### 1AC -- Turtle Island

**Everywhere land resists and refuses—whales that destroy ships, bees that refuse to work, bombed islands that reconstitute themselves. The land also resists in the form of people; Indigenous and Black peoples' resistance is the land's resistance. Indigenous and Black people continue to subvert legal and capitalist technologies as part of that resistance."1**

**Tinker 4** (George Tinker is the Professor of American Indian cultures and religious traditions @ Cliff School of Theology in Denver, member of the Osage nation, Fall 2004, [CL], 1tag sauce from “A Third University Is Possible by La Paperson”, pp. X, slightly edited) recut aaditg

**Did you know that trees talk? Well they do.** They talk to each other, and they’ll talk to you if you listen. Trouble is, white people don’t listen. They never learned to listen to the Indians, so I don’t I suppose they’ll listen to other voices in nature. But I have learned a lot from trees; sometimes about the weather, sometimes about animals, sometimes about the Great Spirit.1 When we talk with non-Indians about nature, there is really nothing you can say in universal Western concepts that is going to make a lot of sense. I think that Western people who come into an Indian environment and attempt to preach take along their own set of categories and use it to deal with Indian people they meet. Anthropologists, summarizing what they find in the Indian tradition, always calling us animists, and that view is accepted by a great many people in the field of religion. We are put in a cultural evolutionary framework, and then we are supposed to move from animism to some great abstract conception of one god.2 Science describes things at a **level of abstraction**, by leaving out of account a **whole range of properties** that they have (colour, beauty, consciousness . . . ). This is for many purposes a very useful procedure, but it does not follow that the properties with which science concerns itself are more real than those it leaves out.3 Did you know that rocks talk? Well, they do. Yes, I am aware that this is an audacious claim—even for an American Indian—made in the context of late modernity (or even postmodernity, if you insist) and in the context of a world indelibly marked by the accomplishments of modern science. But the argument proposed for this essay is that rocks talk and have what we must call consciousness. And we must extend our discussion of rocks to trees—as Walking Buffalo asserts in the quote above—and to the rest of the created world around us. I want to open an exploration of the particular disjunction between the worldviews of American Indian and Euro-Western cultures with regard to Western scientific, religious, and commonsense knowledges. The Western world, long rooted in the evidential objectivity of science, distinguishes at least popularly between things that are alive and things that are inert, between the animate and the inanimate. Among those things that are alive, in turn, there is a consistent distinguishing between plants and animals and between human consciousness and the rest of existence in the world. To the contrary, American Indian peoples understand that all life forms not only have consciousness, but also have qualities that are either poorly developed or entirely lacking in humans.4 Curiously enough, while Western philosophy asserts universally that human beings have consciousness, there is currently no agreement whatsoever as to what that consciousness is and whether its qualities are to be identified through a process of scientific study (neurology, psychology, and so on) or through philosophical or theological reflection. Yet Western culture, the emergent world culture (in Immanuel Wallerstein’s useful parlance)5 of globalized capital and Western science, is equally sure that rocks certainly do not have consciousness. What, then, is the nature of these contrasting epistemological claims? Is the Indian worldview “merely” religious—with no value in fact?6 Is the Euro-Western scientific worldview a perception of reality that is equally a “mythological” system? Or is it to be understood as a singular truth-value that is incontrovertible? Allow me to begin with a personal reminiscence from the summer of 1986. R O C K S The Kanukamaoli artist was describing how he found the large rock boulders that he sculpted so beautifully into images of Kanukamaoli deity figures. These sculptures, the artist was quick to note, were never for sale and hence were not the source of his sustenance. Speaking to a diverse group of U.S. academics and Pacific Rim artists and scholars gathered at the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii, the man responded to a question by saying, “I don’t find them; they find me! I might be walking along the beach, and one would reach out and bite the heel of my foot.” This explanation resonated deeply with a young American Indian scholar (namely, myself) who was also a conference participant. In my response to the Kanukamaoli brother, I remembered having accompanied an older medicine man on an outing to gather rocks for a special purification ceremony (or sweat lodge, as it is sometimes called in English). “As we walked up an arroyo away from the pick-up,” I reported, “I began to notice some pretty nice rocks right away—just like the ones used regularly in these ceremonies. Why don’t we take these, I asked? The medicine man shook his head, said, ‘No, not those,’ and kept on walking. All the time we were getting further up the arroyo, and I knew who was going to have to carry all those rocks back to the truck. Finally, more than a quarter mile from the truck, the medicine man nodded and pointed to some rocks that looked just like the hundreds we had passed by along the way. ‘These have agreed to go with us,’ he said. ‘They will help us in our prayers.’” The lone British academic present, a professor of American studies at Oxford, immediately jumped in with the severe criticism, “That’s what is wrong with you people. You are so anthropocentric! You think that everything in the world works the way you do.” The critique was emotional rather than rational; it was rooted in nearly a week’s worth of frustrated attempts to communicate across cultural barriers as well as in a lifetime of immersion in a culture that thinks of itself as somehow universal and normative—and thus inherently superior—a position of intellectual fascism, however naïve. As he finished his short tirade, I rose to argue that exactly the opposite is actually the case. “I am sorry Professor W., but that comment cannot go unchallenged. You see, **you are the ones who are actually anthropocentric.** You believe that everything in the world works differently from yourselves.” Consciousness, Intelligence, and Evolution This claim of consciousness for rocks raises difficult questions for those rooted in the knowledge base of Western science. It raises questions, of course, about the type of consciousness that I intend to identify, given Western science's proclivity for ever more discrete cognitional categorization. But it also raises questions about theories of evolution and the dominance of notions of progress and development in contemporary discourse. [End Page 107] As an American Indian, first of all, I must confess that I am not yet a believer in the "fact" of evolution.7 I do not believe that we Osages evolved from monkeys. However, should it some day be actually proven beyond any doubt that Osages have descended from monkeys, I would be deeply honored to share such a respectable lineage—even though the only monkeys in North America arrived with the colonial occupation and settlement. At the same time, we Indians would continue to have deep concerns for the Euro-Western proclivity for understanding descent as a category of ascendancy leading to the anthropocentric privileging of the human mind. American Indians are deeply aware of our part in another family tree entirely—one predicated on interrelationship rather than on descent or hierarchy of any kind. As Osages, our closest living relatives in this world, for instance, are our brothers and sisters the buffalo and our sister corn, to both of whom I shall return in due course. And, of course, we cannot forget rocks. A principle objection to theories of evolutionary descent on the part of American Indian people, then, stems from this ubiquitous Indian notion of interrelationship and the respect that Indian people maintain for all life forms in our world, including rocks and trees. Rather than elevate human beings to the apex of an evolutionary ascendancy (i.e., Darwin's common descent), the lack of human privileging over these other life forms means that Indians understand that all life shares equal status and that **value, personhood, and intelligence** must be recognized in **all life.** If there is a hierarchy of beings in the Indian experience of the world, humans are found at the bottom rather than at the top, being the youngest and least wise of all living things. As Deloria reports: The primary focus of creation stories of many tribes placed human beings as among the last creatures who were created and as the youngest of the living families. We were given the ability to do many things but not specific wisdom about the world. So our job was to learn from other older beings and to pattern ourselves after their behavior. We were to gather knowledge, not dispense it.8 We Osage do seem to come close to agreeing with current cosmological (and, perforce, evolutionary) theories in one regard: we hold that rock is tsage, the oldest living being—for which reason some call the tsage "grandparents" or "beloved old ones." And we know these old ones to be repositories of great wisdom and balance. In this context it should be noted that notions of deep time are not intrinsically foreign to Indian peoples. Unlike that version of the Euro-Western story based on the Hebrew Bible and so highly touted by more conservative Christians, Indian accounts of the beginnings never postulate a temporally ascertainable date.9 But, like some creationists, we do take our stories seriously. [End Page 108] As the oldest and wisest of all life forms, then, rocks are to be deeply respected as a category but especially as persons. They are the source of all life on the planet, and they continue to generously give of themselves for maintaining all life—especially in the ceremony popularly called sweat lodge, or the ceremony of purification.10 And it is a particular kind of rock that has made itself available for use in making the sacred pipe that is foundational to so many Indian prayers and ceremonies. These sacred pipes (nonnionba wakon) are also living beings, constructions of stone (the bowl) and wood (the stem) that possess a life of their own just as the stones used in a purification ceremony are living relatives. Charles Red Corn makes this point abundantly clear in the opening of his novel, A Pipe for February. Faced with the dramatic changes brought about by colonial conquest at the turn of the last century, a group of Osage families decides to put away one of their clan ceremonial pipes, a process requiring a formal burial—a funeral. The wife of the nonhonzhinga (a ceremonial leader/elder/pipe keeper) sits holding the pipe during the ceremony: As his wife her position was to look after the Pipe. She held it cradled in her arms and close to her breasts and in her grief she rocked the Pipe as she would rock an infant and when the woman could no longer restrain herself she began wailing a prayer song for one who has died.11 What are we to think of this description? Are pipes or rocks alive?Do they have consciousness? Deloria again captures the sense of Indian knowledge and experience as he describes the lives of rocks and their relationship to human beings: **"We are all relatives" when taken as a methodological tool for obtaining knowledge means that we observe the natural world by looking for relationships between various things in it.** That is to say, **everything in the natural world has relationships with every other thing** and the total set of relationships makes up the natural world as we experience it. This concept is simply the relativity concept as applied to a universe that people experience as alive and not as dead or inert. Thus, Indians knew stones were the perfect beings because they were self-contained entities that had resolved their social relationships and possessed great knowledge about how every other entity, and every species, should live. **Stones had mobility** but they did not have to use it. Every other being had mobility and needed, in some specific manner, to use it in their relationships.12 [End Page 109]

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that endorses the best form of *grounded normativity* – a call that realizes state based sovereignty is *incapable* of capturing indigenous struggle

**Mann 16** – Director of the Centre for Global Political Economy @ Simon Fraser University, [Geoff, “From Countersovereignty to Counterpossession?”, Historical Materialism 24.3 (2016) 45–61, DKP] recut aaditg

What exactly does Coulthard mean by ‘countersovereignty’? This is the term’s sole appearance in Red Skin, White Masks, so we cannot triangulate across a series of arguments. We can only work it out by investigating the ways in which his analysis of Indigenous struggles describes a material territorial and political relation, in particular to and with the land. To do so is to understand the ways in which sovereignty is absolutely incapable of capturing that relation, part but not all of which is contained in the idea of ‘grounded normativity’: Indigenous struggles against capitalist imperialism are best understood as struggles oriented around the question of land – struggles not only for land, but also deeply informed by what the land as a mode of reciprocal relationship (which is itself informed by place-based practices and associated forms of knowledge) ought to teach us about living our lives in relation to one another and our surroundings in a respectful, nondominating and nonexploitative way. The ethical framework provided by these place-based practices and associated forms of knowledge is what I call ‘grounded normativity’.20 The principal obstacle to an orthodox conception of sovereignty in that relation – indeed, the dynamic that gives it a ‘countering’ sense of active resistance or reversal – is the centrality of reciprocity. Within any given territory, sovereignty is by definition a non-reciprocal relation. Whether one understands it as constituted in the Schmittian ‘decider’ who arrogates the power of exception, or in the adoption of subjection by the many before the body of the one, or even in a more collective-democratic mode, sovereignty is, at root, all about rule. Against this, take as exemplary the following arguments: ‘we are as much a part of the land as any other element’; Dene are ‘an inseparable part of an expansive system of interdependent relations covering the land and animals, past and future generations, as well as other people and communities’; or, as Coulthard quotes Dene leader Philip Blake, ‘We have been satisfied to see our wealth as ourselves and the land we live with’.21 Alfred puts it beautifully, One of the main obstacles to achieving peaceful coexistence is of course the uncritical acceptance of the classic notion of sovereignty as the framework for discussions of political relations between peoples. The discourse of sovereignty has effectively stilled any potential resolution of the issue that respects indigenous values and perspectives. Even ‘traditional’ indigenous nationhood is commonly defined relationally, in contrast to the dominant formulation of the state: there is no absolute authority, no coercive enforcement of decisions, no hierarchy, and no separate ruling entity.22 To the extent that Red Skin, White Masks endorses a vehement rejection of that formulation, in defence of (to take only one instance of many) ‘a place-based ethics that fundamentally challenged the assumed legitimacy of colonial sovereignty over and capitalist social relations on Dene territories’, it is a challenge not only to specifically colonial forms of sovereignty, but to any and all forms of sovereignty that can be logically or historically paired with the modifier ‘colonial’.23 Which is to say, again, that Coulthard’s position is perhaps very much like that of Monture: that Indigenous sovereignty is about the ‘right to be responsible’: it ‘is really a question of identity (both individual and collective) more than it is a question of an individualized property right’, and ‘identity requires a relationship with territory (and not a relationship based on the control of that territory)’.24

#### Settler colonialism expropriates native bodies through a process of proletarianization and racialization grounds Traditional Western Labor movements necessitating an analysis of coloniality – any attempt to challenge existing capitalist structures begins with the analysis of the 1ac.

Englert 20 [Sai Englert is a lecturer in the Institute for Area Studies. I work on political economy and development in the Middle East. July 20, 2020 “Settlers, Workers, and the Logic of Accumulation by Dispossession” <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/anti.12659> ] //aaditg

An Alternative Reading: Settler Colonies and the Exploitation of the Native By focusing on an ideal form of settler colonialism, SCS directs much of its analytical focus to the Anglo-Saxon settler colonial world, in particular, to North America and Australia. There are important exceptions, including for example, the excellent collection edited by Elkins and Pedersen (2005), Saranillio’s (2013) focus on Asian settler colonisation, or the 2018 special issue of Settler Colonial Studies on Algeria (Barclay et al. 2018), but these remain outliers. The near absence of studies of South American or African settler colonies is striking, as has been remarked on by a host of different scholars including Kelley (2017), Vimalassery et al. (2016) and Speed (2017). These authors also make the connection between these silences and the identification of elimination as the specific characteristic of settler colonial regimes. Kelley (2017:269) points out that the African encounter with settler colonialism was primarily marked by exploitative processes. He demonstrates this not only through the case of enslaved African population, discussed above, but also through the centrality of exploitation in the case of settler colonialism in South Africa. He shows convincingly how, in the construction of white settler social relations in the country, “the expropriation of the native from the land was a fundamental objective, but so was proletarianization. They wanted the land and the labour, but not the people—that is to say, they sought to eliminate stable communities and their cultures of resistance”. The attempted elimination of collective peoplehood, Kelley shows, is here a political goal pursued through exploitation, unsettling the sharp division theorised by Wolfe and Veracini. Following a similar critique with a focus on South American settler regimes, Speed (2017:784) argues they have remained largely outside of the framework of SCS precisely because Spanish settlers did not either exploit or eliminate but did both, in different ways, depending on time and place. The issue of labour alongside that of land defines much of these experiences, as does indigenous labour resistance: “In places like Mexico and Central America, such labour regimes … were often the very mechanisms that dispossessed indigenous peoples of their lands, forcing them to labour in extractive undertakings on the very land that had been taken from them”. As these cases show, here are settler colonies that were deeply dependent on the labour of the indigenous population and although displacement and expropriation were definitely a central part of their modus vivendi, as was the undermining of collective indigenous claims over the land, so was the exploitation of their labour. Furthermore, as O’Brien (2017) points out, even within SCS’ favoured settings, such as North America, the overemphasis on elimination as foundational can have complicated consequences. She points out—alongside others discussed above—that an important distinction should be made between “logics” of political elimination and actual elimination. Failing to do so can overstate the power of settler regimes and fail to capture the ongoing importance of indigenous resistance. O’Brien (2017:254) instead argues that “Indigenous resistance to colonial power … continues to override the logic of elimination”. This critique is not only important in terms of understanding different forms of settler colonial regimes, but also in reflecting on processes of de-colonisation. It is striking, for example, that settler colonies based primarily on the exploitation of the indigenous population more often achieved their independence from both the settler state and the metropolis. Acknowledging this, Mamdani (2015:596) notes that “[f]or students of settler colonialism in the modern era, Africa and America represent two polar opposites. Africa is the continent where settler colonialism has been defeated; America is where settler colonialism triumphed”. While taking seriously the unfinished nature of this triumph, pointed out above, and the ongoing nature of indigenous resistance, the difference in outcomes so far can be accounted for through the different treatment by the settler colonial regimes of the indigenous populations. It was the very dependence of settler colonial regimes in Africa on native labour, which laid the foundation for their destruction. It was the ability of indigenous resistance movements in Algeria and Southern Africa to shut down the settler economy as well as challenge the colonial states militarily that made decolonisation possible.2 This is also a reality that settlers themselves understood. As Lockman (2012) argues, it was, in part, the example of resistance by indigenous labour in other settler colonial settings, in particular in South Africa, that convinced Labour Zionists in Palestine to reject a model based on the exploitation of the indigenous population and opt for its exclusion instead (see below). In fact, some scholars, such as Fieldhouse (1982) in hisThe Colonial Empires, made the existing variety of labour regimes central to the study of settler colonialism. He took the presence of settlers, and the establishment of European societies within the colonial territories, as the determining characteristics of “colonies of settlements” as opposed to “colonies of occupation”. Fieldhouse then divided settler colonies in three categories: “pure”, “mixed”, and “plantation” settlements, which denote, respectively, settler societies based on imported settler labour, those constructed around a significant but minoritarian settler population where indigenous labour continued to play a central role, and those where imported enslaved populations worked on plantations for small settler minorities. Importantly, Fieldhouse’s approach (and that of others after him, such as Shafir 1996) demonstrates the danger of supposing a hermetic separation between different models. Instead, settler colonies have a variety of different strategies at their disposal, which can include exploitation, elimination, or both. One strategy can morph into another through such processes as the development of new strategic necessities for the colonial powers, interactions with indigenous resistance, or changing economic relations with the metropolis. Fieldhouse (1982:181) shows how the French colonisation of Algeria started as a colony of occupation in the North of the country. It was only in response to the 1834 Algerian revolt that France annexed more of the country and established French settlements in an attempt to pacify the indigenous peoples. In South Africa, Fieldhouse (1982:188–189) argues that the interaction between Boer and British colonisation, indigenous resistance, and the discovery of precious metal and diamonds in the second half of the 19th century, changed the nature of the settler colonial enterprise from pure to mixed. The question of labour (and therefore exploitation) is then a crucial aspect in the organisation of settler colonialism. This is true both in terms of the relationship between the settler colonial power and the native populations, but also in terms of social relations within the settler colonial polity. In fact, the labour movement within settler colonies has often been at the forefront of the imposition of racial segregation through colour bars, limits on racialised migration, and “whites-only” policies. The reasons behind this tendency will be discussed in greater detail below, but for now it will suffice to point out that from the late-19th century onwards, white working class movements across the settler colonial world organised over the question of limiting, excluding, or containing the use of indigenous and/or racialised workers. They furthermore rebelled against the settler states, or united with indigenous workers for collective improvement to their labour rights. In the United States, white workers organised against the competition of African American workers in the aftermath of emancipation, as well as the barring of Chinese migration to California, which successfully passed into law in the late 19th century (see Day 2016; Karuka 2019). Similar campaigns where waged in both South Africa and Australia against the immigration of Asian workers in the early 20th century. In fact, the formation of the Australian Labour Party took place on the basis of taking the “white Australia” campaign into parliament (Hyslop 1999; Shafir 1996). Perhaps the most emblematic example of these labour campaigns for the exclusion of racialised workers is that for the colour bar in South Africa (and later for the imposition of Apartheid) by the white workers' movement. In a strange mixture of internationalist rhetoric and settler colonial racism the white miners in 1922 raised the slogan: “Workers of the World, Unite and Fight for a White South Africa” (Reddy 2016:101). In the case of the Zionist colonisation of Palestine, the labour movement even became the social actor behind which the entire settler polity united. As Shafir (1996) has shown, Zionist colonial strategy in Palestine transformed, under the leadership of the Labour Zionist movement in the early decades of the 20th century, from a settler colonial project based primarily on exploited Palestinian labour to one which emphasised their exclusion and reliance on “Hebrew labour” instead. The change was brought about by the campaigns led by the settler labour movement, colonial responses to Palestinian resistance, and the material problems faced by the Zionist movement in attempting to attract new settlers to Palestine. More will be said about this in the fifth section of this paper. For now it will suffice to point out that the Labour Zionist movement fought for this form of settler organisation against Palestinian workers as well as against settler bosses and their project for a settler economy based on the exploitation—not the elimination—of the natives. The guiding principle of this movement was that to make settlement effective Jewish workers needed to be granted higher wages and living standards, while indigenous workers needed to be excluded from the labour market all together. It is this logic of full separation, that Sayegh (2012:214), described as lying at the root of the Zionist project in Palestine: “[R]acial self-segregation, racial exclusiveness and racial supremacy”. A series of important points emerge from this alternative view of settler colonialism. Firstly, the exclusive Wolfe-an focus on elimination of the native as opposed to exploitation, although of central importance within some periods and locales of settler colonialism, does not allow one to develop an effective general axiomatic analysis of the settler colonial form and its social relations. Secondly, the racial organisation of labour—whether settler, enslaved, or indigenous—and the struggle over its organisation between settlers and indigenous populations, as well as between settlers themselves, are a crucial aspect of settler colonialism, both in its eliminatory and/or exploitative forms (on which more below). Thirdly, the participation of settler labour movements in the colonial project, particularly in the process of control and/or expulsion of racialised, enslaved, and/or indigenous population appears as a key characteristic across the settler colonial world.

#### Refuse the settler lifeworlds that westphalian sovereignty is constructed upon as radical break from settler society

**Smith 18**. Gola Smith is a Black and Native woman, Northern Virginia Community College, BA in Philosophy [“Indigenous Lifeworlds,” 2018, *Academia*, URL: [https://www.academia.edu/39219089/Indigenous\_Lifeworlds?auto=download]//vikas](https://www.academia.edu/39219089/Indigenous_Lifeworlds?auto=download%5d//vikas) recut aaditg

I plan to introduce a series of papers concerning the necessary stances Indigenous and Black activists – and their ‘allies’ 1 – must take. This issue forwards the basics of my stance and thoughts – as a Black and Indigenous woman – on Indigenous refusal and resurgence (in line with the concerns of Glen Coulthard with contemporary Indigenous and Settler activism).

"Many **proposals have been made to us to adopt your laws**, your religion, **your manners and your customs**. We would be better pleased with beholding the good effects of these doctrines in your own practices, than with hearing you talk about them".

- Old Tassel, Chief of the Tsalagi (Cherokee)

**For centuries we have been told by Settlers that our lives and stories are** merely **tools of the Settler**, **who insists on fueling his** new **futures with the essence of Indigenous life**. Time and time again, **the same story unfolds**: **one more** - seemingly benign - **policy for the Savage that implicitly affirms** the **Westphalian sovereignty**. **Indigenous life struggles to finds its place in an environment intoxicated** with stories and promises of progress. **Those of us on the Rez increasingly have nothing more to look at than** our **tribal land grants** from the Settler’s institutions as evidence of Indigenous antiquity.

As Glen Coulthard reminds us, the **tools to resolve our grievances will never lie in** what he terms “**recognition**,”2 **but a refusal of Settler sovereignty**. Those who ask us to adopt **the tools of colonial institutions**, "**do not provide the tools** required **to protect us against the unilateral construction of our rights**.” **The Indigenous spirit** - or adanvdo - **can only be vitalized through** a politics of **resurgence that refuses negotiation in its entirity**. Our solution lies in our own communities through a “politics of authentic self-affirmation.” Coulthard forwards the Idle No More movement as evidence of such resurgence. **The Indigenous spirit is** “**reclaimed and revitalized**” **through** its blockades and **refusals of Settler lifeworlds**. Indigenous activists – even if in everyday conversation – relate to each other in their hatred of the Settler pipelines being built on Turtle Island.

This cannot be a site of negotiation.

More often than not, Indigenous scholars arguing in favor of incremental reforms that rely on a politics of recognition forget that **the site at which our demands align does matter**. The value in Indigenous activist movements (like Idle No More) lies not in their ability to affect Settler politics, but in the ability to refuse recognition altogether. Even if Indigenous politicians legislatively halted construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline, Indigenous life would not be benefited. This is because **the lifeworlds being built are not Indigenous lifeworlds**. **They are Settler lifeworlds.**

**This is not to say the slew of legislative changes enacted by Indigenous politicians has not benefited communities**, **but to forward an alternative orientation for** our **politics**. I will offer a brief discussion of the “SURVIVE Act” to demonstrate my point. Even if funds are set aside for Indigenous tribes through the “SURVIVE Act” to “respond to the emotional, psychological, or physical needs of a victim of crime,” the question of when we can start building our own lifeworlds still remains. **What we need are not** more **Settler** criminal justice **systems because the discussion** of a “criminal justice system” **is** - itself – **mediated by the destruction of our lifeworlds**. Before we were colonized, the Tsalagi had peace towns for wrongdoers, nothing like the prisons now being built on Indigenous lands for wrongdoers.

This shit is all wrong. Stop telling me what to do. Let Indigenous activists create solutions from the mobilization of our politics. **Don’t make us touch your shit.**

#### Thus I affirm : Turtle Island should recognize an unconditional right of indigenous peoples to strike as a site of ethical governance and resistance against westphalian settler sovereignty.

#### Turtle Island’s reclamation of land by indigenous bodies makes it the *only* just government.

**Avant, 20** (JOAN TAVARES Avant, Joan Tavares Avant, M.Ed., is a member of the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe, Wampanoag Deer Clan mother, and a former director of the Mashpee School District’s Indian Education Program. She can be reached at turtle5avant@comcast.net., 9-11-2020, accessed on 11-2-2021, CapeNews.net, "North America Known As Turtle Island To Indigenous Tribes", https://www.capenews.net/mashpee/columns/north-america-known-as-turtle-island-to-indigenous-tribes/article\_450f4f21-6782-52c3-8c43-34c928a81b40.html)

Believe it or not, it is under your feet if you are living in North America and walking on Mother Earth. Many Native American tribes have this believe and have it in their folklore stories. One reason is the continent’s shape. The North American area has the shape of the turtle’s shell with a spiny ridge, the Rocky Mountains. Protruding from the shell are the tail of Mesoamerica; the limbs of Florida, Baja California, Alaska and Quebec-Labrador; and the head pointing toward the North Pole. The continent also has 13 regions that correspond to the 13 plates that are on turtle’s shell**. Many traditional elders say the natural, sacred way to govern ourselves was taught to us by way of the nature of the turtle.** Mayan tribes make mention of their story. In the earliest days, when the Earth was covered with water, the animals tried, one by one, to create land, so they could stop swimming and rest. After all the other animals tried and failed, it was Turtle who—despite suffering some derision from the others, even though they themselves had failed—dove down many, many times to the bottom of the primeval sea, holding her breath far longer than any other creature can and, by bringing up a small mouthful of dirt each time, eventually created this continent. The Mohawk tribe has a little different story: “In the beginning, all the families of the world lived together on the shell of a turtle (Turtle Island). However, as time went by, they began to argue and even fight with each other. Seeing this, the Creator pulled the shell’s 13 sections apart, separating them by impassable, undrinkable gulfs of salt water to prevent them from continuing to bicker with each other.”

#### Recognizing resistance is a site of putting the settler subject in flux creating a break in the repetitive practices and logics in settler colonialism

Henderson 15 [ Phil Henderson works Department of Political Science, University of Victoria, Victoria, Canada “Imagoed communities: the psychosocial space of settler colonialism” Oct 21 ,2015 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1092194> ] //aaditg

The imago produced by settler ‘development’ is necessary for the erasure of indigeneity – just as the erasure of indigeneity is necessary for the production of a stable imago. This clustering within the imago of the psyche and the social is the critical element in the production of a subject that reflexively occludes its own involvement in the ongoing dispossession of indigenous peoples. In their report to the Ipperwash Inquiry, the Chippewas of Nawash note that as indigenous sovereignty is nullified in the minds of settlers: a kind of psychological terra nullius is created – the land is now emptied of people who matter and so it does not matter that trap lines are drowned by hydro projects, or hunting grounds clear-cut, or that fishing nets are stolen out of the water.62 At a distance, the duplicity here is quite strange. Lines are drowned, forests are cut, nets are stolen, because settlers know reflexively that they have a right – duty even – to shape the vacant land according to their collective and individual needs. Yet, the very things which they seek to remove should prove the falsity of terra nullius, as they evidence indigenous presence. The settler subject is able to gloss the violence of his actions so easily, however, because he is ultimately the product of, and dependent upon, a series of power relations that actively disappear indigenous peoples as active sovereign bodies. Within the psychosocial order of settler sovereignty, supported by the settler imago, these acts are understood as progressive or represent an adherence to the law, and become unreadable to the settler for what they are: the latest in a series of dispossessive acts. Destabilizing a dispossessive subject Not only does the concept of the spatial imago allow us to interrogate the formation of the settler as a subject, it also provides a powerful analytical tool to explain the extreme vitriolic reactions that indigenous peoples constantly face from settlers. Many point to racism as SETTLER COLONIAL STUDIES 49 the source of such reactions, and this is not without cause, as settlers have long imbibed a sense of racial and cultural superiority – particularly toward indigenous peoples. Despite these prejudices, however, Wolfe notes that the ‘primary motive’ of settler colonialism’s domination ‘is not race’ but ‘access to territory’. 63 Thus, inasmuch as the settler colonial imago validates access to territory by occluding indigenous sovereignty, the ongoing presences on and claims to the land by indigenous peoples trouble the settler imago and induce panic in settler subjects. Facing assertive indigenous presences within settler colonial spaces, settlers must answer the legitimate charge that their daily life – in all its banality – is predicated upon the privileges produced by ongoing genocide. The jarring nature of such charges offers an irreconcilable challenge to settlers qua settlers.64 Should these charges become impossible to ignore, they threaten to explode the imago of settler colonialism, which had hitherto operated within the settler psyche in a relatively smooth and benign manner. This explosion is potentiated by the revelation of even a portion of the violence that is required to make settler life possible. If, for example, settlers are forced to see ‘their’ beach as a site of murder and ongoing colonization, it becomes more difficult to sustain it within the imaginary as a site of frivolity.65 As Brown writes, in the ‘loss of horizons, order, and identity’ the subject experiences a sense of enormous vulnerability.66 Threatened with this ‘loss of containment’, the settler subject embarks down the road to psychosis.67 Thus, to parlay Brown’s thesis to the settler colonial context, the uncontrollable rage that indigenous presences induce within the settler is not evidence of the strength of settlers, but rather of a subject lashing out on the brink of its own dissolution. This panic – this rabid and insatiable anger – is always already at the core of the settler as a subject. As Lorenzo Veracini observes, the settler necessarily remains in a disposition of aggression ‘even after indigenous alterities have ceased to be threatening’. 68 This disposition results from the precarity inherent in the maintenance of settler colonialism’s imago, wherein any and all indigenous presences threaten subjective dissolution of the settler as such. Trapped in a Gordian Knot, the very thing that provides a balm to the settler subject – further development and entrenchment of the settler colonial imago – is also what panics the subject when it is inevitably contravened.69 We might think of this as a process of hardening that leaves the imago brittle and more susceptible to breakage. Their desire to produce a firm imago means that settlers are also always already in a psychically defensive position – that is, the settler’s offensive position on occupied land is sustained through a defensive posture. For while settlers desire the total erasure of indigenous populations, the attendant desire to disappear their own identity as settlers necessitates the suppression of both desires, if the subject’s reliance on settler colonial power structure is to be psychically naturalized. Settlers’ reactions to indigenous peoples fit, almost universally, with the two ego defense responses that Sigmund Freud observed. The first of these defenses is to attempt a complete conversion of the suppressed desire into a new idea. In settler colonial contexts, this requires averting attention from the violence of dispossession; as such, settlers often suggest that they aim to create a ‘city on the hill’. 70 Freud noted that the conversion defense mechanism does suppress the anxiety-inducing desire, but it also leads to ‘periodic hysterical outbursts’. Such is the case when settlers’ utopic visions are forced to confront the reality that the gentile community they imagine is founded in and perpetuates irredeemable suffering. A second type of defense is to channel the original desire’s 50 P. HENDERSON energy into an obsession or a phobia. The effects of this defense are seen in the preoccupation that settler colonialism has with purity of blood or of community.71 As we have already seen, this obsession at once solidifies the power of the settler state, thereby naturalizing the settler and simultaneously perpetuating the processes of erasing indigenous peoples. Psychic defenses are intended to secure the subject from pain, and whether that pain originates inside or outside the psyche is inconsequential. Because of the threat that indigeneity presents to the phantasmatic wholeness of settler colonialism, settlers must always remain suspended in a state of arrested development between these defensive positions. Despite any pretensions to the contrary, the settler is necessarily a parochial subject who continuously coils, reacts, disavows, and lashes out, when confronted with his dependency on indigenous peoples and their territory. This psychic precarity exists at the core of the settler subject because of the unending fear of its own dissolution, should indigenous sovereignty be recognized.72 Goeman writes as an explicit challenge to other indigenous peoples, but this holds true to settler-allies as well, that decolonization must include an analysis of the dominant ‘self-disciplining colonial subject’. 73 However, as this discussion of subjective precarity demonstrates, the degree of to which these disciplinary or phenomenological processes are complete should not be overstated. For settler-allies must also examine and cultivate the ways in which settler subjects fail to be totally disciplined. Evidence of this incompletion is apparent in the subject’s arrested state of development. Discovering the instability at the core of the settler subject, indeed of all subjects, is the central conceit of psychoanalysis. This exception of at least partial failure to fully subjectivize the settler is also what sets my account apart from Rifkin’s. His phenomenology falls into the trap that Jacqueline Rose observes within many sociological accounts of the subject: that of assuming a successful internalization of norms. From the psychoanalytical perspective, the ‘unconscious constantly reveals the “failure”’ of internalization.74 As we have seen, within settler subjects this can be expressed as an irrational anxiety that expresses itself whenever a settler is confronted with the facts regarding their colonizing status. Under conditions of total subjectification, such charges ought to be unintelligible to the settler. Thus, the process of subject formation is always in slippage and never totalized as others might suggest.75 Because of this precarity, the settler subject is prone to violence and lashing out; but the subject in slippage also provides an avenue by which the process of settler colonialism can be subverted – creating cracks in a phantasmatic wholeness which can be opened wider. Breakages of this sort offer an opportunity to pursue what Paulette Regan calls a ‘restorying’ of settler colonial history and culture, to decanter settler mythologies built upon and within the dispossession of indigenous peoples.76 The cultivation of these cracks is a necessary part of decolonizing work, as it continues to panic and thus to destabilize settler subjects. Resistance to settler colonialism does not occur only in highly visible moments like the famous conflict at Kanesatake and Kahnawake,77 it also occurs in reiterative and disruptive practices, presences, and speech acts. Goeman correctly observes that the ‘repetitive practices of everyday life’ are what give settler spaces their meaning, as they provide a degree of naturalness to the settler imago and its psychic investments.78 As such, to disrupt the ease of these repetitions is at once to striate radically the otherwise smooth spaces of settler colonialism and also to disrupt the easy (re)production of the settler subject. Goeman calls these subversive acts the ‘micro-politics of resistance’, which historically SETTLER COLONIAL STUDIES 51 took the form of ‘moving fences, not cooperating with census enumerators, sometimes disrupting survey parties’ amongst other process.79 These acts panic the subject that is disciplined as a product of settler colonial power, by forcing encounters with the sovereign indigenous peoples that were imagined to be gone. This reveals to the settler, if only fleetingly, the violence that founds and sustains the settler colonial relationship. While such practices may not overthrow the settler colonial system, they do subvert its logics by insistently drawing attention to the ongoing presence of indigenous peoples who refuse erasure. Today, we can draw similar inspiration from the variety of tactics used in movements like Idle No More. From flash mobs in major malls, to round dances that block city streets, and even projects to rename Toronto locations, Idle No More is engaged in a series of micro-political projects across Turtle Island.80 The micro-politics of the movement strengthen indigenous subjects and their spatialities, while leaving an indelible imprint in the settler psyche. Predictably, rage and resentment were provoked in some settlers;81 however, Idle No More also drew thousands of settler-allies into the streets and renewed conversations about the necessity of nation-to-nation relationships. With settler colonial spaces disrupted and a relationship of domination made impossible to ignore, in the tradition of centuries of indigenous resistance, Idle No More put the settler subject into serious flux once more.

#### Turtle island destabilizes western hegemony through decolonial subversive politics

**Sefa Dei 18** – professor at Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto Director for the Centre for Integrative Studies at OISE/UT and Carnegie African Diaspora Fellow [George J., ““Black Like Me”: Reframing Blackness for Decolonial Politics” 2018, Educational Studies, 54:2, 117-142, DKP] recut aaditg

We must evoke a form of “radical indigenism” (Garroute, 2003) for Black and African peoples everywhere to engage in decolonial resistance and subversive politics. The goal is to destabilize Western hegemonies in knowledge, economics, and political and material practices. Colonialism has been unending in the power and reach of its ideas and imperial designs. We must, therefore, claim the language of land and territory in discussions about African Indigeneity as a project of decolonization. Land is both metaphorical and concrete. The metaphorical is to allow us to claim that sense of belonging to place, space, and history. It is metaphorical because this Indigeneity resides in our bodies and cultural memories as well as our spiritual and psychic senses.

A distinction between Indigenous and Indigenous settler societies could be helpful. Indigenous helps theorize the shared experiences and histories of peoples whose Lands were and/or have been dispossessed by colonial and imperial forces and those Indigenous in settler communities/nations who still struggle to uphold their legal claims and titles to ancestral Lands. For Black peoples living in both Africa and White colonial settler communities like Turtle Island [Canada] we are implicated in discussion of settlerhood violence. We are not complicit in the sense of perpetuating colonial violence against Indigenous peoples. But the discussion implicates us in how we own up to our responsibilities and begin to build solidarities to support struggles against White colonial settler violence (see Dei, 2017b; McClure, 2015; McKittrick & Woods, 2007). I agree that citizenship on stolen Lands is very problematic because it is tied to Land dispossession and the displacement of peoples through violent global genocidal processes. The colonial state uses citizenship to legitimize itself. For Black and African bodies claims of colonial citizenship implicate us as much as our labor was used to serve White colonial capital projects. The fact that Whiteness itself has been a colonial fabrication (Cesaire, 1972) and we must understand the colonial history behind that settler state (Smith, 2010). And for Black and African peoples, our existence, however, cannot be reduced to simply a search for citizenship nor in the service for capital (King, 2014, 2016)

#### The indigenous struggle the 1AC recognizes through its agency is a moment of the force of civil society struggle through strategic skill and planning as erasure operates through dismissal of non-western approaches

**Hastings 16** – Assistant Professor, Conflict Resolution at Portland State University, EDD, Portland State, MA in Mass Communication at University of Wisconsin-Superior [Tom, “Turtle Island 2016 Civil Resistance Snapshot,” Journal for the Study of Peace and Conflict, 2016, DKP] recut aaditg

The basic study of indigenous nonviolent struggle is unique in the northern Western hemisphere—now widely referred to as Turtle Island by indigenous peoples, from a Lenape origin story. Unlike other identity groups, indigenous groups retain their own governments, sometimes aligned with their civil society and sometimes seemingly the tools of the dominant culture. The sharpest differences can come from the loyalty of some tribes to their tribal governments as those governments themselves—in possession of a certain degree of sovereignty—resist the state/province and/or federal governments (Cobb, 2010). This allegiance of a civil society movement to a tribal government rather than the more normal US or Canadian civil resistance (some grouping of citizenry versus government) is helpful to analyzing US Native American resistance and Canadian First Nation civil resistance. Indeed, the not-infrequent rallying cry is some version of “We are nations, not minorities.” Civil rights and human rights usually relate to individual rights; tribal rights are collective (Sturm, 2014). This complicates both the practice and analysis of strategic nonviolence. Throughout this exegesis of Native American and First Nation civil resistance, I use examples from several struggles, but most pointedly and repeatedly from the one I immersed in for several years—the Anishinaabe struggle of 1976-1993 with the civil resistance at boat landings most massively from 1989-1992, when thousands of whites mobilized to attempt to stop Anishinaabe fishers and hundreds of nonviolent monitors and de-escalators trained and deployed alongside the tribal members.

Another unique layer of this conflict map is that it is overlain by individual band identities within tribal nations. The efforts by some to create a pan-Indian identity as the next step toward assimilation into the dominant culture (e.g., Native American instead of Santee Sioux or First Nation instead of Wet'suwet'e) completely failed (McKenzie-Jones, 2010)—the terms are used by externals far more than by Native Americans, for example. As with any peoples, attempts to impose ontology can only succeed in the most superficial sense— temporarily as an expedient in the face of real or perceived threat, and authentic agency is required to develop meaningful dialog (Desbiens & Rivard, 2014). Inevitably, even (or perhaps especially) in national Native American associations, each person is carefully identified by nation (Anishinaabe, Sioux, etc.) and by band (e.g. St. Croix Anishinaabe, Brule Sioux) and some individuals are also careful to denote clan within the band. Acting in coalition is not the same as assuming a common undifferentiated identity.

Many factors contribute to the growing success of Native American and First Nation nonviolent campaigns and movements, not the least of which is the sense, informed by a burgeoning history, that tribes have agency, something occluded, arguably, by historical norms that ignored any agency except futile violent resistance. Native and First Nation cultures— similarly to indigenous cultures in every colonized area of the world for many years—were assumed inferior. People were subjects of anthropological research, not participants with a role in determining methodologies, utilities, parameters or goals—this was a factor in essential erasure of indigenous agency in public policy considerations. This is changing (Lemelin, et al., 2014). The multipronged challenges—civil resistance, legal, political, media—conspired to change the dynamics. As the sophistication of the movements grows, and as coalitional efforts add to broader successes, the likelihood of a tribe choosing nonviolent civil resistance over either capitulation or violence increases.

Of course in the US, the black experience in the Civil Rights struggle pitted a different loyalty (to an improved version of the US Constitution, with a Bill of Rights and other Amendments) against a different opposition (loyalty to a tribal government and ambivalence toward the US government). Black resistance from the 1955-1965 period was a model in most ways for Native Resistance but also revealed marked differences. Rima Wilkes (2015) explores the contrasts between black and white Americans and in prior pieces (2004 and 2006) examines some of the variables in First Nations resistance, offering comparative insights. When considering Native American and First Nations unarmed resistance, then, the definition of civil society is unique; it includes governments at some level of sovereignty on both sides in many cases. It is quite likely that a First Nation or Native American struggle will include a member of a tribe’s executive branch alongside an average citizen, with the imprimatur of the tribe backing the tribal official and the average tribal enrolled member as well.

Native American (US) and First Nation (Canada) unarmed civil resistance is growing to connect with indigenous civil society around the world and with immigrant settler allies in the US and Canada. Anticipating the allure of treaty rights and growing legal clout, Walter Bresette (Red Cliff Anishinaabe) declared to anti-treaty rights groups who were associated with the blood sports—hunting, fishing (Rod and Gun clubs)—“Our treaty rights will be your best friend, you just can’t see it yet.” Indeed, during the Wisconsin/Minnesota/Michigan struggle for reaffirmation, Joe and Joe Dan Rose, James Schlender, and Bresette all went as individuals to anti-treaty rights mass meetings as brave lone emissaries. This was bold and gained them respect and even defections (Whaley & Bresette, 1994). Bresette was prophetic.

Indeed, many of the dominant culture individuals and groups who opposed Native American treaty rights are now in coalition with those tribes (Grossman, 2005; Lipsitz, 2008). From pre-European contact, when some indigenous nations were experimenting with nonviolent alternatives to war—e.g., counting coup—to modern nonviolent native resistance to US-Canada pipelines and other threats to indigenous lifeways, nonviolent resistance to invasion, occupation, genocide, environmental destruction and oppression has been far more successful than has armed resistance. That this civil resistance originates from warrior cultures is remarkable yet sensible to students of civil resistance. Nonviolent conduct is often more disciplined when a culture values a warrior’s commitment. This is often the case for indigenous movements in the Western hemisphere from above the Arctic Circle to the US-Mexico border.

Why are these cultures considered warrior cultures?

First, although many tribes and most First Nations never fought or lost a war to the invading settler nations, they did lose most control over most land for most of the time since Europeans invaded and since Canada and the US were formed as nation-states. This massive loss militates an emotional reliance upon a historical insistence of resistance—which, for most of our human history and even still for much of humankind—implied violent resistance. To help the generations know that the land used to belong to Native Americans and First Nations and was not simply abandoned or given away except under duress, the warrior identity is of great help. Anything less than irredentist aspirations forfeits a legacy of respect, only adding to the trauma of ancestral loss and present day poverty in so many cases.

Second, the history of empires is a history of stripping indigenous peoples of all their traditions and rights—religious, civil, linguistic, cultural, music, art, appearance (including dress and body/facial alteration and hair), land ownership, land use, motility, diet, financial/economic/property, legal status, educational opportunity—and only re-awarding those rights piecemeal as the conquered people step up to demonstrate loyalty to the empire, and especially to join the military of the empire to continue the process of conquering the next people. Native Americans volunteer for the US armed forces at high rates and honor that at virtually every opportunity—at feasts, speeches, powwows, etc. (Hafen, 2013) This prestige is given to those, then, who are buying a seat at the table by being willing to fight and die for the empire that conquered them. The warriors who serve the armed forces of the empire are doing so just as much—arguably more—for the glory and good name of their tribal nation as they are for the conquering nation.

As with any nonviolent struggle, identity formation is generally recursive (Smithey, 2013). In the Wisconsin case of the nonviolent struggle for the ability to exercise treaty rights, the fishers who braved hostile crowds to exercise those rights were honored at tribal ceremonies frequently, contributing to that recursive identity process of the nonviolent warrior.

Native American and First Nation nationalism is informed by all forms of ongoing resistance and by the status of each native nation in relationship to other native nations and the dominant culture, a complex weave of feedback that in turn informs the resistance. 1 Externals can only barely begin to understand this complex of psychosocial cultural forces. The same indigenous warrior who fought in Afghanistan or Iraq may be first in line to defend tribal land and lifeways against a US or Canadian government-sponsored or permitted oil pipeline, fracking wells, coal trains, or rail tank cars full of chemicals used to mine. They may well commit to violent warfare in service of the empire and to absolute nonviolence in defense of the tribe at home, but it often feels similar in some profound senses and in warrior-worthy discipline.2

A snapshot of indigenous nonviolent civil resistance in this region shows the force of civil society struggle done with strategic skill and planning. While the indigenous peoples of the US and Canada are very small minorities (2.9 percent and 4.3 percent, respectively), the victories achieved defending treaty rights, protecting the environment, resisting harmful dominant culture practices, and fighting potential harmful legislation in both countries have been increasingly impressive. Those struggles are more enhanced by stronger coalitions with non-indigenous allies and indigenous peoples from around the hemisphere and the world as those formerly colonized peoples increasingly connect and engage in mutual support (Grossman, 2008; Hansen, 2015).

#### Embracing Turtle Island lets us cultivate an understanding of resources as not commodities but rather as family which challenges our orientation to neoliberalism

Eaton 21 [Emily Eaton is a columnist at the Minnesota Daily. The Minnesota Daily “Eaton: Treaties, tribes and Turtle Island” Feb 10, 2021 <https://mndaily.com/265372/opinion/eaton-treaties-tribes-and-turtle-island/> ]//aaditg

As Dockry explains, tribes think about the natural world and its resources in a much different light than westernized society. Natural resources aren’t commodities for consumption, they are family. Indigenous activists and tribal members refer to the United States by a name with strong ties to the natural world: Turtle Island. A pipeline spill that damages a bed of wild rice would not only violate treaty rights, but it would also damage an important part of Indigenous culture. For Dockry, the construction of Line 3 sits at a complicated nexus of ideals. Much of his work is devoted to tribal sovereignty, pushing him to defer to the decisions of tribal governments. But, he said, “Our tribal leaders are saying we need to start healing our relationship to the planet” — that includes phasing out the use of fossil fuels. Changing the way we look at tribal nations isn’t just about considering another point of view. For Tara Houska, it’s about going back to her roots. Houska is a prominent voice in Indigenous advocacy and the fight against Line 3. She’s a Couchiching First Nation Anishinaabe, a former tribal attorney, advisor to Bernie Sanders and creator of this TEDTalk, among many other accomplishments. When I called her, however, she was on her way to buy a new skinning knife. After fighting inequities and mistreatment of indigenous populations at the federal level, Houska recognized the need for a strong frontline fight against tribal erasure. In response, she founded the Giniw Collective, a group led entirely by Indigenous women and two-spirit individuals. The organization focuses on land protection and defense. Protesting Line 3 is a piece of that, but so is mutual aid work, spreading traditional knowledge, wild ricing, hunting and fishing. In essence, the Collective works to restore the native way of living in balance with the natural world. The name itself pays homage to the generations past who have fought for the Indigenous lifestyle. Giniw is the golden eagle, believed to live between the human and the spirit world, a messenger who connects the past and present. The Giniw Collective creates a space that honors history and allows young people to grow and learn. Houska understands first hand what it’s like to care deeply about a cause and feel as though no one is listening. Though she still participates in traditional advocacy (for example, The Giniw Collective recently hosted Rep. Ilhan Omar), Houska passionately believes that “direct action … standing with the land in a real way, in a physical way, is one of the most under-resourced, undersupported forms of advocacy.” Advocacy is empowering, she explained to me, but only when people take risks and see the impact that can be had. When asked what she would like to say to people who are passionate about Line 3, but can’t seem to make the leap to protesting on the frontlines, Houska replied. “There were 68,000 comments submitted by concerned community members against the Line 3 pipeline,” she began. “There were thousands of hours put into hearings, … and there was a unanimous decision made to approve the pipeline. Our system is broken. It is heavily skewed towards industry. We aren’t going to make change comfortably. I don’t think we’re going to stop Line 3 by sitting behind a computer screen. It takes bravery and it takes action to effect change.”

**Refuse the invocation of “fairness” in response to radical Native politics – it’s a tactic to congeal their violent internalization of Settler grammars of governmentality**

**Dale 14**. Dr. Norman Dale is a 2014 graduate of the Ph.D. Program in Leadership & Change at Antioch University [“Decolonizing the Empathetic Settler Mind: An Autoethnographic Inquiry,” 2014, Antioch University, URL: [https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send\_file?accession=antioch1413921151&disposition=inline]//vikas](https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send_file?accession=antioch1413921151&disposition=inline%5d//vikas) recut aaditg

**Using foundational violence** of many formats, these European **newcomers set up** systems of **governance that** eventually **became independent** of the old homeland. **Critical in assuring permanence of these structures was to overwhelm indigenous numbers** with settler populations, **a task accomplished by a combination of state-encouraged immigration and** varied means for **indigenous depopulation including massacres, deportation and** what Crosby (1976) called “virgin-soil” **epidemics**. In almost every case, such Euro-**settlers** brought strongly **espoused enlightenment values of** liberty and **fairness**, **which were**, of course, **utterly odds with the theft they were perpetrating**. **This meant having to cover up** the violence, thievery, and **genocide**, all that psychological legerdemain **which became constitutive of** what Veracini (2010) calls **settler “consciousness.”** The politics of memory and forgetting permeates **the settler colonial strategy** and **must saturate individual settler mind-sets** to work well. The indoctrination of my early youth (Chapter IV) certainly conformed closely to the major precepts of settler colonialism, as posited by Veracini. The films and television shows I saw, the adolescent stories of frontier heroism I imbibed, and the **history** I was **taught** and loved, **could now be seen as a totalizing settler consciousness**. Moreover, the pardonable gullibility of childhood lasted not only into my young professional career, whereby, as I have discussed in Chapters V and VI, I had ample, but untaken, opportunities to grasp the enormity of Canada’s White hegemonic system. How often I could have segued my passions for ecology and “small-is-beautiful”-style (Schumacher, 1973) community survival, into **seeing indigenous struggles not as merely other examples of these preoccupations**—**but as transcendent of them**, arguably **the most** **extreme and reprehensible embodiment** of things that I knew were amiss in contemporary Canada. **But** just **as I** had **passed by the disappointingly modern (un)Indian-ness of Caughnawaga (Kahnawake)** as a child, without much interest, now **I drove myself so many times in the 1960s by the austere Shubenacadie Indian Residential School**, thinking only that it was an interesting prominence on the otherwise bare riparian meadows along the river north of Halifax. **Settler colonial studies are attracted especially to the disjuncture between ideals and practices** among the now-majority European-originating populations **who espouse equality and freedom among all**, yet who thrive on the spoils of conquest and outright theft. **To live with oneself day to day amidst this cognitive dissonance requires** an array of **self-deceptive strategies** that Veracini (2010) and many other scholars of settler colonialism have portrayed at both levels. And the strategies clearly worked for me, most tangibly in my many years of acting the social liberal and progressive but, as I say, literally and figuratively driving by, inattentive to the symbols and institutions of cruel hegemony.