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#### Settlerism is an everyday process shaped by affective investments in institutions that claim jurisdiction over native land.

Mark Rifkin, PhD, Director of the Women's and Gender Studies Program and Professor of English at the University of North Carolina, Greensboro. “Settler common sense.” Settler Colonial Studies, 2013 Vol. 3, Nos. 3–4, 322–340, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.810702. JJN

In Walden (1854), Henry David Thoreau offers a vision of personhood divorced from the state, characterizing his experience of “Nature” during his time at Walden Pond as providing him with a sense of his own autonomous embodiment and a related set of ethical resources that enable him to reject the demands of contemporary political economy.1 The invocation of “Nature” appears to bracket the question of jurisdiction, opening into a different conceptual and phenomenological register that displaces the problem of locating oneself in relation to the boundaries of the state. However, the very feeling that one has moved beyond geopolitics, that one has entered a kind of space that suspends questions of sovereignty or renders them moot, depends on the presence of an encompassing sovereignty that licenses one’s access to that space. If the idea of “Nature” holds at bay the question of jurisdiction so as to envision a kind of place for cultivating a selfhood that can oppose state logics/politics, it also effaces the ways that experience/vision of personhood itself may arise out of the legal subjectivities put in play by the jurisdictional claiming/clearing of that space as against geopolitical claims by other polities, specifically Native peoples. Thoreau offers an example of how settlement – the exertion of control by non-Natives over Native peoples and lands – gives rise to modes of feeling, generating kinds of affect through which the terms of law and policy become imbued with a sensation of everyday certainty. This affective experience productively can be characterized as an instantiation of what more broadly may be characterized as settler common sense. The phrase suggests the ways the legal and political structures that enable non-Native access to Indigenous territories come to be lived as given, as simply the unmarked, generic conditions of possibility for occupancy, association, history, and personhood. Addressing whiteness in Australia, Fiona Nicoll argues that “rather than analysing and evaluating Indigenous sovereignty claims…, we have a political and intellectual responsibility to analyse and evaluate the innumerable ways in which White sovereignty circumscribes and mitigates the exercise of Indigenous sovereignty”, and she suggests that “we move towards a less coercive stance of reconciliation with when we fall from perspective into an embodied recognition that we already exist within Indigenous sovereignty”. 2 Addressing the question of how settlement as a system of coercive incorporation and expropriation comes to be lived as quotidian forms of non-Native being and potential, though, may require tactically shifting the analytical focus such that Indigenous sovereignties are not at the center of critical attention, even as they remain crucial in animating the study of settler colonialism and form its ethical horizon. “An embodied recognition” of the enduring presence of settler sovereignty, as well as of quotidian non-Native implication in the dispossession, effacement, and management of indigeneity, needs to attend to everyday experiences of non-relation, of a perceptual engagement with place, various institutions, and other people that takes shape around the policies and legalities of settlement but that do not specifically refer to them as such or their effects on Indigenous peoples. In order to conceptualize the mundane dynamics of settler colonialism, the quotidian feelings and tendencies through which it is continually reconstituted and experienced as the horizon of everyday potentiality, we may need to shift from an explicit attention to articulations of Native sovereignty and toward an exploration of the processes through which settler geographies are lived as ordinary, non-reflexive conditions of possibility. In Marxism and Literature, Raymond Williams argues for the necessity of approaching “relations of domination and subordination” as “practical consciousness” that saturat[es] … the whole substance of lived identities and relationships, to such a depth that the pressures and limits of what can ultimately be seen as a specific economic, political, and cultural system seem to most of us the pressures and limits of simple experience and common sense.3 Understanding settlement as, in Williams’s terms, such a “structure of feeling” entails asking how emotions, sensations, psychic life take part in the (ongoing) process of realizing the exertion of non-Native authority over Indigenous peoples, governance, and territoriality in ways that saturate quotidian life but are not necessarily present to settlers as a set of political propositions or as a specifically imperial project of dispossession. In the current scholarly efforts to characterize settler colonialism, the contours of settlement often appear analytically as clear and coherent from the start, as a virtual totality, and in this way, the ongoing processes by which settler dominance actively is reconstituted as a set of actions, occupations, deferrals, and potentials slide from view. We need to ask how the regularities of settler colonialism are materialized in and through quotidian non-Native sensations, inclinations, and trajectories. Moreover, administrative initiatives and legalities become part of everyday normalizations of state aims and mappings but in ways that also allow for an exceeding of state interests that potentially can be turned back against the state, giving rise to oppositional projects still given shape and momentum by the framings that emerge out of the ongoing work of settler occupation – such as in Walden. The essay will close with a brief reading of Thoreau’s text that illustrates how its ethical framing emerges out of, and indexes, everyday forms of settler feeling shaped by state policy but not directly continuous with it. 1. The figure of the vanishing Indian still remains prominent within US popular and scholarly discourses, both explicitly and implicitly. Within this narrative, Native peoples may have had prior claims to the land, but they, perhaps tragically, were removed from the area, or died out, or ceased to be “really” Indian, or simply disappeared at some point between the appearance of the “last” one and the current moment, whenever that may be.4 As against this tendency, scholars who seek to track the workings of settler colonialism face an entrenched inattention to the ways non-Native conceptions and articulations of personhood, place, property, and political belonging coalesce around and through the dispossession of Native peoples and normalization of (the) settler (-state’s) presence on Native lands. Insistence on the systemic quality of such settler seizures, displacements, identifications responds to this relative absence of acknowledgment by emphasizing its centrality and regularity, arguing that the claiming of a naturalized right to Indigenous place lies at the heart of non-Native modes of governance, association, and identity. However, such figurations of the pervasive and enduring quality of settler colonialism may shorthand its workings, producing accounts in which it appears as a fully integrated whole operating in smooth, consistent, and intentional ways across the socio-spatial terrain it encompasses. Doing so, particularly in considering the exchange between the domains of formal policy and of everyday life, may displace how settlement’s histories, brutalities, effacements, and interests become quotidian and common-sensical. Looking at three different models, I want to sketch varied efforts to systemize settler colonialism, highlighting some questions that emerge when they are read in light of issues of process and affect. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay – invasion is a structure not an event.” 5 Offering perhaps the most prominent definition of settler colonialism, Wolfe’s formulation emphasizes the fact that it cannot be localized within a specific period of removal or extermination and that it persists as a determinative feature of national territoriality and identity. He argues that a “logic of elimination” drives settler governance and sociality, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence”, adding, “Settler colonialism destroys to replace.” 6 Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/period of conquest, however, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settler-colonial society” (390), and “the process of replacement maintains the refractory imprint of the native counter-claim” (389). Yet, when and how do projects of elimination and replacement become geographies of everyday non-Native occupancy that do not understand themselves as predicated on colonial occupation or on a history of settler-Indigenous relation (even though they are), and what are the contours and effects of such experiences of inhabitance and belonging? In characterizing settlement as a “structure”, “logic”, and a “will”, Wolfe seeks to integrate the multivalent aspects of ongoing processes of non-Native expropriation and superintendence, but doing so potentially sidesteps the question of how official governmental initiatives and framings become normalized as the setting for everyday non-Native being and action in ways that cannot be captured solely by reference to “the murderous activities of the frontier rabble” (392–3).

#### Ideal theory is a form of abstraction away from the material violence of settler colonialism – their view from nowhere is not only useless but actively props up settlerism.

Nichols 13 Nichols, R. (2013). Indigeneity and the Settler Contract today. Philosophy & Social Criticism, 39(2), 165–186. doi:10.1177/0191453712470359 SM

Throughout the 20th century, of course, these ‘high theories’ of human development have come under considerable attack. Although anti-imperial leaders and thinkers from those subject to European colonization had always offered trenchant critiques of the European discourse of progress, and counter-narratives were always available from within European thought, it was not until the 20th century that this counter-discourse began to take hold within Europe itself in any significant way. For instance, one of the first demands of the former colonies in the United Nations was to insist on the removal of references from UN documents to members in terms of ‘civilized’ versus ‘uncivilized’. The reason they gave was that this discourse was a prevailing justification for western imperialism in both its colonial and neo-colonial forms and, by the end of the two world wars – themselves major blows to European pretensions to be the standard of civilization – thousands of people in the West were reading these criticisms and taking them more seriously. And so, combined with various other factors (including the rise of Anglo-American analytic philosophy generally), the historical-anthropology language has largely been displaced by other modes of philosophical reflection – namely, more ‘ideal’ theory. As we also all know, in the early 1970s a particular variant of this formal or ideal theory came to predominate in the western academy. The publication of John Rawls’ A Theory of Justice (1971) and Robert Nozick’s Anarchy, State and Utopia (1974) revived and reactivated the intellectual tradition of social contract theory.3 Political 166 Philosophy and Social Criticism 39(2) Downloaded from psc.sagepub.com at NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIV on March 18, 2015 philosophers after Rawls and Nozick have been generally reluctant to engage in the grand, complex historical and anthropological narratives that characterized the work of, for instance, Hegel and Marx. Instead, they argued that guiding principles for the organization of a just society (and a just relationship between societies) can be generated by abstracting away from the specific historical and cultural conditions of the present. By imagining oneself in (to use Rawls’ parlance) an ‘original position’, behind a ‘veil of ignorance’ (i.e. without knowledge of one’s race, gender, culture, social location, etc.), it is possible to determine what first principles would be generally acceptable to all (regardless of the above qualifiers). The notion of an original ‘contract’ between such individuals is thus used as a device of representation to generate a normative theory which can then be used to critically examine actually existing practices. This tradition and mode of philosophical reflection have come to replace the 19th-century historical-anthropological discourse as the prevailing manner in which philosophers and political theorists in the western academy (but especially in Anglo-American countries) analyse the possibility of a just relationship to non-western societies. The purpose of this article is to reflect not only upon the limitations, but more importantly upon the political function of this approach, particularly when it is deployed as a resource for reflection on the political struggles and normative claims of the indigenous peoples in the settler-colonial societies of the Anglo-American world (e.g. Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United States). In so doing, I hope to present a small slice of a much larger project comprising a genealogy of what I will refer to here asthe ‘Settler Contract’.4 In usingthe term ‘Settler Contract’ I am deliberately playing off of previous work by philosophers and political theorists who have been concerned to show the historical function and development of social contract theory in relation to specific axes of oppression and domination. Two of the most important contributions to this literature are Carole Pateman’s The Sexual Contract and CharlesMills’TheRacialContract.In Pateman’s 1988 work, she rereadthe canon of western social contract theory in an attempt to demonstrate that the presumptively neutral and ideal accounts of the origins of civil society as presented in the works of, for instance, Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau, were in fact always (implicitly or explicitly) sexual-patriarchal narratives that legitimized the subordination of women. In 1995, Charles Mills deliberately borrowed from Pateman in his project of unmasking the racial (or, more precisely, whitesupremacist) nature of the contract. There, Mills defined the ‘Racial Contract’ as ... that set of formal or informal agreements or meta-agreements ... between the members of one subset of humans, henceforth designated by (shifting) ‘racial’ (phenotypical/genealogical/cultural) criteria C1, C2, C3 ... as ‘white,’ and coextensive (making due allowance for gender differentiation) with the class of full persons, to categorize the remaining subset of humans as ‘nonwhite’ and of a different and inferior moral status, subpersons, so that they have a subordinate civil standing in the white or white-ruled polities the whites either already inhabit or establish or in transactions as aligns with these polities, and the moral and juridical rules normally regulating the behaviour of whites in their dealings with one another either do not apply at all in dealings with nonwhites or apply only in a qualified form.5 Although they have not necessarily used the specific term of art ‘Settler Contract’, for some time now various thinkers have attempted to contribute to an expansion on these Nichols 167 Downloaded from psc.sagepub.com at NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIV on March 18, 2015 themes by demonstrating the ways in which social contract theory has served as a primary justificatory device for the establishment of another axis of oppression and domination: an expropriation and usurpation contract whereby the constitution of the ideal civil society is premised upon the extermination of indigenous peoples and/or the displacement of them from their lands. I will use the term ‘Settler Contract’ to refer to the strategic use of the fiction of a society as the product of a ‘contract’ between its founding members when it is employed in these historical moments to displace the question of that society’s actual formation in acts of conquest, genocide and land appropriation.6 The Settler Contract’s reactivation is used not to deny the content of specific indigenous peoples’ claims, but rather to shift the register of argumentation to a highly abstract and counter-factual level, relieving the burden of proof from colonial states. In such a case, the original contract between white colonial settlers thus ‘simultaneously presupposes, extinguishes, and replaces a state of nature. A settled colony simultaneously presupposes and extinguishes a terra nullius.’ 7 The Settler Contract then refers to the dual legitimating function of the philosophical and historical-narrative device of the ‘original contract’ as the origins of societal order: first, by presupposing no previous indigenous societies and second, by legitimizing the violence required to turn this fiction into reality. Although the Settler Contract has obvious similarities and points of overlap with the Racial Contract, and is constituted in gendered and sexualized practices, it is analysable as a distinct axis since it pertains more to issues related to land appropriation and the subordination of previously sovereign polities and societies. My specific contribution here is twofold. First, I am interested in expanding the scope of these critical genealogies to include the mode of argumentation or style of reasoning endemic to social contract theory. In order to explain what I mean by this it is helpful to look to a point of difference between Pateman and Mills. Although Charles Mills sees the actual historical instantiation of contract theory as implicated in white supremacy, he nevertheless argues that the form or model of reasoning it represents can be ‘modified and used for emancipatory purposes’.8 Mills argues that the language of an ideal contract that constitutes society ‘serves a useful heuristic purpose – it’s a way of dramatizing the original social contract idea of humans choosing the principles that would regulate a just society’.9 This is why Mills described his work as a contribution to that long struggle to ‘close the gap between the ideal of the social contract and the reality of the Racial Contract’.10 Carole Pateman, on the other hand, has argued that the theoretical device of an appeal to the ‘ideal’ contract is itself inherently problematic. This is because Pateman, unlike Mills, sees contract theory as requiring the ‘fiction’ of property in the person. This theoretical presupposition is, according to Pateman, necessarily enabling of domination and oppression. She writes: Property in the person cannot be contracted out in the absence of the owner. If the worker’s services (property) are to be ‘employed’ in the manner required by the employer, the worker has to go with them. The property is useful to the employer only if the worker acts as the employer demands and, therefore, entry into the contract means that the work becomes a subordinate. The consequence of voluntary entry into a contract is not freedom but superiority and subordination.11 168 Philosophy and Social Criticism 39(2) Downloaded from psc.sagepub.com at NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIV on March 18, 2015 Although Pateman’s more radical and comprehensive critique of social contract theory is instructive here, my contribution is different still. While I agree in general with Pateman’s assessment of the inherently problematic nature of contract theory, my aim is to bring to light another facet of this, one specifically related to colonization. As I will discuss in more length below, I am concerned to show how the appeal to an ‘ideal’ original contract, even as a heuristic device for the generating of ‘first principles’, serves to displace questions of the historical instantiation of actual political societies and domains of sovereignty and, as such, has served and continues to serve the function of justifying ongoing occupation of settler societies in indigenous territory. To do this, I draw upon a Foucaultian distinction between historico-political vs philosophico-juridical discourses of sovereignty and right as a means of complementing and augmenting previous work on the Settler Contract. Furthermore, I argue that the philosophico-juridical discourse of the Settler Contract has its origins – both in historical time and as an event repeated in contemporaneous time – at the moment in which the weight of the past cannot be borne. Contract theory can therefore be studied not merely in terms of the content of its claims (i.e. true or false depictions of indigenous peoples), but in terms of its strategic function in relieving the burden of the historical inheritance of conquest. When read in light of this function, I argue, contract theory emerges as an inherently problematic framework for the adjudication of indigenous claims and, moreover, for the establishment of a non-colonial relationship between indigenous peoples and settler-colonial societies. This also means, however, that unlike Pateman and Mills, I am less interested in the specific content of, for instance, the racist and demeaning depictions of indigenous peoples as pre-political ‘savages’ in the works of contract theorists since it is my claim that even independent of any specifically negative portrayal of indigenous peoples within such work, social contract theory is still a vehicle for the displacement of such peoples, conceptually and in actual historical fact. In fact, I want to argue, it is in those places where contract theory is at its most abstract (purportedly neutral and non-evaluative) that it often functions most effectively as a strategy of settler-colonial domination. The second contribution to this discussion I would like to make is to demonstrate how this form of theory continues to function today with respect to the claims of indigenous peoples. Thus, I am also less concerned here with the historical figures of Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and Kant than Pateman or Mills, and more interested in those contemporary thinkers who explicitly work in this tradition – philosophers such as John Rawls, Robert Nozick and, the focus of this article, Jeremy Waldron. A few caveats before I proceed. First, it is not my claim that contemporary thinkers such as Rawls, Nozick, or Waldron necessarily intend to facilitate the logic of the Settler Contract (though I do not rule out this possibility either). I am not primarily interested in what specific authors intend to do with their arguments, but rather with how a specific rhetorical structure or style of argumentation shapes the discursive space such that certain outcomes appear as the logical or necessary conclusion to an argument when, in fact, the debate has been skewed in this direction by the point of departure itself. Second, I acknowledge that my selection of authors is non-comprehensive. I have chosen here to focus on Jeremy Waldron’s recent application of the social contract tradition to the claims of indigenous peoples. This is in part because (as I said at the outset) this particular article is merely one small slice of a much larger genealogy. But it is also in Nichols 169 Downloaded from psc.sagepub.com at NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIV on March 18, 2015 part because Waldron represents a kind of ‘exemplary figure’ here. One of the difficulties in examining contemporary analytic contract philosophy as it relates to indigenous claims is that, overwhelmingly, philosophers working within this tradition do not consider such questions at all. Jeremy Waldron is a major exception to this rule. Since Waldron explicitly locates his work within the tradition descending from Hobbes and Locke, through Kant to Rawls and Nozick, and because Waldron’s influential and prominent role as legal scholar enmeshes his work closely with the juridical apparatus that actually adjudicates indigenous claims in Anglo-settler societies, and finally, because Waldron (a New Zealander of European descent) takes up the question of ‘indigeneity’ so directly and seriously, it seems appropriate to take him as an exemplar of the attempt to reformulate some modified version of analytic contract theory in relation to indigenous peoples.

#### Settler colonialism is deeply engrained in Western culture and reflects in the universalist logic of non-naturalistic ethics – their philosophy gets appropriated to justify extermination of Indigenous peoples because of its cultural starting point.

John **Hinkinson** – Editor at Arena, an Australian maganzine. “Why Settler Colonialism?” Arena. 20**12**. https://arena.org.au/why-settler-colonialism/ JJN

Settler colonialism as a practice is a subset of colonial history, one where the colonial relationship converts into a very specific cultural practice. It is where the ‘settler culture’ seeks a permanent place in the colonial setting and, as such, enters an unrelenting cultural logic of misrecognition and blindness towards the cultural other, issuing in acts of objective cruelty and cultural destruction. Because this relationship is based in cultures, which are prior to the individual (while simultaneously forming the individual), it is a relationship that is especially difficult to put aside. Empirically speaking, there are many such examples in history, many arising in the period of Western Empire associated with modernity and expansionism in the New World. Settler colonialism as a field illuminates the history of these myriad examples while bridging into accounts of contemporary expressions of the settler phenomenon, from the continued cultural suppression arising out of nineteenth-century Empire (in Africa, the Americas, Australia and New Zealand, for example) to twentieth-century expressions in Palestine. If settler colonialism is to develop as a field of critical study it needs to include but go far beyond empirical accounts simply framed by an ethic of cultural justice. To do this it is necessary to develop a theory and account of how settler colonialism as a practice is based culturally. And this will require a broader frame of reference than the specific localities of settler-colonial practice, a broader frame that shows how this phenomenon is an effect of power based in attitudes to other cultures more generally. For it is arguable that the settler-colonial attitude derives from a widespread cultural politics set within a larger frame, one which the world today assumes, rather than reflexively knows or seeks to reform. This is to speak of a continuing imperialist attitude expressed in a view of other cultures that has little respect for those cultures’ core assumptions. There are crude expressions of this lack of cultural empathy, but there are also ‘high’ expressions, such as those embodied in the universalist philosophy of the West. For high universalism, the emancipatory principle is argued to be beyond all specific cultures and, as such, superior to all of them. Recent US adventures in the Middle East come to mind, where the invocation of ‘freedom’ has become a sign of disrespect for the complex cultures of the region. Imposed ‘freedom’ has devastating effects. Common to these expressions is a deep cultural blindness associated with modernity that is unable to view other cultures empathically or engage them in informed, reciprocal cultural interchange. Rather, knowledge of such cultures has predominantly developed instrumentally as a means to domination. These relations of cultural power at a more general level both generate the settler colonial relationship and reflexively feed off its effects. As John Gray remarks in his Black Mass, the Enlightenment is responsible for many racist policies, especially towards colonized peoples. Enlightenment philosophers have a special responsibility, as is seen in the case of Locke: John Locke was a Christian committed to the idea that humans are created equal, but he devoted a good deal of intellectual energy to justifying the seizure of the lands of indigenous people in America.(8) Other philosophers, including Kant, are mired in much the same logic. The goal of equality within a universal civilization was the prospect, but this could only be achieved by the peoples of the colonies ‘giving up their own ways of life and adopting European ways’.(9) If they did not willingly give up their ways of life, extermination, an idea that was widespread, might be entertained. This was not merely a Nazi policy. When H. G. Wells asked himself about the fate of ‘swarms of black and yellow and brown people who do not come into the needs of efficiency’, he replied: ‘Well, the world is not a charitable institution, and I take it they will have to go’.(10) John Gray goes on: Nazi policies of extermination … drew on powerful currents in the Enlightenment and used as models policies in operation in many countries, including the world’s leading liberal democracy. Programmes aiming to sterilize the unfit were under way in the United States. Hitler admired these programmes and also admired America’s genocidal treatment of indigenous peoples: he ‘often praised to his inner circle the efficiency of America’s extermination — by starvation and uneven combat — of the “Red Savages” who could not be tamed by captivity’.(11) If there is any doubt about the crucial role of settler colonialism in the power effects of the West one should turn to the recent book by Timothy Snyder, Bloodlands.(12) Here the author confirms that the various plans constructed by Hitler and the Nazi regime for the mass starvation of the Slavs and the Final Solution of the Jews of Eastern Europe were based on settler-colonial assumptions, in particular as expressed in the example of the United States and the conquest of the Native American peoples. Hitler’s plan (the Generalplan Ost) to colonize the Ukraine breadbasket was one that sought to turn back the clock of industrialization in the Soviet Union, deliberately starve unwanted millions of people, introduce German settlers up to the Urals, enslave Slavs where they were deemed to be essential for economic production and push the Jews of Eastern Europe beyond the Urals into Asia. While the plan was quickly frustrated in its detail by the resistance of the Soviets, Hitler’s plan is nevertheless illustrative of crucial background assumptions and elaborations of notions of ‘development’. For Hitler, Colonization would make of Germany a continental empire fit to rival the United States, another hardy frontier state based upon exterminatory colonialism and slave labor. The East was the Nazi Manifest Destiny. In Hitler’s view, ‘in the East a similar process will repeat itself for a second time as in the conquest of America’. As Hitler imagined the future, Germany would deal with the Slavs much as the North Americans had dealt with the Indians. The Volga River in Russia, he once proclaimed, will be Germany’s Mississippi.(13) As suggestive as this material may be, the point is not that of equating the United States with the Nazis. Rather it is to make the more important ethical point about Western powers and Western culture: they are interwoven with practices that take settler colonialism for granted, practices that arguably define the underside of modernity.

#### Attempts to leverage extinction impacts as calls for action are fabricated by the logic of elimination - settlers have a psychological investment in imagining the end of the world to create a sense of white vulnerability at the expense of enacting decolonization.

Dalley 16

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

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

#### Khurana is colonial equivocation and a move to innocence – fails to address settler colonalism which is specifically a link. Also calls indigenous people “savages” which is independently messed up and a link bc they’re still portrayed as the other
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Moves to innocence III: Colonial equivocation

A more nuanced move to innocence is the homogenizing of various experiences of oppression as colonization. Calling different groups ‘colonized’ without describing their relationship to settler colonialism is an equivocation, “the fallacy of using a word in different senses at different stages of the reasoning" (Etymonline, 2001). In particular, describing all struggles against imperialism as ‘decolonizing’ creates a convenient ambiguity between decolonization and social justice work, especially among people of color, queer people, and other groups minoritized by the settler nation-state. ‘We are all colonized,’ may be a true statement but is deceptively embracive and vague, its inference: ‘None of us are settlers.’ Equivocation, or calling everything by the same name, is a move towards innocence that is especially vogue in coalition politics among people of color.

People of color who enter/are brought into the settler colonial nation-state also enter the triad of relations between settler-native-slave. We are referring here to the colonial pathways that are usually described as ‘immigration’ and how the refugee/immigrant/migrant is invited to be a settler in some scenarios, given the appropriate investments in whiteness, or is made an illegal, criminal presence in other scenarios. Ghetto colonialism, prisons, and under resourced compulsory schooling are specializations of settler colonialism in North America; they are produced by the collapsing of internal, external, and settler colonialisms, into new blended categories.

This triad of settler-native-slave and its selective collapsibility seems to be unique to settler colonial nations. For example, all Aleut people on the Aleutian Islands were collected and placed in internment camps for four years after the bombing of Dutch Harbor; the stated rationale was the protection of the people but another likely reason was that the U.S. Government feared the Aleuts would become allies with the Japanese and/or be difficult to differentiate from potential Japanese spies. White people who lived on the Aleutian Islands at that same time were not interned. Internment in abandoned warehouses and canneries in Southeast Alaska was the cause of significant numbers of death of children and elders, physical injury, and illness among Aleut people. Aleut internment during WWII is largely ignored as part of U.S. history. The shuffling of Indigenous people between Native, enslavable Other, and Orientalized Other16 shows how settler colonialism constructs and collapses its triad of categories.

This colonizing trick explains why certain minorities can at times become model and quasi-assimilable (as exemplified by Asian settler colonialism, civil rights, model minority discourse, and the use of ‘hispanic’ as an ethnic category to mean both white and non-white) yet, in times of crisis, revert to the status of foreign contagions (as exemplified by Japanese Internment, Islamophobia, Chinese Exclusion, Red Scare, anti-Irish nativism, WWII anti- semitism, and anti-Mexican-immigration). This is why ‘labor’ or ‘workers’ as an agential political class fails to activate the decolonizing project. “[S]hifting lines of the international division of labor” (Spivak, 1985, p. 84) bisect the very category of labor into caste-like bodies built for work on one hand and rewardable citizen-workers on the other. Some labor becomes settler, while excess labor becomes enslavable, criminal, murderable.

The impossibility of fully becoming a white settler - in this case, white referring to an exceptionalized position with assumed rights to invulnerability and legal supremacy - as articulated by minority literature preoccupied with “glass ceilings” and “forever foreign” status and “myth of the model minority”, offers a strong critique of the myth of the democratic nation- state. However, its logical endpoint, the attainment of equal legal and cultural entitlements, is actually an investment in settler colonialism. Indeed, even the ability to be a minority citizen in the settler nation means an option to become a brown settler. For many people of color, becoming a subordinate settler is an option even when becoming white is not.

“Following stolen resources” is a phrase that Wayne has encountered, used to describe Filipino overseas labor (over 10% of the population of the Philippines is working abroad) and other migrations from colony to metropole. This phrase is an important anti-colonial framing of a colonial situation. However an anti-colonial critique is not the same as a decolonizing framework; anti-colonial critique often celebrates empowered postcolonial subjects who seize denied privileges from the metropole. This anti-to-post-colonial project doesn’t strive to undo colonialism but rather to remake it and subvert it. Seeking stolen resources is entangled with settler colonialism because those resources were nature/Native first, then enlisted into the service of settlement and thus almost impossible to reclaim without re-occupying Native land. Furthermore, the postcolonial pursuit of resources is fundamentally an anthropocentric model, as land, water, air, animals, and plants are never able to become postcolonial; they remain objects to be exploited by the empowered postcolonial subject.

Equivocation is the vague equating of colonialisms that erases the sweeping scope of land as the basis of wealth, power, law in settler nation-states. Vocalizing a ‘muliticultural’ approach to oppressions, or remaining silent on settler colonialism while talking about colonialisms, or tacking on a gesture towards Indigenous people without addressing Indigenous sovereignty or rights, or forwarding a thesis on decolonization without regard to unsettling/deoccupying land, are equivocations. That is, they ambiguously avoid engaging with settler colonialism; they are ambivalent about minority / people of color / colonized Others as settlers; they are cryptic about Indigenous land rights in spaces inhabited by people of color.

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

#### The alternative is a call for place-based education – this requires relating theorizing to present realities of injustice and acknowledging the ways settler colonialism creates those injustices to ground our strategies and normative theories. The alternative is unconditional and does not fiat anything – since our links are to the 1AC’s framework, it is an alternative metaethic that should be used to derive ethical frameworks that would conclude material decolonization is obligatory. It’s unconditional.
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As place-based educators have worked to disrupt the norms of schooling, they have started to examine the normative conception of place within the Western knowledge system. This, in turn, has led prominent scholars of place to sug- gest that the dominant understanding of place exists in an abstract capacity that subordinates place to simplistic conceptualizations of land as divorced from the personal and ontological. David Orr (2005) is emblematic of this perspective when he suggests, “Place has no particular standing in contemporary education” (87); all places have been relegated to “‘real estate’ or mere natural resources, their larger economic, ecological, social, political, and spiritual possibilities lost to the purely and narrowly utilitarian” (89). Western epistemology, and subsequently Western schooling, has come to be seen as placeless (Greenwood 2009, 2013a; Marker 2006; Orr 2005; Sobel 2004). Marking the Western concept of place as “narrowly utilitarian” is rooted in an accurate understanding of the distorted realities imposed by capitalism, but I argue that Western epistemology is not placeless and that, in addition to the distorted values of capitalism, place operates in a more significant capacity by shaping and influencing the self. Place, as it is articulated through a Western knowledge system, intersects with a social epistemology that normalizes domination through systems of white supremacy, settler colonialism, heteropatriarchy, and anthropocentrism, among other modes of domination. As a result, these epistemic norms curate conceptions of place, and come to bear on the way one knows oneself, others, and one’s relation to the natural world. Emerging from this normalized epistemological context, this article focuses on how Western social epistemologies constitute places in relation to the raced, classed, and gendered ontological possibilities embedded in the dominant knowl- edge system. Of particular interest is the method by which this oppressive epis- temology formulates an ideal social actor, an ideal social being that mirrors and reinforces the cognitive, moral, material, and spiritual norms of the operative modes of domination. In this article, I pay specific attention to how this formula- tion of the ideal social actor is established upon a particular conception of place that is integral in perpetuating domination. This article is rooted in the idea that to envision a better and more just fu- ture, the nuances and reality of systemically imposed oppression and violence must be understood. Jose ́ Medina (2013) offers an example of a similar guid- ing principle in The Epistemology of Resistance, in which he uses an approach to epistemology that emerges from an understanding that the prevailing social episte- mology operates from a normalized injustice. Medina explains, “If our normative theories should start where we are, in medias res, we should start our theorizing by reflecting on the details of the actual injustices that surround us, rather than by speculating what a perfect justice might be. We need a theory of injustice more than a theory of justice” (12, emphasis in original). In response, Medina argues that epistemologies of resistance must be cultivated through critical understand- ings of how injustice is epistemically proliferated across social systems and must begin with a structural account of domination. This article harbors a parallel spirit, and seeks to elucidate the epistemic mechanics of white supremacy and settler colonialism, to consider the possibilities of building resistance, and to encourage critical epistemic interrogation and introspection in place-based education. Place is an appropriate point of departure for this critical epistemic interroga- tion because inherent to place-based models of learning is epistemic challenge—a shifting of perspective that dares to see and understand the world around us in new ways (Gruenewald 2003). Critical epistemic shifts can move conceptions of place beyond simplistic visions of geography and flattened understandings of the land or the environment to a point where the soil, streams, and multitudes of beings engaged in complex relationships can be seen on their own terms outside of economic utility. Following the path set by many place-based scholars, I also see critical potential in place (Basso 1996; Cajete 1994, 1999; Greenwood 2013a, 2013b; Kawagley and Barnhardt 1999; Pen ̃a 1998). We all exist in place and we are all engaged in a subtle process of place-making: constituting and defining the places we exist in (Basso 1996), and thus the potential of place-based learning to encourage a shift in awareness towards our most intimate environments. As this article suggests, such an epistemic shift can be pushed further to incorporate a critical awareness of how place intersects with race, gender, and colonialism. How- ever, epistemic interrogation cannot only be comprised of an individual critically engaging structural aspects of epistemology. Interrogation must also forefront a process of “self-estrangement” (Medina 2013, 19), in which epistemic positional- ity is located, and an individual seeks awareness of their relationship to epistemic structures and matrices of power. Accordingly, place-based inquiry needs to more thoroughly engage the complex epistemic relationship between modes of domi- nation, conceptions of the natural world, and the politics of self. The structural epistemologies that influence conceptions of the self are not only enmeshed with white supremacy and settler colonialism. As has been pointed out by many scholars, educators and activists, to truly understand domination it must be seen in its entirety, meaning that white supremacy and settler colonialism have to be understood alongside the likes of heteropatriarchy (Smith 2006) and anthropocentrism (Martusewicz, Edmundson, and Lupinacci 2011; Plumwood 2002). Although these modes of domination employ intersecting and mutually invested logics (e.g., a dependence on false dichotomies like man/woman, nature/culture, reason/passion, mind/body; Plumwood 2002), they do not always operate in the same manner, and thus need to be considered on their own terms and according to their epistemic uniqueness (Medina 2013). With that being said, this article’s primary focus is on the structural epistemic interactions between white supremacy, settler colonialism, and place, hence the spotlight on white settler epistemology. I do my best to honestly engage with the complexities inherent to conversations of structure, positionality, and identity, and to acknowledge the concomitant nature between white supremacy and other modes of domination and elucidate these intersections where possible. To build upon the critical possibilities of epistemic interrogation within place- based education, this article examines white settler epistemology in relation to the politics of place and politics of self. To properly situate the role of place within the white settler epistemology, I argue that settler traditions of place are constituted by normative habits and practices that have been passed down for generations, encouraging particular relations to place, and ultimately impacting the contemporary potential of place-based education. Addressing the function of place within both white supremacy and settler colonialism provides a look at some of the nuances of settler traditions of place. The work of John Locke, as an epistemic representative of the West, is analyzed to push the politics of place to incorporate the politics of self. Locke’s theory of land, nature, people, and labor brings to light the racist, sexist, and anthropocentric characteristics and values of the ideal social actor embedded in Western epistemology. There is a radical potential in place-based education to promote productive epistemic friction and interrogation of the epistemic genealogy of the West. However, a critical comprehension of how we are differentially incorporated into epistemic structures is required to fully realize its potential.

#### The discourse of the 1AC is what perpetuates settler traditions that are rooted in the logic of domination – centering Indigenous scholarship and questions of epistemology is your role as a judge
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Situating Settler Traditions Settler traditions of place are an epistemic genealogy—the ethics, logics, and ideologies foundational to a knowledge system that have been passed down across generations, a knowledge framework that establishes what is known (the socially constructed commonsense of a culture), how things come to be known (the process of attaining new knowledge), how the world is to be interpreted according to what is known (the social construction of reality), and how the self is known in relation to perceived reality (the politics of self). Tradition is used as a conceptual tool allowing for domination to be empha- sized as an on-going historical process, while also allowing for epistemology as tradition to simultaneously be evolutionary and a cherished cultural artifact. As a cultural product, settler traditions of place are transmitted across generations through discipline, teaching, modeling and other forms of direct and subtle so- cial communication resulting in normalized habits, beliefs, values, and practices. In speaking about “western cultural traditions,” Val Plumood (2002) argues that there are “epistemic and moral limitations” embedded in these traditions—these normalized habits—that perpetuate hierarchized notions of the world that privi- lege white-hetero-landowning males (99). As Martusewicz et al. (2011) explain, these subtle discourses manifest as taken-for-granted cultural assumptions that are rooted in racism, sexism, classism that intertwine with and reflect the cultivation of violent relationships with the more-than-human world and natural systems that we depend on for life (119). The tradition in question here is the social air that penetrates the Western world, interacting with human beings whether they want it to or not. Using tradition as a metaphor for epistemology allows me to emphasize the way epistemology can im- pact every aspect of life while remaining removed from a deterministic position. Embedded in discourse, tradition appears as ever-present; despite this, individual social actors have the agency to break tradition. Consequently, in the same way that an individual breaks from familial, cultural, or religious tradition and faces the ramifications for transgressing, epistemic transgression can also incur social fallout and cause friction. When an individual epistemically transgresses, they employ an epistemic praxis (the operationalization of an alternative or critical epistemology) that goes against the grain and is counter to the tradition that defines the social environment. For conversations concerning the cultivation of criticality (like the one herein) this break in tradition is absolutely desirable and can inspire what Jose ́ Medina (2013) calls epistemic friction. Epistemic friction is contained in those uncomfortable moments in which our taken-for-granted assumptions about the world begin to crack. These moments can be transformative and cat- alyze critical consciousness to imagine and hopefully actualize an alternative epistemology.

### Framework

#### Top level framing issues –

#### 1] Every morally repugnant blip in the 1AC is an independent link that they shouldn’t be allowed to kick out of – a refusal to hold the aff accountable for the racist choices they made in the 1AC encourages students to knowingly blip out racist one liners for strategic gain and is a form of settler fluidity

#### 2] You should auto reject any aff FW arg that tries to claim the impacts of the K don’t matter – denying that things like genocide or racism matter makes the debate space unsafe and encourages the development of racist subjectivities – that outweighs – a] accessibility – maintaining a safe environment is a pre requisite to every other impact b] it disproves the conclusion of their theory even if you can’t pinpoint exactly where it fell apart

#### 3] I’m making this clear at the top – I am NOT going to read util and they can NOT extend their util offense – there are two ROBs in the round – kant and the K ROB – and if we win kant is wrong that means you should evaluate the K’s framing which is explicitly not utilitarian and is about the aff’s research project not the consequences of the plan – no 1ar extinction outweighs bullshit

#### AT: Apriori ethics

#### 1] Beginning a priori assumes the position of a disembodied calculator that isn’t accessible to natives who are tied to their identity

#### 2] A priori knowledge can’t exist – if two people disagree about a priori claims you have to devolve to empirical claims to resolve them

#### 3] All of the ideal theory bad args answer this

#### AT: Uncertainty

#### 1] Winning our structural claim proves certain experiences are universal features of an antagonistic settler state or world

#### 2] Comparison of experiences solves – we can prioritize natives claims to land over settler claims

#### 3] It’s a link – conclusion of the arg would be to say since some settlers don’t experience dispossession than dispossession can’t be an end line evil which is white pandering

#### AT: Is ought gap

#### 1] we can derive ethics from lived experience ie from taking the positionality of those who have violence committed against them – that’s our seawright ev

#### 2] Introspection on the is bridges the gap to the ought – i.e. strong intuitive conceptions that genocide is bad suggests human capacity to identify morality leads to our fw

#### AT: Unconditional human value (Korsgaard 83)

#### 1] Even if reason is necessary for all decision-making processes its fallacious to therefore value reason in and of itself – I need oxygen to do anything but the standard is not maximizing oxygen

#### AT: Inescapability/regress

#### 1] Presupposes we need to keep asking why is this good or bad – even if that process leads us to unconditional human worth, our argument is the decision to avoid regress solves the problem of regress because we can choose to recognize genocide is bad full stop

#### 2] I can choose to be a smagent – guess its not binding!

#### AT: Universalizability

#### 1] Universal ethics is impossible and violent -- ethics is informed by social location and subject position– a rich white person might have an obligation not to steal but that doesn’t mean someone stealing to feed their family is bad

#### 2] Indigenous people are excluded from their conception of reason – indigenous agency destabilizes settler sovereignty which necessitates the relegation of the native to the nonhuman – the inevitable 1AR pivot to “we recognize ALL agency” is a settler ruse of inclusion that creates cruel optimism in the possibility of Western theory to provide liberation

#### AT: Judgements are universal

#### 1] Tailoring objection – you can tailor your rule to be specific to your circumstances which makes any action or maxim universalizable

#### AT: FW hijack (Korsgaard 98) – cross apply answers to unconditional human value

#### AT: Aspec (Ripstein 15)

#### 1] Is ought fallacy – just because governments do use their fw doesn’t mean they should

#### 3] Locks in settler state as norm – appealing to existing institutions as the only possible model of a state is a link because it fractures struggles for alternative worlds

#### Don’t reject consequentialism –

#### Top level –

#### 1] Morally repugnant – allows policymakers to skirt responsibilty for the racist effect of their actions – for example, settlers claiming their intent wasn’t to wipe out the indigenous population when they settled – that proves the link to the K

#### 2] Empirically denied – obviously the 1AC relies on predictions too cuz they do things like make theory args that rely on consequences, assume you will vote for them if they win, etc

#### Action theory is wrong -- 1] we can stop dividing at a reasonable point which solves infinite regress 2] turn – intent focus can’t explain substitutability – for example, if I make a promise to mow the grass, intent based theories can’t explain why I have an ethical obligation to stand up or to turn on the mower

#### Induction succeeds – the way you test theories is you assume they’re true and see if they are accurate, obviously saying deductive logic is true also relies on deduction in the first place – independently proves the link to the K because it gives indigenous people cruel optimism – eg settlers have been violent for centuries but maybe they won’t be tomorrow

#### No infinite consequences – at a certain point the probability becomes so small that we can’t determine the link differential so we just stop calculating

### Contention

#### Acquisition of property can never be unjust – to create rights violations, there must already be an owner of the property being violated, but that presupposes its appropriation by another entity.

Feser 1, (Edward Feser, 1-1-2005, accessed on 12-15-2021, Cambridge University Press, "THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS AN UNJUST INITIAL ACQUISITION | Social Philosophy and Policy | Cambridge Core", Edward C. Feser is an American philosopher. He is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Pasadena City College in Pasadena, California. [https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1) [brackets](https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/social-philosophy-and-policy/article/abs/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-unjust-initial-acquisition/5C744D6D5C525E711EC75F75BF7109D1)%20%5bbrackets) for gen lang] //phs st

There is a serious difficulty with this criticism of Nozick, however. It is just this: There is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources; therefore, there is no case to be made for redistributive taxation on the basis of alleged injustices in initial acquisition. This is, to be sure, a bold claim. Moreover, in making it, I contradict not only Nozick’s critics, but Nozick himself, who clearly thinks it is at least possible for there to be injustices in acquisition, whether or not there have in fact been any (or, more realistically, whether or not there have been enough such injustices to justify continual redistributive taxation for the purposes of rectifying them). But here is a case where Nozick has, I think, been too generous to the other side. Rather than attempt —unsatisfactorily, in the view of his critics—to meet the challenge to show that initial acquisition has not in general been unjust, he ought instead to have insisted that there is no such challenge to be met in the first place. Giving what I shall call “the basic argument” for this audacious claim will be the task of Section II of this essay. The argument is, I think, compelling, but by itself it leaves unexplained some widespread intu- itions to the effect that certain specific instances of initial acquisition are unjust and call forth as their remedy the application of a Lockean proviso, or are otherwise problematic. (A “Lockean proviso,” of course, is one that forbids initial acquisitions of resources when these acquisitions do not leave “enough and as good” in common for others.) Thus, Section III focuses on various considerations that tend to show how those intuitions are best explained in a way consistent with the argument of Section II. Section IV completes the task of accounting for the intuitions in question by considering how the thesis of self-ownership itself bears on the acqui- sition and use of property. Section V shows how the results of the previ- ous sections add up to a more satisfying defense of Nozickian property rights than the one given by Nozick himself, and considers some of the implications of this revised conception of initial acquisition for our under- standing of Nozick’s principles of transfer and rectification. II. The Basic Argument The reason there is no such thing as an unjust initial acquisition of resources is that there is no such thing as either a just or an unjust initial acquisition of resources. The concept of justice, that is to say, simply does not apply to initial acquisition. It applies only after initial acquisition has already taken place. In particular, it applies only to transfers of property (and derivatively, to the rectification of injustices in transfer). This, it seems to me, is a clear implication of the assumption (rightly) made by Nozick that external resources are initially unowned. Consider the following example. Suppose an individual A seeks to acquire some previously unowned resource R. For it to be the case that A commits an injustice in acquiring R, it would also have to be the case that there is some individual B (or perhaps a group of individuals) against whom A commits the injustice. But for B to have been wronged by A’s acquisi- tion of R, B would have to have had a rightful claim over R, a right to R.

By hypothesis, however, B did not have a right to R, because no one had a right to it—it was unowned, after all. So B was not wronged and could not have been. In fact, the very first person who could conceivably be wronged by anyone’s use of R would be, not B, but A himself, since A is the first one to own R. Such a wrong would in the nature of the case be an injustice in transfer—in unjustly taking from A what is rightfully his—not in initial acquisition. The same thing, by extension, will be true of all unowned resources: it is only after some- one has initially acquired them that anyone could unjustly come to possess them, via unjust transfer. It is impossible, then, for there to be any injustices in initial acquisition.7