulacrum plays within settler colonialism. Following the general description, this study then reviews how each simulacrum is generally evoked though and by music. Finally, each section concludes with examine how the simulacrum is specifically heralded in Dwellers of the Western World. “The Red Man”2 and Simulacrum of Absence The simulacrum of ‘The Red Man’ may be contrarily depicted as either an emotionally explosive brute or a stoic barbarian. He is almost always portrayed as primitive and backwards, juxtaposed against the supposed technological (and intellectual) advancement of the simulacrum of ‘The White Man’ (Bird 1996). He is portrayed as a historicized “other,” a relic of the past. Stereotypical depictions in “traditional” regalia serve to temporally distance him from the here and now (Ross and Lester 1996). The simulacrum of ‘The Red Man,’ as he is often portrayed in American culture, serves many purposes. First, the simulacrum of ‘The Red Man’ provides justification for the policy “Kill the Indian, save the man” (Pratt 1973, 260). This trope of the “ignorant savage” allows for Western thinkers to view themselves as great liberators, freeing ‘The Red Man’ from himself. It is this Western notion of unrestrained freedom that has allows the settler colonial state to occupy indigenous lands and commit the genocide of indigenous peoples (Alfred 2005). Secondly, the simulacrum serves as a mechanism for the erasure of indigenous people; those in search of the signified ‘Red Man’ will be unable to find him. Current manifestations of indigeneity, in failing to correspond to the simulacrum of ‘The Red Man,’ are denied. Settler colonial occupation of land, predicated on the assumed absence of the original inhabitants, is substantiated by this repudiation. Thus, the immutable “authentic” ethnographic representation has destroyed ‘The Red Man’; the indigenous person “dying for having been ‘discovered’” (Baudrillard and Foss 1983, 13). Musically, the simulacrum of ‘The Red Man’ is heralded through the (mis)appropriation of indigenous music through a Western metaphysics of aesthetics. “That which is now described as dance, song and ceremony was (simplistically put) much more a way of passing on information including history, lore and law, than the recreational pursuits that are presently ascribed” (Immiboagurramilbun 2005 cited in Somerville 2012, 13). This conceptualization of music is beyond a Western epistemology that considers music as a cultural byproduct rather than an ontologically inseparable part of the people and place from which it comes. As a result, within a Western framework the “song” can be disentangled from its purpose and place and becomes knowable only as what the song is, not what it does, for whom, where. Furthermore, additional violation occurs through the generation of an idealized form of generic pan-indigenous music through a process of aggregation. These generalized musical representations bear resemblance neither to the sonorities of any indigenous group, nor attend to the relationship of “song” to culture and, more importantly, place. Despite the fact that indigenous epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies are inexorably tied to land, musical generalizations serve as broad brush strokes painting all indigenous people the same shade of red. This generic, pan-indigenous framework undermines the fundamental relation of people to country and instead offers a sonically abstracted sense of placeless commonality amongst disparate indigenous groups. Detached from land and lumped together through this process of abstraction, the heralded “Red Man” becomes both homogenous and moveable. Thus, atrocities such as the reservation system seem to be justifiable; indigenous peoples are assumed to possess neither uniqueness nor an attachment to place. Furthermore, expressions of indigeneity that fail to correspond to abstracted pan-indigenous sonorities are denied their authenticity. The heralded simulacrum of ‘The Red Man’ erases the indigenous person, and settler colonial occupation of land is tenable.
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