# Settler Colonialism Kritik

### 1NC Settler Colonialism

#### THE INSTITUTION IS COLONIAL AND WORKING WITHIN IT CONTINUES STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE

#### The concept of sovereign, liberal U.S. democracy is contingent upon settler colonialism – equality and participation are possible only through the subjugation of indigenous peoples. Free speech constitutes a right of the self to speak which is a tool of colonization.

GOLDSTEIN 14 Alyosha Goldstein, is Associate Professor of American Studies at the University of New Mexico.Formations of United States Colonialism, 2014 [Google Books - <https://books.google.com/books?id=UzXhBQAAQBAJ&pg>=] bcr 4/29/17

Much as' the proponents of U.S. continental conquest "touted equality and citizenship as the irreproachable telos of territorial expansion, champions of American exceptionalism often insist that liberal democracy is based on the consent of the governed and, as such, the United States is constitutionally opposed to the tyrannies of colonial rule.33 Modern constitutional democracy was, from this perspective, an altruistic gift generously extended to indigenous peoples and others subjected to U.S. colonial rule on a supposedly interim basis.84 Indeed, as James Tully argues, "The right of the self-proclaimed civilized imperial powers to extend colonial and international modern constitutional regimes around the world correlated with a 'sacred duty to civilize' the indigenous peoples under their rule."85 Yet, as Jacques Derrida observes, "the question of calculation, of numerical calculation, of equality according to number" are in certain respects constitutive of "the question of democracy."3-5 If "domestically" the settler colonial logic of elimination tacitly underwrites the numerical presumptions of U.S. democracy, internationally and in the wake of decolonization, Derrida contends that the "lack of an established majority for the United States and its allies (for what are called the ‘western democracies') [at the United Nations] has no doubt become, with the end of the Cold War, the setting and stage for this rhetoric of rogue states."87 Although anxiously projected abroad as a counter to a diminished confidence in numbers, the rogue state attribution nonetheless continually threatens to unsettle legitimacy "at home." Audra Simpson argues in this sense: "The cornerstones of democratic governance-consent, citizenship, rule by representation -are revealed to be precarious at best when the experiences of Indigenous peoples are brought to bear on democracy's own promises and tenets."88 She maintains that sovereignty as asserted by "Indigeneities that move through reservations and urban locales, persistent and insistent 'survivals' (descendants of treaty signatories, descendants of the historically recognized, as well as the unrecognized, in collective or individual form) . . . are nightmarish for the settler state, as they call up both the impermanence of state boundaries and the precarious claims to sovereignty enjoyed by liberal democracies such as the United States."39 The sense in which the conceit that majoritarian consent mandates historical and political closure thus remains at most an elusive claim that scholarship such as the work included in this book serves to trouble.

#### Universities are crucial sites of settler colonialism – campuses are constructed on stolen and used to cement the dominant status of white epistemology

SIU 15 Oriel María Siu is Assistant Professor and the founding Director of Latino Studies at the University of Puget Sound., MUJERES TALK, 10/13/15, ["On the Colonial Legacy of U.S. Universities and the Transcendence of Your Resistance", https://library.osu.edu/blogs/mujerestalk/2015/10/13/on-the-colonial-legacy-of-u-s-universities-and-the-transcendence-of-your-resistance/] bcr 4-29-2017

As people of color, you were never meant to be at a university. I was never meant to teach at one. And your family and I were never meant to be here celebrating your graduation today. The establishment of universities you see, were a direct result of the European colonization of the Americas and later white settler expansion all over the globe, a process begun in 1492. From the beginning, universities served as a crucial tool for the introduction and retention of a white Eurocentered power structure in these occupied territories. In the Americas, universities were created and run by British and Spanish settlers and later by their descendants for the purpose of founding and retaining the colonial order of things. The founding years of the first universities in this continent should therefore be no surprise; they directly paralleled the English and Spanish processes of colonization north, center, and south: the Universidad Autónoma de Santo Domingo (1538), Universidad de San Marcos of Perú (1551), Real y Pontificia Universidad de México, today the UNAM (1551), and Harvard University (1636), to name but a few. Through savage processes of forced displacement, genocide, racialization, and the enslavement of Natives and Africans, whites self-proclaimed themselves superior to other people upon entering the Americas. From 1492 to 1592 –or the first 100 years of the occupation alone– it has been estimated that Europeans decimated more than 90 million indigenous people in the Americas, making it the bloodiest holocaust in the history of human kind (other estimates place this number above the 100 million people mark). Aside from this genocide, more than 11 million Africans were shipped across the Atlantic, with death rates so high during that atrocious Middle Passage that many lives were lost at sea. Engendered by a system of slavery and the decimation and removal of Native life, the colonial order of things in the Americas consisted of the formation of a particular economic system; one which controlled, confiscated and reserved productive Native lands for the use of the white settler; one which ensured the flow of exploitable, cheap and free labor for the occupiers’ benefit; and one which ensured little to no upward mobility for the colonized. Universities, as I was saying, were crucial to the retention and functioning of this colonial order.

#### Normative academic discourse of individual free expression rely on the colonialist model of education – the aff’s communicative model impels conformity which creates a power differential in speech and assimilates indigenous students

Burke ’07, [Burk, Nanci M. "Conceptualizing American Indian/Alaska Native college students’ classroom experiences: Negotiating cultural identity between faculty and students." Journal of American Indian Education 46.2 (2007): 1-18. SK]

**[Indigenous]** American Indian/Alaska Native **college students have been frequently** viewed as an at-risk population (Indian Nations At-Risk Task Force, 1990), if not **ignored or negated in academic research and scholarship** altogether. At-risk factors attributed to American Indian/Alaska Native college students and their experiences derive from comparisons to a culturally dominant student population. When textbooks and educators categorize the dominant student population's experiences as standard, all practices, ways of knowing, and textbook references appear to refer to a normative paradigm by which all marginalized student groups are evaluated. In this manner, many Native student experiences and ways of knowing are problematized, resulting in the dominant culture's marginalization of American Indian/Alaska Native individuals, inextricably labeling them as Other. Historically, American Indians/Alaska Natives "have suffered from systematic genocide within Western society," including **imposed educational assimilation**, economic dependency, cultural deprivation, **and institutionalized oppression** (Poupart, 2003, p. 87). Multiple challenges generate stressful situations that affect any college student's experiences. However, students from the dominant, privileged culture rarely experience the same demands that American Indian/Alaska Native students living a bicultural life endure. **Structural inequality embedded in academic discourse creates chasms of disservice to students of color.** Journal of American Indian Education - Volume 46, Issue 2, 2007 5 This content downloaded from 128.163.8.204 on Sun, 30 Apr 2017 12:04:58 UTC All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms Many socio-economic-cultural tenets imposed by Western academic discourse create challenges for American Indian/Alaska Native students trying to acquire college degrees with which privileged student populations do not contend. For example, students from the dominant culture might easily understand culturally relevant course content since it relates to their daily lives and worldview. Conversely, the same course content might prove to be culturally irrelevant to Indigenous students if their perception or worldview lacks similar experiences or comprehension. Cultural dissonance often compounds American Indian/Alaska Native students' adjustment to college life (Carnegie Foundation, 1990; Cole & Denzine, 2002; Machamer & Gruber, 1998; Parker, 1998; Whitbeck, Hoyt, Stubben, & LaFromboise, 2001). Social constructs such as competition in a predominantly Anglo classroom may conflict with Native **cultural values of** "**harmony, unity, and a basic oneness**" (Pewewardy, 2003, p. 36). Machamer and Gruber (1998) found that in many Indian communities, overt competition is considered rude, and that a Native student is likely to feign ignorance rather than compete with a classmate. Swisher's (1990) research confirms that Native traditions embrace collaboration more readily than competition among classmates. **In college classrooms** where **colonialist values and pedagogy emphasize individual achievement**, Non-Indian instructors may perceive American Indian/Alaska Native students as culturally deprived, rather than rich in Native cultural traditions, if students do not demonstrate assertive or competitive behaviors. Instructors may misinterpret Native student behaviors as noncompliance with expected classroom norms and attempt to impose assimilation via signing a ready-to-sign cultural contract. Additional cultural values, distinctive from the dominant culture, such as family socialization patterns, conformity to authority and respect for elders, taciturnity, strong tribal social hierarchy, and patrimonial/matrilineal clans, are deeply rooted in Native teachings (Pewewardy, 2003). Indigenous cultural traditions may result in diametric opposition to American Indian/Alaska Natives' college experiences on non-Native campuses. Core Beliefs and Values Cajete (1999) stipulates several culturally shared, core behaviors and values, which he attributes to Indigenous traditions. Some of the behaviors that Cajete (1999) identified as American Indian/Alaska Native specific (but not to any specific tribe) are **demonstrations of quietness and silence**, especially when individuals are uncomfortable; tendencies toward nonverbal communication preferences rather than talking; appreciation for attentiveness and listening; and inclinations toward tentativeness, especially in unfamiliar contexts. **White instructors could perceive demonstrations of these types of behaviors as assimilation** and acceptance of a ready-to-sign contract (Jackson, 1999) since some behaviors could be viewed as nonassertive or compliancy from a Eurocentric perspective. 6 Journal of American Indian Education - Volume 46, Issue 2, 2007 This content downloaded from 128.163.8.204 on Sun, 30 Apr 2017 12:04:58 UTC All use subject to http://about.jstor.org/terms Many Native **[Indigenous] children are encouraged to be active listeners, rather than participants in discussions. While effective listening is a social construct perceived as a beneficial attribute for students in college courses, dialogic participation is expected as a means to demonstrate knowledge. Non-Native teachers may misinterpret classroom behaviors that are deemed appropriate in a tribal community, as uncooperative or uncommunicative**. Indigenous students who hesitate to speak openly in class could be viewed as resistant to signing a cultural contract. Educators need to be aware that **while there is no single American Indian/Alaska Native learning style, there are cultural traditions that profoundly affect how Native students learn, live, and communicate** (Cajete, 1999). Wieder and Pratt's (1990) exemplary research demonstrates the behavioral dichotomy that American Indian/Alaska Native tribal members face when attempting to function in a Eurocentric, colonialist world while remaining authentically Indian. Recognizing there are some differences in demonstrated behaviors depending on tribal membership, Wieder and Pratt clearly indicate that "acting like a real Indian crosses all tribal lines and ... is employed in recognizing any real Indian" regardless of tribal affiliation (1990, p. 51). Wieder and Pratt confirm that there are seven socially constructed behaviors within an Indigenous culture deemed essential when identifying an individual as a real Indian to other Indians. These cultural behaviors include "reticence with regard to interaction with strangers, the acceptance of obligations, razzing, attaining harmony in face to-face relations, modesty and 'doing one's part' taking on familial relations, permissible and required silence, and public speaking" [quotation marks, authors'] (1990, p. 51). **A student's compliance with the behaviors designated as Indian behaviors demonstrates essential knowledge of and respect for Native cultural traditions: a clear marker of one's cultural identity.** The patterns of behavior listed above, used to communicate a shared identity, clearly establish a cultural identity that American Indian/Alaska Native students have available to negotiate. It is also significant to mention that the behaviors that collectively link Indigenous students to one another are evaluated in relation to expectations from the hegemonic standards imposed by the dominant culture and classroom interactions. Given the expectations of remaining authentic to American Indian/Alaska Native values, the cultural identity challenges that Native students negotiate in Anglo classroom interactions appear significant. **Native students may not wish to sacrifice their cultural identity to assimilate** or be prepared to sign a ready-to-sign cultural contract when entering a college or university classroom. However, **given the inherent power differential that exists between instructors and students in a typical classroom, students have extremely limited options.**

#### Settler colonialism structures our lived reality – ongoing displacement of the indigenous controls the root cause of all forms of oppression

LEWIS 17 Adam Lewis, is a settler anarchist of Scottish, Welsh, English and Irish heritage working on anti-colonial politics in social movement and academic contexts. He lives in Kitchener (Six Nations of the Grand River Territory, Haudenosaunee, Anishinaabe and Neutral lands), and is working on a PhD in Environmental Studies and anarchist engagements with Indigenous struggles of resistance at York University. His recent work is published in the journal Settler Colonial Studies and appears in the edited collection Theories of Resistance: Anarchism Geography and the Spirit of Revolt (Rowan and Littlefield, 2016). E-International Relations, 2/1/2017, ["From Standing Rock to Resistance in Context: Towards Anarchism against Settler Colonialism", http://www.e-ir.info/2017/02/01/from-standing-rock-to-resistance-in-context-towards-anarchism-against-settler-colonialism/] bcr 4-29-2017

Settler colonialism can generally be defined, following those such as Patrick Wolfe (1999, 2006) and Lorenzo Veracini (2010), as a form of colonialism where newcomers travel to new lands with the intent to stay and replicate the societies they left. In this sense, settlers come to new lands with the express purpose of taking them for themselves via the dispossession and ultimately the disappearance of Indigenous peoples. As Arvin, Tuck and Morrill (2013, 12) argue: Settler colonialism is a persistent social and political formulation in which newcomers/colonizers/settlers come to a place, claim it as their own, and do whatever it takes to disappear the Indigenous that are there. Within settler colonialism, it is exploitation of land that yields supreme value. In order for settlers to usurp the land and extract its value, Indigenous peoples must be destroyed, removed and made into ghosts. They suggest further that settler colonialism also importantly intersects with structures of heteropatriarchy that have mobilized gendered violence and forced gender binaries on Indigenous communities. In the context of Canada and the United States this has been the process of settlement and it is fundamental to the context of resistance. This is not to say that Canada and the US do not have their own particular contexts, as the ways in which settler colonial governments have engaged with Indigenous peoples have been different and complex, but an underlying structure of settler colonial violence is shared. Settler colonialism is one of the founding logics in both Canada and the United States (or a key pillar upholding white supremacy according to Andrea Smith [2006], alongside capitalism/slavery and orientalism/war). As I have argued, following the work of Joel Olson (2009) on white supremacy, settler colonialism can be understood as ‘strategically central’ to the context of resistance in Canada and the US (Lewis, 2015). As Coulthard reminds us, any future visions of decolonization on Indigenous lands “must account for the complex ways that capitalism, patriarchy, white supremacy, and the state interact with one another to form the constellation of power relations that sustain colonial patterns of behavior, structures, and relationships.” This calls for an analysis of settler colonialism alongside and in intersection with all forms of oppression and domination and how they operate in particular contexts. Here is where more recent readings of Marx’s primitive accumulation can be quite useful (see also Coulthard, 2014). Primitive accumulation links capitalist expansion in settler colonial states directly to the dispossession of Indigenous lands. Capitalism continually seeks new areas to move into to promote expansion. As Coulthard points out, processes of accumulation are not reducible to the rise of capitalism at a particular time, but continue in order to expand the reach of capitalist accumulation into new areas. In Canada and the US, where much of the land has already been taken via the multiple forms of transfer Veracini (2010) mentions, including open warfare, forced removal, treaty or land claims settlements (part of what Peter Kulchyski has called the ‘violence of the letter’ of legal and political processes of the state), Indigenous territories have been and continue to be targeted as potential spaces for increased capitalist accumulation. In particular, such lands are desired for the continuation of Canada’s resource extractive industries, which increasingly include the expansion of pipeline and transportation infrastructures. “Indigenous peoples are primarily viewed and treated as physical obstacles standing in the way of resource capital,” Pflug-Back and Kesīqnaeh note, “rather than as a source of exploitable labour, they are obstacles to be removed through violence, assimilation, criminalization, and other genocidal measures.” The events at Standing Rock make this all the more clear. Settler colonialism and capitalism need to be seen as crucial structures if we are to understand processes of disposition in both the US and Canadian contexts. This is an important point, in that we must refuse to see colonialism as a finished project. As Patrick Wolfe (1999, see also 2006) suggests, settler colonialism is a structure rather than an event. It is insufficient to look to specific points of contact as the moments from which settler colonialism or the suppression and domination of particular Indigenous nations emerge. Settler colonialism is ongoing and continues to play into the very fabric of contemporary society, and what this means for resistance becomes a crucial question for anarchists and all those who seek more radical liberatory visions of the future.

The alternative is a politics of decolonization as the greatest rupture – the process of the 1NC is uniquely beneficial. The 1NC’s call for decolonization, the *demand* for decolonization is exactly why the critique is so crucial to this approach. This is a demand for violent revolt on college campus’

Fanon in ‘61, [THE WRETCHED OF THE EARTH By FRANTZ FANON Preface by JEAN-PAUL SARTRE Translated by CONSTANCE FARRINGTON GROVE, WEIDENFELD NEW YORK CONCERNING VIOLENCE, published post hum in 1961, SK.]

National liberation, national renaissance, the restoration of nationhood to the people, commonwealth: whatever may be the headings used or the new formulas introduced, **decolonization is always** a **violent** phenomenon. **At whatever level we study it**--relationships between individuals, new names for sports clubs, the human admixture at cocktail parties, in the police, on the directing boards of national or private banks--decolonization is quite simply the replacing of a certain "species" of men by another "species" of men. Without any period of transition, there is a total, complete, and absolute substitution. It is true that we could equally well stress the rise of a new nation, the setting up of a new state, its diplomatic relations, and its economic and political trends. But we have precisely chosen to speak of that kind of tabula rasa which characterizes at the outset all decolonization. Its unusual importance is that it constitutes, from the very first day, the minimum demands of the colonized. To tell the truth, **the proof of success lies in a whole social structure being changed from the bottom up**. **The extraordinary importance of this change is that it is willed, called for,** demanded**.** The need for this change exists in its crude state, impetuous and compelling, in the consciousness and in the -35- lives of the men and women who are colonized. But the possibility of this change is equally experienced in the form of a terrifying future in the consciousness of another "species" of men and women: the colonizers. **Decolonization**, **which sets out to change the** order of the **world**, **is**, obviously, **a program of** complete disorder. **But it cannot come as a result of** magical practices, nor of a **natural shock**, nor of a friendly understanding. Decolonization, as we know, is a historical process: that is to say that it cannot be understood, it cannot become intelligible nor clear to itself except in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give it historical form and content. Decolonization is the meeting of two forces, opposed to each other by their very nature, which in fact owe their originality to that sort of substantification which results from and is nourished by the situation in the colonies. Their first encounter was marked by violence and their existence together--that is to say the exploitation of the native by the settler--was carried on by dint of a great array of bayonets and cannons. The settler and the native are old acquaintances. In fact, the settler is right when he speaks of knowing "them" well. For it is the settler who has brought the native into existence and who perpetuates his existence. The settler owes the fact of his very existence, that is to say, his property, to the colonial system. Decolonization never takes place unnoticed, for it influences individuals and modifies them fundamentally. It transforms spectators crushed with their inessentiality into privileged actors, with the grandiose glare of history's floodlights upon them. It brings a natural rhythm into existence, introduced by new men, and with it a new language and a new humanity. Decolonization is the veritable creation of new men. But this creation owes nothing of its legitimacy to any supernatural power; **the** -36- **"thing" which has been colonized becomes [hu]man during the same process by which it frees itself. In decolonization, there is therefore the need of a complete calling in question of the colonial situation.** If we wish to describe it precisely, we might find it in the wellknown words: "The last shall be first and the first last." Decolonization is the putting into practice of this sentence. That is why, **if we try to describe it, all decolonization is successful**. **The naked truth of decolonization evokes for us the searing bullets and bloodstained knives which emanate** from it. For if the last shall be first, this will only come to pass after a murderous and decisive struggle between the two protagonists. That affirmed intention to place the last at the head of things, and to make them climb at a pace (too quickly, some say) the well-known steps which characterize an organized society, can only triumph if we use all means to turn the scale, including, of course, that of violence. You do not turn any society, however primitive it may be, upside down with such a program if you have not decided from the very beginning, that is to say from the actual formulation of that program, to overcome all the obstacles that you will come across in so doing. The native who decides to put the program into practice, and to become its moving force, is ready for violence at all times. From birth it is clear to him that this narrow world, strewn with prohibitions, can only be called in question by absolute violence. The colonial world is a world divided into compartments. It is probably unnecessary to recall the existence of native quarters and European quarters, of schools for natives and schools for Europeans; in the same way we need not recall apartheid in South Africa. Yet, if we examine closely this system of compartments, we will at -37- least be able to reveal the lines of force it implies. SK

#### The role of the ballot is hauntology – debate must be grounded in a confrontation of settler colonialism that encompasses constant remembrance and criticism

Eve Tuck and C. Ree, Handbook of Autoethnography, 2013, 1- Associate Professor of Critical Race and Indigenous Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto. She has conducted research with youth and community organizations on their experiences of social and education policies including exit exams, graduation policies, mayoral control, immigration policies, and migrant education policies. ["A Glossary of Haunting", <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/557744ffe4b013bae3b7af63/t/557f2d6ce4b029eb4288a2f8/1434398060958/Tuck+%26+Ree%2C+A+Glossary+of+Haunting.pdf>] bcr 8-30-2016

Colonization is as horrific as humanity gets: genocide, desecration, poxed blankets, rape, humiliation. Settler colonialism, then, because it is a structure and not just the nefarious way nations are born (Wolfe, 1999), is an ongoing horror made invisible by its persistence—the snake in the flooded basement. Settler colonial relations are comprised by a triad, including a) the Indigenous inhabitant, present only because of her erasure; b) the chattel slave, whose body is property and murderable; and c) the inventive settler, whose memory becomes history, and whose ideology becomes reason. Settler colonialism is the management of those who have been made killable, once and future ghosts—those that had been destroyed, but also those that are generated in every generation. “In the United States, the Indian is the original enemy combatant who cannot be grieved” (Byrd, 2011, p. xviii). Settler horror, then, comes about as part of this management, of the anxiety, the looming but never arriving guilt, the impossibility of forgiveness, the inescapability of retribution. Haunting, by contrast, is the relentless remembering and reminding that will not be appeased by settler society’s assurances of innocence and reconciliation. Haunting is both acute and general; individuals are haunted, but so are societies. The United States is permanently haunted by the slavery, genocide, and violence entwined in its first, present and future days. Haunting doesn’t hope to change people’s perceptions, nor does it hope for reconciliation. Haunting lies precisely in its refusal to stop. Alien (to settlers) and generative for (ghosts), this refusal to stop is its own form of resolving. For ghosts, the haunting is the resolving, it is not what needs to be resolved. Haunting aims to wrong the wrongs, a confrontation that settler horror hopes to evade. Avery Gordon observes, Haunting is a constituent element of modern social life. It is neither premodern superstition nor individual psychosis; it is a generalizable social phenomenon of great import. To study social life one must confront the ghostly aspects of it. This confrontation requires (or produces) a fundamental change in the way we know and make knowledge, in our mode of production. (1997, p. 7) Social life, settler colonialism, and haunting are inextricably bound; each ensures there are always more ghosts to return.

### Case

#### On Bryant – political strategies limit the capabilities of what is good – the fact that our alternative is deemed as radical is the link - any notion of progressivism advances the settler colonial project making it try-or-die to make the impossible demand of ending America

ISASI ET AL. 13 A. Isasi-Diaz, was professor emerita of ethics and theology at Drew University M. Fulkerson, R. Carbine Theological Perspectives for Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness: Public Intellectuals for the Twenty-First Century pp. 4, 2013 [Google Books - <https://books.google.com/books?id=WB5EAgAAQBAJ&pg>=] bcr 4/29/17

Native feminism provides a critical intervention in this discourse. Because the United States could not exist without the genocide of Native peoples, genocide is not a mistake or aberration of US democracy but is foundational to it. As Sandy Grande states in Red Pedagogy: The United States is a nation defined by its original sin: the genocide of American Indians....American Indian tribes are viewed as an inherent threat to the nation, poised to expose the great lies of U.S. democracy: that we are a nation of laws and not random power; that we are guided by rea- son and not faith; that we are governed by representation and not executive order; and Finally, that we stand as a self-determined citizenry and not a kingdom of blood or aristocracy....From the perspective of American Indians, "democracy" has been wielded with impunity as the first and most virulent weapon of mass destruction. (Grande 2004, 31-32) Thus, the nati0n-state, particularly the United States, is not the bastion of freedom, with some of its ideals having been eroded under the Bush regime; the policies enacted during the Bush regime in Fact are the fulfillment of the ideals of US democracy. While the United States claims to protect the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit ofhappiness, all these are pursued at the expense of the Native nations that continued to be subjected to genocidal policies, the enslavement of Black peoples, and the exploitation of immigrant labor to enable this "happiness." Rather than call for upholding the law, therefore, indigenous Feminism calls on progressives to work against the law. Thus for those committed to decolonization, the indigenous dream For America would be its end. While it seems radical to call for the end of the United States, the fact that it seems radical to call for an end to settler colonialism demon- strates the extent to which settler colonialism has so effectively limited our political imaginaries.

B. No reason as to why political action means action by the state – for example their solvency is about people revolting means we are better on this question

C.

On Zanotti

1. This talks about government – our link is specific to the college campus
2. No warrant as to why we flip the power structure if we engage – our evidence proves the opposite
3. No reason as to why the aff is more a method of engagement than the neg

Theory:

#### Adv 1 -

#### No impact – students don’t care enough to speak up

MASCIOTRA 17 Professor David Masciotra, is the author of "Mellencamp: American Troubadour" (University of Kentucky Press), and is currently at work on a collection of personal essays for Agate Publishing. Columnist @ Salon, 4-23-2017, ["The truth about the campus “free speech wars”", http://www.salon.com/2017/04/23/the-truth-about-the-campus-free-speech-wars/] bcr 4-24-2017

My most battering battle in the campus free speech wars is attempting to get the students to speak. Speech, of any kind, would come as a welcome change from the blank stares I’m accustomed to receiving from my students when I ask for reaction to the previous night’s reading assignment. Many right-wing paranoiacs accuse the professorate of attempting to “indoctrinate” the student body according to a Marxist agenda of critical race theory and intersectionality. I would settle for someone raising his hand and saying, “I liked the Hemingway story.” Far from feeling under threat from students who enforce their increasingly sensitive and hostile ideology on their surroundings, the only complaints I have received are grade protests. “Why did I get a C?” doesn’t quite have the drama or make for compelling “news at 9” flashing banners on television, as a trash can flying through a window in Berkeley, California, or a protest aimed at Ann Coulter, but the grade complaint is typically the only petition a student will file and professor will field. I might actually throw a party to celebrate receiving a complaint against a political statement I made in a lecture because such an objection from a student would imply that the plaintiff was paying attention.

#### Free speech protections are irrelevant – people’s isolated worldviews and self-censorship overwhelm

MCLAUGHLIN 17 Eliott C. Mclaughlin, Senior Writer Since 2005 Eliott has served as writer, producer, field reporter, blogger, newsdesk editor and Southeast Bureau liaison. He's now a CNN Digital senior writer.CNN 4-20-2017, ["War on campus: The escalating battle over college free speech", http://www.cnn.com/2017/04/20/us/campus-free-speech-trnd/] bcr 4-20-2017

Assaults on college free speech have been waged for decades, but they used to be top-down, originating with government or school administrators. Today, experts say, students and faculty stifle speech themselves, especially if it involves conservative causes. Harvey Klehr, who helped bring controversial speakers to Emory during his 40 years as a politics and history professor, said the issues college students rally around today come "embarrassingly from the left." Oppose affirmative action or same-sex marriage and you're branded a bigot, he said. Where debate once elevated the best idea, student bodies are now presented slanted worldviews, denying them lessons in critical thinking, he said. "History is full of very, very upsetting things. ... Grow up. The world is a nasty place," he said. "If you want to confront it, change it, you have to understand the arguments of nasty people." Berkeley political science professor Jack Citrin began attending UCB in 1964 during the advent of the free speech movement, when Berkeley students "viewed ourselves as a beacon of the ability to handle all points of view." Universities expose young people to ideas and challenge what they believe about science, politics, religion or whatever. But many students today exist only in the bubble of what they believe, he said. "It's an indicator of the erosion of the commitment to open exchange and a retreat into psychobabble," Citrin said.

#### **Adv 2 -**

#### The defense of free speech empowers the academic elite – they hide behind it to justify their agendas and silence critics

GOLDBERG 17 Jonah Goldberg, senior editor Jonah Goldberg is a bestselling author and columnist and fellow of the National Review Institute. His nationally syndicated column appears regularly in scores of newspapers across the United States. National Review, 4-24-2017, ["What The Free Speech Debate Misses", http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/446998/campus-censorship-isnt-issue] bcr 4-25-2017

In other words, the problem isn’t a lack of commitment to free speech (though that is a problem). The free speech argument is downstream of the real dilemma: The people running what should be citadels of civilizational confidence have turned against our civilization. Maybe some atheist speaker has been banned because he would hurt the feelings of religious students, but I’ve not heard about it. In other words, these administrators aren’t principally concerned with the sensitivities of “students” or even “students of color” or female students, but of particular students who adhere to a specific ideology. The administrators use them as props and excuses to justify their ideological, quasi-religious, agenda. The irony comes when the defenders of these totalitarian enclaves must defend their stance to the larger society. Normal people and other elite critics shout “What about free speech?” And so the secular priests contort themselves into pretzels trying to make the case that their censorship is somehow consistent with some nonsensical notion of a “higher principle” of what free speech is. They can’t be honest and say, “We have a heckler’s veto for anything that smacks of heresy and we’re not afraid to use it.”