## 1

#### Settler colonialism is a permeating structure that operates via the promotion of the nation-state – it thrives off of the elimination of indigenous people and their relationship to land – that appropriation turns them into ghosts

Tuck and Yang 12 (Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang; 2012; Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40; *“Decolonization is not a metaphor”*; accessed 12/7/21; <https://clas.osu.edu/sites/clas.osu.edu/files/Tuck%20and%20Yang%202012%20Decolonization%20is%20not%20a%20metaphor.pdf>; Eve Tuck is a Unangax̂ scholar in the field of Indigenous studies and educational research. Tuck is the associate professor of critical race and indigenous studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto; K. Wayne Yang is Provost of John Muir College and Professor of Ethnic Studies at the University of California, San Diego; pages 5-7) HB \*brackets in original\* \*They use masculine pronouns to describe the settler not through direct association of the settler as a man but rather a dominating subject characterized as hypermasculine\*

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 overlap4 - 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 slaves5 , 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 a new "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.6 The 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 desires7 . 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

#### Journalistic objectivity relies on the narrative of a “view from nowhere” which papers over individuals material connection – that enables the continuance of false narratives that upholds a history of erasure

Brake 21 (Justin Brake; 7/5/21; Briarpatch Magazine; *“Built on a foundation of white supremacy”*; accessed 3/4/22; <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/built-on-a-foundation-of-white-supremacy>; Justin Brake is an independent journalist from Ktaqmkuk (Newfoundland) who presently lives and works in unceded Algonquin territory. A settler with Mi’kmaq ancestry, much of Justin’s work focuses on Indigenous rights and liberation. He is a writer and editor with the Breach and a regular contributor to the Independent) HB \*Brackets in original\*

The criminalization of Indigenous land defence – and of the journalism that reported on it – forced me and the land protectors through years of court hearings. In the end, the dam was built and Innu and Inuit living downstream now suffer the consequences of the violence inflicted upon their river and their ways of life. Some talked about the occupation’s silver linings: Innu, Inuit, and settler Labradorians “know now that they need to stick together to be heard and to be strong,” Innu land defender David Nuke told APTN in 2018. A 2019 decision from the Court of Appeal of Newfoundland and Labrador in my case recognized the special role journalists play when they cover Indigenous land defence. When granting an injunction, the judges wrote, courts must be careful not to infringe on Canadians’ constitutionally protected right to a free press. But in the years since 2016, as I’ve watched media coverage of Wet’suwet’en, Haudenosaunee, and Secwepemc land defence, I’m not sure a lack of press freedom is the main issue hindering good reporting on Indigenous resistance. As the reckoning with racism in Canadian newsrooms over the last year shows us, when the journalism industry is built on a foundation of white supremacy, publications and reporters become unwilling – maybe even unable – to acknowledge their biases and the ways their work upholds colonialism. Objectivity and settler colonialism “Watch your language.” That was the warning, written into an op-ed title, given by a daily newspaper columnist who took issue with my and other journalists’ use of the term “land protector” in our coverage of the Muskrat Falls resistance. “Reporters should avoid such language, laden as it is with inherent subjectivity,” the columnist went on. “[T]he last thing any journalist wants is to fuel those who are perpetually coiled and ready to yell ‘Media bias!’” The debate over the utility and legitimacy of objectivity in journalism is almost as old as the ideal itself. Objectivity “hinges on a more fundamental belief that there is a knowable world, a way of seeing that, once we set aside our own subjectivities, can be universally achieved or at least universally agreed upon,” journalist Lewis Raven Wallace writes in The View From Somewhere. Defenders of objectivity, like The Elements of Journalism authors Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel, argue that “[o]bjectivity was not meant to suggest that journalists were without bias. To the contrary, precisely because journalists could never be objective, their methods had to be. In the recognition that everyone is biased, in other words, the news, like science, should flow from a process for reporting that is defensible, rigorous, and transparent.” But too often, objectivity is conflated with the views of those in positions of power. In Seeing Red: A History of Natives in Canadian Newspapers, Mark Cronlund Anderson and Carmen L. Robertson detail how, over the course of this country’s short history, Canadian newspapers have supported and advanced settler colonialism. Under the guise of “objective” reporting, journalists have consistently othered and stereotyped Indigenous Peoples, misrepresented them, and outright erased their histories and cultures. “The colonial stereotypes have endured in the press, even flourished,” the authors noted a decade ago. “That the prose may have become less ‘blatant’ however suggests that the audience has become more familiar with the genre conventions of colonial discourse. To put it another way: the nation has been built.” Robert Ballantyne, a Cree-Mohawk grad student at Carleton University and former CBC and Toronto Star journalist, is researching anti-colonial reporting methods. He says objectivity “makes it difficult for journalists to confront their own work, as if they are somehow capable of transcending their own backgrounds, biases, and communities.” Armed with what Ballantyne calls a perceived “superpower of fairness,” journalists’ indoctrination in objectivity “can create an almost impossible situation to have difficult conversations and create change if someone believes they are beyond reproach.” Tałtan journalist Candis Callison and her colleague Mary Lynn Young argue in their book Reckoning: Journalism’s Limits and Possibilities that “what journalists think happened is deeply related to who they are and where they’re coming from in broad and specific senses – and that there are multiple truths and perspectives that contribute to understanding what ‘really’ happened,” they write. Instead of pretending to be objective, they suggest journalists could be transparent about who they are and where they come from. “Recognizing individual and collective social and historical location needs to become part of the methodology for journalists in order to situate themselves, their knowledge, and expertise within a wider web of relations and entanglements.” The land and the economy Though non-Indigenous journalists benefit from colonization by living on stolen lands and reaping the benefits of Canada’s economy, we rarely – if ever – hear about land as anything but a resource to exploit. Within settler colonialism, Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang write, “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.” “There are dominant narratives” in journalism, explains IndigiNews managing editor Emilee Gilpin, a Michif journalist of Cree-Métis, Filipina, and settler descent. Gilpin previously worked as the National Observer’s lead on its First Nations Forward series and is committed to decolonizing journalism and the media. She points to Canada’s economy as an example of a dominant narrative and notes few journalists ever question its nature or legitimacy when reporting on Indigenous land defence. Everything journalists report is in relation to the economy, she says, “as if that’s just the assumed reality, as if that’s the world view that we’re all working from.” In a 2020 interview for TVO, Seeing Red author Carmen Robertson told Kanyen’kehá:ka journalist Shelby Lisk that while some journalists have improved their coverage of Indigenous land defence, there remains a “disconnect [between] what land means from a settler perspective — a possession, a way to improve economics in this country — and then the notion of land as something other than that, which is a relational or kinship tie, which many Canadians, for the most part, just can’t even fathom.” As a result of that disconnect, Robertson says, “we see those stereotypes bubble through, because the fact that they’re ‘stopping progress,’ they’re stopping the economy, that doesn’t play well [with Canadians].” Countering extractive journalism When Ukwehu:we journalist Karl Dockstader embedded with Haudenosaunee land defenders at Six Nations of the Grand River last summer, he didn’t fully appreciate the significance of what he was doing. “I’ve always seen myself as an outsider when it comes to journalism, and I never realized what an asset that was until I set up a tent at 1492 Land Back Lane,” he says, recalling the early days of the land reclamation in opposition to the construction of a new housing development on the outskirts of Caledonia, Ontario. Dockstader and Sean Vanderklis, who co-host One Dish, One Mic on Niagara radio station Newstalk 610 CKTB, took a different approach to their reporting. “We believed we had a responsibility to follow traditional protocol before inviting land defenders on to the radio,” Dockstader says. As Indigenous journalists, he and Vanderklis are accountable to the communities they cover, Dockstader explains, which involves developing relationships and earning trust. When the pair visited the site, they played “LaGolf” – a lacrosse-golf hybrid game – with land defenders. “I sat around the fire, I jammed out a couple horn rattle tunes and water drum, traditional songs, with one of the singers there. And we just got to know the camp,” Dockstader recalls. The pair’s newsgathering and reporting methodologies stand in stark contrast to how most journalists do their work. “The extractive approach to journalism treats facts like coal in a mine, using sources and places the way mining companies use land – as a resource to dig into, and then leave behind,” writes Wallace in The View From Somewhere. Extractive journalism “goes hand in hand with ‘objectivity’: the outside observer objectifies the people and places the stories are about, who become ‘sources’ rather than human beings.” Courtney Skye, who is Mohawk Turtle Clan from Six Nations and a researcher, policy analyst, and consultant, has supported 1492 Land Back Lane’s efforts. She praises Dockstader and Vanderklis’ approach to covering the land defence. “They did a really professional job of reminding people of their role and their work, but at the same time they are Indigenous reporters,” she says, pointing out that the Oneida Nation, of which Dockstader is a citizen, is one of the six that comprise Six Nations of the Grand River. “When you are in your home territory and you have familial connections and responsibilities to people, and you understand what those are – our laws, our ways of being should mean more and should supersede the expectations of colonial professionalism,” she says. For his work, Dockstader was charged with mischief and failure to comply with a court injunction that was intended to get land defenders off the construction site. The Canadian Association of Journalists and Canadian Journalists for Free Expression immediately condemned, “in the strongest possible terms, the Ontario Provincial Police’s decision to arrest and lay charges against an award-winning Indigenous journalist.” Three and a half months later, the Crown withdrew the charges, saying there was no reasonable prospect of conviction. In its 2021 World Press Freedom Index report, Reporters Without Borders noted the ongoing criminalization of journalists who cover Indigenous land defence in its critique of Canada’s track record on press freedom. Making power visible Journalists covering land defence stories often report on “divisions” within communities as a way to represent the diverse ideas and perspectives Indigenous people have on issues like resource development, land stewardship, and protection of collective rights. But without historical context and an eye to power, journalists often end up supporting colonial power structures, says Hayden King, who is Anishinaabe from Beausoleil First Nation and the executive director of the Yellowhead Institute, an Indigenous-led research centre at Ryerson University. “This whole notion of factionalism can be its own narrative trope,” he explains. “If reporters had the tools to critically assess who will benefit from the story [they’re] telling, it might offer some correctives to how that story is told.” Six Nations’ most recent chief and council – elected by less than 10 per cent of eligible voters – signed an accommodations agreement with the housing developer in 2019. However, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council, which represents Six Nations’ traditional governance system, has never consented to the development and has publicly supported 1492 Land Back Lane. Skye says it’s crucial that journalists reporting on the land reclamation recognize the ways colonialism has disrupted Haudenosaunee decision-making processes. “Through the imposition of the Indian Act, certain people have been elevated into positions of power, [into] systems of hierarchies,” she explains. “It’s one of the ways that colonialism continues to hold Indigenous people back.” People often respond to colonial oppression by conforming to the system in order to access power, Skye says. “A lot of people see that as a way to our safety, a way to our success, and I try to always remember that and not to hold a person personally responsible for it. But you have to have that simultaneous contextualization of where people sit and the kind of access to powers that they have, which ultimately informs their opinions and their positions.” For Wallace, simply incorporating different perspectives into a story isn’t good enough. “We don’t need more ‘both sides’ reporting as a matter of course. We need a reckoning with the cultural forces of white supremacy and patriarchy themselves – these animating fantasies of superiority,” they write. “That requires a new framework for journalism – one that doesn’t shy away from analyzing and naming power and oppression.”

#### The aff’s focus on environmental justice starts from a basis of domination and invasion. Their environmental focus is an unequal platform that refuses to acknowledge how indigenous people do not have the same relationship with the environment that they do. Any focus on the environment must first start by fore-fronting Native experiences with land or else they just recreate settler colonialism. Gilio-Whitaker19

“Mainstream Settler Society Needs a Land-and Place Based Ethics,” Dina Gilio-Whitaker (Colville Confederated Tribes), May 13 2019, //FD WHS

For many years now I have been studying, writing, and thinking about what environmental justice means for Indigenous peoples. In my most recent book,[***As Long as Grass Grows: The Indigenous Fight for Environmental Justice From Colonization to Standing Rock***](http://www.beacon.org/As-Long-as-Grass-Grows-P1445.aspx), I take on the topic in very broad but specific ways. I see United States settler colonialism as a history of environmental injustice; in other words, **colonization and environmental injustice go hand in hand** for Native people. In general, the field of environmental justice (EJ) refers to injustice as the ways people of color are disproportionately exposed to toxic development and other processes that place them at higher risk of illness and other attendant harms (such as lower property values and gentrification). EJ is based on the concept of environmental racism. That’s a pretty narrow way of understanding environmental injustice, I argue, and as the scholarship and activism becomes more sophisticated, it is becoming more nuanced in the ways environmental injustice is understood. This is where my book fits in. In the book, I contend that **for Indigenous people, environmental injustice is an entirely different animal, because it involves far more than toxic development.** For Native people, **it begins as processes of invasion that historically have often removed them from their ancestral lands and resulted in the subsequent disruption of communities to maintain themselves according to their own**[**“original instructions.”**](https://www.powells.com/book/-9781591430797)**This kind of social death is part of the genocidal structure of settler colonialism.** The original instructions are based on worldviews and philosophical paradigms far different than those of the dominant (Eurocentric) society. **Eurocentric ways of living on the land stem from a domination framework.** The domination framework descends from religious imperatives that separate humans from the environment and justify the violent intrusion into other people’s lands—what we today call colonization. Think of the story where Adam and Eve are commanded by God to go out and dominate the world, and the Cain and Abel story in which murder and the taking of land are justified. At the same time, **it has laid the foundation for a relationship to land and place** that **only sees land for how it can be put to human use. This is always already an exploitative, extractive relationship**. Indigenous worldviews, on the other hand, are based on concepts we sometimes refer to as the four R’s: relationality, reciprocity, respect, and responsibility. In a world based on relationships, all life is seen in terms of kinship (we often refer to this paradigm as [**“kincentrism”**](https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/traditional-ecological-knowledge/85A275CF02E0631B7DD59EC8D4561734)). This is a non-hierarchical orientation to the world in which other life-forms are relations who have agency. In a world of relationships, all beings are bound by reciprocity and responsibility based on respect. Since time immemorial, these principles ensured viable, diverse communities of humans and their nonhuman relations, and are what made Indigenous North American societies inherently sustainable. **Relationships to the natural world based on domination and exploitation are what construct today’s world of fetishized hypercapitalism in a logic of never-ending growth.** Like cancer, **endless growth on a finite planet can only lead to death—death of other people and societies, other species, and eventually the self.**This is why efforts to reverse the death spiral the human race is currently on must begin with a reorientation to the natural world and other human beings. [It cannot generate solely from a different orientation to economics](http://www.ienearth.org/talking-points-on-the-aoc-markey-green-new-deal-gnd-resolution/), as the Green New Deal implies. “Green capitalism,” as is it sometimes called, falls far short of guarding human and biological diversity from further destruction. **Reimagining societies based on sustainability demands that we think relationally and spatially**. I am talking about two different but intertwined concepts here. **First, environmental justice for Indigenous peoples must proceed not from a framework of environmental racism, but from a history of colonialism which is maintained in an ongoing structural relationship of domination and paternalism between the US and tribal nations, to which the nations have never consented.** This includes but is ultimately [**beyond racism**](https://www.beaconbroadside.com/broadside/2018/11/unpacking-the-invisible-knapsack-of-settler-privilege.html) because colonization begins with ideas of cultural and religious superiority (i.e. the [**doctrine of Christian discovery**](https://doctrineofdiscovery.org/)), not racial superiority. Furthermore, **environmental justice policy and law must be capable of acknowledging Native people’s very different religious paradigms and relationships to land. It currently does not, and that results in gross and ongoing violations and lack of protection of sacred sites, especially on lands outside reservation boundaries or those of tribes not recognized by the federal government**. The most obvious examples of these kinds of violations are **the**[**desecration of Standing Rock Sioux burials**](https://newsmaven.io/indiancountrytoday/archive/standing-rock-sioux-tribe-condemns-destruction-and-desecration-of-burial-grounds-tbGDUq4PW0aOVUZEiVIweA/)**that occurred during the construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline and the inability of Southwest peoples to stop the desecration of sacred sites through snowmaking with treated sewage wastewater at the**[**Snowbowl ski resort on the San Francisco Peaks**](http://protectthepeaks.org/)**mountain in Arizona**. Countless others can be named. Secondly, **unless there is major paradigm shift in mainstream settler society and its governing institutions, the future is questionable at best and catastrophic at worst.** Learning to think relationally opens space to imagine different kinds of answers to the most difficult existential issues, instead of different versions of the same unworkable solutions we keep returning to over and over again. **An orientation to land and place based on the four R’s must also take into consideration society’s relationship to Indigenous peoples and its domination-based paradigm. Settler society can then finally be accountable for its genocidal and whitewashed historical narratives**. In these ways, settler society can construct a land- and place-based ethic that affirms life in all its forms and help ensure the futurity and diversity of all human and nonhuman communities.  Indigenous cultures have always had important things to teach settlers. It’s not too late.

#### The alternative is a refusal of the affirmative – an engagement in the process of decentering settler subjectivities and injecting indigenous knowledge – in this project, refusal constitutes a multi-faceted method towards decolonization

Grande 18 (Sandy Grande; 2018; Routledge Publishing; *“Refusing the University,”* a chapter in the series of essays *“Toward What Justice?: Describing Diverse Dreams of Justice in Education”*; accessed 12/22/21; ask me for the pdf; Sandy Grande is associate professor and Chair of the Education Department at Connecticut College. Her research interfaces critical Indigenous theories with the concerns of education; 58-62) HB

Taking into account the power relations of both capitalism and white supremacy, Indigenous scholars posit refusal as a positive stance that is: less oriented around attaining an affirmative form of recognition… and more about critically revaluating, reconstructing and redeploying culture and tradition in ways that seek to prefigure… a radical alternative to the structural and psycho-affective facets of colonial domination. (Coulthard, 2007, p. 456) In this way, Indigenous refusal both negatively rejects the (false) promise of inclusion and other inducements of the settler state and positively asserts Indigenous sovereignty and peoplehood. In Mohawk Interruptus (2014), Audra Simpson theorizes refusal as distinct from resistance in that it does not take authority as a given. More specifically, at the heart of the text, she theorizes refusal at the “level of method and representation,” exposing the colonialist underpinnings of the “demand to know” as a settler logic. In response, she develops the notion of ethnographic refusal as a stance or space for Indigenous subjects to limit access to what is knowable and to being known, articulating how refusal works “in everyday encounters to enunciate repeatedly to ourselves and to outsiders that ‘this is who we are, this is who you are, these are my rights’” (Simpson, 2007, p. 73). Mignolo (2011) and Quijano (1991) similarly take up refusal in relation to knowledge formation, asserting Indigenous knowledge itself as a form of refusal; a space of epistemic disobedience that is “delinked” from Western, liberal, capitalist understandings of knowledge as production. Gómez-Barris (2012) theorizes the Mapuche hunger strikes as “an extreme bodily performance and political instantiation” of refusal, an act wherein their starving bodies upon the land literally enact what it means to live in a state of permanent war (p. 120). Understood as expressions of sovereignty, such acts of refusal threaten the settler state, carrying dire if not deadly consequences for Indigenous subjects. As noted by Ferguson (2015), “capitalist settler states prefer resistance” because it can be “negotiated or recognized,” but refusal “throws into doubt” the entire system and is therefore more dangerous. While within the university the consequences of academic refusal are much less dire, they still carry a risk. To refuse inclusion offends institutional authorities offering “the gift” of belonging, creating conditions of precarity for the refuser. For example, refusal to participate in the politics of respectability that characterizes institutional governance can result in social isolation, administrative retribution, and struggles with self-worth. Similarly, the refusal to comply with the normative structures of tenure and promotion (e.g., emphasizing quantity over quality; publishing in “mainstream” journals) can and does lead to increased marginalization, exploitation, and job loss.16 And, in a system where Indigenous scholars comprise less than 1% of the professorate, such consequences not only bear hardships for individuals but also whole communities. That said, academic “rewards” and inducements accessed through recognition-based politics can have even deeper consequences. As Jodi Byrd (2011) reminds us, the colonization of Indigenous lands, bodies, and minds will not be ended by “further inclusion or more participation” (Byrd, 2011, p. xxvi). The inspirational work of Black radical and Indigenous scholars compels thinking beyond the limits of academic recognition and about the generative spaces of refusal that not only reject settler logics but also foster possibilities of co-resistance. The prospect of coalition re-raises one of the initial animating questions of this chapter: What kinds of solidarities can be developed among peoples with a shared commitment to working beyond the imperatives of capital and the settler state? Clearly, despite the ubiquitous and often overly facile calls for solidarity, building effective coalitions is deeply challenging, even among insurgent scholars. Within this particular context, tensions between Indigenous sovereignty and decolonial projects and anti-racist, social justice projects, raise a series of suspicions: whether calls for Indigenous sovereignty somehow elide the a priori condition of blackness (the “unsovereign” subject),17 whether anti-racist struggles sufficiently account for Indigenous sovereignty as a land-based struggle elucidated outside regimes of property, and whether theorizations of settler colonialism sufficiently account for the forces and structures of white supremacy, racial slavery, and antiblackness. Rather than posit such tensions as terminally incommensurable, however, I want to suggest a parallel politics of dialectical co-resistance. When Black peoples can still be killed but not murdered; when Indians are still made to disappear; when (Indigenous) land and Black bodies are still destroyed and accumulated for settler profit; it is incumbent upon all those who claim a commitment to refusing the white supremacist, capitalist, settler state, to do the hard work of building “interconnected movements for decolonization” (Coulthard, 2014). The struggle is real. It is both material and psychological, both method and politics, and thus must necessarily straddle the both/and (as opposed to either/or) coordinates of revolutionary change. In terms of process, this means working simultaneously beyond resistance and through the enactment of refusal—as fugitive, abolitionist, and Indigenous, sovereign subjects. Within the context of the university, this means replacing calls for more inclusive and diverse, safe spaces within the university with the development of a network of sovereign, safe houses outside the university. Kelley reminds us of the long history of this struggle, recalling the Institute of the Black World at Atlanta University (1969), the Mississippi Freedom Schools, and the work of Black feminists Patricia Robinson, Donna Middleton, and Patricia Haden as inspirational models. As a contemporary model, he references Harney and Moten’s vision of the undercommons as a space of possibility: a fugitive space wherein the pursuit of knowledge is not perceived as a path toward upward mobility and material wealth but rather as a means toward eradicating oppression in all of its forms (Undercommoning Collective). The ultimate goal, according to Kelley (2016), is to create in the present a future that overthrows the logic of neoliberalism. Scholars within Native studies similarly build upon a long tradition of refusing the university, theorizing from and about sovereignty through land-based models of education. Whereas a fugitive flees and seeks to escape, the Indigenous stands ground or, as Deborah Bird points out, “to get in the way of settler colonization, all the native has to do is stay at home” (as cited in Wolfe, 2006, p. 388). The ultimate goal of Indigenous refusal is Indigenous resurgence; a struggle that includes but is not limited to the return of Indigenous land. Again, while the aims may be different (and in some sense competing), efforts toward the development of parallel projects of co-resistance are possible through vigilant and sustained engagement. The “common ground” here is not necessarily literal but rather conceptual, a corpus of shared ethics and analytics: anti-capitalist, feminist, anti-colonial. Rather than allies, we are accomplices—plotting the death but not murder of the settler university. Toward this end, I offer some additional strategies for refusing the university: First and foremost, we need to commit to collectivity—to staging a refusal of the individualist promise project of the settler state and its attendant institutions. This requires that we engage in a radical and ongoing reflexivity about who we are and how we situate ourselves in the world. This includes but is not limited to a refusal of the cycle of individualized inducements—particularly, the awards, appointments, and grants that require complicity or allegiance to institutions that continue to oppress and dispossess. It is also a call to refuse the perceived imperative to self-promote, to brand one’s work and body. This includes all the personal webpages, incessant Facebook updates, and Twitter feeds featuring our latest accomplishments, publications, grants, rewards, etc. etc. Just. Make. It. Stop. The journey is not about self—which means it is not about promotion and tenure—it is about the disruption and dismantling of those structures and processes that create hierarchies of individual worth and labor. Second, we must commit to reciprocity—the kind that is primarily about being answerable to those communities we claim as our own and those we claim to serve. It is about being answerable to each other and our work. One of the many things lost to the pressures of the publish-or-perish, quantity-over-quality neoliberal regime is the loss of good critique. We have come to confuse support with sycophantic praise and critical evaluation with personal injury. Through the ethic of reciprocity, we need to remind ourselves that accountability to the collective requires a commitment to engage, extend, trouble, speak back to, and intensify our words and deeds. Third, we need to commit to mutuality, which implies reciprocity but is ultimately more encompassing. It is about the development of social relations not contingent upon the imperatives of capital—that refuses exploitation at the same time as it radically asserts connection, particularly to land. Inherent to a land-based ethic is a commitment to slowness and to the arc of inter-generational resurgence and transformation. One of the many ways that the academy recapitulates colonial logics is through the overvaluing of fast, new, young, and individualist voices and the undervaluing of slow, elder, and collective ones. And in such a system, relations and paradigms of connection, mutuality, and collectivity are inevitably undermined. For Indigenous peoples, such begin and end with land, centering questions of what it means to be a good relative. Toward this end, I have been thinking a lot lately about the formation of a new scholarly collective, one that writes and researches under a nom de guerre—like the Black feminist scholars and activists who wrote under and through the Combahee River Collective or the more recent collective of scholars and activists publishing as “the uncertain commons.”18 If furthering the aims of insurgence and resurgence (and not individual recognition) is what we hold paramount, then perhaps one of the most radical refusals we can authorize is to work together as one; to enact a kind of Zapatismo scholarship and a balaclava politics where the work of the collectivity is intentionally structured to obscure and transcend the single voice, body, and life. Together we could write in refusal of liberal, essentialist forms of identity politics, of individualist inducements, of capitalist imperatives, and other productivist logics of accumulation. This is what love as refusal looks like. It is the un-demand, the un-desire to be either of or in the university. It is the radical assertion to be on: land. Decolonial love is land.

#### The role of the ballot should be to center indigenous scholarship – any project of research should begin and end with placing the indigenous demands and resistance at it’s forefront. Our role as settlers specifically obligates us to center our politics in the context of ensuring accountability

Carlson 16 (Elizabeth Carlson; 10/21/16; Settler Colonial Studies; *“Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies”*; accessed 12/28/21; ask me for the pdf; Elizabeth Carlson is an Assistant Professor at the School of Social Work at Laurentian University; pages 9-10) HB

Relational and epistemic accountability to Indigenous peoples 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 humility 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 provided 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.

## Case

## Framing

#### The construction of the end of the world relies on an all lives matter discourse which distorts the perception of events – that ignores the material reality that the global south experiences extinction level events every day which injects the notion of white heroism

Mitchell and Chaudry 20 (Audra Mitchell and Aadita Chaudry; 2020; International Relations, Vol. 34, Issue 3; *“Worlding beyond ‘the’ ‘end’ of ‘the world’: white apocalyptic visions and BIPOC futurisms”*; accessed 1/27/22; <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0047117820948936>; Audra Mitchell is a settler scholar living on Haudenosaunee, Anishinaabe, and Attawandaron lands in what is currently called Canada. She holds the Canada Research Chair in Global Political Ecology at the Balsillie School of International Affairs. Audra has published widely on the subjects of extinction, large-scale ecological harms, more-than-human ethics, ecological thought, and violence studies. Audra’s current work focuses on understanding the role of colonization, genocide, land-based gendered and sexual violence and extractivism in driving global patterns of extinction; Aadita Chaudhury is a settler PhD candidate in science and technology studies at York University, in Tkaronto (Toronto) in what is now Canada. She is currently completing her dissertation project on exploring global theory and praxis around managing ecosystem fires and narratives surrounding combustion through the lens of capitalism and colonialism.; pages 311-315) HB

White subjectivities 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 BIPOCmajority 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.

## Advantage

#### Clean energy drives global land and resource competition – global wars.

Freeman 18. Freeman\* and Bazilian\*\*, 18 - research associate for energy and U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations and an energy and environment fellow with Young Professionals in Foreign Policy\*, executive director of the Payne Institute and a professor of public policy at Colorado School of Mines, non-resident fellow at the Columbia University Center on Global Energy Policy, non-resident senior associate with the Energy and National Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies\*\* (Madison\* and Morgan\*\*, ‘How Renewable Energy Could Fuel Future Conflicts’, October 8 2018, https://www.georgetownjournalofinternationalaffairs.org/online-edition/2018/10/8/how-renewable-energy-could-fuel-future-conflicts)/ceng/msdi21

Renewable energy technologies promise to help our world avert some of the worst impacts of climate change. However, some of the minerals and metals they require could contribute to conflict. In the past, fossil fuels were the primary link between energy and conflict, as control and transport of oil and gas drove political unrest, wars over territory, and interventions by powerful countries concerned with securing their supply chains. However, the energy landscape is changing rapidly, with cleaner sources of electricity swiftly replacing fossil fuels. The energy transition now seems inevitable, with renewable energy technologies forecasted to constitute almost half of global electricity generation by 2050. While the global transition to clean energy promises a more sustainable energy future, the switch also creates new challenges through the control of critical minerals used for clean energy technology. Investment in clean energy technologies totaled over $330 billion in 2017 and is expected to accelerate over the coming decades, which will cause the demand for minerals critical to these technologies to change accordingly. For example, the global lithium-ion battery market could more than quadruple to $93 billion by 2025. Driven by the booming electric vehicle market and expanding energy storage sector, demand will increase for lithium, cobalt, and magnesium. Clean energy minerals and metals, similar to fossil fuels, are concentrated in certain geographic areas, and may be subject to similar contests over their control. As the world continues to transition from oil, gas, and coal to solar and wind, policymakers must take careful steps to ameliorate the risk of negative externalities from the changing landscape of mineral extraction. Clean Energy Risks Multiple Forms of Conflict Growth of clean energy technologies may increase the risk of at least three types of conflict: outbreaks of violence in states with weak institutions, competition over global resource commons, and weaponization of minerals essential to these technologies in trade disputes. First, reserves of metals and minerals for clean energy technologies can motivate violent conflict in states with weak institutions and rule of law. Similar to the “resource curse” of many oil-rich states, developing nations with large natural resource endowments often experience corruption and violence as different groups vie to control wealth-generating extractive operations. For instance, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) produces more than 60 percent of the world’s cobalt, a key component of lithium-ion batteries for electric vehicles and electricity storage. The country already suffers from widespread violent conflict, perpetuated by mining wealth, that has driven the creation of at least seventy armed groups, resulted in massive humans rights violations, and displaced millions. An increase in demand for cobalt for electric vehicles and grid-scale battery storage could further intensify conflict in the country. Second, these minerals could also increase competition among states over the global commons. The Arctic Ocean and the South China Sea, two contested maritime areas, both contain considerable mineral and metal deposits along undersea fault lines. As ice retreat opens up more of the Arctic Ocean, exploration for deep-sea deposits of minerals useful for clean energy technology could drive countries that claim territory in the region to assert their claims more forcefully. In the South China Sea, Beijing has begun to develop deep sea mining capacities, which will contribute to its effort to establish control of the mineral-rich seabed. China has demonstrated its willingness to flaunt international law and violate other countries’ sovereign claims to the seabed. Conflict over deep-sea minerals would aggravate these disputes. Finally, China’s hegemony over the global mining operations of many of these critical minerals creates a risk that it will use these elements as trade weapons. China produces 95 percent of rare earth elements and leads production in many other minerals and metals critical to clean energy technologies. This control is highly centralized within specific Chinese companies – one Chinese firm, Tianqi Lithium, controls nearly half of the world’s lithium. As part of China’s strategy to become the “center of the clean energy universe,” these minerals are integral to its economic future. Past trade disputes, including China's withholding of rare earths from Japan in 2010, should cause concern, as they show Beijing is willing to ignore international trade norms surrounding critical metals and minerals. As the trade war between the United States and China escalates, there is a risk that China may leverage these minerals’ geopolitical power and restrict their export to the United States.

#### No tipping point—overwhelming experimental ev.

Jeremy Hance 18, wildlife blogger for the Guardian and a journalist with Mongabay focusing on forests, indigenous people, climate change and more. He is also the author of Life is Good: Conservation in an Age of Mass Extinction., 1-16-2018, "Could biodiversity destruction lead to a global tipping point?," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/environment/radical-conservation/2018/jan/16/biodiversity-extinction-tipping-point-planetary-boundary

“It makes no sense that there exists a tipping point of biodiversity loss beyond which the Earth will collapse,” said co-author and ecologist, José Montoya, with Paul Sabatier Univeristy in France. “There is no rationale for this.” Montoya wrote the paper along with Ian Donohue, an ecologist at Trinity College in Ireland and Stuart Pimm, one of the world’s leading experts on extinctions, with Duke University in the US. Montoya, Donohue and Pimm argue that there isn’t evidence of a point at which loss of species leads to ecosystem collapse, globally or even locally. If the planet didn’t collapse after the Permian-Triassic extinction event, it won’t collapse now – though our descendants may well curse us for the damage we’ve done. Instead, according to the researchers, every loss of species counts. But the damage is gradual and incremental, not a sudden plunge. Ecosystems, according to them, slowly degrade but never fail outright. “Of more than 600 experiments of biodiversity effects on various functions, none showed a collapse,” Montoya said. “In general, the loss of species has a detrimental effect on ecosystem functions...We progressively lose pollination services, water quality, plant biomass, and many other important functions as we lose species. But we never observe a critical level of biodiversity over which functions collapse.”

#### Conservatives will use false balance and perceived liberal bias to spew climate change denialism under the guise of objectivity

Hoewe et al. 21 [Jennifer Hoewe, Assistant Professor, Brian Lamb School of Communication, Purdue University Kathryn Cramer Brownell, Associate Professor, Department of History, Purdue University, and Eric C. Wiemer, Doctoral Candidate, Brian Lamb School of Communication, Purdue University, 02-2021, “The Role and Impact of Fox News,” De Gruyter, https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/for-2020-2014/html]/Kankee

One of the areas clearly related to Fox News consumption is migration-related policy, specifically building a wall between the United States and Mexico. Conservative media narratives surrounding immigration often use invasion as a framework for commentary, which has bolstered the presence of more radical antiimmigration views in mainstream media and undermined policy reform (Goodman forthcoming; Rosenwald 2019). As Chavez (2001, 2013) has shown, portraying Latin American immigrants as a problem advances a “Latino threat narrative” that objectifies, dehumanizes, and stigmatizes immigrants in a way that supports policies that “limit their social integration and obstruct their economic mobility” (Chavez 2013, p. 6). Conservative media, notably talk radio and then Fox News, capitalized on this idea of immigration as a threat to bolster their ratings and relevance to conservative audiences. For example, talk radio and Fox News played such a prominent role in derailing reform that Senator Charles Schumer (D-NY) and Senator Lindsey Graham (R-SC) had a private dinner with Murdoch and Ailes explaining why framing immigration reform as “amnesty” would undermine the bipartisan legislative efforts to advance immigration reform in 2011 (Rosenwald 2019). The rise of Internet blogs like Breitbart continued to inflame nationalist ideas around immigration, ultimately pushing figures like Sean Hannity, Rush Limbaugh, and Laura Ingraham further to the right and toward sensationalism to keep up the race for high ratings (Rosenwald 2019). The second issue highlighted in this research is climate-related policy. Given that political ideology and education effectively predict news media preference and opinions about climate change (Bolin and Hamilton 2018), this finding shows that personal characteristics can influence both choice in news sources and opinions about climate-related policy—and this relationship has been exacerbated by conservative media coverage of the issue. Just two years after Fox News launched, top Fox News figures contended that reports about global warming as a fact, not a controversy, was evidence of liberal bias in the mainstream press. **Ailes argued that many reporters believed that “environmentalism is always good and anyone who opposes it is always bad. We don’t necessarily agree with that” (Hickey 1998).** As the scientific consensus surrounding climate change has grown, conservative think tanks and corporations have invested in research to challenge these ideas and advance the deregulation of fossil fuel industries (MacLean 2017; Oreskes 2010). The push for “balance” in newsrooms meant that a range of media outlets also began covering climate change as a controversy, allowing misinformation campaigns advanced by private interests to undermine the credibility of scientific research on the issue. Consequently, climate change—an issue that once had bipartisan support—has become an extremely politically polarized policy debate (Oreskes 2010). As Stahl (2016) showed, Fox News has played a role in shifting policy conversations through a “synergistic triangle of neoconservative argumentation” between conservative media and other conservative institutions**—** notably the American Enterprise Institute and the Weekly Standard (p. 180). Finally, the COVID-19 pandemic presents a new area of influence for Fox News and its viewers. Prior research suggests that conservatives should have responded to the threat of a pandemic by displaying increased caution (Young 2020). But they responded more strongly to information provided by the Republican Party, including information aired on Fox News, that discounted the threat of the virus. Very recent evidence shows that this resulted in conservatives’ reluctance to engage in the recommended behaviors for reducing the spread of the virus, including wearing masks and social distancing.

#### Journalistic objectivity undermines climate action by framing established science as undecided, evenly balanced debates

Stecula and Merkley 19 [Dominik A. Stecula, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Colorado State University with a PhD from the University of Columbia, and Eric Merkley, Professor of Political Science in the Department of Political Science at the University of Toronto, 2-26-2019, "Framing Climate Change: Economics, Ideology, and Uncertainty in American News Media Content From 1988 to 2014," Frontiers, https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fcomm.2019.00006/full]/Kankee

Uncertainty and Risk in Climate Change A final set of important frames in climate news coverage involves the communication of uncertainty and risk in climate change. Scientific uncertainty exists when there is a lack of scientific knowledge or disagreement over the knowledge that exists at a given point in time (Friedman et al., 1999). Researchers understand that all forms of scientific endeavors involve such uncertainty. In the context of climate change, discussion of uncertainty can focus on conflicting claims or a lack of knowledge about the existence or cause of climate change, its present-day effects, and the difficulty with assessing probabilities of specific outcomes and their consequences in the future (Patt and Schrag, 2003; Renn et al., 2011). Journalists covering scientific issues, such as climate change, are also routinely confronted with uncertainty, since controversy and debate are important criteria for the “newsworthiness” of a story (Friedman et al., 1999). As a result, how journalists present and describe scientific uncertainty affects how the public interpret such uncertainty. Communicating this uncertainty, however, is notoriously difficult (Fischhoff and Davis, 2014). Scientific discourse often involves an amount of details that can overwhelm even seasoned experts. It can also leave out crucial uncertainties that are commonly understood by the experts within the field, but need to be communicated to the broader public (Fischhoff and Davis, 2014). Finding the right balance is difficult, yet essential, considering the important role that uncertainty plays in human decision making (Curley et al., 1986; Sword-Daniels et al., 2018). Psychological research shows that uncertainty generally has a negative effect on prosocial behaviors, since it tends to enable people to adopt self-serving narratives about their actions and limit their capacity to cooperate in social dilemma situations (Hine and Gifford, 1991; Dannenberg et al., 2015; for a review of the literature, see Kappes et al., 2018). Experimental work highlights that uncertainty framing also matters for climate change related behaviors, such as decreasing one's energy consumption (Morton et al., 2011). A focus on uncertainty in news coverage can potentially reduce the public's support and engagement in climate action because of the unclear outcomes of such actions. Uncertainty can take several forms in climate change coverage. On a wide range of climate impacts and long-range forecasts of future warming there is uncertainty that is appropriately acknowledged by experts in the media's coverage of climate science. More problematic is if uncertainty is used in a way that casts doubt on the well-established tenants of the climate consensus of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)—that climate change is happening, is predominantly man-made through the production of greenhouse gas emissions, and will result in severe environmental and human harm. The persuasive power of uncertainty in this context is its implicit justification and reification of the status quo, especially as it pertains to fossil-fuel usage and carbon emissions (Feygina et al., 2010). One way in which this type uncertainty enters the media coverage of climate change has been through the journalistic engagement of so-called “false balance.” Reporters frequently treat topics as debates in which they present “both sides” in order to adhere to a journalistic norm of objectivity. This norm exists, in part, because both journalists and the general public prize it (Schudson, 1978; Giannoulis et al., 2010), but also because it acts as a mechanism to protect journalists from attacks on their credibility and to preserve access to sources on both sides of a given political debate (Hallin, 1989; Shoemaker and Reese, 2013). The desire for balance also serves the media's tendency toward drama and conflict in news coverage (Bennett, 2007). In many contexts it is important for journalists to be fair and evenly balanced in their presentation of different sides of a story, but it quickly becomes awkward when discussing the existence or causes of climate change where the credibility of each side does not have equal weight. And, the consequences of this coverage are troubling. Presenting a scientific consensus as a debate confuses the public on the state of the science and, in the case of climate change, possibly reduces support for climate action (Friedman et al., 1999; Corbett and Durfee, 2004; Koehler, 2016; McCright et al., 2016). Newsroom norms of objectivity will only contribute to a balanced presentation of a political debate if another side presents itself. Journalists ultimately rely on easily accessible sources when reporting on the news. And, because of the activism of the fossil fuel industry and conservative movement, there have been no shortage of sources ready and willing to use a platform provided by journalists to cast doubt on climate science—the so-called “Merchants of Doubt” (Oreskes and Conway, 2011). Scholars have noted that these groups have made a concerted effort to mobilize opposition to climate mitigation policy by undermining trust in foundations of climate science for both the public and policy makers (Jacques et al., 2008; Dunlap and McCright, 2011; Dunlap and Jacques, 2013; Farrell, 2016a,b). While these groups are likely not as active in the media as conventional wisdom might suggest (Merkley and Stecula, 2018), it is still possible that the press, and in particular conservative media, pick up on their message of uncertainty in their coverage of climate science even if they don't explicitly cite these actors. As the broader research on misinformation has shown, various myths surrounding climate science, including those pertaining to certainty of different outcomes, tend to be “sticky,” and hence very difficult to correct (Lewandowsky et al., 2012). Efforts to correct such information tend to be ineffective, and, in some circumstances might even result in what is called a backfire effect, when people get more entrenched in their original position (Nyhan and Reifler, 2010; Lewandowsky et al., 2012). Some promising work suggests that exposing people to correct information prior to misinformation might be an effective way to “inoculate” them from the perils of misinformation, at least in some contexts, but the broader point remains that, if the press disseminates uncertainty frames about climate change, such information might play a negative role in people's attitudes about climate change and climate change mitigation policies (Cook et al., 2017; Jolley and Douglas, 2017). The themes of uncertainty have been analyzed in the context of climate change news coverage. Some research has shown that coverage of climate change in the 1990s and early 2000s was characterized by scientific inaccuracy and uncertainty, which was driven by an adherence to balanced reporting and resistance to a growing body of scientific evidence. More recently, however, balance nearly disappeared from the press (Zehr, 2000; Boykoff and Boykoff, 2004, 2007; Boykoff, 2007). The scope of this work, however, has been fairly limited in terms of the time dimension as well as the amount of news coverage examined, as was highlighted in the previous section. However, scholars who have been examining this feature of news coverage of climate change in the comparative context, have highlighted that the U.S. coverage features substantially more climate skeptic voices pushing doubt about climate science, compared to countries like India or France (Painter and Ashe, 2012). Furthermore, contrary to the findings in the U.S.-centric literature, the authors found that skeptics voicing climate increased their media presence between 2007 and 2010 (Painter and Ashe, 2012). In a separate analysis, Painter (2013) also found that uncertainty was the second most common frame used in climate change coverage, appearing in 76 percent of American articles, however it was the salient frame in only 13 percent of the coverage. It is important to note that this analysis, however, was based only on a total of 55 articles. This disparity in findings highlights the need to systematically examine uncertainty in the context of American news coverage and examine degrees of uncertainty, not just whether the frame is present or not.

## 2n

#### Settler colonialism is a process not an event – through the building and legitimation of the nation state settlers have begun an unending project of elimination that seeks to place indigenous people into a position of exploitation and subjugation. Genocide and logics of elimination didn’t end with the trail of tears – it continues to this very day with the Dakota Access Pipeline and police violence. Settler colonialism uses these as tools of a larger project to continue to alienate and exploit the very land we are on – that culminates into endless cycles of environmental destruction and genocide – that’s Tuck and Yang 12

#### Our interpretation is that this debate should be a question of centering indigenous scholarships and finding the best way to hold settlers accountable – that’s the Carlson evidence. They should be held accountable for the way they have constructed their 1AC – that’s most fair since they should be forced to defend the entirety of the 1AC not just the plan text especially since research methods and epistemology shape the language and construction of the affirmative

#### There’s an omission disad to their model – political projects and research that omit analyses of the relationships that individuals have to settler colonialism only recreates complacency and toxic relationships to projects of decolonization. If we win our theory of power then that means that this outweighs any justifications they may make for their impacts since they rely on a flawed understanding of impact calculus and epistemology

#### Independently, any risk of a link should be an independent reason to vote negative because it proves the 1AC is invested into the parasitic relationship between elimination and land separation and is a disad to their interp

#### The alternative is an affirmation of refusal – this entails a critical revaluation and reflexive position of our ties to settler colonialism – that gives potential to engage in a struggle against those ties to open new possibilities of decolonization. This is a constant, unending process in which we inject indigenous epistemologies into everyday life – that forces a continual encounter that spurs collectivity and mutuality through a multifaceted process to enunciate a self in the face of the otherizing forces of settler colonialism. IE the Kahnawà:ke people engaging in forceful negation of movement and resettlement disrupt settlers understanding of their relationship to elimination as a shock which helps force momentum to decolonize stolen land

### 2NR – A2 – Perm do Both

#### No – it’s a question of starting points – if we win that theirs is problematic then that means inclusion in the world of the alt produces insincere attempts at decolonization which turns it into a discursive move – that empties the alternative of meaning and turns it into a liberal posterboard

#### The Objective Journalism link – that’s the break evidence – the 1AC’s forwarding of objective journalism enforces a model of the press that recreates a focus on a view from nowhere by (insert aff specific explanation here) – that seeks to erase individual’s relations to land subjugation by promoting an erasure of the self in favor of contrived “neutrality.” This “both sides get a say” logic promotes false tropes of indigenous movements by characterizing diversity as “fracturing” which paints a picture reinforces domination and erasure of the specific demands of indigenous movements.

#### That turns case -