### 1nc – Shell

#### Settler colonialism is a structure of technologies, not an event, a patterning of social relations that renders indigenous land and life infinitely fungible.

**paperson 17** [La, also K. Wayne Yang, an associate professor of ethnic studies at the University of California, San Diego. “A Third University Is Possible” June 2017]

Land is the prime concern of settler colonialism, contexts in which the colonizer comes to a “new” place not only to seize and exploit but to stay, making that “new” place his permanent home. Settler colonialism thus complicates the center–periphery model that was classically used to describe colonialism, wherein an imperial center, the “metropole,” dominates distant colonies, the “periphery.” Typically, one thinks of European colonization of Africa, India, the Caribbean, the Pacific Islands, in terms of external colonialism, also called exploitation colonialism, where land and human beings are recast as natural resources for primitive accumulation: coltan, petroleum, diamonds, water, salt, seeds, genetic material, chattel. Theories named as “settler colonial studies” had a resurgence beginning around 2006.[2] However, the analysis of settler colonialism is actually not new, only often ignored within Western critiques of empire.[3] The critical literatures of the colonized have long positioned the violence of settlement as a prime feature in colonial life as well as in global arrangements of power. We can see this in Franz Fanon’s foundational critiques of colonialism. Whereas Fanon’s work is often generalized for its diagnoses of anti/colonial violence and the racialized psychoses of colonization upon colonized and colonizer, Fanon is also talking about settlement as the particular feature of French colonization in Algeria. For Fanon, the violence of French colonization in Algeria arises from settlement as a spatial immediacy of empire: the geospatial collapse of metropole and colony into the same time and place. On the “selfsame land” are spatialized white immunity and racialized violation, non-Native desires for freedom, Black life, and Indigenous relations.[4] Settler colonialism is too often thought of as “what happened” to Indigenous people. This kind of thinking confines the experiences of Indigenous people, their critiques of settler colonialism, their decolonial imaginations, to an unwarranted historicizing parochialism, as if settler colonialism were a past event that “happened to” Native peoples and not generalizable to non-Natives. Actually, settler colonialism is something that “happened for” settlers. Indeed, it is happening for them/us right now. Wa Thiong’o’s question of how instead of why directs us to think of land tenancy laws, debt, and the privatization of land as settler colonial technologies that enable the “eventful” history of plunder and disappearance. Property law is a settler colonial technology. The weapons that enforce it, the knowledge institutions that legitimize it, the financial institutions that operationalize it, are also technologies. Like all technologies, they evolve and spread. Recasting land as property means severing Indigenous peoples from land. This separation, what Hortense Spillers describes as “the loss of Indigenous name/land” for Africans-turned-chattel, recasts Black Indigenous people as black bodies for biopolitical disposal: who will be moved where, who will be murdered how, who will be machinery for what, and who will be made property for whom.[5] In the alienation of land from life, alienable rights are produced: the right to own (property), the right to law (protection through legitimated violence), the right to govern (supremacist sovereignty), the right to have rights (humanity). In a word, what is produced is whiteness. Moreover, it is not just human beings who are refigured in the schism. Land and nonhumans become alienable properties, a move that first alienates land from its own sovereign life. Thus we can speak of the various technologies required to create and maintain these separations, these alienations: Black from Indigenous, human from nonhuman, land from life.[6] “How?” is a question you ask if you are concerned with the mechanisms, not just the motives, of colonization. Instead of settler colonialism as an ideology, or as a history, you might consider settler colonialism as a set of technologies —a frame that could help you to forecast colonial next operations and to plot decolonial directions. This chapter proceeds with the following insights. (1) The settler–native– slave triad does not describe identities. The triad—an analytic mainstay of settler colonial studies—digs a pitfall of identity that not only chills collaborations but also implies that the racial will be the solution. (2) Technologies are trafficked. Technologies generate patterns of social relations to land. Technologies mutate, and so do these relationships. Colonial technologies travel. In tracing technologies’ past and future trajectories, we can connect how settler colonial and antiblack technologies circulate in transnational arenas. (3) Land—not just people—is the biopolitical target.[7] The examples are many: fracking, biopiracy, damming of rivers and flooding of valleys, the carcasses of pigs that die from the feed additive ractopamine and are allowable for harvest by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The subjugation of land and nonhuman life to deathlike states in order to support “human” life is a “biopolitics” well beyond the Foucauldian conception of biopolitical as governmentality or the neoliberal disciplining of modern, bourgeois, “human” subject. (4) (Y)our task is to theorize in the break, that is, to refuse the master narrative that technology is loyal to the master, that (y)our theory has a Eurocentric origin. Black studies, Indigenous studies, and Othered studies have already made their breaks with Foucault (over biopolitics), with Deleuze and Guatarri (over assemblages and machines), and with Marx (over life and primitive accumulation). (5) Even when they are dangerous, understanding technologies provides us some pathways for decolonizing work. We can identify projects of collaboration on decolonial technologies. Colonizing mechanisms are evolving into new forms, and they might be subverted toward decolonizing operations. The Settler–Native–Slave Triad Does Not Describe Identities One of the main interventions of settler colonial studies has been to insist that the patterning of social relations is shaped by colonialism’s thirst for land and thus is shaped to fit modes of empire. Because colonialism is a perverted affair, our relationships are also warped into complicitous arrangements of violation, trespass, and collusion with its mechanisms. For Fanon, the psychosis of colonialism arises from the patterning of violence into the binary relationship between the immune humanity of the white settler and the impugned humanity of the native. For Fanon, the supremacist “right” to create settler space that is immune from violence, and the “right” to abuse the body of the Native to maintain white immunity, this is the spatial and fleshy immediacy of settler colonialism. Furthermore, the “humanity” of the settler is constructed upon his agency over the land and nature. As Maldonado- Torres explains, “I think, therefore I am” is actually an articulation of “I conquer, therefore I am,” a sense of identity posited upon the harnessing of nature and its “natural” people. Indeed, for Fanon, it is the perverse ontology of settler becomings—becoming landowner or becoming property, becoming killable or becoming a killer—and the mutual implication of tortured and torturer that mark the psychosis of colonialism. This problem of modernity and colonial psychosis is echoed in Jack Forbes’s writings: Columbus was a wétiko. He was mentally ill or insane, the carrier of a terribly contagious psychological disease, the wétiko psychosis. . . . The wétiko psychosis, and the problems it creates, have inspired many resistance movements and efforts at reform or revolution. Unfortunately, most of these efforts have failed because they have never diagnosed the wétiko. Under Western modernity, becoming “free” means becoming a colonizer, and because of this, “the central contradiction of modernity is freedom.” Critiques of settler colonialism, therefore, do not offer just another “type” of colonialism to add to the literature but a mode of analysis that has repercussions for any diagnosis of coloniality and for understanding the modern conditions of freedom. By modern conditions of freedom, I mean that Western freedom is a product of colonial modernity, and I mean that such freedom comes with conditions, with strings attached, most manifest as terms of unfreedom for nonhumans. As Cindi Mayweather says, “your freedom’s in a bind.”

#### The destruction of relationships to land constitutes ontological violence – only a theoretical frame that can theorize land can understand the intricacies of the settler colonial situation.

**Tuck and Yang 12** – associate professor of critical race and indigenous studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto and director of ethnic studies at UC San Diego

Eve Tuck and K Wayne Yang, “Decolonization is not a Metaphor”, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society, Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, <http://clas.osu.edu/sites/clas.osu.edu/files/Tuck%20and%20Yang%202012%20Decolonization%20is%20not%20a%20metaphor.pdf> // sam

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

#### The 1ac is a form of settler colonial emplacement that renders outer space a lifeless void upon which the settler can infinitely project colonial fantasies of the final frontier via a “more ethical” communist space exploration – the question of this debate is not “private space good, private space bad” but rather how we should understand space - just because the 1ac says the word colonialism doesn’t make them anti-colonial – their understanding of space is still bad.

**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

We started talking about space colonization because the ways it interferes with Sky Country and our relationships with it. The term space colonization can be used to refer not only to plans for the long-term settlement of planets other than earth, but also to space exploration and exploitation. These plans include the exploitation of resources from asteroids, the moon and other space bodies, and the annexation of Indigenous lands and displacement of Indigenous peoples for installations that promote space exploration (including observatories and launch sites). To address these plans, we need to extend our conversations into discussions of space colonization, its processes and imaginaries, and the economic and legal architecture developing around it. Critical engagement with the relationality of space is an important point of focus by Indigenous communities, scholars and their supporters (Burarrwanga et al., 2013; Bawaka Country incl et al. 2019; Bhathal, 2006; Johnston, 2010; Cornum, 2015; Hunt 2018; Fuller et al., 2014; Watts, 2013; Todd, 2016), as well as within geography and the social sciences more broadly (Beery, 2012, 2016; Dickens & Ormrod, 2007, 2016; Johnston, 2010; MacDonald, 2007, 2008). Work in Indigenous futurisms for example, powerfully critiques ideas and practices of ‘outer space’ (and indeed futurity in many forms and expressions) that continue to perpetuate conditions of Indigenous invisibility, and extend settler-colonial narratives and fantasies both into space and into the future (Byrd, 2011; Hunt 2018). Many Indigenous people continue to struggle against the devastating impact of space exploration and colonization in their Countries, including at Woomera on Kokatha and Pitjantjatjara Country in Australia and against the proposed telescope at Mauna Kea in Hawai’i, as they seek to protect and nurture their relations with earth and sky, and to assert their rights and sovereignties (Gorman, 2005; Peryer, 2019). These are critiques that we take inspiration from and aim to engage with, from our own place and experience, particularly as we acknowledge the co-becoming of diverse times, the ways that the future is the past, is the present, and the ways these emerge together with and as place and time (Bawaka Country incl et al., 2016, 2019). These scholars point out that space should not be understood as detached, or distant, from everyday life. Rather, whether through everyday technological realities such as the use of satellite navigation and communications networks, through the proliferation of stakeholders in space - including New Space actors – or through the ways that realities and imaginings of sky-worlds inform realities and imaginings on earth, ‘outer space’ continues to play a crucial and increasingly central place in life on, as, and beyond, earth. Despite regular media reports of technological developments such as the successful testing of reusable rockets (Sheetz, 2017), space colonization, tends to be treated as a fantasy or science fiction plot by global publics (Dickens & Ormrod, 2007). Recent developments in both the private and nationalized space industries, and indeed new collaborations between the two, are rapidly changing this scenario. Since the 1980s, for example, a group of primarily US-based entrepreneurs, advocates and space scientists, collectively referred to as ‘NewSpace’, have been competing to be the first to exploit outer space for resources. Although the NewSpace community embraces diverse perspectives and subjectivities (Oman-Reagan, 2015), its dominant figures share an understanding of the unbounded resources of the universe and the right of humans to dominate it (Valentine, 2012). The dominant actors in NewSpace enterprises are white, male, Euro-Americans who are amongst the world’s wealthiest individuals, including PayPal and Tesla entrepreneur Elon Musk, founder of Space Exploration Technologies Corporation (SpaceX); entrepreneur Peter Diamandis, who is a principle in mining company Planetary Resources; and Amazon owner Jeff Bezos, who founded spaceflight company Blue Origin. These companies pursue various goals, including the development of reusable, cost-effective launch systems (SpaceX, Blue Horizon) and off-Earth mining equipment and techniques (Deep Space Industries, Planetary Resources).2 Although the drive to mine and possibly settle space is fuelled largely by private actors, several states, including the US, China and Qatar, offer increasing support for this industry, including funding infrastructure, research and development (Beery, 2012). Jason Beery (2012) points out that although major space agencies such as NASA have been contracting with private companies for decades, governments increasingly regard commercial projects, such as space ports, as part of their core efforts to promote economic growth, stability and the reproduction of the political-economic system (Beery, 2012:25). In some cases, states are working actively to create legal frameworks to enable or even incentivize the exploitation of space. Notably, although not the only example, in late 2015, the Spurring Private Aerospace Competitiveness and Entrepreneurship (SPACE) Act passed by the US Congress granted the exclusive right to US companies to exploit minerals, water and other resources (excluding biological life) found in space on a first-come, first-serve basis. The SPACE Act grants private property rights to US-based companies on the presumption that space has no owners or inhabitants. For many advocates of space exploration and exploitation, extending resource markets into space is a means of gaining exclusive legal control over territory and resources, and, in this context, the term ’colonization’ is used in aspirational tones. For example, one early proponent of commercial space colonization envisions a future in which the “global expansion of European technology and civilization brought about by the terrestrial age of exploration is but a pale foreshadowing” (Lewis, 1996:5). Indeed, many space entrepreneurs and boosters do not flinch at the term ’colonization’ – they actively embrace it, as a beneficial project undertaken for, and in the name of, humanity (UNOOSA 1999). Of course, significant ground-work is required to frame colonization in aspirational terms given the deep violences that have occurred in its name, and so we turn now to four central attitudes deployed by many would-be space colonizers and advocates to highlight some of the foundations of these claims. While relationships with space are in no way monolithic, and indeed dominant Western accounts have their own diverse pre-Enlightenment engagements with the cosmos, as well as complex contemporary relationships, the tropes that we discuss here are strong and pervasive. These tropes act to empower and propel imaginaries and realties, both on earth and in the sky, that enact colonizing pasts/presents/futures and negate the active agencies, legal orders and sovereignties of First Nations people and of Sky Country, in all its diverse manifestations. First, many proponents of space colonization speak of space as a terra nullius: an uninhabited wilderness awaiting exploitation. This proposition underpins claims that there are no Indigenous people in space, and no people Indigenous to space. NASA, for example, claims that their goal is to “build new land, not steal it from the natives [sic]” (NASA, 2014). Even scholars who are overtly critical of mainstream space programs and their effects on Indigenous peoples tend to cede this point. For instance, astrobiologist David Grinspoon (2004) argues that, “Mars has no people to be displaced … we may have the opportunity to explore lands that are truly unoccupied, giving outlet to our need to explore without trampling on others.” Space archaeologist Alice Gorman (2005:88) has written extensively on the links between Australia’s space programme and its consolidation as a settler colonial state (Gorman, 2005). Yet, even in her critique of this colonial project, Gorman contends that …of all landscapes, perhaps space alone can claim to be a true ‘wilderness’. Before 1957, there were no material traces of human activity. And while there may yet be life in the solar system, there has been no human life; no autochthons, no Indigenous inhabitants. Interplanetary space was a real terra nullius. Terra nullius, a legal fiction which provided a foundation for the invasion and colonization of Australia and other First Nations territories globally, is not defined as a place with no people, rather it is a place that is deemed to have no Law/lore, no protocols and no constitutive relationships (Langton, 2001). To speak of Sky Country in this way, then, is an erasure of Indigenous Law, and of many, diverse legal orders, relationships and systems that extend to, and include, space. The image of space as an empty wilderness makes it possible for would-be space colonizers to present their plans as victim-free or ethically unproblematic.3 It also creates the impression that space is lawless and ungoverned, which opens it up to almost unregulated exploitation untrammeled by ethical concerns. As one international space law scholar argues, there are assumed to be “no known natives to outer space … [so] there seems to be nothing inherently immoral about a right of first grab” (Reinstein, 1999:79). During the Cold War, fears that a rush to grab control of space for commercial or military purposes would result in inter-state conflict prompted its designation as a res communes: a global commons owned by humanity and regulated by international organizations. The Outer Space Treaty (United Nations, 1966) (still the most fundamental piece of international space law) designates space as “the province of all mankind” and argues that its exploration and use “shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries” (United Nations, 1966:13). On this basis, the OST prohibits “national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means” (United Nations, 1966:13). This norm was subsequently developed in the 1999 Vienna Declaration on Space and Human Development (United Nations, 1999), which argues that the use of space is crucial to addressing the rising demand for resources, changes in sea level and deforestation, and fostering international cooperation, amongst other goals. Legal frameworks based on the principle of res communes may appear to be oriented towards protecting space. But they violate Sky Country in a different way: they annex it as the property of the nebulous category of ’humanity’, defined in large part by the UN, and rooted in Western liberal values and modes of governance (Mitchell, 2014). The act of claiming Sky Country as the property of “mankind” follows the same logic as the creation of national parks through the displacement of Indigenous peoples and their forms of governance (Adams, 2004; Brockington & Igoe, 2006). Indeed, some scholars of international space law have proposed a ‘planetary park’ model, in which whole planets would be designated as wilderness reserves (Bruhns & Haqq-Misra, 2016). This strategy is intended to preserve the environment of space in the face of intense competition for resources. Both of these approaches – understanding space as an uninhabited wasteland, or as the “province of all mankind”– repeat familiar colonial tropes. The former reproduces the logic of terra nullius, while the latter erases the particular forms of inhabitation, care and co-creation carried out by many Indigenous peoples. A second proposition that underpins dominant framings of space and that acts to validate its exploitation is that space is inanimate or lifeless. Without supporting life, this apparently empty wilderness can be treated as a massive store of “off-earth resources” (Virgin Galactic, 2014, italics ours), which are assumed to be nearly infinite in comparison to those available on earth. For instance, Planetary Resources states that a single platinum-rich 500 m wide asteroid contains approximately 174 times the annual output of platinum, and 1.5 times the known world-reserves of platinum-group metals (ruthenium, rhodium, palladium, osmium, iridium and platinum) (Planetary Resources, 2014). These resources are intended to meet increasing resource demands made by a rising population on Earth, but also to fuel projects of colonization beyond the solar system (Deep Space Industries, 2014). Treating space as a lifeless, uninhabited, un-governed wilderness and store of resources also allows proponents of space colonization to envision it as a dumping ground for pollution and ecologically-harmful activity, a move that echoes the racialized undertones of environmental injustices on earth, whereby harmful activities are concentrated around vulnerable people and places (Schlosberg, 2009). Some proponents of space mining argue not only that the extraction of minerals in Sky Country is ethically defensible, but also that it can occur with little regulation or concern for ecological damage. Whilst other scholars and activists argue that space is an environment that requires careful ecological management (Bruhns & Haqq-Misra, 2016; Olson, 2012), these arguments appear to have had little impact on major NewSpace entrepreneurs, whose plans hinge on the ability to export the damage of extraction to the weakly regulated realm of space. Indeed, some Newspace proponents claim that space extraction will have the positive effect of reducing ecological harms on earth. For instance, space resource company Planetary Resources argues that its aim is to externalize dangerous and polluting extraction activities “safely outside of our delicate biosphere” (Planetary Resources, 2014). Similarly, Space Adventures principal Chris Anderson asks rhetorically: Wouldn’t it be great if one day, all of the heavy industries of the Earth—mining and energy production and manufacturing—were done somewhere else, and the Earth could be used for living, keeping it as it should be, which is a bright-blue planet with lots of green? (quoted in Fallows, 2013) Anderson’s rhetorical question seeks to justify ongoing extractive practices, both on and off earth, by displacing the harms they cause outside of the scope of mainstream ethics (see Mitchell, 2016). In framing space as lifeless and inanimate, the knowledges, Laws and agencies of the beings and becomings of space, and the ongoing relationships that many cultures have with space, are nullified. This, then, allows for a seemingly unproblematized move of settler-colonial emplacement, one in which the active agencies of asteroids, planets, metals and gases, may be ignored and made invisible, and within which Laws, sovereignties and relationships of Indigenous people are negated (Hunt, 2018). Constructions of space as lifeless and inanimate also rely on the assumption that it is separate and distinct from earth. This idea is encapsulated through the Western imaginary of earth as a sealed vessel disconnected from space and in an image of the enclosed globe that has come to be understood as co-terminous with earth. This motif of Western cosmology is epitomized by early images of earth from space, including the iconic Earthrise photograph from the 1968 Apollo mission, and the equally famous Blue Marble photograph from the 1972 Apollo 17 mission (see Oliver, 2015; Lazier, 2011; Cosgrove, 1994, 2001) and, more recently, Google Earth imagery (Helmreich, 2011). Throughout these transformations, the globe has been framed as an enclosed structure whose function is to shelter humans from a cold, dead, and threatening external universe (Sloterdijk, 2014). As Nigel Clark (2005) argues, these images of a perfectly round, self-enclosed space have eclipsed the idea of earth as part of a cosmic ecosystem engaged in lively exchanges (see also Beery, 2016; Collis, 2017; Mendenhall, 2018; Ormrod, 2014). Taken together, these tropes – of space as lifeless and inanimate, of it being a terra nullius, of space as separate and discontinuous from earth – suggest that there are no ethical challenges associated with these ways of relating to space. Guwak teaches otherwise. We now turn to her to learn about order and negotiation, the agency of Sky Country, how earth, sea and sky co-become, and the ethical relationships and responsibilities these entail.

#### This is the best card in the debate – Marxism is not a radical anticolonial ideology but rather one rooted in a denial of our responsibilities to land – please read it at the end of the debate because it solos the aff and also talks about space travel.

**Means 80** – Russell Charles Means was an Oglala Lakota activist for the rights of Native Americans, libertarian political activist, actor, musician, and writer.

Russell Means, "For America To Live Europe Must Die" The Anarchist Library, July 1980, https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/russell-means-for-america-to-live-europe-must-die // sam

The only possible opening for a statement of this kind is that I detest writing. The process itself epitomizes the European concept of “legitimate” thinking; what is written has an importance that is denied the spoken. My culture, the Lakota culture, has an oral tradition, so I ordinarily reject writing. It is one of the white world’s ways of destroying the cultures of non-European peoples, the imposing of an abstraction over the spoken relationship of a people. So what you read here is not what I have written. It is what I have said and someone else has written down. I will allow this because it seems that the only way to communicate with the white world is through the dead, dry leaves of a book. I don’t really care whether my words reach whites or not. They have already demonstrated through their history that they cannot hear, cannot see; they can only read (of course, there are exceptions, but the exceptions only prove the rule). I’m more concerned with the American Indian people, students and others, who have begun to be absorbed into the white world through universities and other institutions. But even then it’s a marginal sort of concern. It’s very possible to grow into a red face with a white mind; and if that’s a person’s individual choice, so be it, but I have no use for them. This is part of the process of cultural genocide being waged by Europeans against American Indian peoples’ today. My concern is with those American Indians who choose to resist this genocide, but may be confused as to how to proceed. (You notice I use the term American Indian rather than Native American or Native indigenous people or Amerindian when referring to my people.) There has been some controversy about such terms, and frankly, at this point, I find it absurd. Primarily it seems that American Indian is being rejected as European in origin — which is true. But all the above terms are European in origin; the only non-European way is to speak of Lakota — or, more precisely, of Oglala, Brule, et. — and of the Dineh, the Miccousukee, and all the rest of the several hundred correct tribal names. (There is also some confusion about the word Indian, a mistaken belief that it refers somehow to the country, India. When Columbus washed up on the beach in the Caribbean, he was not looking for a country called India. Europeans were calling that country Hindustan in 1492. Look it up on the old maps. Columbus called the tribal people he met “Indio,” from the Italian in dio, meaning “in God.”) It takes a strong effort on the part of each American Indian not to become Europeanized. The strength for this effort can only come from the traditional ways, the traditional values that our elders retain. It must come from the hoop, the four directions, the relations: it cannot come from the pages of a book or a thousand books. No European can ever teach a Lakota to be Lakota, a Hopi to be Hopi. A master’s degree in “Indian Studies” or in “education” or in anything else cannot make a person into a human being or provide knowledge into the traditional ways. It can only make you into a mental European, an outsider. I should be clear about something here, because there seems to be some confusion about it. When I speak of Europeans or mental Europeans, I’m not allowing for false distinctions. I’m not saying that on the one hand there are the by-products of a few thousand years of genocidal, reactionary European intellectual development which is bad; and on the other hand there is some new revolutionary intellectual development which is good. I’m referring here to the so-called theories of Marxism and anarchism and “leftism” in general. I don’t believe these theories can be separated from the rest of the European intellectual tradition. It’s really just the same old song. The process began much earlier. Newton, for example, “revolutionized” physics and the so-called natural science by reducing the physical universe to a linear mathematical equation. Descartes did the same thing with culture. John Locke did it with politics, and Adam Smith did it with economics. Each one of these “thinkers” took a piece of the spirituality of human existence and converted it into a code, an abstraction. They picked up where Christianity ended: they “secularized” Christian religion, as the “scholars” like to say — and in doing so they made Europe more able and ready to act as an expansionist culture. Each of these intellectual revolutions served to abstract the European mentality even further, to remove the wonderful complexity and spirituality from the universe and replace it with a logical sequence: one, two, three. Answer!. This is what has come to be termed “efficiency” in the European mind. Whatever is mechanical is perfect; whatever seems to work at the moment — that is, proves the mechanical model to be the right one — is considered correct, even when it is clearly untrue. This is why “truth” changes so fast in the European mind; the answers which result from such a process are only stopgaps, only temporary, and must be continuously discarded in favor of new stopgaps which support the mechanical models and keep them (the models) alive. Hegel and Marx were heirs to the thinking of Newton, Descartes, Locke and Smith. Hegel finished the process of secularizing theology — and that is put in his own terms — he secularized the religious thinking through which Europe understood the universe. Then Marx put Hegel’s philosophy in terms of “materialism,” which is to say that Marx despiritualized Hegel’s work altogether. Again, this is in Marx’ own terms. And this is now seen as the future revolutionary potential of Europe. Europeans may see this as revolutionary, But American Indians see it simply as still more of that same old European conflict between being and gaining. The intellectual roots of a new Marxist form of European imperialism lie in Marx’ — and his followers’ — links to the tradition of Newton, Hegel, and the others. Being is a spiritual proposition. Gaining is a material act. Traditionally, American Indians have always attempted to be the best people they could. Part of that spiritual process was and is to give away wealth, to discard wealth in order not to gain. Material gain is an indicator of false status among traditional people, while it is “proof that the system works” to Europeans. Clearly, there are two completely opposing views at issue here, and Marxism is very far over to the other side from the American Indian view. But lets look at a major implication of this; it is not merely an intellectual debate. The European materialist tradition of despiritualizing the universe is very similar to the mental process which goes into dehumanizing another person. And who seems most expert at dehumanizing other people? And why? Soldiers who have seen a lot of combat learn to do this to the enemy before going back into combat. Murderers do it before going out to commit murder. Nazi SS guards did it to concentration camp inmates. Cops do it. Corporation leaders do it to the workers they send into uranium mines and steel mills. Politicians do it to everyone in sight. And what the process has in common for each group doing the dehumanizing is that it makes it all right to kill and otherwise destroy other people. One of the Christian commandments says, “Thou shalt not kill,” at least not humans, so the trick is to mentally convert the victims into nonhumans. Then you can proclaim violation of your own commandment as a virtue. In terms of the despiritualization of the universe, the mental process works so that it become virtuous to destroy the planet. Terms like progress and development are used as cover words here, the way victory and freedom are used to justify butchery in the dehumanization process. For example, a real-estate speculator may refer to “developing” a parcel of ground by opening a gravel quarry; development here means total, permanent destruction, with the earth itself removed. But European logic has gained a few tons of gravel with which more land can be “developed” through the construction of road beds. Ultimately, the whole universe is open — in the European view — to this sort of insanity. Most important here, perhaps, is the fact that Europeans feel no sense of loss in this. After all, their philosophers have despiritualized reality, so there is no satisfaction (for them) to be gained in simply observing the wonder of a mountain or a lake or a people in being. No, satisfaction is measured in terms of gaining material. So the mountain becomes gravel, and the lake becomes coolant for a factory, and the people are rounded up for processing through the indoctrination mills Europeans like to call schools. But each new piece of that “progress” ups the ante out in the real world. Take fuel for the industrial machine as an example. Little more than two centuries ago, nearly everyone used wood — a replenishable, natural item — as fuel for the very human needs of cooking and staying warm. Along came the Industrial Revolution and coal became the dominant fuel, as production became the social imperative for Europe. Pollution began to become a problem in the cities, and the earth was ripped open to provide coal whereas wood had simply been gathered or harvested at no great expense to the environment. Later, oil became the major fuel, as the technology of production was perfected through a series of scientific “revolutions.” Pollution increased dramatically, and nobody yet knows what the environmental costs of pumping all that oil out of the ground will really be in the long run. Now there’s an “energy crisis,” and uranium is becoming the dominant fuel. Capitalists, at least, can be relied upon to develop uranium as fuel only at the rate at which they can show a good profit. That’s their ethic, and maybe that will buy some time. Marxists, on the other hand, can be relied upon to develop uranium fuel as rapidly as possible simply because it’s the most “efficient” production fuel available. That’s their ethic, and I fail to see where it’s preferable. Like I said, Marxism is right smack in the middle of the European tradition. It’s the same old song. There’s a rule of thumb that can be applied here. You cannot judge the real nature of a revolutionary doctrine on the basis of the changes it proposed to make within the European power structure and society. You can only judge it by the effect it will have on non-European peoples. This is because every revolution in European history has served to reinforce Europe’s tendencies and abilities to export destruction to other peoples, other cultures and the environment itself. I defy anyone to point out an example where this is not true. So now we, as American Indian people, are asked to believe that a “new” European revolutionary doctrine such as Marxism will reverse the negative effect of European history on us. European power relations are to be adjusted once again, and that’s supposed to make things better for all of us. But what does this really mean? Right now, today, we who live on the Pine Ridge Reservation are living in what white society has designated a “National Sacrifice Area.” What this means is that we have a lot of uranium deposits here, and white culture (not us) needs this uranium as energy production material. The cheapest, most efficient way for industry to extract and deal with the processing of this uranium is to dump the waste by-products right here at the digging sites. Right here where we live. This waste is radioactive and will make the entire region uninhabitable forever. This is considered by industry, and by the white society that created this industry, to be an “acceptable” price to pay for energy resource development. Along the way they also plan to drain the water table under this part of South Dakota as part of the industrial process, so the region becomes doubly uninhabitable. The same sort of thing is happening. The same sort of thing is happening down in the land of the Navajo and Hopi, up in the land of the Northern Cheyenne and Crow, and elsewhere. Thirty percent of the coal in the West and half of the uranium deposits in the United States have been found to lie under reservation land, so there is no way this can be called a minor issue. We are resisting being turned into a National Sacrifice Area. We are resisting being turned into a national sacrifice people. The costs of this industrial process are not acceptable to us. It is genocide to dig uranium here and draw the water table — no more, no less. Now let’s suppose that in our resistance to extermination we begin to seek allies (we have). Let’s suppose further that we were to take revolutionary Marxism at its word: that it intends nothing less than the complete overthrow of the European capitalist order which has presented this threat to our very existence. This would seem to be a natural alliance for American Indian people to enter into. After all, as the Marxists say, it is the capitalists who set us up to be a national sacrifice. This is true as far as it goes. But, as I’ve tried to point out, this very “truth” is deceptive. Revolutionary Marxism is committed to even further perpetuation and perfection of the very industrial process which is destroying us all. It offers only to “redistribute” the results — the money, maybe — of this industrialization to a wider section of the population. It offers to take wealth from the capitalists and pass it around; but in order to do so, Marxism must maintain the industrial system. Once again, the power relations with European society will have to be altered, but once again the effects upon American Indian peoples here and non-Europeans elsewhere will remain the same. This much the same as when power was redistributed from the church to private business during the so-called bourgeois revolution. European society changed a bit, at least superficially, but its conduct toward non-Europeans continued as before. You can see what the American Revolution of 1776 did for American Indians. It’s the same old song. Revolutionary Marxism, like industrial society in other forms, seeks to “rationalize” all people in relation to industry — maximum industry, maximum production. It is a materialist doctrine that despises the American Indian spiritual tradition, out cultures, our lifeways. Marx himself called us “precapitalists” and “primitive.” Precapitalist simply means that, in his view, we would eventually discover capitalism and become capitalists; we have always been economically retarded in Marxist terms. The only manner in which American Indian people could participate in a Marxist revolution would be to join the industrial system, to become factory workers, or “proletarians,” as Marx called them. The man was very clear about the fact that his revolution could occur only through the struggle of the proletariat, that the existence of a massive industrial system is a precondition of a successful Marxist society. I think there is a problem with language here. Christians, capitalists, Marxists. All of them have been revolutionary in their own minds, but none of them really means revolution. What they really mean is a continuation. They do what they do in order that European culture can continue to exist and develop according to its needs. So, in order for us to really join forces with Marxism, we American Indians would have to accept the national sacrifice of our homeland; we would have to commit cultural suicide and become industrialized and Europeanized. At this point, I’ve got to stop and ask myself whether I’m being too harsh. Marxism has something of a history. Does this history bear out my observations? I look to the process of industrialization in the Soviet Union since 1920 and I see that these Marxists have done what it took the English Industrial Revolution 300 years to do; and the Marxists did it in 60 years. I see that the territory of the USSR used to contain a number of tribal peoples and they have been crushed to make way for the factories. The Soviets refer to this as “the National Question,” the question of whether the tribal peoples had a right to exist as people; and they decided the tribal peoples were an acceptable sacrifice to industrial needs. I look to China and I see the same thing. I look to Vietnam and I see Marxists imposing an industrial order and rooting out the indigenous tribal mountain people. I hear a leading Soviet scientist saying that when the uranium is exhausted, then alternatives will be found. I see the Vietnamese taking over a nuclear power plant abandoned by the U.S. military. Have they dismantled and destroyed it? No, they are using it. I see China exploding nuclear bombs, developing nuclear reactors, and preparing a space program in order to colonize and exploit the planets the same as the Europeans colonized and exploited this hemisphere. It’s the same old song, but maybe with a faster tempo this time. The statement of the Soviet scientist’s is very interesting. Does he know what this alternative energy source will be? No, he simply has faith. Science will find a way. I hear revolutionary Marxists saying that the destruction of the environment, pollution, and radiation will be controlled. And I see them act on their words. Do they know how these things will be controlled? No, they simply have faith. Science will find a way. Industrialization is fine and necessary. How do they know this? Faith. Science will find a way. Faith of this sort has always been known in Europe as religion. Science has become the new European religion for both capitalists and Marxists; they are truly inseparable; they are part and parcel of the same culture. So, in both theory and practice, Marxism demands that non-European peoples give up their values, their traditions, their cultural experience altogether. We will all be industrialized science addicts in a Marxist society. I do not believe that capitalism itself is really responsible for the situation in which American Indians have been declared a national sacrifice. No, it is the European tradition; European culture itself is responsible. Marxism is just the latest continuation of this tradition, not a solution to it. To ally with Marxism is to ally with the very same forces that declare us an acceptable cost. There is another way. There is the traditional Lakota way and the ways of the other American Indian peoples. It is the way that knows that humans do not have the right to degrade Mother Earth, that there are forces beyond anything the European mind has conceived, that humans must be in harmony with all relations or the relations will eventually eliminate the disharmony. A lopsided emphasis on humans by humans — the European’s arrogance of acting as though they were beyond the nature of all related things — can only result in a total disharmony and a readjustment which cuts arrogant humans down to size, gives them a taste of that reality beyond their grasp or control and restores the harmony. There is no need for a revolutionary theory to bring this about; it’s beyond human control. The nature peoples of this planet know this and so they do not theorize about it. Theory is an abstract; our knowledge is real. Distilled to it’s basic terms, European faith — including the new faith in science — equals a belief that man is God. Europe has always sought a Messiah, whether that be the man Jesus Christ or the man Karl Marx or the man Albert Einstein. American Indians know this to be truly absurd. Humans are the weakest of all creatures, so weak that other creatures are willing to give up their flesh that we may live. Humans are able to survive only though the exercise of rationality since they lack the abilities of other creatures to gain food through the use of fang and claw. But rationality is a curse since it can cause human beings to forget the natural order of things in ways other creatures do not. A wolf never forgets his or her place in the natural order. American Indians can. Europeans almost always do. We pray our thanks to the deer, our relations, for allowing us their flesh to eat; Europeans simply take the flesh for granted and consider the deer inferior. After all, Europeans consider themselves godlike in their rationalism and science. God is the Supreme Being; all else must be inferior. All European tradition, Marxism included, has conspired to defy the natural order of things. Mother Earth has been abused, the powers have been abused, and this cannot go on forever. No theory can alter that simple fact. Mother Earth will retaliate, the whole environment will retaliate, and the abusers will be eliminated. Things will come full circle, back to where they started. That’s revolution. And that’s a prophecy of my people, of the Hopi people and of other correct peoples. American Indians have been trying to explain this to Europeans for centuries. But, as I said earlier, Europeans have proven themselves unable to hear. The natural order will win out, and the offenders will die out, the way deer die when they offend the harmony by over-populating a given region. It’s only a matter of time until what Europeans call “a major catastrophe of global proportions” will occur. It is the role of American Indian peoples, the role of all natural beings, to survive. A part of our survival is to resist. We resist not to overthrow a government or to take political power, but because it is natural to resist extermination, to survive. We don’t want power over white institutions; we want white institutions to disappear. That’s revolution. American Indians are still in touch with these realities — the prophecies, the traditions of our ancestors. We learn from the elders, from nature, from the powers. And when the catastrophe is over, we American Indian people will survive; harmony will be reestablished. That’s revolution. At this point, perhaps I should be very clear about another matter, one which should already be clear as a result of what I’ve said. But confusion breeds easily these days, so I want to hammer home this point. When I use the term European, I’m not referring to a skin color or a particular genetic structure. What I’m referring to is a mind-set, a worldview that is a product of the development of European culture. Peoples are not genetically encoded to hold this outlook, they are acculturated to hold it. The same is true for American Indians or for the members of any other culture. It is possible for an American Indian to share European values, A European worldview. We have a term for these people; we call them “apples” — red on the outside (genetics) and white on the inside (their values). Other groups have similar terms: Black have their “oreos;” Hispanos have “coconuts” and so on. And, as I said before, there are exceptions to the white norm: people who are white on the outside, but not white inside. I’m not sure what term should be applied to them other than “human beings.” What I’m putting out here is not a racial proposition but a cultural proposition. Those who ultimately advocate and defend the realities of European culture and its industrialism are my enemies. Those who resist it, who struggle against it, are my allies, the allies of American Indian people. And I don’t give a damn what their skin color happens to be. Caucasian is the white term for the white race: European is an outlook I oppose. The Vietnamese Communists are not exactly what you might consider genetic Caucasians, but they are now functioning as mental Europeans. The same holds true for the Chinese Communists, for Japanese capitalists or Bantu Catholics or Peter “MacDollar” down at the Navajo reservation or Dickie Wilson up here at Pine Ridge. There is no racism involved in this, just an acknowledgment of the mind and spirit that make up culture. In Marxist terms I suppose I’m a “cultural nationalist.” I work first with my people, the traditional Lakota people, because we hold a common worldview and share an immediate struggle. Beyond this, I work with other traditional American Indian peoples, again because of a certain commonality in worldview and form of struggle. Beyond that, I work with anyone who has experience the colonial oppression of Europe and who resists its cultural and industrial totality. Obviously, this includes genetic Caucasians who struggle to resist the dominant norms of European culture. The Irish and the Basques come immediately to mind, but there are many others. I work primarily with my own people, with my own community. Other people who hold non-European perspectives should do the same. I believe in the slogan, “Trust your brother’s vision,” although I’d like to add sisters in the bargain. I trust the community and the culturally based vision of all the races that naturally resist industrialization and human extinction. Clearly, individual whites can share in this, given only that they have reached the awareness that continuation of the industrial imperatives of Europe is not a vision, but species suicide. White is one of the sacred colors of the Lakota people — red, yellow, white and black. The four directions. The four seasons. The four period of life and aging. The four races of humanity. Mix red, yellow, white and black together and you get brown, the color of the fifth race. This is the natural order of things. It therefore seems natural to me to work with all races, each with it’s own special meaning, identity and message. But there is a peculiar behavior among most Caucasians. As soon as I become critical of Europe and its impact on other cultures, they become defensive. They begin to defend themselves. But I am not attacking them personally; I’m attacking Europe. In personalizing my observations on Europe they are personalizing European culture, identifying themselves with it. By defending themselves in this context, they are ultimately defending the death culture. This is a confusion which must be overcome, and it must be overcome in a hurry. None of us has energy to waste in such false struggles. Caucasians have a more positive vision to offer humanity than European culture. I believe this. But in order to attain this vision it is necessary for Caucasians to step outside European culture — alongside the rest of humanity — to see Europe for what it is and what it does. To cling to capitalism and Marxism and all the other “isms” is simply to remain within European culture. There is no avoiding this basic fact. As a fact, this constitutes a choice. Understand that the choice is based on culture, not race. Understand that to choose European culture and industrialism is to choose to be my enemy. And understand that the choice is yours, not mine. This leads me back to address those American Indians who are drifting through the universities, the city slums, and other European institutions. If you are there to learn to resist the oppressor in accordance with your traditional ways, so be it. I don’t know how you manage to combine the two, but perhaps you will succeed. But retain your sense of reality. Beware of coming to believe the white world now offers solutions to the problems it confronts us with. Beware, too, of allowing the words of native people to be twisted to the advantage of our enemies. Europe invented the practice of turning words around on themselves. You need only look to the treaties between American Indian peoples and various European governments to know that this is true. Draw your strength from who you are. A culture which regularly confuses revolution with continuation, which confuses science and religion, which confuses revolt with resistance, has nothing helpful to teach you and nothing to offer you as a way of life. Europeans have long since lost all touch with reality, if they ever were in touch with it. Feel sorry for them if you need to, but be comfortable with who you are as American Indians. So, I suppose to conclude this, I would state clearly that leading anyone toward Marxism is the last thing on my mind. Marxism is as alien to my culture as capitalism and Christianity are. In fact, I can say I don’t think I’m trying to lead anyone toward anything. To some extent I tried to be a “leader,” in the sense that white media like to use that term, when the American Indian Movement was a young organization. This was a result of a confusion that I no longer have. You cannot be everything to everyone. I do not propose to be used in such a fashion by my enemies. I am not a leader. I am an Oglala Lakota patriot. This is all I want and all I need to be. And I am very comfortable with who I am.

#### “In the future, we would be singing about the moon that existed before” – theoretical frames that understand the earth and sky as fundamentally separate ignore the intimate connections between bodies that govern space. The alternative is a rejection of the 1ac’s relationships to place and space in favor of a relational approach that recognizes our infinite obligation to never take without giving back and to respect the nonhuman as we do ourselves – that’s mutually exclusive with their detached, utilitarian analysis of 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)
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“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.

#### Refusal is not just a no but rather a generative process that intervenes into bad research projects and generates alternative politics that allow us to live more ethically in the world.

**Tuck and Yang 14** – associate professor of critical race and indigenous studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto and director of ethnic studies at UC San Diego

Eve Tuck and Wayne C Yang, “R-Words: Refusing Research,” Humanizing research: Decolonizing qualitative inquiry with youth and communities, vol 223 pp 239 – 243 [https://townsendgroups.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/tuckandyangrwords\_refusingresearch.pdf //](https://townsendgroups.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/tuckandyangrwords_refusingresearch.pdf%20//) sam

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 (p. 78), 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. To explore how refusal and the installation of limits on settler colonial knowledge might be productive, we make a brief detour to the Erased Lynching series (2002–2011) by Los Angeles–based artist Ken Gonzales-Day (see Figure 12.1). Gonzales-Day researched lynching in California and the Southwest and found that the majority of lynch victims were Latinos, American Indians, and Asians. Like lynchings in the South, lynchings in California were events of public spectacle, often attended by hundreds, sometimes thousands of festive onlookers. At the lynchings, professional photographers took hours to set up portable studios similar to those used at carnivals; they sold their images frequently as postcards, mementos of public torture and execution to be circulated by U.S. post through- out the nation and the world. Lynching, we must be reminded, was extralegal, yet nearly always required the complicity of law enforcement—either by marshals or sheriffs in the act itself, or by judges and courts in not bothering to prosecute the lynch mob afterward. The photographs immortalize the murder beyond the time and place of the lynching, and in their proliferation, expand a single murder to the general murderability of the non-White body. In this respect, the image of the hanged, mutilated body itself serves a critical function in the maintenance of White supremacy and the spread of racial terror beyond the lynching. The spectacle of the lynching is the medium of terror. Gonzales-Day’s Erased Lynching series reintroduces the photographs of lynching to a contemporary audience, with one critical intervention: The ropes and the lynch victim have been removed from the images. Per Gonzales-Day’s website (n.d.), the series enacted a conceptual gesture intended to direct the viewer’s attention, not upon the lifeless body of the lynch victim, but upon the mechanisms of lynching themselves: the crowd, the spectacle, the photographer, and even consider the impact of flash photography upon this dismal past. The perpetrators, if present, remain fully visible, jeering, laughing, or pulling at the air in a deadly pantomime. As such, this series strives to make the invisible visible. The Erased Lynching series yields another context in which we might consider what a social scientist’s refusal stance might comprise. Though indeed centering on the erasure of the former object, refusal need not be thought of as a subtractive methodology. Refusal prompts analysis of the festive spectators regularly backgrounded in favor of wounded bodies, strange fruit, interesting scars. Refusal shifts the gaze from the violated body to the violating instruments—in this case, the lynch mob, which does not disappear when the lynching is over, but continues to live, accumulating land and wealth through the extermination and subordination of the Other. Thus, refusal helps move us from thinking of violence as an event and toward an analysis of it as a structure. Gonzales-Day might have decided to reproduce and redistribute the images as postcards, which, by way of showing up in mundane spaces, might have effectively inspired reflection on the spectacle of violence and media of terror. However, in removing the body and the ropes, he installed limits on what the audience can access, and redirected our gaze to the bodies of those who were there to see a murder take place, and to the empty space beneath the branches. Gonzales-Day introduced a new representational territory, one that refuses to play by the rules of the settler colonial gaze, and one that refuses to satisfy the morbid curiosity derived from settler colonialism’s preoccupation with pain. Refusals are needed for narratives and images arising in social science research that rehumiliate when circulated, but also when, in Simpson’s words, “the representation would bite all of us and compromise the representational territory that we have gained for ourselves in the past 100 years” (p. 78). As researcher-narrator, Simpson tells us, “I reached my own limit when the data would not contribute to our sovereignty or complicate the deeply simplified, atrophied representations of Iroquois and other Indigenous peoples that they have been mired within anthropologically” (p. 78). Here Simpson makes clear the ways in which research is not the intervention that is needed—that is, the interventions of furthering sovereignty or countering misrepresentations of Native people as anthropological objects. Considering Erased Lynchings dialogically with On Ethnographic Refusal, we can see how refusal is not a prohibition but a generative form. First, refusal turns the gaze back upon power, specifically the colonial modalities of knowing persons as bodies to be differentially counted, violated, saved, and put to work. It makes transparent the metanarrative of knowledge production—its spectatorship for pain and its preoccupation for documenting and ruling over racial difference. Thus, refusal to be made meaningful first and foremost is grounded in a critique of settler colonialism, its construction of Whiteness, and its regimes of representation. Second, refusal generates, expands, champions representational territories that colonial knowledge endeavors to settle, enclose, domesticate. Simpson complicates the portrayals of Iroquois, without resorting to portrayals of anthropo- logical Indians. Gonzales-Day portrays the violations without reportraying the victimizations. Third, refusal is a critical intervention into research and its circular self-defining ethics. The ethical justification for research is defensive and self-encircling—its apparent self-criticism serves to expand its own rights to know, and to defend its violations in the name of “good science.” Refusal challenges the individualizing discourse of IRB consent and “good science” by high- lighting the problems of collective harm, of representational harm, and of knowledge colonization. Fourth, refusal itself could be developed into both method and theory. Simpson presents refusal on the part of the researcher as a type of calculus ethnography. Gonzales-Day deploys refusal as a mode of representation. Simpson theorizes refusal by the Kahnawake Nation as anticolonial, and rooted in the desire for possibilities outside of colonial logics, not as a reactive stance. This final point about refusal connects our conversation back to desire as a counterlogic to settler colonial knowledge.

#### Defending the sacred is key to indigenous life – only an understanding of the world based in mutual obligation can make this world liveable.

**LaDuke 5** – Winona LaDuke is an Ojibwe economist, environmentalist, writer and industrial hemp grower, as well as a former vice presidential candidate along with Ralph Nader, known for her work on tribal land claims and preservation, as well as sustainable development

Winona LaDuke, “Recovering the Sacred: The Power of Naming and Claiming” South End Press, 2005 // sam

How does a community heal itself from the ravages of the past? That is the question I asked in writing this book. I found an answer in the multifaceted process of recovering that which is “sacred.” This complex and intergenerational process is essential to our vitality as Indigenous peoples and ultimately as individuals. This book documents some of our community’s work to recover the sacred and to heal. What qualifies something as sacred? That is a question asked in courtrooms and city council meetings across the country. Under consideration is the preservation or destruction of places like the Valley of the Chiefs in what is now eastern Montana and Medicine Lake in northern California, as well as the fate of skeletons and other artifacts mummified by collectors and held in museums against the will of their rightful inheritors. Debates on how the past is understood and what the future might bring have bearing on genetic research, reclamation of mining sites, reparations for broken treaties, and reconciliation between descendants of murderers and their victims. At stake is nothing less than the ecological integrity of the land base and the physical and social health of Native Americans throughout the continent. In the end there is no absence of irony: the integrity of what is sacred to Native Americans will be determined by the government that has been responsible for doing everything in its power to destroy Native American cultures. Xenophobia and a deep fear of Native spiritual practices came to the Americas with the first Europeans. Papal law was the foundation of colonialism; the Church served as handmaiden to military, economic, and spiritual genocide and domination. Centuries of papal bulls posited the supremacy of Christendom over all other beliefs, sanctified manifest destiny, and authorized even the most brutal practices of colonialism. Some of the most virulent and disgraceful manifestations of Christian dominance found expression in the conquest and colonization of the Americas. Religious dominance became the centerpiece of early reservation policy as Native religious expression was outlawed in this country. To practice a traditional form of worship was to risk a death sentence for many peoples. The Wounded Knee Massacre of 1890 occurred in large part because of the fear of the Ghost Dance Religion, which had spread throughout the American West. Hundreds of Native spiritual leaders were sent to the Hiawatha Asylum for Insane Indians for their spiritual beliefs.1 The history of religious colonialism, including the genocide perpetrated by the Catholic Church (particularly in Latin America), is a wound from which Native communities have not yet healed. The notion that non-Christian spiritual practices could have validity was entirely ignored or actively suppressed for centuries. So it was by necessity that Native spiritual practitioners went deep into the woods or into the heartland of their territory to keep up their traditions, always knowing that their job was to keep alive their teachers’ instructions, and, hence, their way of life. Native spiritual practices and Judeo-Christian traditions are based on very different paradigms. Native American rituals are frequently based on the reaffirmation of the relationship of humans to the Creation. Many of our oral traditions tell of the place of the “little brother” (the humans) in the larger Creation. Our gratitude for our part in Creation and for the gifts given to us by the Creator is continuously reinforced in Midewiwin lodges, Sundance ceremonies, world renewal ceremonies, and many others. Understanding the complexity of these belief systems is central to understanding the societies built on those spiritual foundations—the relationship of peoples to their sacred lands, to relatives with fins or hooves, to the plant and animal foods that anchor a way of life.2 Chris Peters, a Pohik-la from northern California and president of the Seventh Generation Fund, broadly defines Native spiritual practices as affirmation-based and characterizes Judeo-Christian faiths as commemorative.3 Judeo-Christian teachings and events frequently commemorate a set of historical events: Easter, Christmas, Passover, and Hannukah are examples. Vine Deloria, Jr., echoes this distinction: Unlike the Mass or the Passover which both commemorate past historical religious events and which believers understand as also occurring in a timeless setting beyond the reach of the corruption of temporal processes, Native American religious practitioners are seeking to introduce a sense of order into the chaotic physical present as a prelude to experiencing the universal moment of complete fulfillment.4 The difference in the paradigms of these spiritual practices has, over time, become a source of great conflict in the Americas. Some 200 years after the U. S. Constitution guaranteed freedom of religion for most Americans, Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act in 1978 and President Carter signed it into law. Although the act contains worthy language that seems to reflect the founders’ concepts of religious liberty, it has but a few teeth. The act states: It shall be the policy of the United States to protect and preserve for American Indians their inherent right of freedom to believe, express, and exercise the traditional religions of the American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut and native Hawaiians, including but not limited to access to sites, use and possession of sacred objects, and the freedom to worship through ceremonial and traditional rites.5 While the law ensured that Native people could hold many of their ceremonies, it did not protect the places where many of these rituals take place or the relatives and elements central to these ceremonies, such as salt from the sacred Salt Mother for the Zuni or salmon for the Nez Perce. The Religious Freedom Act was amplified by President Clinton’s 1996 Executive Order 13007, for preservation of sacred sites: “In managing Federal lands, each executive branch agency with statutory or administrative responsibility for the management of Federal lands shall…avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sacred sites.”6 Those protections were applied to lands held by the federal government, not by private interests, although many sacred sites advocates have urged compliance by other landholders to the spirit and intent of the law. The Bush administration, however, has by and large ignored that executive order.7 Today, increasing numbers of sacred sites and all that embodies the sacred are threatened. While Judeo-Christian sacred sites such as “the Holy Land” are recognized, the existence of other holy lands has been denied. There is a place on the shore of Lake Superior, or Gichi Gummi, where the Giant laid down to sleep. There is a place in Zuni’s alpine prairie to which the Salt Woman moved and hoped to rest. There is a place in the heart of Lakota territory where the people go to vision quest and remember the children who ascended from there to the sky to become the Pleiades. There is a place known as the Falls of a Woman’s Hair that is the epicenter of a salmon culture. And there is a mountain upon which the Anishinaabeg rested during their migration and from where they looked back to find their prophesized destination. The concept of “holy land” cannot be exclusive in a multi-cultural and multi-spiritual society, yet indeed it has been treated as such. We have a problem of two separate spiritual paradigms and one dominant culture—make that a dominant culture with an immense appetite for natural resources. The animals, the trees and other plants, even the minerals under the ground and the water from the lakes and streams, all have been expropriated from Native American territories. Land taken from Native peoples either by force or the colonists’ law was the basis for an industrial infrastructure and now a standard of living that consumes a third of the world’s resources. By the 1930s, Native territories had been reduced to about 4% of our original land base. More than 75% of our sacred sites have been removed from our care and jurisdiction.8 Native people must now request permission to use their own sacred sites and, more often than not, find that those sites are in danger of being desecrated or obliterated. The challenge of attempting to maintain your spiritual practice in a new millennium is complicated by the destruction of that which you need for your ceremonial practice. The annihilation of 50 million buffalo in the Great Plains region by the beginning of the 20th century caused immense hardship for traditional spiritual practices of the region, especially since the Pte Oyate, the buffalo nation, is considered the older brother of the Lakota nation and of many other Indigenous cultures of the region. Similarly, the decimation of the salmon in northwest rivers like the Columbia and the Klamath, caused by dam projects, over-fishing, and water diversion, has resulted in great emotional, social, and spiritual devastation to the Yakama, Wasco, Umatilla, Nez Perce, and other peoples of the region. New efforts to domesticate, patent, and genetically modify wild rice similarly concern the Anishinaabeg people of the Great Lakes. It is more than 500 years since the European invasion of North America and more than 200 years since the formation of the United States. Despite these centuries of spiritual challenges, Native people continue, as we have for centuries, to always express our thankfulness to Creation—in our prayers, our songs, and our understanding of the sacredness of the land. Dr. Henrietta Mann is a Northern Cheyenne woman and chair of the Native American Studies Department at Montana State University. She reiterates the significance of the natural world to Native spiritual teaching: Over the time we have been here, we have built cultural ways on and about this land. We have our own respected versions of how we came to be. These origin stories—that we emerged or fell from the sky or were brought forth—connect us to this land and establish our realities, our belief systems. We have spiritual responsibilities to renew the Earth and we do this through our ceremonies so that our Mother, the Earth, can continue to support us. Mutuality and respect are part of our tradition—give and take. Somewhere along the way, I hope people will learn that you can’t just take, that you have to give back to the land.

#### Land back!

**Washington 16** – My name is Rowland Keshena Robinson. I am of the Menominee Nation of Wisconsin, though I grew up in Bermuda, on the outer fringes of the anglo-Caribbean, and currently live and work in the Gdoo-Naaganinaa Territory: the traditional lands of the Attiwonderon, Anishinaabeg, and Rotinonshón:ni, a geographic region today also known as southern Ontario. I know that I am far from the first Menominee person to live amongst our Anishinaabeg kin, however it is in an act of good kinship that I recognize that I am a guest on this territory, and that I owe much of my intellectual and personal development to the time I have spent here and with the Anishinaabeg and Rotinonshón:ni peoples of this region. I first moved to Canada in 2005 to pursue my undergraduate studies in the humanistic and social scientific disciplines of anthropology and sociology, which I eventually transitioned into a Masters Degree in public issues anthropology, my project for which examined the distance (the “gulf” to repeat my terminology of the time) that existed then, and which in many ways exists now, between Native academics, who spend much time in analysing and theorizing about our social, cultural, political, and economic situation, and grassroots Native activists who are directly engaged in the day-to-day struggle for justice, whatever that may mean to individual actors.,

Rowland "Ena͞emaehkiw” Keshena Washington, "The ABC of Decolonization" The Anarchist Library, 5-16-2016, https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/rowland-ena-emaehkiw-keshena-robinson-the-abc-of-decolonization#toc1 // sam

This probably seems like a given, given what has been written above, however what I want to clarify here is that a genuine decolonial and abolitionist politics in the northern bloc of settler colonialism must abandon the idea that white/settler/master population has an inherent right to a piece of this continent in any way, shape or form. It’s not that white/settler/master class struggle anarchists and marxists explicitly claim such a position, because they don’t (at least not that I have ever seen), but it is implicit quite clearly in their various lines (other relatively superficial disagreements between ultimately similar ideological tendencies aside). Here I am not addressing those formations and individuals whose lines are entirely rooted in a politics of pure anti-racism, as how that position (radical integration into the settler colonial empire) leads to this point does not need much explanation; rather I am aiming this at those forces and individuals who have a political line that recognizes, on some level, colonial oppression (often alongside racism as some kind of dual racial-national oppression). Most of the marxist-leninist and maoist formations within the northern bloc, as well as what would seem to be an increasing number of anarchists, put forth a sort of watered down recognition for decolonial and abolitionist struggle, though not necessarily for the same reasons. For both the marxists and anarchists who support, at least on paper, decolonial and abolitionist demands, their lines are inherently weakened by their being subsumed under the rubric problematized by the first two sections of this essay. For marxist-leninists and maoists in particular however their political support for full decolonization is further weakened by a general non-recognition of the decolonial aspirations of First Nations. Many of these formations provide lip-service support to Black, Xicanx & Boricua independence, but tend to only provide vague platitudes when it comes to the question of First Nations. Perhaps I am too much of a cynic, jaded by too many negative experiences working within and around white/settler/master-dominated marxist and anarchist organizations, but I believe that this is because they have a deep psychological unwillingness to confront the consequences of genuine Native liberation. From this their history vis-à-vis the Native and Black nations has been one of decades long false internationalism, parasitism and opportunism in their relations with the revolutionary decolonial and abolitionist movements that have risen to the surface at different junctures, and is directly rooted in their socio-economic positioning within the imperialist pecking order. Cynically, rather than in any kind of genuinely meaningful way, they can support Xicanx, Boricua and Black independence, only because while they would have to allow the succession of a few (though some quite large) swaths of imperial territory[6], it is a scenario that leaves the bulk of the land in white/settler/master hands. Support for the liberation of, and return of land to, First Nations, as well as Michif and Genízaro kin, would mean the surrender of the entirety of the white/settler/master nation’s land base. Indeed, this the reason that the white/settler/master garrison population exists at all: to physically hold down the land against the people from whom it was seized. This is also why the state enacts every kind of juridical tool at its disposal in order to head off Native land claims outside of a revolutionary situation. The white/settler/master left cannot imagine a future where the garrison population does not continue to hold down the majority of the land of Turtle Island in a socialized/communized dispensation of settler colonial power. It doesn’t matter if white/settler/master society is re-organized on the basis of a confederation of autonomous anarchist municipalities and industrial collectives, or a federative socialist workers’ republic of the marxist sort: so long as the land is not relinquished back to its original owners then all that will develop is settler colonialism with a marxist or anarchist face. As such, it must be not just recognized that all of Turtle Island is stolen land, but that over the course of any genuinely revolutionary struggle for social transformation all of it must be liberated, and not just symbolically, even if that goes against the material interests of the white/settler/master population. The rights and aspirations of those nations that have been territorially engulfed by the expansion of empire will be given primacy.