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

#### 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 traces of the Indian haunt US empire – the naturalization of the imperial war machine occurs via the identification of the enemies of empire with the native – this creates a brutal, genocidal American regime that legitimizes itself through liberal projects of inclusion like the 1ac, coercing legitimate criticisms of the state and capital into the service of empire.

**Byrd 11** – Jodi A. Byrd is a citizen of the Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma and associate professor of English and Gender and Women's Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign where she is also a faculty affiliate at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications.

Jodi Byrd, “The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism” pp. xvii-xix, UMN Press, 2011 // sam

There is more than one way to frame the concerns of The Transit of Empire and more than one way to enter into the possibilities that transit might allow for comparative studies. On the one hand, I am seeking to join ongoing conversations about sovereignty, power, and indigeneity—and the epistemological debates that each of these terms engender—within and across disparate and at times incommensurable disciplines and geographies. American studies, queer studies, postcolonial studies, American Indian studies, and area studies have all attempted to apprehend injury and redress, melancholy and grief that exist in the distances and sutures of state recognitions and belongings. Those distances and sutures of recognitions and belongings, melancholy and grief, take this book from the worlds of Southeastern Indians to Hawai‘i, from the Poston War Relocation Center to Jonestown, Guyana, in order to consider how ideas of “Indianness” have created conditions of possibility for U. S. empire to manifest its intent. As liberal multicultural settler colonialism attempts to flex the exceptions and exclusions that first constituted the United States to now provisionally include those people othered and abjected from the nation-state’s origins, it instead creates a cacophony of moral claims that help to deflect progressive and transformative activism from dismantling the ongoing conditions of colonialism that continue to make the United States a desired state formation within which to be included. That cacophony of competing struggles for hegemony within and outside institutions of power, no matter how those struggles might challenge the state through loci of race, class, gender, and sexuality, serves to misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism that made the United States possible as oppressor in the first place. As a result, the cacophony produced through U.S. colonialism and imperialism domestically and abroad often coerces struggles for social justice for queers, racial minorities, and immigrants into complicity with settler colonialism. This book, on the other hand, is also interested in the quandaries poststructuralism has left us: the traces of indigenous savagery and “Indianness” that stand a priori prior to theorizations of origin, history, freedom, constraint, and difference.³ These traces of “Indianness” are vitally important to understanding how power and domination have been articulated and practiced by empire, and yet because they are traces, they have often remained deactivated as a point of critical inquiry as theory has transited across disciplines and schools. Indianness can be felt and intuited as a presence, and yet apprehending it as a process is difficult, if not impossible, precisely because Indianness has served as the field through which structures have always already been produced. Within the matrix of critical theory, Indianness moves not through absence but through reiteration, through meme, as theories circulate and fracture, quote and build. The prior ontological concerns that interpellate Indianness and savagery as ethnographic evidence and example, lamentable and tragic loss, are deferred through repetitions. How we have come to know intimacy, kinship, and identity within an empire born out of settler colonialism is predicated upon discourses of indigenous displacements that remain within the present everydayness of settler colonialism, even if its constellations have been naturalized by hegemony and even as its oppressive logics are expanded to contain more and more historical experiences. I hope to show through the juridical, cultural, and literary readings within this book that indigenous critical theory provides alternatives to the entanglements of race and colonialism, intimacy and relationship that continue to preoccupy poststructuralist and postcolonial studies. The stakes could not be greater, given that currently U.S. empire has manifested its face to the world as a war machine that strips life even as it demands racialized and gendered normativities. The post-/ national rhetorics of grief, homeland, pain, terrorism, and security have given rise to what Judith Butler describes as a process through which the Other becomes unreal. “The derealization of the ‘Other,’” Butler writes, “means that it is neither alive nor dead, but interminably spectral. The infinite paranoia that imagines the war against terrorism as a war without end will be one that justifies itself endlessly in relation to the spectral infinity of its enemy, regardless of whether or not there are established grounds to suspect the continuing operation of terror cells with violent aims.”⁴ But this process of derealization that Butler marks in the post-/ grief that swept the United States, one could argue, has been functioning in Atlantic and Pacific “New Worlds” since . As Geonpul scholar Aileen Moreton-Robinson argues, discourses of security are “deployed in response to a perceived threat of invasion and dispossession from Indigenous people,” and in the process, paranoid patriarchal white sovereignty manages its anxiety over dispossession and threat through a “pathological relationship to indigenous sovereignty.”⁵ In the United States, the Indian is the original enemy combatant who cannot be grieved. Within dominant discourses of postracial identity that depend on the derealization of the Other, desires for amnesty and security from the contradictory and violent occupations of colonialist wars exist in a world where, as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak points out, “metropolitan multiculturalism—the latter phase of dominant postcolonialism—precomprehends U.S. manifest destiny as transformed asylum for the rest of the world.”⁶ As a result, the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself. The Transit of Empire, then, might best be understood as a series of preliminary reflections on how ideas of Indians and Indianness have served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself as settler imperialism at this crucial moment in history when everything appears to be headed towards collapse.

#### Their attachment to apocalyptic threat analysis is rooted in the fear of the end of Western futures only salvageable via the heroism of the white subject – reject their All Lives Matter politics.

**Mitchell and Chaudhury 20** – Audra Mitchell, Balsillie School of International Affairs, and Aadita Chaudhury, York University – Keele Campus

Audra Mitchell and Aadita Chaudhury “Worlding beyond ‘the’ ‘end’ of ‘the world’: white apocalyptic visions and BIPOC futurisms” International Relations 2020, Vol. 34(3) 309–332 // sam :)

Discourses that predict the imminent ‘end of the world’ are not as universal as they often claim to be. The futures they fear for, seek to protect and work to construct are rooted in a particular set of global social structures and subjectivities: whiteness. Whiteness is not reducible to skin pigmentation, genetics or genealogy. It is a set of cultural, political, economic, normative, and subjective structures derived from Eurocentric societies and propagated through global formations such as colonization and capitalism. These multi-scalar structures work by segregating bodies through the inscription of racial difference, privileging those they recognize or construct as ‘white’4 and unequally distributing harms to those that they do not.5 Whiteness is also a form of property6 that accrues benefits – including material, physical, and other forms of security – and pervasive forms of power, across space, time, and social structures. Due in part to its trans-formation through long-duration, global patterns of violence and conquest, whiteness takes unique forms wherever and whenever it coalesces, so it should not be treated as universal – despite its own internal claims to this status. Most of the leading contributors to mainstream ‘end of the world’ discourses discussed in this article are rooted in Euro-American cultural contexts, and in particular in settler colonial and/or imperial states such as the United States, Canada, Australia, and the United Kingdom. As such, the forms of whiteness they embody are linked to particular histories of settlement, frontier cultures, resource-based imperialisms, genocides of Indigenous communities, histories of slavery, and modes of anti-Blackness. Whiteness is remarkable in its ability to render itself invisible to those who possess and benefit from it. Many, if not most, of the (often liberal humanitarian) authors of ‘end of the world’ discourses seem unaware of its integral influence on their thinking, and would almost certainly be horrified at the thought of their work entrenching racialized injustices. We are not suggesting that these authors espouse explicit, intentional and/or extreme racist ideals, on which much public discussion by white people of racism tends to focus.7 Nor do we wish to homogenize or present as equivalent all of the viewpoints discussed in this paper, which display a range of expressions of whiteness and levels of awareness thereof.8 On the contrary, we work to center broad, everyday, structural ways in which underlying logics of whiteness and white supremacy frame and permeate mainstream paradigms and discourses, including those identified as liberal, humanitarian, or progressive. Even amongst white people who consciously and explicitly disavow racism, unconscious, habitual, normalized, structurally-embedded assumptions circulate, and are reproduced in ways that perpetuate race9 as a global power structure. This includes one of the authors of this paper (Mitchell), who, as a white settler,10 continues to benefit from and participate – and thus ‘invest’11 – in structures of whiteness, and therefore has a continual responsibility to confront them (although total divestment is not possible).12 The ‘habits’ of racism13 are reflected strongly in the way that contemporary ‘end of the world’ narratives frame their protagonists: those attributed with meaningful agency and ethical status in the face of global threats; those whose survival or flourishing is prioritized or treated as a bottom line when tradeoffs are imagined and planned; and, crucially, those deemed capable of and entitled to ‘save the world’ and determine its future. This is expressed in several key features of the genre, including its domination by white thinkers; the forms of subjectivity and agency it embraces; and the ways it contrasts its subjects against BIPOC communities. First, contributors to fast-growing fields like the study of ‘existential risk’ or ‘global catastrophic risk’ are overwhelmingly white. As we will see, almost all of the authors identified by the literature review on which this paper is based, and certainly the most influential thinkers in the field, are white. For example, the seminal collection Global Existential Risk, 14 which claims to offer a comprehensive snapshot of this field, is edited by two white male Europeans (Nick Bostrom and Milan Circovic) and authored by an almost entirely white (and all-male) group of scholars. Likewise, the most senior positions within influential think tanks promoting the study of ‘existential risk’, such as the Future of Humanity Institute, the Cambridge Center for the Study of Existential Risk and Humanprogress.org, are dominated by white men, with few exceptions.15 Another expression of this tendency toward epistemic whiteness is found in the habit, prominent amongst white academics, of citing all or mostly-white scholars, which entrenches a politics of citation16 that privileges whiteness and acknowledges only some intersectionalities as relevant.17 As mentioned above, Mitchell’s (2017)18 work offers an example of this tendency: while it engages critical, feminist, and queer postapocalyptic visions written by white authors, it does not center BIPOC perspectives or knowledge systems. These examples do not simply raise issues of numerical representation, nor can whiteness necessarily be dismantled simply by altering these ratios. More importantly, all-white or majority white spaces create epistemes in which most contributors share cultural backgrounds, assumptions, and biases that are rarely challenged by alternative worldviews, knowledge systems or registers of experience. In such epistemes the perceived boundaries of ‘human thought’ are often elided with those of Euro-centric knowledge. For example, influential American settler journalist David Wallace-Wells19 contends that there exists no framework for grasping climate change besides ‘mythology and theology’. In so doing, he ignores centuries of ongoing, systematic observation and explicit articulations of concern by BIPOC knowledge keepers about climactic change. The bracketing of BIPOC knowledges not only severely limits the rigor of discourses on global crises, but also, as bi-racial organizer and thinker adrienne maree brown20 argues, it produces distorted outcomes. For instance, it smuggles normative judgments that ‘turn Brown bombers into terrorists and white bombers into mentally ill victims’ into apparently ‘objective’ claims. Similarly, the influential work of Black American criminologist Ruth Wilson Gilmore21 demonstrates how white imaginaries of the threat posed by BIPOC bodies has produced the massive global penal complex and the radically unequal distribution of life chances. In short, imaginaries create worlds, so it matters greatly whose are privileged, and whose are excluded. Further, emerging narratives of the ‘end of the world’ explicitly center figures of whiteness as their protagonists – as the survivors of apocalypse, the subjects capable of saving the world from it, and as those most threatened. In these discourses, ‘survivors’ are framed as saviors able to protect and/or regenerate and even improve Western forms of governance and social order by leveraging resilience, scientific prowess, and technological genius. For example, the cover of American settler scientists Tony Barnosky and Elizabeth Hadley’s book Tipping Points for Planet Earth features a stylized male ‘human’ whom they identify as former California governor Jerry Brown (a powerful white settler politician) holding the earth back from rolling over a cliff.22 Similarly, presenting a thought experiment about the planet’s future, Homer-Dixon23 asks his readers to imagine ‘an average male – call him John’ (in fact, the most popular male name globally at the time of writing was Mohammed). This is followed by images of a Caucasian male dressed in safari or hiking gear – both emblematic of symbols colonial conquest24 – tasked with choosing from two forks on a path, as imagined by white American poet Robert Frost. This image of rugged masculine whiteness, embodied in physical strength, colonial prowess, and the ability to dominate difficult landscapes is mirrored in his framing of his former co-workers on oil rigs in the Canadian prairies25 as models of resilience. Similarly, American settler science writer Annalee Newitz26 proposes the Canadian province of Saskatchewan as a ‘model for human survival’, based on her perceptions of the resilience, persistence and collaborative frontier attitudes of its people. Saskatchewan is a notoriously racist part of Canada, in which violence against Indigenous people continues to be integral to its white-dominated culture27 – yet this polity and its culture are held up by Newitz as a model of ‘human’ resilience. By imagining subjects in whom whiteness is elided with resilience and survival, these discourses not only normalize and obscure the modes of violence and oppression through which perceived ‘resilience’ – or, in blunt terms, preferential access to survival – is achieved. They also work to displace the threat of total destruction ‘onto others who are seen as lacking the resourcefulness of the survivor’.28 In addition, many ‘end of the world’ narratives interpellate subjects of white privilege by assuming that readers are not (currently) affected by the harms distributed unequally by global structures of environmental racism. For instance, Barnosky and Hadley29 (italics ours) state, ‘if you are anything like we are, you probably think of pollution as somebody else’s problem. . . you probably don’t live near a tannery, mine dump or any other source of pollution’. For many people of color, living near a source of pollution may be nearly inescapable as a result of structural-material discrimination, including zoning practices and the accessibility of housing.30 Viewing ecological harms as ‘someone else’s problem’ is a privilege afforded to those who have never been forced contemplate the destruction of their communities or worlds.31 At the same time, these authors – along with many others working in the genre – invoke narratives akin to ‘all lives matter’ or ‘colour-blindness’32 that erase unequal distributions of harm and threat. For instance, during their international travels for scientific research and leisure, Barnosky and Hadley (italics ours) describe a dawning awareness that ‘the problems we were writing about. . . were everybody’s problems. . .no one was escaping the impacts. . . including us’. They go on to frame as equivalent flooding in Pakistan that displaced 20million people and killed 2000 with the inconveniences caused by the temporary flooding of the New York subway system in 2012. In addition, they cite evidence of endocrine disruption in American girls caused by pollution, stating that the youngest of the cohort are African American and Latina but that ‘the most dramatic increase is in Caucasian girls’33 (italics ours). In this framing, even though BIPOC children remain most adversely affected, white children are pushed to the foreground and framed as more urgently threatened in relative terms. These comparisons background the disproportionate burden of ecological harm born by BIPOC, and reflect a stark calculus of the relative value of white and BIPOC lives. The ‘all lives matter’ logic employed here constructs ‘a universal human frailty’34 in which responsibility for ecological threats is attributed to ‘humans’ in general, and the assignment of specific culpability is avoided. While Newitz avers that ‘assigning blame [for ecological harm] is less important than figuring out how to. . . survive’,35 we argue that accurately attributing responsibility is crucial to opening up futures in which it is possible to dismantle the structural oppressions that unequally distribute harms and chances for collective survival. Preoccupation with the subjects of whiteness in ‘end of the world’ discourses is also reflected in the framing of BIPOC communities as threats to the survival of ‘humanity’. These fears are perhaps most simply and starkly expressed in anxieties over population decline within predominantly white countries, paired with palpable fear of rising birth rates amongst BIPOC communities. Chillingly, such fears are often connected to the mere biological survival of BIPOC, and the reproductive capacities of Black and Brown bodies – especially those coded as ‘female’, and therefore ‘fertile’ within colonial gender binaries.36 For instance, in his treatise on ‘over’-population, American settler science writer Alan Weisman addresses the ‘problem’ raised by the likely significant increase of survival rates (especially amongst children) as a result of widely-available cures for illnesses such as malaria or HIV. Since, he avers, it would be ‘unconscionable’ to withhold these vaccines, Weisman suggests that malaria and HIV research funding should also promote family planning – that is, control of BIPOC fertility – since ‘there’s no vaccine against extinction’.37 Here, BIPOC survival and reproductivity is literally – even if not strictly intentionally – framed as an incurable disease that could culminate in ‘extinction’. Although some of these discussions examine total growth in human populations globally,38 much of this research focuses on relative population sizes, usually of BIPOC majority places to those inscribed as white. For instance, British doctor John Guillebaud predicts a ‘birth dearth’ in Europe while likening ‘unremitting population growth’ in other parts of the world to ‘the doctrine of the cancer cell’.39 Although these regions are described in various ways throughout the genre – for instance, as ‘poor’ or ‘developing’, the areas slated for growth are almost always BIPOC-majority. For example, Hungarian demographer Paul Demeny (italics ours) argues that Europe’s population is steadily shrinking ‘while nearby populations explode’.40 Drawing on Demeny’s work, HomerDixon warns of a future 3:1 demographic ratio between North Africa/West Asia and Europe, along with 70% growth in Bangladesh, 140% growth in Kenya, and a doubling of the populations of Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, and Nigeria. Directly after sharing these statistics, he appends a list of international news reports referring to, for example, clashes between Indigenous communities in Kenya, riots in Shanghai, and murder rates in Mexico.41 In so doing, he directly juxtaposes BIPOC population growth with stereotypes of violence and ‘incivility’. BIPOC are often represented in these narratives as embodiments of ecological collapse and threat, embedding the assumption that ‘black people don’t care about the environment’,42 and that the global ‘poor’ will always prioritize short-term economic needs above ecological concerns. This belief is reflected in travelogue-style descriptions of ecological devastation, including Barnosky and Hadley’s musings, while on holiday in Utah, that the ancient Puebloan society collapsed because they had run out of water – a situation which they project onto future Sudan, Somalia, and Gaza. In addition, they diagnose the fall of what they call the ‘extinct’ Mayan community to overpopulation and over-exploitation of resources – despite the survivance43 of over 6million Mayan people in their Ancestral lands and other places at the time of writing.44 These descriptions chime with the common refrain on the part of settler states that BIPOC are unable to care properly for their land, even in the absence of conflicting data. This constructed ignorance allows those states to frame BIPOC territories as ‘wasteland’ awaiting annexation or improvement, or as dumping grounds for the externalities of capitalism.45 What’s more, the use of BIPOC communities as cautionary tales for planetary destruction strongly suggests that the redistribution of global power, land ownership, and other forms of agency toward BIPOC structures would result in ecological disaster.

#### Their performative universalization of Western governance exports settler colonial governance globally.

Morgensen 11 (Scott Luria, ‘The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now,’ *Settler Colonial Studies*, 1:1, 52-76)

My argument is that such readings are conditional on another that they occlude, and that in turn is conditioned by them. In the sixteenth centuries, as colonisation took shape in the settler societies of the Americas, a relational position purposefully formed. Countering the overtly genocidal violence of Sepulveda’s contravention of Indigenous humanity, Las Casas argued, for his time, a more compassionate, inclusive, and – I will return to this – liberal mode of settler colonial governance. Las Casas affirmed Indigenous humanity under God’s universal law and the necessity of its defence within a settler society. Yet his claim functioned precisely as a logic of elimination, in that recognising people of Indigenous heritage as subject racialised populations barred them from any difference that could trouble settler rule. As the incompletely consanguine children of Western law, they remained ever on the verge of eviction from it if they troubled the terms of their protection: amalgamation. Their proximity to exception arose under settler rule precisely by considering the degree to which Indigenous peoples may be included in the body of the West and its law. Far from being arbitrary, this concern was requisite to a settler society defining its relation to racialised differences on the lands it remade. A capacity in Western law to simultaneously incorporate and eliminate, recognise and except racialised and primitive difference was learned in settler projects of Indigenous elimination that established Western law on lands beyond ‘the West’. To the extent that they succeeded, settler colonialism made Western law spatially nonspecific and demonstrably universal, long prior to late modern mechanisms of global governance, and as their genealogical condition. Today, the ongoing naturalisation of settler colonialism positions settler states as exemplary of liberal governance universalised within and as Western law. A noted example transpired at the 2009 G20 Summit, when Prime Minister Stephen Harper found it useful to portray a gentle face for Canadian leadership by pointedly asserting that Canada ‘has no history of colonialism’.34 The significance of his comment was its clarity – notable for a leader quite familiar with critiques of Canada bearing a colonial relationship to Indigenous peoples. Harper obliquely invoked here the baggage of states such as the United Kingdom, France and Japan that negotiate tense relations with former conquests when governing global economics. On a global stage, Harper’s Canada separates from colonial legacies in Africa and Asia to assert a moral neutrality that is conveniently consistent with the universality of international law. The confidence in Harper’s statement would be implausible if his audiences – broader than we may care to think – truly believed that Canada practices colonisation. From theses of terra nullius, to justifications that ‘guns, germs, and steel’ made Indigenous replacement inevitable, to a sense that settler states ‘decolonised’ after rule devolved to white citizens: settlers readily present as other than colonists.35 Yet while Harper might believe that as a Canadian he inherits something other than conquest, I suggest that his exoneration hinges less on such belief, and more on a general appearance that ‘Canada’ exemplifies the universalisation of liberal modernity on the global stage. Interestingly, Harper’s statement appeared barely a year after his government responded to years of Indigenous activism by issuing a state apology for the Residential School system. As a primary agent in the genocidal histories Lawrence recounts, Residential Schools forcibly relocated Indigenous children to sites where they were killed by disease or neglect, or survived to be assimilated into settler society via enforced separation from and erasure of familial and community ties. As an educative mode of disciplinary power, Residential Schools situated internees and all Indigenous peoples as children: wards of a state whose paternalism appears not only in past abuse but in the present apology, which suggests that the state will better manage the Indigenous people over whom it retains a power to protect or destroy. The apology’s consistency with Harper’s disavowal of colonial history naturalises settler colonialism both ‘at home’ and ‘abroad’. We see here that the ongoing coloniality of settler states conditions their practice of liberal governance as not only Western, or even originally Western, but as universal through its instantiation by settler colonialism. I have argued that settler law presents an apotheosis of Western law by utilising its consanguinal logic to amalgamate and eliminate Indigenous peoples and thereby enable settler states to performatively universalise the West. To the extent that they succeed, then global governance precisely continues, naturalises, and globalises settler colonialism in and as our ‘colonial present’.36 The Western law universalised by settler states formed precisely by incorporating and excising Indigenous peoples as potentially yet incompletely consanguine with the social body. If settler law as Western law is projected as liberal governance, it follows a principle that it may arrive and settle anywhere, as itself. Such law then encompasses the provisional humanity of all whom it occupies as racialised and primitive children, whose capacity for defiance nevertheless invests the West with a paternal authority to act as caretaker or killer of ‘kin’ under its care. My argument modifies our interest to read Afghanistan or Iraq as sites of settler colonialism, once the United States gathers its allies for occupation. Settler colonialism occurs at these sites not, or not only because the U.S. or other states occupy Afghani and Iraqi peoples. It occurs more importantly because occupation performatively universalises Western governance through the nominal inclusion of Afghanis and Iraqis within its body of law, only to face elimination of their racialised primitivity: if not by being summarily placed ‘outside’ the law, then by being educated and contained through amalgamation as a potentially ever-endangering difference. Western law attains universality by containing and eliminating differences in the functional extension of settler colonialism as liberal governmentality.

#### 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 –– that enables unsustainable approaches to space exploration.
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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.

#### “In the future, we would be singing about the moon that existed before” – colonial expansion into space inevitably destroys indigenous spiritual connections to Sky Country – theoretical frames that understand the earth and sky as fundamentally separate ignore the intimate connections between bodies that govern space. 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.
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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.

### 1nc – Framework

#### Our interpretation is that the 1ac is an epistemological project – before you evaluate the consequences of the plan text you should weigh its ideological underpinnings.

#### The role of the ballot should be to embrace an ethic of incommensurability that steps away from the endless “what abouts” of the settler and unconditionally commit to decolonization instead of moves towards settler innocence.

**Tuck and Yang 12** (Eve Tuck is a professor at SUNY New Paltz. Wayne K Yang is a professor at the University of California San Diego) “Decolonization is not a metaphor” Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, July 17, 2017 // sam

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework. We want to say, first, that decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions - decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity. Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics - moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone - these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability.

#### Accountability DA – “weigh the aff” is a settler ruse to ensure a lack of accountability for anti-native representations – only our model of debate ensures we can challenge violent representations which internal link turns fairness because it makes debate unsafe for black, brown, and native debaters. Psychological violence outweighs – your role as an educator is to prioritize a model of debate that makes debate safer for students.

#### All of our 1nc K proper evidence justifies why thinking through land and relationships to land is imperative –if we win that is true than we win framework because only an interpretation that understands land as central to our epistemology can create a good politics.
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