# Settler Colonialism K

#### **Settler colonialism is the governing thought of modernity that posits notions of control and desire into the Western man implanting the seed opportunity born out of genocide. Paperson ‘17**

[La Paperson, aka K. Wayne Yang, UC San Diego. 2017. “A Third University is Possible”. <https://manifold.umn.edu/read/a-third-university-is-possible/section/ba50806d-ff18-4100-9998-784aecb42ae4>] //recut faizaan

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. However, the analysis of settler colonialism is actually not new, only often ignored within Western critiques of empire. 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. 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. 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. “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. 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. This creates a host of post+colonial problems that have come to define modernity. Because the humanity of the settler is predicated on his ability to “write the world,” to make history upon and over the natural world, the colonized is instructed to make her [their] claim to humanity by similarly acting on the world or, more precisely, acting in his. 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 aff’s defense of democracy is rooted in settler colonialism and suppression of indigenous authoritative capacity by preaching inclusion while silencing indigeneity in it’s process. Baker 17

 Oliver Baker, PhD candidate and Mellon Fellow American Literary Studies at the University of New Mexico, intersecting histories of settler colonialism, racial capitalism, white supremacy, and class in American literature and culture, “Democracy, Class, and White Settler Colonialism”, 2017, [https://www.academia.edu/34506752/Democracy\_Class\_and\_White\_Settler\_Colonialism)](https://www.academia.edu/34506752/Democracy_Class_and_White_Settler_Colonialism)/RC) 8-13-20 //FD WHS

In recent years. settler state policies have shifted away from a strategy Of direct violence and forced assimilation—mostly in response to the political threat posed by the anticolonial nation• alisms of the mid-twentieth century—and toward what Glen Coulthard describes as a politics of -colonial recognition.- in which settler societies promise greater accommodation and recognition of Indigenous groups but only to the extent that claims of sovereignty or demands for decolonization go unheard and remain disavowed: A politics of colonial recognition also calls for reconciliation and healing between settlers and Indigenous peoples as a way to mend what is believed to be a racial or cultural conflict rather than a struggle over land and sovereignty. While settler societies might affirm the diversity Of Indigenous cultures or even lament past incidents Of colonial violence. Centuries-old structures and institutions of dispossession remain in place. These can be witnessed today in the underdevelopment of tribal economies that encourages the privatization of (or the attempt to dissolve) tribally-held land and resources; neoliberal policies that slash public services and deregulate predatory credit and loan industries. while funding entrepreneurial self-help initiatives in Indian Country; the use of state and police violence to brutalize. incarcerate. and murder unsheltered and working poor Indigenous peoples whose presence -off the reservation- in border towns is seen as a threat and danger to the property and flows of capital of settler society. extraction industries that destructively seek to unearth and/or transport fossil fuels on or through tribal lands: and the ongoing refusal of federal governments to honour the treaties, land claims. and rights to self.determination of the Indigenous nations of North America. A second key analytic of settler colonial studies and Indigenous critical theory is the concept of Indigeneity. Although defined in various ways, for this essay3 purposes Indigeneity can be described as the social category of persons whose ways of life. forms of knowing. and modes Of being depend upon originary relationships to land bases that Euro-American settlers have enclosed and continue to occupy. Because Indigenous peoples claim originary ties to these land bases. their presence or attempt to live on and through them challenges the legitimacy of settler society. As a social category constituted through elimination and genocide. Indigeneity should be understood as distinct from, for example. the category of the wage labourer that is structured by proletarianization and hegemony. If wage labourers. whether employed or unemployed. are struc- turally included in the marketplace where their labour power is exploited. the marketplace itself and the liberal state form that upholds it are nonetheless premised on the elimination of Indigenous peoples altogether. The ideological framework that mediates, legitimates. and reproduces Indigenous dispossession and its category of Indigeneity is the colonial and racial grammar of what Jodi Byrd calls "Indianness.¯• The Indian came to be a social ontology in which Indigenous peoples were under- stood as savage. ancient. living fossils of early humanity. stuck outside of time and space in a state of nature. The Indian was and continues to be both abjected and romanticized in settler culture as a person who exists in a state of natural warfare. instability. and conflict. while also appearing liberated from the constraints and alienation of modern life. In this state of nature, the Indian is understood to lack the capacity to labour productivity. possess property. or enter into social con • tracts. Through such meanings. the Indian emerges as the outside or Other to Euro-American forms of liberal democracy. selfhood. and civil society.• As Byrd emphasizes. - European moder- nity hinges upon Indians as the necessary antinomy through which the New World—along with civilization. freedom. sovereignty. and humanity—comes to have meaning. structure. and pres- ence.-•• The Indian. in short, became the figure of the un-sovereign through which it was understood that the Indian might occupy but could never possess the ability or right to own lands or possess selfhood.' i The dispossession of Indigenous lands. resources. and bodies thus came to be seen less as a form of theft than the natural transition from -savage- communalism to civilized market society. Today. Indianness continues. as Byrd puts it. to "transit U.S. empire,- or put into motion, facil. itate, and cohere the United States' settler imperial project that reaches around the world." It is through Indianness that settlers come to view the lands. resources. and bodies of the earth as spaces and objects of a barren wilderness (terra nullius) freely available for expropriation. The current and future populations living in spaces of the lands and controlling the resources that US settler imperialism attempts to seize or control are, as Byrd explains. made "Indian- or abjected as mindless terrorist-savages whose confrontation with the agents of enclosure is under- stood not as an attempt to resist and survive colonization. occupation. and genocide. but an irrational attack against society. civilization. humanity. and the forces of modern progress. In short. Indianness is what legitimates the process of primitive accumulation or what David Harvey calls -accumulation by dispossession.- which is central to the formation. expansion. and domi- nance of global finance capitalism. What an understanding. then. of settler colonialism. Indigeneity. and Indianness demonstrates concerning the question of alliance-building among oppressed groups today is that political organizing through the spaces of the democratic commons or the identity of the settler wage labourer supports rather than disrupts the colonization of Indigenous peoples of North America In the case of the democratic commons. Calls for preserving and expanding the public institutions and spaces of liberal democracy in order to cultivate more radical and progressive forms of democracy is a demand not to undo or transform but to uphold the settler colonial state As Byrd argues. "one reason why a racial' and just democratic society is a lost cause in the United States is that it is always already conceived through the prior disavowed and misremembered colonization of Indigenous lands that cannot be ended by further inclusion or more participation."" Coulthard echoes this point. showing that "in liberal settler states...the •com. not only belong to somebody.. .they also deeply inform and sustain Indigenous modes of thought and behavior"" While it should be acknowledged that the democratic Commons histori- eally has served an important role in cultivating and producing emancipatory modes Of analysis and forms Of social belonging. such gains have nonetheless always depended upon the tion of Indigenous peoples. Any defence. then, of the democratic commons today must at the same time defend Indigenous sovereignty. This means rethinking how groups relate in the spaces Of the commons in Ways that do not perpetuate liberal democracy's colonial project Oi building public institutions and democratic spaces through the seizure, theft, and colonization of Indigenous lands. bodies. and resources. Class .first models of a renewed workers' movement also risk reproducing colonial disposses. Sion When they fail to recognize that the Indian and the settler Wage labourer are structurally distinct categories Of oppression. former is constituted by dispossession through elimination. while the latter is structured by exploitation through hegemony. Even though exploited. settler wage labourers nonetheless come to experience their status in settler colonialism as a place Of refuge and protection tiom dispossession and abjection. The role of the settler state is to ensure and safeguard the settler wage labourers right not only to possess but not to be dispossessed of property, even if the only property the wage labourer possesses is labour power. In fact. possessing labour power as a commodity to sell on the market indexes the settler wage laboureös right and ability to enter the social Contract and find security from the forms structural exclusion natu• ralized in the position of the Indian. Such a status explains why. when neoliberal forms of precarious labour and exclusions from waged life increasingly target settler wage labourers, they are felt and represented as abnormal. undeserving, and. more importantly. grievable occurrences. The dispossession Of settlers challenges the symbolic and material consisten€y Of settler societies that are premised on dispossessing colonial peoples in order to reward and advantage settlers Of all classes. Settler society retains and reproduces its coherence as the promised site of settler sovereignty, possession. and rights by figuring the neoliberal dispossession of settlers as the exception to be if only because Indigenous dispossession remains the norm to be reproduced and repeated. grievability of neoliberal dispossession. heard today in the refrain that globalization has -abandoned the white working class.- depends upon the ungrievability and normalization of Indigenous dispossession that. in the narratives not only Of manifest destiny but also the demo- cratic commons and normative socialist futures. is depicted and accepted as a natural. inevitable. and necessary process. One of the limits. then. of calling for solidarity through the political identity of the wage labourer is that. in settler colonialism. what organized settler wage labourers demand is not necessarily an end to exploitation but the freedom. protection, and refuge from structural dispossession and exclusion that are normalized and naturalized in the social and racial ontologies of the Indian. Movements on behalf of settler labourers risk ending in reform rather than revolution precisely because they do not so much seek to confront capital as they seek refuge and protection within and through it.

#### Objectivity is a guise that is controlled by settler colonialism in order to propagate settler innocence. There attempts to contribute to an unbiased press only abstracts from confronting settler colonialism and decolonization. Beckermann 19

Beckermann, Kay, ", NEWSPAPERS AS A FORM OF SETTLER COLONIALISM: AN EXAMINATION OF THE DAKOTA ACCESS PIPELINE PROTEST AND AMERICAN INDIAN REPRESENTATION IN INDIGENOUS, STATE, AND NATIONAL NEWS

", 06-14-2019 University of North Dakota, https://library.ndsu.edu/ir/bitstream/handle/10365/31546/Newspapers%20as%20a%20Form%20of%20Settler%20Colonialism.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y, 3-6-2022, //faizaan

**The media—television, radio, newspapers—form Althusser’s communication apparatus (**Sevgi & Ozgokceler, 2016). The institutions within the apparatus contribute to settler colonialism as they recognize Indigenous populations; however, the industry controls the narrative of this community through media frames. Beyond these frames, which will be discussed in the next chapter, the narrative is controlled through the ideology and hegemony of media organizations. Based on the ideology of objectivity, news media (theoretically) attempt to distribute accurate and unbiased information to the masses. However, the institutional structure of the media ensures the dominant ideology is being supported (Althusser, 1971; Mullen & Klaehn, 2010). Media owners and managers control the appearance of objectivity and “their forms of social control must be indirect, subtle, and not at all necessarily conscious” (Gitlin, 2003, p. 259). This is achieved through the hiring of personnel who are typically white and upper- middle-class, decisions as to who is promoted or otherwise rewarded, and organizantional 23 policies. The result is upper-level decision makers that were raised in the dominant ideology and share the “core [emphasis original] hegemonic assumptions of their class” (Gitlin, 2003, p. 260). The media in America are ubiquitous, which makes it an ideal format for those in power to disseminate their ideology to the masses. The media are arguably the most “dynamic part of this ideological structure” (Gramsci, 2009, p. 36) as the dominant class works vehemently to maintain and defend their ideologies and use the press to circulate them to the masses (Gramsci, 2009). News stories that support dominant class ideologies are “reinforcing dominant social norms and values that legitimize the social system” (Gurevitch, Bennett, Curran, & Wollacott, 1982, p. 9) The Propaganda Model investigates how norms and values become standardised in a society. It explores the “relationships between ideology, communicative power and social class interests” (Mullen & Klaehn, 2010, p. 217). Developed by Herman and Chomsky (1988) the model argues that news flows through multple filters, each designed to maintain dominant class power. The Propaganda Model, particularly when viewed through the traditional Marxist lens and Althusser’s ISAs, emphasizes the fact that media are influencers in the control of the dominant ideology (Sevgi & Ozgokceler, 2016). This is accomplished through the five filters of the Propaganda Model: size, ownership, and profit of mass media; advertiser influence; use of sources; flak; and anti-communision as a control mechanism (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). This research focuses on two filters in particular, the size/ownership/profitability of mass media and reliance of government or corporate sources. The size/ownership/profitability (SOP) filter supports the institutional structural argument. The investment needed to start a media organization with significant outreach has grown to extreme proportions (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). Media historian Ben Bagdikian 24 (2004) points out that historically, many different individuals ran the dominant media corporations in America. However, by 2003 only five firms controlled most of the 37,000 media outlets (Bagdikian, 2004). The Big Five,2 as Bagdikian (2004) calls them, have access to the over $2 billion spent per year in advertising; money that helps them purchase and maintain the numerous media entities in their name. This trend continues, as 15 billionaires currently own 90% of American media (Vinton, 2016). This includes individuals such as Jeff Bezos, owner of amazon.com, who purchased the Washington Post for $250 million (Vinton, 2016). Prohibitive costs leads to reduced opportunities for small and/or alternative media to reach the masses as they typically do not possess the necessary capital (Goodwin, 1994).

#### Thus, the only alternative is decolonization.

Tuck and Yang 12(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, //recut FD WHS)

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 when you take away the punctuation he says of lines lifted from the documents about military-occupied land its acreage and location you take away its finality opening the possibility of other futures -Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012) Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for who best centers indigenous scholarship and resistance - Any ethical commitment requires that the aff place themselves in the center of Native scholarship and demands.

Carlson 16

[Elizabeth Carlson, PhD, is an Aamitigoozhi, Wemistigosi, and Wasicu (settler Canadian and American), whose Swedish, Saami, German, Scots-Irish, and English ancestors have settled on lands of the Anishinaabe and Omaha Nations which were unethically obtained by the US government. Elizabeth lives on Treaty 1 territory, the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, Nehiyawak, Dakota, Nakota, and Red River Metis peoples currently occupied by the city of Winnipeg, the province of Manitoba, (2016): Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies, Settler Colonial Studies, DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241213, //recut FD WHS

Arlo Kempf says that ‘where anticolonialism is a tool used to invoke resistance for the colonized, it is a tool used to invoke accountability for the colonizer’.42 Relational accountability should be a cornerstone of settler colonial studies. I believe settler colonial studies and scholars should ethically and overtly place themselves in relationship to the centuries of Indigenous oral, and later academic scholarship that conceptualizes and resists settler colonialism without necessarily using the term: SCT may be revelatory to many settler scholars, but Indigenous people have been speaking for a long time about colonial continuities based on their lived experiences. Some SCTs have sought to connect with these discussions and to foreground Indigenous resistance, survival and agency. Others, however, seem to use SCT as a pathway to explain the colonial encounter without engaging with Indigenous people and experiences – either on the grounds that this structural analysis already conceptually explains Indigenous experience, or because Indigenous resistance is rendered invisible.43 Ethical settler colonial theory (SCT) would recognize the foundational role Indigenous scholarship has in critiques of settler colonialism. It would acknowledge the limitations of settler scholars in articulating settler colonialism without dialogue with Indigenous peoples, and take as its norm making this dialogue evident. In my view, it is critical that we not view settler colonial studies as a new or unique field being established, which would enact a discovery narrative and contribute to Indigenous erasure, but rather take a longer and broader view. Indigenous oral and academic scholars are indeed the originators of this work. This space is not empty. Of course, powerful forces of socialization and discipline impact scholars in the academy. There is much pressure to claim unique space, to establish a name for ourselves, and to make academic discoveries. I am suggesting that settler colonial studies and anti-colonial scholars resist these hegemonic pressures and maintain a higher anti-colonial ethic. As has been argued, ‘the theory itself places ethical demands on us as settlers, including the demand that we actively refuse its potential to re-empower our own academic voices and to marginalize Indigenous resistance’.44 As settler scholars, we can reposition our work relationally and contextually with humi- lity and accountability. We can centre Indigenous resistance, knowledges, and scholarship in our work, and contextualize our work in Indigenous sovereignty. We can view oral Indigenous scholarship as legitimate scholarly sources. We can acknowledge explicitly and often the Indigenous traditions of resistance and scholarship that have taught us and pro- vided the foundations for our work. If our work has no foundation of Indigenous scholarship and mentorship, I believe our contributions to settler colonial studies are even more deeply problematic.

#### There is no room for settler futurity – any assumption that change can be enacted via reform within the state just concedes to the state’s unethical legislative capacity in the first place and denies indigenous sovereignty. **Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernandez 13**

[EVE TUCK and RUBÉN A. GAZTAMBIDE-FERNÁNDEZ. "Curriculum, Replacement, and Settler Futurity" Rochester29.1 (2013): 72-89.] // faizaan

Settler Futurity. The settler colonial curricular project of replacement is invested in settler futurity, or what Andrew Baldwin calls the “permanent virtuality” of the settler on stolen land (2012, p. 173). When we locate the present of settler colonialism as only the production of the past, we overlook how settler colonialism is configured in relation to a different temporal horizon: the future. To say that something is invested in something else’s futurity is not the same as saying it is invested in something’s future, though the replacement project is invested in both settler future and futurity. Futurity refers to the ways in which, “the future is rendered knowable through specific practices (i.e. calculation, imagination, and performance) and, in turn, intervenes upon the present through three anticipatory logics (i.e. pre-caution, pre-emption and preparedness)” (p. 173). Considering the significance of futurity for researching whiteness and geography, Baldwin (2012) wonders whether a past-oriented approach reproduces the (false), Teleological assumption that white racism can be modernized away. Such an assumption privileges an ontology of linear causality in which the past is thought to act on the present and the present is said to be an effect of whatever came before [...] According to this kind of temporality, the future is the terrain upon or through which white racism will get resolved. It cleaves the future from the present and, thus, gives the future discrete ontological form. (p. 174) Thus, in this historical analysis of the settler colonial curricular project of replacement, we seek to emphasize the ways in which replacement is entirely concerned with settler futurity, which always indivisibly means the continued and complete eradication of the original inhabitants of contested land. Anything that seeks to recuperate and not interrupt settler colonialism, to reform the settlement and incorporate Indigenous peoples into the multicultural settler colonial nation state is fettered to settler futurity. To be clear, our commitments are to what might be called an Indigenous futurity, which does not foreclose the inhabitation of Indigenous land by nonIndigenous peoples, but does foreclose settler colonialism and settler epistemologies. That is to say that Indigenous futurity does not require the erasure of now-settlers in the ways that settler futurity requires of Indigenous peoples.

## Case

#### The media is still a site of social exclusion of indigenous voices and silences decolonial pedagogies which means that the 1AC can never reform media institutions to represent indigenous groups. UTS 21

UTS "Indigenous voices still missing in media stories", 07-01-2021, University of Technology Sydney, https://www.uts.edu.au/news/social-justice-sustainability/indigenous-voices-still-missing-media-stories, 3-6-2022, //faizaan

Since the British invasion of Gadigal land at Sydney Cove in 1788, race relations in Australia have been underscored by what [Wiradjuri writer Jack Gibson](https://indigenousx.com.au/media-and-white-blinkers.) describes as the “supremeness of whiteness”. Narratives of [Indigenous inferiority and deficiency](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1329878X1314900117), combined with paternalistic policies, have produced a cultural climate where non-Indigenous voices have often dominated debate on matters of concern and importance to Indigenous communities. However, in recent years, Indigenous [journalists](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/aug/03/nothing-about-us-without-us-thats-why-we-need-indigenous-owned-media) and storytellers have sought to change this. [The Uluru Statement From the Heart](https://apo.org.au/node/91606) calls for a process of truth-telling. And as the Black Lives Matter movement has grown, some media organisations are recognising the need to deal with their histories of racist representations. In 2020, for example, the Stuff Group in New Zealand [apologised](https://www.stuff.co.nz/pou-tiaki/our-truth/123533668/our-truth-t-mtou-pono-stuff-introduces-new-treaty-of-waitangi-based-charter-following-historic-apology) for its racist and exclusionary depictions of Māori over decades. [Our new research](https://alltogethernow.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/When-inclusion-means-exclusion-report-2021.pdf), published as a joint report from All Together Now, University of Technology Sydney, Deakin University and Cultural and Indigenous Research Australia, examines the ways in which the mainstream media use language, voices, and other features (such as sources and points of view) to represent and frame Indigenous communities and issues. Our research revealed the media is increasingly depicting Indigenous people and communities in “inclusive” ways. In a survey of 288 opinion pieces about Indigenous communities across mainstream newspapers and television networks in Australia, we found that 151 had inclusive depictions of Indigenous people. Articles were considered inclusive if their language defied racial stereotypes, condemned racism, or gave a voice to Indigenous people. However, when we delved more deeply into a smaller sample of these inclusive pieces using discourse analysis, we found that inclusive commentary can still deny agency to Indigenous people through marginalising Indigenous voices. Exploring surface level inclusion Focusing on 20 opinion articles published between 2019 and 2020 in five leading newspapers - The Sydney Morning Herald, The Australian, The Daily Telegraph, Herald Sun and The Courier Mail - we found that Indigenous voices, points of view and sources were routinely under-represented, while relevant historical and cultural context was regularly overlooked. This obscures the actions and views of Indigenous people in the political debates that matter to their communities. Our research found what we called surface level inclusion: inclusion of Indigenous people through the absence of negative stereotypes, but excluding Indigenous authors, perspectives, historical and cultural contexts, and voices

#### New affs bad; 4 subpoints

#### 1. Rigorous Scrutiny — we were deprived of the opportunity to research and prepare a response to the case. Secrecy undermines rejoinder and prevents meaningful testing—destroys the possibility for debate as a site for revolutionary training.

#### 2. Perverse Incentives — “new aff” debates are bad because they lack preparation and coherent clash. Voting for them encourages students to value new above good. Catching others off-guard is not a portable skill and commodifies the content of their arguments.

#### 3. turns The Case — effective activism requires well-informed debates between leftists. They’ve ruined this opportunity to participate in a well- informed disagreement that can improve our activism.

#### 4. you get new affs you just have to disclose a plan text, you should drop them since they are engaging in unfair and un-educational practices within debate by preventing my ability to engage in the round.

#### These are all reasons to drop the debater, as they spread forms of unfairness and bad education models in debate