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## 1NC

#### **Equality of education is a farce: Attempting to “reform” material conditions ignores settler colonial history and practices in education.**

Masta 19 [Stephanie Masta, Berkeley Review of Education, 8(2), "Challenging the Relationship Between Settler Colonial Ideologies and Higher Education Spaces", 2019, https://escholarship.org/content/qt55p0c597/qt55p0c597.pdf] **Tfane23**
Although settler colonialism is a concept discussed by scholars across academic disciplines, my work focuses specifically on the application of settler colonialism in education. By using Indigenous student experiences as my lens, I demonstrate the pervasiveness of settler colonial ideology. Settler colonialism’s historical role in education has served three prominent functions: to reduce the power of Indigenous nations (Brayboy, 2005), to force assimilation and adoption of western-dominated thinking (Steinman, 2015), and to perpetuate narratives of erasure at multiple points of Colonial Ideology and Higher Ed 181 analysis (Patel, 2016). Looking at this intersection of colonialism and education is important because Education was and in many ways continues to be (1) a battle for the hearts and minds of Indigenous nations; (2) a colonial call for assimilation; and (3) a responsibility of the federal government arising from a series of agreements between Indian nations and the U.S. meant to open up land bases to a burgeoning immigrant population. (Brayboy, Faircloth, Lee, Maaka, & Richardson, 2015, p. 1) As Battiste (2013) wrote, “Education, like the institutions and societies it derives from, is neither culturally neutral nor fair. Education has its roots in a patriarchal, Eurocentric society, complicit with multiple forms of oppression of women, sometimes men, children, minorities, and Indigenous peoples” (p. 159). Educational institutions within the settler society, then, represent a prime site for negotiating between colonial rule and Indigenous sovereignty. An ongoing concern for Indigenous communities is the relationship between power and settler colonial control. Dei and Asgharzadeh (2001), in their foundational work on anti-colonial frameworks, argued “Colonial” includes all forms of dominating and oppressive relationships that emerge from structures of power and privilege inherent and embedded in our contemporary social relations . . . colonial is not defined simply as foreign or alien, but more importantly, as dominating and opposing. (p. 308) Relatedly, Glenn (2015) argued that while some forms of colonialism aim to take resources for the advantage of the colonizing country, the objective of settler colonialism is to acquire land to settle permanently. It is this settling that is most destructive to Indigenous communities. Although forms of colonialism include the exploitation of natural and human resources, settler colonialism has a more specific goal: to acquire, control, and define these resources and the territory as a whole. This process can be accomplished through genocide, forced removal, and assimilation, all of which occurred in the U.S. Although early settler colonial societies replaced Indigenous communities through physical assault and violence, another vehicle was needed because settler colonialism is also “an institutionalized or normalized (and therefore mostly invisible) ideology of national identity” (Lovell, 2007, p. 3). Moreover, because the goals and outcomes of settler colonialism are inextricably linked to U.S. nationalism, the structural nature of education—both church-based and governmental—made it the perfect vehicle for replicating and reinforcing settler colonial ideology (Dunbar-Ortiz, 2016; Glenn, 2015). One such example is off-reservation boarding schools, in which settlers forcibly removed Indigenous students from their homes, placed them in “schools,” and attempted to remove all traces of their Indigenous identity. Indigenous students were beaten for speaking their language, forced to work in horrible conditions for no payment, and prevented from communicating with their families (Adams, 1995). In many ways, education remains the perfect vehicle. Twenty years ago, Willinsky (1998) argued that the educational project of colonialism in western countries was only the beginning, and, given its enormity, was to live on as an unconscious aspect of education. Therefore, it is 182 Masta essential to make conscious how entrenched and ongoing the process of settler colonialism is within the context of education (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). A key element of making conscious the role of settler colonialism in education is recognizing how everyone is implicated in settler colonial practices, even if they are unaware of it because of how normalized settler colonial ideologies are in educational spaces (Tuck & Yang, 2012). This normalizing occurs in postsecondary education through faculty’s pedagogical and research practices. In the following section, I discuss the postsecondary education context to illustrate the type of educational environments the participants in my study experienced, and how this contributed to their understanding of settler colonialism.

#### Systems of innocence like education are the founding principles of Set Col – they create an invisible system of oppression that historicizes genocide and allows that very violence to continue.

**Henderson 15** [Phil. Department of Political Philosophy at the University of Victoria. “Imagoed communities: the psychosocial space of settler colonialism,” published in SETTLER COLONIAL STUDIES. Pg 2-3. Accessible here at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1092194>, Reichle]

While colonialism is present as an historic fact within public consciousness, settler colonialism remains largely the property of academic and activist circles. Fundamentally, this is a result of settler colonialism’s double move: disappearing and erasing both the settler and indigenous peoples as politically articulable subjects, and thus rendering settlers’ desires for domination inarticulable.2 Patrick Wolfe makes the astute observation that, within the settler colonial context, the invasion of indigenous peoples’ territories by Europeans becomes a ‘structure rather than an event’ as in colonialism.3 This invasion-as-structure carries with it the impetus for the formation of a wholly new polity and – as I show – a new political subject. In the Indian experience of colonization, for example, Europeans contented themselves with brutally repressing indigenous populations in order to extract labor or open markets. Contrarily, settler colonization operates under a ‘logic of elimination’. 4 Total disavowal of indigenous presences – indeed of the possibility of meaningful indigenous lives at all – is necessary to facilitate the imagining of a ‘settler body politic “to come”’. 5 To be achieved by murder, removal, or assimilation. If a settler colony is to be a viable political order, it must be seen as the only viable order and must secure ‘the violent erasures of alternative modes’ of being, whether physically, culturally, and psychically.6A common tactic to secure these erasures involves a concerted effort to deny that indigenous peoples hold fidelity to place. To this effect, settlers portray indigenous peoples as nomads with no sense of place.7 When reality contradicts these myths – that is, when nations are clearly in continuous and deep relationships with the land – indigenous peoples are often forced into nomadism as settlers raze their communities.8 These supposed nomads become, in the eyes of settlers, relics of a past that must inevitably fade away. Once this settler myth transmogrifies nations into nomads, the violences of colonization become ‘naturalized as an unfortunate byproduct of progress’. 9 Enraptured by the idea of their inevitable ascendance, settlers voraciously pursue the creation of a new polity. Either by outright murder, forcible removal, or disrupting indigenous peoples’ access to their territory, settlers transform the land and establish themselves therein both spatially and temporally. As they create cities, establish a state, build (rail)roads and homes, settlers perpetuate and naturalize the violence inherent in their continued existence within colonized spaces. Commitment to the perpetuation of settler colonial projects necessitates continual erasure of the indigenous presences which – try as they might – the settler can never fully expunge. In most contemporary cases, the repetitive erasure of indigenous peoples is facilitated by the settler state. Adam Barker has noted that the process of colonization is often initially carried out by collectives of settlers; however, over time, states are created to ensure the perpetuation of the settler colony.10 Once a state is established, it must ensure its own reproduction, which, in the context of settler colonization, simultaneously reproduces the erasure of indigenous peoples. Amongst settler states’ most effective methods of erasure is nationalism, which Mishuana Goeman describes as a powerful tool for producing within settlers a strong attachment to the colonized territory.11 Nationalism deploys a metonymic chain of historical, cultural, political, and even religious symbols that together offer meaning on both an individual and a communal level. Strong affective resonances are used: scenes of ‘honor’ and ‘glory’ on a battlefield, memories of tragedy, or awe-inspiring achievements are all common nationalistic tropes. By producing a sense of place and community, nationalism seeks to secure a holistic ‘we’, which imbricates a multiplicity of individuated subjects. Against this ‘we’ is set the overdetermined and phantasmatic figure of an alien ‘them’, which necessarily is seen as a threat to ‘us’. 12 Barker asserts that this dichotomy, which in settler societies often conjures the image of the frontier, is not a phenomenon of the periphery; rather, it occurs ubiquitously. The ubiquity of the frontier results from the consistency with which settlers and indigenous peoples interact – indeed, intermingle. Moreover, Barker notes, this is not a process driven solely by elites for strategic position; it happens ‘everywhere that there are settler collectives, and it occurs constantly’. 13

#### Settlement is an everyday process, constituted not only by the physical genocide of natives but is reiterated through the geopolitical affective interactions within this space that normalizes Settler Sovereignty through daily practices. The Role of the Ballot is to vote for the debater who best provides a method of disorienting ourselves—the breaking apart from the institutionalization of the Settler State. Rifkin 13

(Mark, “Settler common sense,” *Settler Colonial Studies*, Volume 3, Issue 3, pp. 322-340) JJ

In this sense, non-Natives need not function as agents of the state or as conscious purveyors of state aims in order to rematerialize state-effects by drawing on extant geographies, discourses, and normative frames as an anchor in processes of affective sense-making and “reckoning with their environment”. Moreover, such reinvestments in processes of settlement need not appear, or be experienced as, affirmations of the state, instead operate as the unreflexive, generic, given conditions of personhood, occupancy, and belonging, and these actualizations, enactments of “familiarity”, may not be identical or congruent with each other, inasmuch as multiple histories of state action that inhabit, orient, and stimulate the present “impress” in ways that might produce different (even incommensurate) forms of engagement. A Thoreauvian inclination toward “nature” as a space of escape from the extant regime of property ownership, comfort in the (Lockean) privatized autonomy of one’s home(stead), and immersion in the obscure anonymities of urban dwelling do not resemble each other and arise out of disparate affective – and perhaps ethical – commitments, but all iterate, to varied effects, the geopolitical self-evidence and security of the state whose unquestioned endurance anchors and animates them. Yet, inasmuch as they all continue to depend on treating the “historical density” of the settler-state – including its territorial coherence and overriding sovereignty in that space – as the “already there”, they participate in the regularization and becoming obvious of the settler colonial occupation of Native lands. In addition, that very (re)production of the nation as self-evident, or of its political geography as ethically neutral, may serve as a shared frame/experience through which to mediate, negotiate, and reconcile conflicts over land tenure, access to political and economic resources, personal identity, and membership in the polis. The continuing assertion and exertion of settler sovereignty may be described, returning to Williams’s formulation addressed earlier, as saturating rather than determining, as exerting pressures on the everyday life of non-Natives in ways that are formative and that influence “practical consciousness” without taking a singular form and without producing an inherent and unchanging alignment of “relationships, institutions, and formations”. the continued presence of Native peoples, including in areas from which they putatively have “vanished”, the question remains as to how the endurance of indigeneity and nonNatives’ encounters with Natives intersect with the kinds of settler orientation and momentum I have been addressing.20 In describing how sensation gets resolved into a coherent perceptual field, Merleau-Ponty observes, Our perception in its entirety is animated by a logic which assigns to each object its determinate features in virtue of those of the rest, and which ‘cancel out’ as unreal all stray data; it is entirely sustained by the certainty of the world, providing a sense of “the primordial constancy of the world as the horizon of all our experiences” (365),21 and he later notes, “My thought, my self-evident truth is not one fact among others, but a value-fact which envelops and conditions every possible one,” such that the various phenomena apprehended “must figure in my universe without completely disrupting it” (463). To the extent that the legal geography of the settler-state engenders ordinary modes of personhood, placemaking, and belonging, it provides “fixed points” through which one “reckons with the possible”, and from that perspective, Indigenous landedness, sovereignty, collectivity appear as “stray data” that function as “unreal”, challenging the apparent “constancy of the world” in non-Native experience. In this way, discourses and accounts of Native disappearance may function as the conscious translation of disturbances to the perceptual “self-evident truth” of the US jurisdiction and attendant geographies of everyday life. Furthermore, following this line of thought, tropes of Indianness may be understood as a kind of plug-in in Latour’s sense that allows Native presence to “figure” in settler phenomenologies without “completely disrupting” them. Returning to Byrd’s argument about the ways Indianness (the racializing construction of Native peoples as a population for assault/management/ inclusion) displaces indigeneity (place-based polities with legitimate claims to sovereignty over their homelands), that process could be interpreted less as “the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself” (xix), than as a form of crisis-management that enables non-Natives to accommodate and engage with Indigenous presence in ways that contain the threat it poses to quotidian modes of affective anchorage in which the settler-state and its legal and political mappings are lived as given.22 In other words, the deployment of various modes of Indianization through which Native peoplehood and sovereignty are converted into forms of anomaly – conceptually and perceptually segregated from the space of routine experience as a kind of categorical, geographic, political, and/or temporal aberration – can be understood as an expression of an ongoing process of making “unreal” Native sovereignties in the ordinary enactment and stabilization of US sovereignty as the basis for non-Native sensation. This approach can be distinguished from the interpretation of such figuration as part of an explicit project of dispossession that articulates directly with existing institutional aims (although such exceptionalization also operates as a vital mechanism of state practice).23 Moreover, the coding of Native people(s) as Indians allows for the articulation of propositional statements about them – including expressions of ambivalence, support, sympathy, and guilt – in ways that may still make constant the regularity of the legalities, jurisdiction, and mappings of the (settler-)state. However, in seeking to manage potential disruptions to settler certainty, the process of Indianization also may signal possibilities for reorientation, moments when settler phenomenologies might shift into something new. In this way, the “Indian” emerges both as a figure of dismissal and foreclosure and of potential transformation: implicitly marking the unacknowledged presence of a quotidian settler phenomenology which serves as the condition of emergence and circulation for that trope while also holding out the possibility for opening into an engagement with enduring Native presence, landedness,

#### Thus, the alternative is to embrace a settler colonial framework to create a new history in favor of indigenous communities – it’s a prerequisite to working within the state

Hoxie 08 [Frederick E. Hoxie, Ethnic and Racial Studies Volume 31 | Issue 6, "Retrieving the Red Continent: settler colonialism and the history of American Indians in the US: Ethnic and Racial Studies: Vol 31, No 6", August 19, 2008, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01419870701791294] **Tfane23**
The settler colonialism framework allows historians to view indigenous struggles in a transnational context. As communities beset by settler colonists, indigenous groups who struggle to maintain their autonomy are inadequately defined when referred to simply as ‘traditional’ people clinging desperately to the past. Moreover, the rise of democratic ideologies among settler colonists ideologies that regularly defined free white settlers as racially or culturally superior to indigenous peoples can be viewed as developments with progressive 1158 Frederick E. Hoxie Downloaded by [DUT Library] at 09:46 06 October 2014 as well as destructive implications. Finally, the settler colonial framework allows scholars to present indigenous populations in other than solely cultural terms. Settler colonialism does not generate narratives rooted in the ‘clash of cultures’. Instead it directs our attention to a series of confrontations that engage, first, invaders and defenders and, later, a complex array of collaborators, mediators and deal-makers operating on all sides of the confrontation. These encounters produce both resistance, and in Marshall Sahlins’s words ’culturally informed processes of interpretation and adaptation’ (Sahlins 2005, p. 5). But the settler colonial framework does more than help reframe confrontations between invaders and indigenous peoples. Over time, successful, expanding settler colonies produced an ideology of settler nationalism which created internationally-recognized ‘settler states’ which ultimately sought to extend national citizenship to indigenous peoples (Denoon 1979; Weaver 1996; Tyrell 2002). Initially, pioneering settlers excluded Natives from their settlements and erected institutions that separated the new nation’s citizens and Natives. Once established, however, the rulers of these settler states made rhetorical (and eventually, substantial) efforts to incorporate the indigenous survivors of the dispossession into their new nations. In settler colonies Natives were first surrounded by strangers who sought to displace them and profit from their resources. Native leaders were faced with the task of protecting their communities by both resisting the outsiders and seeking some way to accommodate their demands. (That accommodation was made both attractive and difficult by the settlers’ appeal to universal doctrines such as democracy and individual liberties and by their willingness, on occasion, to sign treaties with indigenous leaders.) The process of creating settler states on Native lands was (and continues to be) punctuated both by conflict between the two groups, periods of alliance or negotiated peace, and by prolonged struggles within each community over tactics and strategies for the future. As settler nations emerged in North America and the Pacific, the descendants of newcomers and their Native subjects gradually came to share languages, family ties, religious faiths, economies, political systems and a common popular culture. Distinct communities remained, even as they participated in overlapping social, economic and political institutions and indigenous people were wrapped within the institutions of the settler nation. By viewing the experiences of indigenous peoples in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States through the lens of settler colonialism, scholars have begun to trace the outlines of a global indigenous history that is both linked to and independent of Western European expansion. The settler colonialism framework perspective steers scholars away from narratives that cast indigenous Retrieving the Red Continent 1159 Downloaded by [DUT Library] at 09:46 06 October 2014 people solely as victims or ‘problems’ in stories of national expansion even as it persists in linking Native and national narratives (see Chakrabarty 2000). Finally, the settler colonial framework has structured much of Native experience in these new nations. Certainly earlier indigenous traditions and values have persisted, but the expanding presence of the settler state has formed a central theme in the modern history of Native peoples. Embedded in that theme is the ongoing threat posed by settler states whose existence is predicated on the replacement of the ‘deficient’ communities that preceded them. As Patrick Wolfe has pointed out: ‘settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizer come to stay invasion is a structure not an event’ (Wolfe 1999, p. 2; see also Wolfe 2006). As a consequence, the complex mixture of resistance and adaptation is a permanent feature of indigenous life within settler colonial states. Settler colonialism and the Red Continent In North America, the ongoing struggle between indigenous communities and the settler state called the United States has affected every Native community within the nation’s borders. The effects of this encounter intensified after 1776 and shaped those communities’ encounters with modernity. Viewing indigenous groups as participants in an ongoing contest with settler colonialism in the US brings a wide array of Native American experiences into focus and encourages scholars to look beyond single tribes or culture areas. This framework also illuminates previously obscure connections between different aspects of Indian life. Viewed from the perspective of settler colonialism, family histories are related to structural changes in the environment or shifts in economic systems, for example, while popular representations of indigenous peoples can be viewed in relation to changes in national political culture.

## 2NR Spec

### Overview

#### Education is a native death trap – they hide the politics of native erasure of education by claiming to “reform” education for minorities The aff’s belief in the intrinsic value of education creates the settler innocence that makes settler colonial violence invisible. Settlers use the veil of innocence to strip indigenous people of their identities, assimilating them to American culture through the logic of elimination That’s the Henderson evidence. That means only the alternative solves. By injecting native history into current history and breaking the traditional means of viewing settler-indigenous relationships, we can work within the state to make meaningful change.

### Link Defense

#### Link is education – you miss the forest for the trees. Education is an inherently settler colonialist system, which means reforming material conditions under the guise of “betterment” only re-ifies set col violence.

#### They say we don’t link to standardized tests – we don’t need to. The topic regards that standardized tests are a way to make college admissions more difficult, implying that colleges want to rid standardized testing in order to make admissions more appealing. That’s the link – we critique the assumption that a college education is good in the first place.

#### Universities were created based on settler colonial mechanisms like land-capital relationships – it’s an apriori reason to reject the institution.

Paperson 17 [La Paperson, University of Minnesota Press, "“Land. And the University Is Settler Colonial” in “A Third University Is Possible” on Manifold @uminnpress", 2017, https://manifold.umn.edu/read/a-third-university-is-possible/section/561c45d2-9442-42d5-9938-f8c9e2aafcfc#ch02] **Tfane23**
Land accumulation as institutional capital is likely the defining trait of a competitive, modern-day research university. Land is not just an early feature in the establishment of universities. Land is a motor in the financing of universities, enabling many of them to grow despite economic crises. In my own university context during the subprime loan bust of 2008, California campuses expanded facilities construction even while classes were closed, staff furloughed, enrollments frozen, and tuition and fees hiked.[1] One common joke is that “UC” means “Under Construction” rather than “University of California”; similar satirical acronyms exist throughout the research university world. The irony of continued property expansion and revenue generation while enrollments are capped and tuitions balloon has characterized the twenty-first-century university. Land is the keystone of the university, yet land is least likely to be discussed in any critical treatment of it. Universities do not exist in some abstract academic place. They are built on land, and especially in the North American context, upon occupied Indigenous lands. From where I write, the California public university system is a land-grant institution. This means that stolen land was (and is) the literal capital used to buy and build one of the largest university systems in the world; the tripartite of California community colleges, California state universities, and the University of California system constitute the largest such public institution in the world (and, arguably, the largest public institution of any sort). Land-grant institutions were legally born in 1862, when Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act into law. The passage of the Morrill Act is often narrated as a quiet, civilian accomplishment during the U.S. Civil War. Nonetheless, it was truly intimate to war and to the production of a Yankee North American empire. In 1862, seven Southern states seceded from the Union and thus removed from Congress the dissenting votes that had previously blocked the Morrill Act from becoming law. The act gave federal public lands to (Union) states, allotting thirty thousand acres of recently appropriated Indigenous lands for each senator and representative to stake out. States were encouraged to sell these “land grants” to raise money for new public universities that would research and educate American settlers in agriculture, science, and mechanical arts. Land is turned into capital for constructing universities for the principal goal of growing industry:[2] That all moneys derived from the sale of the lands aforesaid by the States to which the lands are apportioned . . . the moneys so invested shall constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished, . . . and the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated, by each State which may take and claim the benefit of this act, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college. (Morrill Act, section 4, para. 7) Land as capital and not as campuses is an innovation of the land-grant university. That is, states are able to trade, develop, and sell land to fund the construction of public universities. Land as capital incentivized land speculation. For example, New York State acquired its Morrill Act lands in 160-acre denominations, or “scrip,” which could be traded privately, even for lands in other states. Most notably, Ezra Cornell, cofounder of Cornell University and of the Western Union Company, traded 532,000 acres of scrip in New York to acquire timber-rich lands in Wisconsin. The “Western Lands,” as they were appropriately dubbed, fueled Cornell University from 1865 until the last scrip was finally liquidated in 1935.[3] Therefore land-grant universities are built not only on land but also from land. Morrill Act universities are also charged with the research and development of land, particularly for agribusiness. Thus the university system, especially in the westward-expanding empire of the United States, is intimately underwritten as a project of settler colonialism—the seizing of Native land, the conversion of land into capital, the further domestication of “wilderness” into productive agricultural estates, and the research mandate to procure profitable plants from around the world to colonize North American soil. The public university, with its charge to underwrite industry and agribusiness, literally changed the landscape of the Americas: The leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes. (Morrill Act, section 4, para. 1) The prioritization of settler colonial technologies—agricultural and mechanical engineering, not to mention military tactics—reflects how land-grant universities were commissioned as part of the empire-self-making project of the United States. The year 1862 also saw the passage of the Homestead Act, which allowed for settlers to apply directly for landownership. Between 1862 and 1934, the federal government granted 1.6 million homesteads, distributing more than 270 million acres—10 percent of all land in the United States—into private (settler) ownership. Homesteading was only officially discontinued in 1976 in the mainland United States and in 1986 in Alaska. The year 1862 also saw the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and one can see the alchemy of capitalism at work: accumulation of land, conversion of land into capital, conversion of capital into institutions, conversion of land into agribusiness. In my own University of California context, the state legislature established an Agricultural, Mining, and Mechanical Arts College in 1866,[4] the same year of the Three Knolls Massacre, where settlers killed forty Yahi, including the father of “Ishi, the last Yahi.” Also that year, the College Homestead Association purchased 160 acres of Ohlone land in hopes of selling new homesteads to settlers to fund the private College of California. Those lands, along with the Agricultural, Mining, and Mechanical Arts College, would become present-day UC Berkeley. Ironically, “Ishi” became a well-known spectacle for Berkeley anthropologists. After his death, his body was autopsied at the University of California medical school. His body was cremated at a cemetery in Colma, while his brain was shipped to and stored at the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C.—until his remains were finally repatriated back to the Redding Rancheria and Pit River tribe in 2000. Such stories of land appropriations built upon Indigenous vanishings directly haunt the histories of all the UC campuses, whose birth dates march right through the twentieth century: UCLA (1927), UC Santa Barbara (1958), UC Davis (1959), UC Riverside (1959), UC San Diego (1960), UC San Francisco (1964), UC Santa Cruz (1965), UC Irvine (1965), and UC Merced (2005). There is nothing ancient about this history.

### Alt Defense

#### **The alt solves – not only does it provide a new lense for which to view America’s colonial past, but it has transitional effects and spills over to material change**

Hoxie ’08 – August 19, 2008, Frederick E. Hoxie is Swanlund Professor of History, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, and coauthor of The People: A History of Native America; “Retrieving the Red Continent: settler colonialism and the history of American Indians in the US,” <https://www-tandfonline-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/pdf/10.1080/01419870701791294?needAccess=true> // shurst)

The settler colonialism framework allows historians to view indigenous struggles in a transnational context. As communities beset by settler colonists, indigenous groups who struggle to maintain their autonomy are inadequately defined when referred to simply as ‘traditional’ people clinging desperately to the past. Moreover, the rise of democratic ideologies among settler colonists ideologies that regularly defined free white settlers as racially or culturally superior to indigenous peoples can be viewed as developments with progressive 1158 Frederick E. Hoxie as well as destructive implications. Finally, the settler colonial framework allows scholars to present indigenous populations in other than solely cultural terms. Settler colonialism does not generate narratives rooted in the ‘clash of cultures’. Instead it directs our attention to a series of confrontations that engage, first, invaders and defenders and, later, a complex array of collaborators, mediators and deal-makers operating on all sides of the confrontation. These encounters produce both resistance, and in Marshall Sahlins’s words ’culturally informed processes of interpretation and adaptation’ (Sahlins 2005, p. 5). But the settler colonial framework does more than help reframe confrontations between invaders and indigenous peoples. Over time, successful, expanding settler colonies produced an ideology of settler nationalism which created internationally-recognized ‘settler states’ which ultimately sought to extend national citizenship to indigenous peoples (Denoon 1979; Weaver 1996; Tyrell 2002). Initially, pioneering settlers excluded Natives from their settlements and erected institutions that separated the new nation’s citizens and Natives. Once established, however, the rulers of these settler states made rhetorical (and eventually, substantial) efforts to incorporate the indigenous survivors of the dispossession into their new nations. In settler colonies Natives were first surrounded by strangers who sought to displace them and profit from their resources. Native leaders were faced with the task of protecting their communities by both resisting the outsiders and seeking some way to accommodate their demands. (That accommodation was made both attractive and difficult by the settlers’ appeal to universal doctrines such as democracy and individual liberties and by their willingness, on occasion, to sign treaties with indigenous leaders.) The process of creating settler states on Native lands was (and continues to be) punctuated both by conflict between the two groups, periods of alliance or negotiated peace, and by prolonged struggles within each community over tactics and strategies for the future. As settler nations emerged in North America and the Pacific, the descendants of newcomers and their Native subjects gradually came to share languages, family ties, religious faiths, economies, political systems and a common popular culture. Distinct communities remained, even as they participated in overlapping social, economic and political institutions and indigenous people were wrapped within the institutions of the settler nation. By viewing the experiences of indigenous peoples in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States through the lens of settler colonialism, scholars have begun to trace the outlines of a global indigenous history that is both linked to and independent of Western European expansion. The settler colonialism framework perspective steers scholars away from narratives that cast indigenous Retrieving the Red Continent 1159 people solely as victims or ‘problems’ in stories of national expansion even as it persists in linking Native and national narratives (see Chakrabarty 2000). Finally, the settler colonial framework has structured much of Native experience in these new nations. Certainly earlier indigenous traditions and values have persisted, but the expanding presence of the settler state has formed a central theme in the modern history of Native peoples. Embedded in that theme is the ongoing threat posed by settler states whose existence is predicated on the replacement of the ‘deficient’ communities that preceded them. As Patrick Wolfe has pointed out: ‘settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizer come to stay invasion is a structure not an event’ (Wolfe 1999, p. 2; see also Wolfe 2006). As a consequence, the complex mixture of resistance and adaptation is a permanent feature of indigenous life within settler colonial states.

#### The alt spills over – contextualizing native ontologies are critical to resolving racial and gendered violence.

Glenn 15 [Evelyn Nakano Glenn, American Sociological Association, "Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation", 2015, https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/attach/journals/jan15srefeature.pdf] **Tfane23**
In this article I argue for the necessity of a settler colonialism framework for an historically grounded and inclusive analysis of U.S. race and gender formation. A settler colonialism framework can encompass the specificities of racisms and sexisms affecting different racialized groups—especially Native Americans, blacks, Latinos, and Asian Americans—while also highlighting structural and cultural factors that undergird and link these racisms and sexisms. I offer here a first rough sketch of a settler colonialism–framed analysis of racial formation in certain critical periods and places in the United States. I engage with recent theoretical work that views settler colonialism as a distinct transnational formation whose political and economic projects have shaped and continue to shape race relations in first world nations that were established through settler colonialism. My aim is to avoid lumping all racisms together, even for the benign purpose of promoting cross-race alliances to fight racial injustice. Equally, I wish to avoid seeing racisms affecting various groups as completely separate and unrelated. Rather, I endeavor to uncover some of the articulations among different racisms that would suggest more effective bases for cross-group alliances. In the latter regard, one implication of taking settler colonialism seriously is to advance decolonization as a necessary goal in the quest to achieve race and gender justice. Indeed, the elaboration of the settler colonialism framework has been closely paralleled by the development of decolonial critiques of racial justice projects that aim to achieve liberal inclusion, rather than liberation, of 560440SREXXX10.1177/2332649214560440Sociology of Race and EthnicityGlenn research-article2014 1 University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA Corresponding Author: Evelyn Nakano Glenn, University of California, 506 Barrows Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720.2570, USA. Email: englenn@berkeley.edu Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation Evelyn Nakano Glenn1 Abstract Understanding settler colonialism as an ongoing structure rather than a past historical event serves as the basis for an historically grounded and inclusive analysis of U.S. race and gender formation. The settler goal of seizing and establishing property rights over land and resources required the removal of indigenes, which was accomplished by various forms of direct and indirect violence, including militarized genocide. Settlers sought to control space, resources, and people not only by occupying land but also by establishing an exclusionary private property regime and coercive labor systems, including chattel slavery to work the land, extract resources, and build infrastructure. I examine the various ways in which the development of a white settler U.S. state and political economy shaped the race and gender formation of whites, Native Americans, African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Chinese Americans. Keywords settler colonialism, decolonization, race, gender, genocide, white supremacy Glenn 55 subordinated groups. Theorists of decolonialism, such as Walter Mignolo (2007) and Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2011), argue that the case for liberal inclusion can only be made by working within the narratives, logics, and epistemologies of modernism. Yet, these are the very narratives, logics, and epistemologies that undergird settler colonial projects. Thus, strategies and solutions that adhere to modernist concepts of progress, individuality, property, worth, and so on are fated to reproduce the inequalities that colonialism has created. Mignolo and Maldonado-Torres argue for the necessity of challenging and rejecting modernist concepts. They propose that the border thinking and philosophy of women of color feminists offer counter-hegemonic narratives, logics, and epistemologies that enable the imagining of liberation for men and women of color. What I draw on from decolonial theory is an intersectional perspective, one that recognizes gender, sexuality, and race as co-constituted by settler colonial projects. Before further elaborating the settler colonial framework, I will contextualize my project by briefly reviewing previous efforts to develop conceptual models to analyze and compare racisms affecting varied racialized groups in the United States

#### Only the alt solves for structural violence – other analyses of colonialism and race/gender discrimination miss the nuances.

Glenn 15 [Evelyn Nakano Glenn, American Sociology Association, "Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation", 2015, https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/attach/journals/jan15srefeature.pdf] **Tfane23**
The most widely used sociological frameworks for theorizing race relations in the United States have focused on generating analyses that encompass not just anti-black racism but also anti-Latino and antiAsian American racisms. What these frameworks share is an appreciation that racial hierarchy and inequality are not simply the products of individual beliefs and attitudes but are built into American social structure and that whites have historically benefited from racial inequality. I have found each of the major frameworks, internal colonialism, racial formation, and racialized social systems, useful in my own work in comparative race and gender studies. However, what these theories do not explicitly consider is whether and in what ways U.S. national and regional racial systems may be unique and/or idiosyncratic because they have grown out of distinct material, social, and cultural circumstances, in this case, U.S. settler colonialism. I have offered the concept of “settler colonialism as structure,” as a framework that encourages and facilitates comparativity within and across regions and time. I believe that a settler colonial structural analysis reveals the underlying systems of beliefs, practices, and institutional systems that undergird and link the racialization and management of Native Americans, blacks, Mexicans and other Latinos, and Chinese and other Asian Americans that I have described herein. What are these underlying systems/structures? First, the defining characteristic of settler colonialism is its intention to acquire and occupy land on which to settle permanently, instead of merely to exploit resources. In order to realize this goal, the indigenous people who occupy the land have to be eliminated. Thus, one logic of settler colonial policy has been the ultimate erasure of Native Americans. This goal was pursued through various forms of genocide, ranging from military violence to biological and cultural assimilation. British settler colonialism in what became the United States was particularly effective because it promoted family settlement right from the beginning. Thus, the growth of the settler population and its westward movement was continuous and relentless. Settler ideology justified elimination via the belief that the savage, heathen, uncivilized indigenes were not making productive use of the land or its resources. Thus, they inevitably had to give way to enlightened and civilized Europeans. The difference between indigenes and settlers was simultaneously racialized and gendered. While racializing Native ways of life and Native Americans as “other,” settlers developed their selfidentities as “white,” equating civilization and democracy with whiteness. Indian masculinity was viewed as primitive and violent, while Indian women were viewed as lacking feminine modesty and restraint. With independence from the metropole, the founders imagined the new nation as a white republic governed by and for white men. Second, in order to realize a profitable return from the land, settlers sought to intensively cultivate it for agriculture, extract resources, and build the infrastructure for both cultivation and extraction. For this purpose, especially on large-scale holdings that were available in the New World, extensive labor power was needed. As we have seen, settlers in all regions enslaved Native Americans, and the transnational trade in Native slaves helped to finance the building of Southern plantations. However, in the long run, settlers could not amass a large enough Indigenous slave workforce both because indigenes died in large numbers from European diseases and because they could sometimes escape and then survive in the wilderness. Settlers thus turned to African slave labor. Slave labor power could generate profit for the owner in a variety of ways: by performing field labor, processing raw materials, and producing goods for use or sale and by being leased out to others to earn money for the owner. What linked land taking from indigenes and black chattel slavery was a private property regime that converted people, ideas, and things into property that could be bought, owned, and sold. The purchase, ownership, and sale of property, whether inanimate or human, were regularized by property law or in the case of chattel slaves, by slave law. Generally, ownership entails the right to do whatever one wants with one’s property—to sell, lend, or rent it and to seize the profits extracted from its use. The elimination of Native Americans and the enslavement of blacks form two nodes that have anchored U.S. racial formation. Redness has been made to disappear, such that contemporary Native Americans have become largely invisible in white consciousness. In contrast, blackness has been made 70 Sociology of Race and Ethnicity 1(1) hypervisible, and blacks are constantly present as an imagined threat to whites and the settler colonial social order. As pointed out earlier, Indianness is thought to be diluted and then to disappear through miscegenation, while blackness is thought to be continually reproduced even through generations of miscegenation. In this respect as well as others, the racialization of blacks—the irredeemability and dehumanization of blacks—has been incommensurable with the racialization of other groups. Nonetheless, the racialization of certain (in Lorenzo Veracini’s term) exogenous others has been a prominent feature of settler colonial societies. In the United States, some groups have been recruited and/or tracked into hard labor and super-exploited because they can be induced to work by need and kept in place by restricted mobility. For a nation that purports to stand for freedom, opportunity, and equality, the United States has had a long history of imposing coercive labor regimes, social segregation, and restricted mobility on many of its residents. Racializing certain groups as insufficiently human serves to justify subjecting them to oppression, subordination, and super-exploitation. Thus, conditions of compelled labor short of chattel slavery—contract labor, sharecropping, payment in scrip, wages paid only after completion of a long period of work—were legally allowed and commonly imposed on racialized others even after the abolition of slavery. These practices were designed to immobilize and disable workers’ ability to survive by other means and thereby tie down theoretically free workers. These forms of coercion might be labeled de facto slavery because they do not involve ownership of the person and the enforcement of slave law. The experiences of national and local policies toward Mexicans and Chinese were examined herein to help illuminate the linked processes of racialization and super-exploitation in U.S. settler colonialism. Racialization has been integral to resolving the contradiction between settler ideologies of freedom, equality, and progress and the unfreedom, inequality, and denial of mobility and citizenship rights to Mexican Americans in the Southwest and Chinese Americans in the Far West. The various technologies of control and management (segregation, cultural erasure, terrorism, expulsion, and legal exclusion) served the interests of capitalism by enabling landowners, plantation owners, and railroad companies to super-exploit these exogenous others. At the same time, racialization of “others” enabled white workers to reap a psychic reward, the so-called “wages of whiteness” to succor the wounds inflicted by class inferiority. The case studies of Mexican Americans and Chinese Americans further illustrate the importance of paying attention to both the specificities and differences and the connections and commonalities among and between the experiences of various racialized others. Some of the major technologies for control and management of racialized groups were similar, most prominently the use of terrorism. It could be argued that the continuous history of genocide against Native Americans helped to normalize the use of extreme violence against non-white “others.” Extreme violence was rationalized as necessary to ensure settler security. As described, not only blacks, but also Mexicans and Chinese were subjected to extreme and disproportionate violence that might well be characterized as ethnic cleansing. And, as in the case of the denial of the founding violence against Native Americans, white settler culture either denied or forgot its violence toward Mexicans and Chinese by magnifying the threat they posed not only to individual whites but also to the nation.

#### **Set Col spills over – creates the underpinnings for all forms of “otherization”**

Glenn 15 [Evelyn Nakano Glenn, American Sociological Association, "Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation", 2015, https://www.asanet.org/sites/default/files/attach/journals/jan15srefeature.pdf] **Tfane23**
In this article I argue for the necessity of a settler colonialism framework for an historically grounded and inclusive analysis of U.S. race and gender formation. A settler colonialism framework can encompass the specificities of racisms and sexisms affecting different racialized groups—especially Native Americans, blacks, Latinos, and Asian Americans—while also highlighting structural and cultural factors that undergird and link these racisms and sexisms. I offer here a first rough sketch of a settler colonialism–framed analysis of racial formation in certain critical periods and places in the United States. I engage with recent theoretical work that views settler colonialism as a distinct transnational formation whose political and economic projects have shaped and continue to shape race relations in first world nations that were established through settler colonialism. My aim is to avoid lumping all racisms together, even for the benign purpose of promoting cross-race alliances to fight racial injustice. Equally, I wish to avoid seeing racisms affecting various groups as completely separate and unrelated. Rather, I endeavor to uncover some of the articulations among different racisms that would suggest more effective bases for cross-group alliances. In the latter regard, one implication of taking settler colonialism seriously is to advance decolonization as a necessary goal in the quest to achieve race and gender justice. Indeed, the elaboration of the settler colonialism framework has been closely paralleled by the development of decolonial critiques of racial justice projects that aim to achieve liberal inclusion, rather than liberation, of 560440SREXXX10.1177/2332649214560440Sociology of Race and EthnicityGlenn research-article2014 1 University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA Corresponding Author: Evelyn Nakano Glenn, University of California, 506 Barrows Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720.2570, USA. Email: englenn@berkeley.edu Settler Colonialism as Structure: A Framework for Comparative Studies of U.S. Race and Gender Formation Evelyn Nakano Glenn1 Abstract Understanding settler colonialism as an ongoing structure rather than a past historical event serves as the basis for an historically grounded and inclusive analysis of U.S. race and gender formation. The settler goal of seizing and establishing property rights over land and resources required the removal of indigenes, which was accomplished by various forms of direct and indirect violence, including militarized genocide. Settlers sought to control space, resources, and people not only by occupying land but also by establishing an exclusionary private property regime and coercive labor systems, including chattel slavery to work the land, extract resources, and build infrastructure. I examine the various ways in which the development of a white settler U.S. state and political economy shaped the race and gender formation of whites, Native Americans, African Americans, Mexican Americans, and Chinese Americans. Keywords settler colonialism, decolonization, race, gender, genocide, white supremacy Glenn 55 subordinated groups. Theorists of decolonialism, such as Walter Mignolo (2007) and Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2011), argue that the case for liberal inclusion can only be made by working within the narratives, logics, and epistemologies of modernism. Yet, these are the very narratives, logics, and epistemologies that undergird settler colonial projects. Thus, strategies and solutions that adhere to modernist concepts of progress, individuality, property, worth, and so on are fated to reproduce the inequalities that colonialism has created. Mignolo and Maldonado-Torres argue for the necessity of challenging and rejecting modernist concepts. They propose that the border thinking and philosophy of women of color feminists offer counter-hegemonic narratives, logics, and epistemologies that enable the imagining of liberation for men and women of color. What I draw on from decolonial theory is an intersectional perspective, one that recognizes gender, sexuality, and race as co-constituted by settler colonial projects. Before further elaborating the settler colonial framework, I will contextualize my project by briefly reviewing previous efforts to develop conceptual models to analyze and compare racisms affecting varied racialized groups in the United States

### **ROB Defense**

#### Disorientation is necessary, a political strategy that makes this space alien to us

**Rifkin 13** – Associate Professor of English & WGS @ UNC-Greensboro (Mark, “Settler common sense,” Settler Colonial Studies, Volume 3, Issue 3, pp. 322-340)

As opposed to the sense of withdrawal into a space divorced from contemporary political economy, the text also proposes a reframing of perspective, altering the physical sense of relation to one's surroundings via a suspension of their givenness. In this vein, Ahmed suggests, “If orientation is about making the strange familiar through the extension of bodies into space, then disorientation occurs when that extension fails” (11). These moments in the text suggest how the self can become the site for an imaginative break with routine that produces a sensuous reorientation (getting “turned round”). The critical project of the text appears here less as locating a space apart in which to discover the fullness of the self than as the making alien of an already occupied place, such that “we should not recognize” it. The act of turning round, of shifting one's orientation and redirecting the momentum by which one previously was impelled, offers possibilities for perceiving differently, for seeing and engaging in ways that less take for granted the jurisdictional matrix of the state and in which contemporary Native peoples can be acknowledged as themselves important “inhabitants of New England” whose indigeneity compels a reconceptualization of the terms of occupancy for everyone.¶ Becoming conscious of the everyday enactment of settlement involves relinquishing the notion of an autonomous, extra-political selfhood existing in a place apart, instead opening onto a recognition not only of enduring Native presence within contemporary political economy but of the effaced history of imperial superintendence and displacement that provides the continuing condition of possibility for the sense of settler escape into the wilderness. To be clear, the absence of a declared set of imperial commitments does not suggest non-Natives' exoneration from continuing histories of violence perpetrated and perpetuated by the settler-state. Returning from a different direction to Nicoll's critique discussed earlier, there may be an absence of sentiments hostile to Native peoples in non-Natives' speech or writing, or non-Natives may adopt a particular viewpoint supportive of Indigenous sovereignty on delimited plots of land when considering Native peoples as such. However, that absence of malice or declaration of support does not address the ways quotidian experiences of space (with respect to jurisdiction, occupancy, and ownership) and subjectivity (as modular, self-identical, and extralegal) affectively register and iterate settler sovereignty in ways that shape the generation of, for example, ethics, ideals, and political projects that do not take Native nations, voices, and lands as their direct object. While arguments about the structural quality of settler colonialism – its scale, density, duration, and centrality to US life – remain important, their very insistence on its pervasive and systemic operation can create the impression of an integrated whole. However, as Latour observes, if “the body politic” is taken “to be virtual, total, and always already there”, then “the practical means to compose it are no longer traceable; if it's total, the practical means to totalize it are no longer visible; if it's virtual, the practical means to realize, visualize, and collect it have disappeared from view” (162–3). How is the settler body politic composed, collected, and realized in everyday ways through the experiences, perceptions, associations, emplacements, and trajectories of non-Native bodies? How do settler jurisdiction and governmentality shape the material possibilities available to non-Natives in scenes and sites apparently disconnected from Native peoples and Indian policy, and how do non-Natives in their quotidian feelings and interactions (and the cultural productions for which ordinary sensation serves as background) actualize the political and legal geographies of the settler-state? Attending to settler common sense in this way does not so much bracket Indigenous self-determination as draw on it as ethical inspiration to investigate the ways it is deferred through ordinary action whose aim is not such but whose effect is to reiterate the self-evidence of settler geopolitics. Reciprocally, such analysis also seeks to suggest how non-Natives might disorient and reorient themselves, how they might come to understand not only that Indigenous peoples remain part of the social landscape of life in the US but that the very terrain non-Natives inhabit as given has never ceased to be a site of political struggle.

#### The violence of settler colonialism underpins every debate and discussions of education reform. It is only through reiterative speech acts where settlers are presents that the violent erasures from settler colonialism can be challenged and deconstructed – that means debate’s key.

**Henderson 2** [Phil. Department of Political Philosophy at the University of Victoria. “Imagoed communities: the psychosocial space of settler colonialism,” published in SETTLER COLONIAL STUDIES. Pg 12-13. Accessible here at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1092194>, Reichle]

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 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. Settler colonialism has been distinguished from colonialism proper by what Wolfe calls its ‘logic of elimination’, which requires the erasure of indigenous peoples from the colonized territory. This is accomplished through a variety of mechanisms that range from outright violence to policies of gradual elimination. Ultimately, settler colonialism is perpetuated through a double move: to erase indigenous peoples and then to disappear settlers by naturalizing the violence inherent their existence in colonized territory. This is accomplished through the production of spatialities bereft of indigeneity. Out of this spatial logic, an imago of settler society is produced that binds settlers both psychically and socially to each other and to the colonized spaces. The continual (re)production of a settler colonial imago is necessary to secure the psychic horizons of the settler subject; it is also inextricably bound up with an insatiable need to constantly renew the erasure of indigenous peoples. Thus, in order to secure its continued survival as a subject, the settler must always strive to maintain the conditions of settler colonialism. Total erasure of indigeneity is the grotesque desire of the settler that must be constantly disrupted. Where indigenous peoples have persisted as an insurgent presence in the settler imago, they are always already threatening this disruption of the settler subject at its very core. For while the affirmation of indigeneity can induce panic, and subsequently rage, in the settler, it also opens a crack within the imago – that is, within the settler subject itself – through which an ethic of decolonization can emerge. While it seems that settler colonialism is propelled by a tightly circuitous movement of subject formation, projection, and (re)formation, the presence of indigenous peoples in ongoing and sovereign relationship with the land serves as a powerful blockage of to the smoothness of this process.

### **K Trix**

#### **Prior Question - Debate is first and foremost a site of subject formation – thus, we must center the centuries long genocidal structure that forms how we think and exist. The kritik’s affective intervention is essential to destabilize the settler psyche that otherwise coheres itself by pushing this violence out of the picture. Anything else is to sustain the ongoing violence of dispossession – land must come first**

Henderson 15 – prof of political science @ University of Victoria (Phil, ‘Imagoed communities: the psychosocial space of settler colonialism,’ Settler Colonial Studies, Special Issue on Globalizing Unsettlement)

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 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 decenter 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 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.

#### Incommensurability - Decolonization must be practiced through incommensurability – we don’t need to take into account of settler futurity in our impact calc.

**Tuck and Yang 12** [Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society, "Decolonization is not a metaphor", 2012, <https://www.latrobe.edu.au/staff-profiles/data/docs/fjcollins.pdf>] **Tfane23**

**Incommensurability is an acknowledgement that decolonization will require a change in the order of the world** (Fanon, 1963). **This is not to say that Indigenous peoples or Black and brown peoples take positions of dominance over white settlers; the goal is not for everyone to merely swap spots on the settler-colonial triad, to take another turn on the merry-go-round. The goal is to break the relentless structuring of the triad - a break and not a compromise** (Memmi, 1991). **Breaking the settler colonial triad, in direct terms, means repatriating land to sovereign Native tribes and nations, abolition of slavery in its contemporary forms, and the dismantling of the imperial metropole.** Decolonization “here” is intimately connected to anti-imperialism elsewhere. However, **decolonial struggles here/there are not parallel, not shared equally, nor do they bring neat closure to the concerns of all involved - particularly not for settlers. Decolonization is not equivocal to other anti-colonial struggles. It is incommensurable. There is so much that is incommensurable, so many overlaps that can’t be figured, that cannot be resolved.** **Settler colonialism fuels imperialism all around the globe. Oil is the motor and motive for war and so was salt, so will be water. Settler sovereignty over these very pieces of earth, air, and water is what makes possible these imperialisms. The same yellow pollen in the water of the Laguna Pueblo reservation in New Mexico, Leslie Marmon Silko reminds us, is the same uranium that annihilated over 200,000 strangers in 2 flashes.** The same yellow pollen that poisons the land from where it came. Used in the same war that took a generation of young Pueblo men. Through the voice of her character Betonie, Silko writes, “Thirty thousand years ago they were not strangers. You saw what the evil had done; you saw the witchery ranging as wide as the world" (Silko, 1982, p. 174). In Tucson, Arizona, where Silko lives, her books are now banned in schools. Only curricular materials affirming the settler innocence, ingenuity, and right to America may be taught.

#### Root Cause – Our impact is the root cause of the racial injustices you impact into. The Glenn evidence articulates that race and gender divisions were created out of the structure of US settler colonialism – this means the k is a prior issue to the aff impact. We must solve first for the structure of set col before we account for any contingent violence, otherwise our effort will be wasted.

#### Serial Policy Failure – Any policy coming out of the aff would be severely flawed without the alternative. We structure native relations to settlers in a way that reveals settler violence, and thus allows us to work within the state. Without this analysis, policymaking will be perpetuating invisible violence on indigenous people – you can’t solve something you won’t see.

#### K turns any impact calculus because how you understand value and ethical calculus are all ontologically dependent on Red genocide. The genocide of Red flesh clears the way for intra-Settler discussions of ethical value.

Wilderson 10 (Frank, Full Professor of Drama and African American studies at the University of California, Irvine *Red, White, and Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms* pp. 214-220) NIJ

Mogie’s surrealist demand, “send me a big…fat woman …[to] cover up all the cracks in my shack,” goes to the heart of the matter. Red flesh can only be restored, ethically, through the destruction of White bodies, because the corporeality of the indigenous has been consumed by and gone into the making of the Settler’s corporeality. Mogie wants what he has lost; not just his labor power, not just his language or land, but the raw material of his flesh. And, like most “grassroots Indians,” he knows precisely where it went—into the Settler’s “body”—and thus he knows precisely from where to repossess it. Though Mogie’s shack is small, we know from earlier scenes that it has at least two rooms. Therefore, to stretch a White woman across its interior, window-to-window, wall-to-wall, corner-to-corner, and then stretch her across the door, would be to reconfigure her body into grotesque and unrecognizable dimensions. There are serious doubts as to whether a White woman, even as large a White woman as Mogie Yellow Lodge is demanding from the President, “the Great White Father in Washington,” would survive such an ordeal. Imagine such a demand being made, such wallpapering taking place, en mass, on a scale which even Mogie’s inebriated imagination has not yet grasped. [General Andrew Jackson] instructed his troops to cut the noses of the corpses so that no one would be able to challenge the body count. They had bushel baskets full of noses that they brought back. This [practice] got him elected President. [He] campaigned on the basis that he had never met a recalcitrant Indian that he had not killed and never killed an Indian that he had not scalped and that anybody who wanted to question the validity of what he was saying was invited to tea in his parlor that evening so he could display the scalps and prove his point. [He] rode with a saddle bridle made out of the skin of an opposing Indian leader. This is the President of the United States. (Churchill: Book Tour Speech July 31, 2004) One begins to see how wallpapering or insulating one’s room not with “bushel baskets” of White female skin but with even one White woman is simply out of the question. Mogie’s demand, then, is laughed off—managed, constrained, marginalized—by the script. “Hey, ya wanna see me piss in my pants?” are the words he is made to utter next. Words portrayed as the surreal ruminations of an Indian who has reached the end of his inebriated tether, and not as the wisdom of a man who could lead his people. The film is nervous in the face of Mogie’s demand not because of its absurdity but because of its authority. But Mogie is demanding no more of the Great White Father, no more of civil society, than he has already given. In fact, he is demanding less. His surrealism indicates a qualitatively similar ontological relationship between the Red and the White as exists between the Black and the White. The Middle Passage turns, for example, Ashanti spatial and temporal capacity into spatial and temporal incapacity—a body into flesh. This process begins as early as the 1200s for the Slave. lxxvi By the 1530s, Modernity is more self-conscious of its coordinates, and Whiteness begins its ontological consolidation and negative knowledge of itself by turning (part of) the Aztec body, for example, into Indian flesh (Judy (Dis)Forming the American Canon 81). In this moment the White body completes itself and proceeds to lay the groundwork for the intra-Settler ensemble of questions foundational to its ethical dilemmas (i.e., Marxism, feminism, psychoanalysis). In the final analysis, Settler ontology is guaranteed by way of a negative knowledge of what it is not, rather than by way of its positive claims of what it is. Ontological Whiteness is secured not through its cultural, economic, or gendered identities; but by the fact that it cannot be known (positioned) by genocide (or by Accumulation and Fungibility). This negative knowledge has its pleasures… [Unlike Jackson’s army of the early 19 th century, the 16 th century Dutch] didn’t take the noses and they didn’t take the scalps. They took whole heads because they wanted to identify the fact that they had eradicated the entire leadership of the opposition. They brought the heads back to the central square in New Amsterdam [now Manhattan] where the citizenry began to celebrate. They turned it into a sport. People who had participated in the expedition had themselves a jolly game of kick ball using the heads and the citizenry sat around and cheered…(Churchill 7/31/04) …has a sense of affilial inclusion and filial longevity… [In 1864, the 3 rd Regiment of the U.S. Calvary] returned to Denver [Colorado] with their trophies [the vaginas of Native American women stapled to the front of their hats] and held a triumphal parade. [They] proceeded down Larimore Street…and the good citizenry stood up and cheered wildly...[T]he Rocky Mountain News [described it as] “an unparalleled feat of martial prowess that would live forever in the annals of the history and nobility of the race.” (7/31/04) …has a capacity for territorial integrity… Scalp bounties…were officially claimed bounties that were placed on Indians in every antecedent colony in the Eastern Seaboard—French, English, and Spanish. I don’t know about the Dutch. They killed all the Indians around before they had the chance to need a bounty. But from the antecedent colonies this law transferred to every state and territory in forty-eight contiguous states. (7/31/04) …that is, it has the capacity to transform Clearing from a verb into Clearing as a noun… Every [state in the union] placed a bounty on Indians, any Indians, all Indians. [For example in the] Pennsylvania colony in the 1740s, the bounty [was] forty pounds sterling for proof of death of an adult male Indian. That proof of death being in the form of a scalp or a bloody red skin…Proof of death in that form got the bearer of the proof forty pounds sterling. Forty pounds sterling in the 1740s was equivalent to the annual wage of your average farmer. This is big business. Twenty pounds sterling would be paid for proof of death in the same form of an adult female. Ten pounds sterling for proof of death of a child, a child being defined as human being of either sex under ten years of age down to and, yes, including the fetus…In Texas this law was not rescinded until 1887, [when] the debate in the Texas legislature concluded that there was no reason to continue because there was no long sufficient numbers of living Indians in the entire state of Texas to warrant the continuation of it. It had accomplished its purpose. (7/31/04) …and just like that, Little Baby Civil Society was walking on its own two feet. To Grown-up Civil Society (Mogie’s “Great White Father in Washington”) Mogie Yellow Lodge submits his own “personal” genocide reparations bill. A bill that accounts for the perfect symmetry through which Whiteness has formed a body (from the genitals to the body politic) out of “Savage” flesh. The symmetry’s perfection becomes clear when one realizes that today’s 1.6%-to-80.6%, “Savage”-to-Settler ratio is a pure inversion of the sixteenth century’s “Savage” to Settler ratio. lxxvii “Send me a big woman. A fat woman! So that when I sleep with her she’ll cover up all the cracks in my shack and stop the wind from blowing through” is a demand so ethically pure that the film finds it unbearable and, as such, is unable (unwilling?) to let Mogie state it without irony. And yet, Mogie’s outbursts like this—“outbursts” because they are generally infrequent and contained by pity or humor—are the few moments when the film engages the ethical dilemmas of the Settler/“Savage” antagonism (genocide and its impossible semiotics) instead of the ethical dilemmas of the Settler/“Savage” conflict (sovereignty and its semiotics of loss). Again, it is not that Mogie’s demand is absurd and unethical, but rather that it is a demand so pure in its ethicality that it threatens the quotidian prohibitions which, in Modernity, constrain ethics. The demand is far too ethical for the film to embrace and elaborate at the level of narrative. It is a demand that must be policed by sovereign powers.