## **1NC — SetCol**

#### **Settler colonialism is the permeating structure which requires the elimination of indigenous life and land via the occupation of settlers, turning Natives into ghosts.**

**Tuck and Yang 12** [Eve Tuck, associate Professor of Critical Race and Indigenous Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, State University of New York at New Paltz. And K. Wayne Yang, Ph.D., Social and Cultural Studies, University of California, Berkeley, University of California, San Diego*. Decolonization is not a metaphor.* Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, https://clas.osu.edu/sites/clas.osu.edu/files/Tuck%20and%20Yang%202012%20Decolonization%20is%20not%20a%20metaphor.pdf, GC]

Our intention in this descriptive exercise is not be exhaustive, or even inarguable; instead, we wish to emphasize that (a) decolonization will take a different shape in each of these contexts - though they can overlap4 - and that (b) neither external nor internal colonialism adequately describe the form of colonialism which operates in the United States or other nation-states in which the colonizer comes to stay. Settler colonialism operates through internal/external colonial modes simultaneously because there is no spatial separation between metropole and colony. For example, in the United States, many Indigenous peoples have been **forcibly removed** from their homelands onto reservations, indentured, and abducted into state custody, signaling the form of colonization as simultaneously **internal** (via boarding schools and other biopolitical modes of control) and **external** (via uranium mining on Indigenous land in the US Southwest and oil extraction on Indigenous land in Alaska) with a frontier (the US military still nicknames all enemy territory “Indian Country”).The horizons of **the** **settler colonial nation-state** are total and **require** a mode of **total appropriation of Indigenous life and land**, rather than the selective expropriation of profit-producing fragments. **Settler colonialism** is **different** from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the **intention of making a new home** on the land, a homemaking that **insists on settler sovereignty** over all things in their new domain. Thus, relying solely on postcolonial literatures or theories of coloniality that ignore settler colonialism will not help to envision the shape that **decolonization** must take in **settler colonial contexts**. Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article.) **Land** is what is most **valuable**, contested, required. This is both because the settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the **disruption of Indigenous relationships to land** represents a profound **epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence**. This violence is **not temporally contained** in the arrival of the settler but is **reasserted each day** of occupation. This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that settler colonialism is **a structure** and not an event. In the process of settler colonialism, land is remade into property and human **relationships** to land are **restricted** to the relationship of the **owner** to his **property**. **Epistemological, ontological, and cosmological** **relationships** to land are interred, indeed **made pre-modern and backward**. **Made savage**. In order for the **settlers** to make a place **their home**, they must **destroy** and **disappear** the **Indigenous peoples** that live there. Indigenous peoples are those who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they came to be in a particular place - indeed how we/they came to be a place. Our/their relationships to land comprise our/their epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies. For the settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and over time and through law and policy, Indigenous peoples’ claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource. **Indigenous** peoples must be **erased**, must be made into **ghosts** (Tuck and Ree, forthcoming). At the same time, settler colonialism involves the subjugation and **forced labor** of **chattel slaves**5 , whose bodies and lives become the **property**, and who are kept **landless**. Slavery in settler colonial contexts is distinct from other forms of indenture whereby excess labor is extracted from persons. First, chattels are commodities of labor and therefore it is the slave’s person that is the excess. Second, unlike workers who may aspire to own land, the slave’s very presence on the land is already an excess that must be dis-located. Thus, the slave is a desirable commodity but the person underneath is imprisonable, punishable, and murderable. The violence of keeping/killing the chattel slave makes them deathlike monsters in the settler imagination; they are reconfigured/disfigured as the threat, the razor’s edge of safety and terror. The settler, if known by his actions and how he justifies them, sees himself as holding dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as the anthropocentric normal, and as more developed, more human, more deserving than other groups or species. The settler is making a new "home" and that home is rooted in a homesteading worldview where the wild land and wild people were made for his benefit. He can only make his identity as a settler by making the land produce, and produce excessively, because "civilization" is defined as production in excess of the "natural" world (i.e. in excess of the sustainable production already present in the Indigenous world). In order for excess production, he needs excess labor, which he cannot provide himself. The chattel slave serves as that excess labor, labor that can never be paid because payment would have to be in the form of property (land). The settler's wealth is land, or a fungible version of it, and so payment for labor is impossible.6 The settler positions himself as both superior and normal; the settler is natural, whereas the Indigenous inhabitant and the chattel slave are unnatural, even supernatural. Settlers are not immigrants. Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies. Therefore, settler nations are not immigrant nations (See also A.J. Barker, 2009). Not unique, the United States, as a settler colonial nation-state, also operates as an empire - utilizing external forms and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the settler colonial project. This means, and this is perplexing to some, that dispossessed people are brought onto seized Indigenous land through other colonial projects. Other colonial projects include enslavement, as discussed, but also military recruitment, low-wage and high-wage labor recruitment (such as agricultural workers and overseas-trained engineers), and displacement/migration (such as the coerced immigration from nations torn by U.S. wars or devastated by U.S. economic policy). In this set of settler colonial relations, colonial subjects who are displaced by external colonialism, as well as racialized and minoritized by internal colonialism, still occupy and settle stolen Indigenous land. Settlers are **diverse**, **not just** of **white** European **descent**, and include people of color, even from **other** colonial **contexts**. This tightly wound set of conditions and racialized, globalized relations exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization, and by solidarity, against settler colonial forces. Decolonization in exploitative colonial situations could involve the seizing of imperial wealth by the postcolonial subject. In settler colonial situations, seizing imperial wealth is inextricably tied to settlement and re-invasion. Likewise, the promise of integration and civil rights is predicated on securing a share of a settler-appropriated wealth (as well as expropriated ‘third-world’ wealth). **Decolonization in a settler context** is **fraught** because empire, settlement, and internal colony have **no spatial separation**. Each of these features of settler colonialism in the US context - empire, settlement, and internal colony - make it a site of contradictory decolonial desires7 . **Decolonization** as **metaphor** allows people to **equivocate** these **contradictory decolonial desires** because it turns **decolonization** into an **empty signifier** to be filled by any track towards liberation. In reality, the tracks walk all over land/people in settler contexts. Though the details are not fixed or agreed upon, in our view, **decolonization** in the settler colonial context must involve the **repatriation of land** simultaneous to the **recognition** of how land and **relations to land** have always already been **differently understood** and enacted; that is, all of the land, and **not just symbolically.** This is precisely why **decolonization is necessarily unsettling**, especially across lines of solidarity. “Decolonization never takes place unnoticed” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). **Settler colonialism** and its **decolonization** **implicates** and **unsettles** **everyone**.

#### **Nuclear energy necessitates the wastelanding of Indigenous land under the guise of “going green” to protect the Settler nation – extraction materially destroys Indigenous communities and assumes their land as valueless.**

**Montoya 22’**

Teresa Montoya is a Diné media maker and social scientist with training in socio-cultural anthropology, critical Indigenous studies, and filmmaking. Jan 25 2022, “Stockpile: From Nuclear Colonialism to “Clean” Energy Futures”,  *Society For Cultural Anthropology,* <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/stockpile-from-nuclear-colonialism-to-clean-energy-futures>, DOA 3/1/25, //DS + fehmi + jw

In one of his last acts as president of the United States, Donald Trump signed an omnibus spending bill in December 2020 that allocated $75 million to establish a national [uranium reserve program](https://apnews.com/press-release/accesswire/business-government-regulations-john-barrasso-eastern-europe-energy-industry-c1d9ba856189fdcc14874563c24a7a66). This spending, in turn, was based on a series of executive orders, which led to the declaration of uranium as a [“critical mineral”](https://www.usgs.gov/news/interior-releases-2018-s-final-list-35-minerals-deemed-critical-us-national-security-and) for the “economic and national security of the United States.” This [policy](https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2020/04/f74/Restoring%20America%27s%20Competitive%20Nuclear%20Advantage-Blue%20version%5B1%5D.pdf) enabled preparations for what could be another domestic uranium rush under logics of supply chain efficiency and mitigating perceived risks of “foreign adversaries.” As a witness to the destructive potential of rampant uranium extraction on the Navajo Nation, I question how the longer [historical trajectory](https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v01p2/d16) of nuclear stockpiling, settler colonial extraction, and green energy initiatives converge in renewed calls for domestic uranium production today.

Under the Biden administration, the interest in revitalizing domestic uranium extraction did not subside. It was simply rebranded as part of the administration’s goal of achieving 100 percent carbon-free electricity by 2035. Within this mandate, nuclear energy was considered a “clean” alternative for energy transition away from “dirty” fossil fuels. However, the **definition** of **clean** is based on a **relative comparison** to the amount of greenhouse emissions produced by coal-fired plants. Whether projected as clean, critical, or otherwise, the threat of [**nuclear colonialism**](https://www.indigenousaction.org/indigenous-peoples-condemn-nuclear-colonialism-on-columbus-day/) remains markedly **the same**.

While nuclear energy might produce less carbon, it is not a clean energy source if the safety risks of **radioactive waste disposal** and potential **meltdown** are also considered. As inhabitants of the Colorado Plateau can attest, uranium extraction required for nuclear energy production is anything but benign. For many Indigenous peoples whose ancestral homelands have been targeted by the industrial extraction of uranium in the past century, these activities are synonymous with environmental destruction, toxic exposure, and settler colonial hegemony. In other words, as the legitimization of nuclear stockpiling is increasingly couched within green and nuclear energy agendas, the **risk** to our **Indigenous homelands** is no less hazardous than the stockpiling associated with national security agendas.

Homelands—who can feel at home and for whose prosperity—are ultimately at stake in the Indigenous Southwest. The **primary repository of uranium** in the United States is located on the Colorado Plateau, a geologic formation that spans parts of the states of Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado. This land, of course, is also home to **dozens of sovereign** tribal **nations**. Uranium production for a federal stockpile program began on the Navajo Nation in 1946. Fueled by Cold War anxieties, extraction rose steadily over the 1950s and until its decline in the early 1970s. In 2005, the Navajo Nation implemented a [moratorium](http://www.sric.org/voices/2005/v6n2/navajo_pr_dnrpa.php) on uranium mining within its sovereign boundaries to address the “**genocide** [committed] on Navajoland by **allowing** uranium **mining**.” Today, there remain over 500 abandoned uranium mines across the Navajo Nation that continue to pose grave environmental and public **health consequences** for [Diné communities](https://fas.org/pir-pubs/uranium-mining-u-s-nuclear-weapons-program-3/). Though the circumstances that led to the Cold War–era nuclear proliferation have changed in the twenty-first century, familiar ideologies of the **security state** continue to **set the terms** by which uranium production comes to **appear as necessary**, logical, and justified.

The ideological rendering of certain **landscapes** as **targets of extraction**, including Indigenous homelands of the Colorado Plateau, **enable**s and reinforces other forms of **racialized violence**. Confronting the legacy of uranium mining on the Navajo Nation, Traci Brynne Voyles (2015) employs the concept of **wastelanding** to describe the “assumption that **nonwhite lands** are valueless, or valuable **only for what can be mined from beneath them**” that leads to the “subsequent devastation of those very environs by polluting industries.” Therefore, through the exacerbation of such activities, these imagined wasteland cartographies are actualized through the project of extraction itself.

In another settler colonial context, Tlingit scholar Anne Spice (2018) analyzes how the Canadian government employs a **discourse** of “**critical infrastructure**” to transform and **legitimize private energy projects** such as oil pipelines into “crucial matters of national interest.” In both instances, the determination of critical urgency more often serves private energy lobbies that rely on federal intervention to fund and protect their industries at the **expense of Indigenous land and sovereignty**. Take, for instance, [White Mesa Mill](https://www.energyfuels.com/white-mesa-mill), the only remaining uranium mill in the country. Located just outside the White Mesa Ute community and Bears Ears National Monument in southeastern Utah, the mill has processed and disposed of toxic and radioactive waste from across the continent since it was built in the late 1970s. Energy Fuels Inc., which owns the mill as well as several currently inactive uranium mines in the region, stands to directly benefit from the proposed uranium reserve program.

In Bears Ears, struggles over sacred lands protection have coalesced around intensifying public lands debates. It is no coincidence that despite [intertribal](https://bearsearscoalition.org/) efforts to protect their shared ancestral territories from the threat of uranium mining in southeastern Utah, the [boundaries](https://www.kuer.org/health-science-environment/2021-06-01/energy-developers-and-uranium-miners-eye-land-near-bears-ears-national-monument) of the Bears Ears National Monument designation in 2016 were drawn to allow certain uranium mine sites and claims to be potentially reactivated. Indigenous nations working to protect Bears Ears recognize the threat uranium mining continues to pose for [future generations](https://utahdinebikeyah.org/white-mesa-utes-to-march-against-energy-fuels-white-mesa-uranium-mill/) because their demands have been historically minimized or ignored. The struggle over Bears Ears, therefore, draws attention to the ways that liberal sensibilities around **environmental protection** and green energy may at times paradoxically **reinscribe** the same **colonial** and militarized **ecologies** that they claim to resolve. Here, the shape-shifting quality of uranium itself mediates between various forms of colonial dispossession, exposure, and environmental critique.

As the market value of uranium continues to trade higher and [the critical minerals list](https://www.eenews.net/articles/usgs-proposal-yanks-uranium-from-critical-minerals-list/?utm_source=Energy+News+Network+daily+email+digests&utm_campaign=1dd514fd85-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2020_05_11_11_44_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_724b1f01f5-1dd514fd85-89295824) is reconsidered, our scholarship and activism should remain vigilant to the ways clean energy initiatives may work to reproduce the militarized landscapes and environmental injustices they attempt to remedy. While the recent [Bears Ears National Monument restoration](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/10/07/fact-sheet-president-biden-restores-protections-for-three-national-monuments-and-renews-american-leadership-to-steward-lands-waters-and-cultural-resources/) offers a sense of relief from immediate mining threats, the ongoing [litigation](https://www.sltrib.com/news/2021/12/04/utah-attorney-generals/) around this case indicates how quickly land protections for ancestral homelands may change from one administration to the next. Under **set**tler **col**onial regimes, **protecting the homeland** security of some requires the **invasion** of the homelands of **others**. In such spaces, the sentimental and material **ecologies of war** may be difficult to distinguish but their effects are **ever-present** for Indigenous communities.

#### **Nuclear colonialism is not only a material but discursive practice which restricts legitimate debate in order to establish nuclear power as necessary, deeming Native land as zones of sacrifice for the national interests of settlers.**

**Endres ‘09** [Danielle Endres is an Assistant Professor of Communication at the University of Utah, 2-17-2009, The Rhetoric of Nuclear Colonialism: Rhetorical Exclusion of American Indian[Indigenous] Arguments in the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Siting Decision: Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies: Vol 6 No 1, Routledge, http://ereserve.library.utah.edu/Annual/COMM/5370/Endres/rhetoricofnuclear.pdf, Accessed 3-3-2025] DS + fehmi + jw \*brackets added to replace problematic language\* \*other brackets are og\*

Post-colonialism attends to the legacies of colonial systems. Diasporic Indian literary critic and theorist Gayatri Spivak has argued that attention must be paid to the identities of colonized peoples in relation to race, gender, ethnicity, and nationality.20 Raka Shome and Radha Hegde’s scholarship has pushed post-colonialism into critical-cultural communication scholarship.21 Although post-colonialism is a crucial area of study, it unfortunately implies that colonialism is over. For some countries (e.g., India, the Congo) the colonizers have left, leaving post-colonial peoples to grapple with the legacies of colonialism. However, colonialism still exists for indigenous people across the globe. Indigenous scholars such as Glenn Morris and the late Gail Valaskakis resist the notion of post-colonialism.22 As stated by Linda Tuhiwai Smith, ‘‘naming the world as ‘post-colonial’ is, from indigenous perspectives, to name colonialism as finished business ... post-colonial can mean only one thing: the colonizers have left. There is rather compelling evidence that in fact this has not happened.’’23 Despite the surprisingly common contemporary belief that colonization of indigenous nations is a thing of the past, we must not only recognize that colonialism still exists but also explore the communicative practices that maintain colonialism.

The present form of colonialism in the US is what Al Gedicks has called resource colonialism, whereby ‘‘native peoples are under assault on every continent because their lands contain a wide variety of valuable resources needed for industrial development.’’24 As described by Marjene Ambler, the US government works in collusion with large national and multinational corporations to facilitate leases and access to indigenous resources that benefit the government and corporations to the detriment of indigenous communities.25 Resource colonialism depends on ignoring the land ownership rights of the colonized. As such, it also relies on the country’s legal and political system to limit the rights of the colonized, specifically drawing on both the domestic dependent relationship and the trust relationship that **holds American Indian[indigenous] lands** and monies **in ‘‘trust’’** through the Bureau of Indian Affairs.26 As American Indian[indigenous] Studies scholar Sharon O’Brien states, ‘‘today’s ‘Indian wars’ are being fought in corporate boardrooms and law offices as tribes endeavor to protect and control their remaining resources.’’27 Resource colonialism is a reality for many tribes in the US, especially those with oil, gas, coal and uranium reserves. In the Nuclear Colonialism 43 American West, the Western Shoshone, Navajo, Southern Ute, Paiute and Laguna nations possess a wealth of natural resources including uranium ore and vast desert ‘‘wastelands’’ for nuclear waste storage. Historian Gabrielle Hecht noted that ‘‘the history of uranium mining ... shows that colonial practices and structures were **appropriated**\*not overthrown\***by the nuclear age**, and proved **central to its technopolitical success**.’’28 Nuclear colonialism is a tale of resource colonialism.

Colonialism in all its forms is dependent on the discursive apparatus that sustains it. Mary Stuckey and John Murphy point out that rhetorical colonialism recognizes that the language used by colonizers is a crucial justification for the colonial project.29 Caskey Russell argues that ‘‘**vast justification systems** have been set up to **keep colonizers from feeling guilty**.’’30 Indian Law is an integral part of the discursive system of colonialism that is employed over an over again to grant political sovereignty while **simultaneously restricting it**. Political sovereignty for American Indians [indigenous peoples] is a complex concept that reveals that US Indian Law views American Indian [indigenous] nations as colonized peoples. It is not based on the inherent sovereignty of American Indian [indigenous] nations but instead upon the laws of the US that grant political sovereignty to American Indians [indigenous peoples]. Yet, when sovereignty is granted, it is dependent upon acknowledgment by the grantor and is therefore vulnerable to coercive restriction. Although the Constitution, hundreds of treaties, and US Supreme Court decisions affirm the political sovereignty of American Indian [indigenous] nations, this form of political sovereignty is egregiously and unilaterally limited by the US federal government through its laws and policies.31 Three Supreme Court decisions under Chief Justice John Marshall in the early 1800s solidified the assumption that Indian sovereignty is granted and introduced the concept of American Indian [indigenous] nations as ‘‘domestic dependent nations.’’32 According to Wallace Coffey and Rebecca Tsosie of the Native American Rights Fund, ‘‘the concept of Indian tribes as ‘domestic dependent nations’ means that tribal governmental authority is to some extend circumscribed by federal authority.’’33 The domestic dependent status defined by Supreme Court decisions in the 1860s discursively relegates American Indian [indigenous] nations to a partial and contingent nationhood. The term ‘‘domestic dependents’’ also calls forth paternalistic images of American Indians [indigenous peoples] as child-like dependents who need to be protected by the federal government. Given these restrictions, if American Indian [indigenous] nations attempt to use Indian Law and its notion of political sovereignty for the improvement of the nation or to assert sovereignty, the nations are stuck in a catch-22 where they have to accept the limited notion of sovereignty granted through federal law in their quest for more rights within Indian Law. Although political sovereignty may acknowledge that American Indians [indigenous peoples] have distinct nations and governments, this sovereignty is always defined as dependent on and subordinate to the US federal government.

Indigenous resistance over the years has created cracks in the system of resource colonialism, resulting in more control over resources and more lucrative leases for many American Indian [indigenous] nations.34 Recognizing the limitations of political sovereignty as defined by US colonialist laws, Coffey and Tsosie and John Borrows have called for indigenous people to reject political sovereignty and to assert and live by their inherent sovereignty.35 Borrows calls for ‘‘an inherent, unextinguished, and continu44 D. Endres ing exercise of self-government’’ that challenges the imposition of political sovereignty upon American Indian [indigenous] nations by the federal government.36 The concept of ‘‘inherent sovereignty’’ exemplifies the potential for resistance to colonization through a constitutive redefinition of sovereignty that supersedes the political definition.

Nuclearism

Considering the use of American Indian [indigenous] resources and lands in support of the nuclear production process, the discourse of nuclearism intersects with the discourse of colonialism to create the discourse of nuclear colonialism. **Nuclearism** is the **assumption that** nuclear **weapons** and nuclear **power** are **crucial** to the **national interest** and national security, serving to normalize and **justify** all aspects of the nuclear **production** process.37 Nuclearism is an ideology and a **discursive system** that is ‘‘intertextually configured by present discourses such as militarism, **nationalism**, bureaucracy, and **technical-rationality**.’’38 Even with the end of the Cold War, we still see nuclearism present in contemporary US policy such as the call to license new nuclear reactors for the first time in over twenty years and research into new nuclear weapons technology (e.g., bunker busters).

Resistance to nuclearism comes in many forms, one of which is the body of scholarship called nuclear communication criticism. Within this corpus, Bryan Taylor and William Kinsella advocate the study of ‘‘nuclear legacies’’ of the nuclear production process.39 The material legacies of the nuclear production process include the deaths of Navajo uranium miners, the left-over uranium tailings on Navajo land, and Western Shoshone downwinders. However, nuclear waste is in need of more examination; as Taylor writes, ‘‘nuclear waste represents one of the most complex and highly charged controversies created by the postwar society. Perhaps daunted by its technical, legal and political complexities, communication scholars have not widely engaged this topic.’’40 One of the reasons that nuclear waste is such a complex controversy is its connection with nuclear colonialism.

Nuclear communication criticism has focused on examination of the ‘‘practices and processes of communication’’ related to the nuclear production process and the legacies of this process.41 At least two themes in nuclear discourse are relevant to nuclear colonialism: 1) invocation of national interest; and 2) constraints to public debate. First, nuclear discourse is married to the professed national interest, calling for the sacrifices among the communities affected by the legacies of the nuclear production process.42 According to Kuletz, the American **West** has been **constructed** as a ‘‘**national sacrifice zone**’’ because of its connection to the nuclear production process.43 Nuclearism is tautological in its basic **assumption** that nuclear **production serves** the **national interest** and national security and its use of national security and national interest to justify nuclearism. The federal government justifies nuclear production, which disproportionately takes place on American Indian [indigenous] land, as serving the national security. This justification works with the strategy of colonialism that **defines American Indian [indigenous] people** as **part of the nation** and **not** as **separate**, Nuclear Colonialism 45 inherently sovereign entities whose national interest may not include storing nuclear waste on their land.

A second theme in nuclear discourse is its ability to constrain public debate through invoking the national interest, **defining opponents** as **unpatriotic** and employing discursive containment.44 For instance, ‘‘discursive containment often operates on the premise that public participation is a potential hazard to official interests and should be minimized and controlled.’’45 The strategies of nuclear discourse that constrain public debate work in concert with strategies of rhetorical colonialism that exclude and **constrain** the participation of **American Indians [indigenous peoples] in decisions** affecting their land and resources. Taken together, the intersection of the discourses of colonialism and nuclearism create a powerful discourse aimed at perpetuating the nuclear production process for the benefit of the colonizer at the expense of their colonial targets.

Nuclear Colonialism, Discourse, and Yucca Mountain

Nuclear colonialism is inextricably linked to the concept of rhetorical exclusion. According to John Sanchez, Mary Stuckey and Richard Morris rhetorical exclusion is employed by those in power to ‘‘foreclose debate without appearing to engage in undemocratic action.’’46 Using American Indian Movement (AIM) activism and the case of Leonard Peltier as examples, they reveal that rhetorical exclusion provides ‘‘frames through which those who challenge the status quo may be understood.’’47 In their analysis, rhetorical exclusion is primarily a strategy of definition. They reveal the numerous ways that the federal government’s discourse explicitly defines American Indians [indigenous peoples] as **subversive**, inherently dangerous, oppositional, and always already guilty. These definitions build upon and contribute to the assumption that the US federal government is democratic, legitimate, and inherently worthy of **defense** **against** any threats (i.e., **American Indians [indigenous peoples]**). Rhetorical exclusion, then, is a strategy of definition that justifies taking ‘‘whatever actions those in power deem necessary to control challenges to its legitimacy.’’48

Despite the nuanced analysis offered by Sanchez, Stuckey and Morris, their articulation of the strategy of definition discussed above is not the only strategy of rhetorical exclusion in discourse about American Indians [indigenous peoples]. Rather, their discussion of rhetorical exclusion provides a starting point for considering the multiple strategies of rhetorical exclusion in different situations.49 Sanchez, Stuckey and Morris’ articulation of rhetorical exclusion is limited to how American Indians [indigenous peoples] are explicitly defined in federal government documents as threatening or subversive. However, this strategy is used in a context very different from that of the Yucca Mountain controversy. In the late 1960s and 1970s, AIM was highly active and widely covered in the media, such as the takeover of Alcatraz and Wounded Knee. AIM activism in the 1970s called forth a rhetorical situation to which the federal government had to respond. However, even though current American Indian [indigenous] grievances pose as big a threat to the federal government’s modus operandi of colonialism, these issues do not receive the national attention they did in the 1970s. Today, rhetorical exclusion 46 D. Endres includes more subtle ways of excluding American Indian [indigenous] voices from deliberation. This study aims to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of rhetorical exclusion.

The nuclear waste controversy provides a good context for studying rhetorical exclusion. Although the nuclear waste crisis is on the radar of many Americans, the relationship between American Indians [indigenous peoples] and nuclear waste is less apparent. According to a 2002 report by former Secretary of Energy Spencer Abraham, ‘‘we have a staggering amount of radioactive waste in this country.’’50 By 2035, there will be approximately 119,000 metric tons of high-level nuclear waste (well above the 77,000 metric ton limit) at the Yucca Mountain site.51 In anticipation of the current waste crisis, Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA, 1982, amended 1987), which vested responsibility with the federal government for permanently storing high-level nuclear waste from commercial and governmental sources. The NWPA provides an immense subsidy for nuclear power industry because it stipulates that Congress assume billions of dollars of financial responsibility for nuclear waste storage. In 2002, the Secretary of Energy, the President, and Congress officially authorized the Yucca Mountain site as the nation’s first high-level nuclear waste repository. The site authorization was widely opposed by Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute nations who claim treaty-based and spiritual rights to the land. Other American Indian [indigenous] nations and indigenous organizations also opposed the site authorization decision because of its role in nuclear colonialism. My analysis reveals that the federal government, specifically the Department of Energy (DOE), rhetorically excluded American Indians [indigenous peoples] and their arguments from the Yucca Mountain site authorization decision process. However, before discussing the rhetorical exclusion of American Indian [indigenous] arguments against the Yucca Mountain site, it is important to establish that there were indeed arguments against the site.

American Indian [indigenous] Opposition to the Yucca Mountain Site

Although Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute opposition can be seen in webbased American Indian [indigenous] organization documents, in protest events near Yucca Mountain and in articles in Indian Country Today, I focus on the statements and comments from self-identified American Indians [indigenous peoples] of various nations during the Yucca Mountain site authorization public comment period.52 This public comment period is a flawed process. Current models of public participation in decision-making are inherently exclusive because they are technocratic, occur too late for input to change the outcome, are conceived by decision-makers as a one-way transfer of information, and ultimately do not allow the public to influence the decision.53 Current models of public participation also define what counts as legitimate arguments\*scientific and technical arguments\*and exclude social, political, and emotional arguments.54 However, even though the Yucca Mountain site authorization public comment period is a guise of deliberation, it is still important to examine the public comments and the DOE’s response to them. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act (NWPA) legally mandates that the DOE consider public comments before recommending a site for authorization; the Nuclear Colonialism 47 DOE produced a comment summary document and Spencer Abraham responded to selected arguments from the public comment period in his site authorization report.55 Public comment periods were the only time that the federal government directly engaged with opposition to the Yucca Mountain site authorization. My examination of the public comments and the DOE’s response to the public comments therefore reveals how the Department of Energy rhetorically excluded arguments that they were purportedly supposed to address. The DOE simply ignored the arguments made outside of the public comment period, but they actually had to rhetorically construct responses to the arguments made in the public comment period. The main theme in the various public comments submitted by American Indian [indigenous] people is the **value of land**, specifically the spiritual rights to Yucca Mountain. The US claims that the Yucca Mountain nuclear waste site is located on federally controlled land (NTS, Nellis Air force Base, and BLM), but this is contested by Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute nations who claim treaty-based and spiritual rights to the land. The Western Shoshone lay claim to Yucca Mountain under the 1863 Ruby Valley Treaty of Peace and Friendship.56 At a public hearing in Pahrump, Nevada, Corbin Harney indicates that, ‘‘the land that you guys are talking about, the DOE, we still haven’t heard from the federal government or the state that they own the land. Under the Treaty of 1863, we still own it under your federal law.’’57 Yucca Mountain is just one site of an ongoing struggle by the Western Shoshone for their land rights. Based on Supreme Court rulings and laws that argue that the Western Shoshone lost their treaty rights due to the gradual encroachment of westward settlers, the federal government disputes the Western Shoshone claim to the land.58 Employing the **discourse of colonialism**, **the US** **claims** that the Western Shoshone **lost their treaty rights** through an International Claims Commission (ICC) ruling. However, the Western Shoshone contest the government’s interpretation, citing their treaty and a technical loophole that Congress never actually filed a finality clause for the ICC ruling.59 The Western Shoshone case for land ownership is bolstered by two U.N. commission rulings that conclude that the US claim to Western Shoshone lands violates international human rights law.60 In addition to claims of land ownership, members of the Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute nations argue that Yucca Mountain is part of their traditional homeland that holds cultural, spiritual, and resource value. Members of the Las Vegas Paiute, the Lone Pine Paiute Shoshone, the Big Pine Paiute, the Western Shoshone National Council, Western Shoshone, and the Utah Paiute all comment that Yucca Mountain has been part of their homeland since ‘‘time immemorial.’’61 At a public hearing in Las Vegas, Southern Paiute Edward Smith suggests the following about the sacredness of Yucca Mountain: Our people, along with other Southern Paiute tribes and Western Shoshone and Owens Valley Paiute peoples have lived, traveled, worked, raised children, worshiped, harvested plants, animal, water and mineral resources and died in these lands for thousands of years ... These lands are part of our people and we are part of these lands. The two [sic] connected as one and that connection is everlasting ... This land is and will always be Indian land.62 48 D. Endres The connection to Yucca Mountain and the surrounding land is inherently one of place. It is not just any land that is valued; it is specifically Yucca Mountain. Kuletz’s analysis reveals that ‘‘Yucca Mountain may be comparatively small, but it is a powerful place nonetheless. The Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute Indians call the power such places possess Puha because the mountain, like all things Euroamericans call ‘inanimate,’ possesses energy, vitality, [and] life force.’’63 This connection to place is typical of many American Indian [indigenous] cultures. According to Vine Deloria Jr, ‘‘American Indians [indigenous peoples] hold their land\*places\*as having the **highest possible meaning**, and all their **statements are made with this reference point** in mind.’’64 The American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA) purportedly affirms American Indian [indigenous] nations’ rights to practice their religion and access to sacred lands and natural resources (including those outside of reservation lands) essential for conducting the religion, even if the nations have not had contiguous usage. However, Indian Law and the system of colonialism limits the efficacy of the AIRFA and other laws. As the Native American Rights Fund writes: Unfortunately, the laws of the United States overlook that our own landscape is dotted with equally important American Indian [indigenous] religious sites that have served as cornerstones for indigenous religion since time immemorial. The Forest Service, the Park Service, and private interests have been allowed repeatedly to destroy irreplaceable Native sacred sites.65 Therefore, American Indian [indigenous] **spiritual claims** to land are often **overlooked** in favor of competing corporate or **national interests**.

#### **Thus, the only alternative is decolonization – the judge should adopt an ethic of incommensurability and reject the affs attempts at settler futurity via their investments into the interstate system.**

**Tuck and Yang 12** [Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, https://clas.osu.edu/sites/clas.osu.edu/files/Tuck%20and%20Yang%202012%20Decolonization%20is%20not%20a%20metaphor.pdf, JKS]

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework. We want to say, first, that **decolonization is not obliged to answer** those questions - **decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity.** Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics - moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. **It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence**. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone - these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability.

*when you take away the punctuation*

*he says of*

*lines lifted from the documents about*

*military-occupied land*

*its acreage and location*

*you take away its finality*

*opening the possibility of other futures*

-Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012)

**Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.**

#### 

#### **Status quo modernity is unsustainable and the 1AC’s extinction scenarios serve as distractions from IR’s violent coloniality**

**Mitchell 19** (Audra, Associate Professor of and Canada Research Chair in Global Political Ecology at Wilfrid Laurier University "Can international relations confront the cosmos?" in the Routledge Handbook of Critical International Relations. pp.59-60 GC) https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315692449-5/international-relations-confront-cosmos-audra-mitchell

Earthly ruptures such as climate change and accelerating patterns of extinction are rocking the foundations of International Relations (IR) and global politics. These phenomena do not simply demand critique: they are modes of critique in themselves. In their diverse eruptions, they manifest and expose enormous gaps between IR and global theory, earth and the broader cosmos. These earthly critiques are framed in a number of ways: for instance, as ‘evidence’ in Western scientific discourses of climate change; or as the expression of broken laws, protocols and relations with many Indigenous knowledge systems (Mitchell, 2018). By making themselves felt in plural ways, they force IR and global theory to confront two profound possibilities: radical finitude and radical infinitude. ‘Radical finitude’ refers to the idea of the total, complete and possibly imminent negation of existence. Meanwhile, ‘radical infinitude’ reflects existences that vastly exceed the temporal horizons of dominant, Western modes of human life – for instance, Ancestral beings that pre-date, co-exist with and will post-date Western time. Both of these possible conditions place central concepts and assumptions of IR and global theory into question. For instance, as a knowledge system fundamentally invested in sustaining dominant forms and subjects of survival, IR and global theory cannot – or will not – address the radical finitude raised by the possibility of ‘mass extinction’ (Mitchell, 2016). On the contrary, concepts such as ‘security’ and ‘survival’ generate blind spots that maintain IR’s alienation from earthly conditions, and its own role in generating them. On the other hand, some anticipatory responses to the possibility of radical finitude aim to extend these subjects of survival, and particular modes of ‘human agency’ into more spatio-temporal dimensions. In particular, plans for the colonization of outer space, emerging largely within the private sector, challenge existing understandings of survival, colonial power and sovereignty. In this case, too, these foundational concepts of IR and global theory close the disciplinary imaginary to the possibilities and pitfalls of addressing radical infinitude. In combination, these blockages prop up an IR and global theory that is inarticulate about, and unresponsive to, the conditions that shape the multiple, co-existent presents and possible futures of worlds on earth. This raises an important question for the future of IR and global politics: can they confront radical (in)finitude and respond to critiques raised by earth and the broader cosmos? By critiquing mainstream responses to radical (in)finitude – or the lack thereof – this chapter questions whether IR’s foundational concepts can address the critiques raised by earth and the broader cosmos, and better attune itself to their conditions. To this end, it engages with several important forms of critique that might shape the future of, and beyond, IR and global theory. First, by framing earthly disruptions as direct, material critiques of abstract frameworks, it calls for future IR theories that are attuned and responsive to their cosmological conditions. Second, by engaging with speculative critique and theory, it opens up space for the imagination of multiple possible futures that transcend foundational concepts such as survival, security, sovereignty and mainstream norms of ‘humanity’. Third, it engages with Indigenous thought, including Indigenous futurisms, which challenge the colonial cosmo-visions of mainstream IR by bringing Ancestral knowledge to bear on multiple future modes dwelling in relation to other beings on and off earth. Together, these modes of critique offer radical visions of future IR theories that could open up space for plural modes of co-flourishing in the face of profound, earthly disruptions. Radical finitude and global extinction Does life on earth have a long-term future? Increasingly influential discourses of ‘existential risk’ argue that states and international institutions need to pay more attention to developments that ‘threaten the existence of our entire species’ (CSER, 2015). They examine a range of possible threats to the survival of homo sapiens, from those raised by emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence, nano-technology and synthetic biology to climate change, global pandemics, nuclear terrorism and even cosmic events such as asteroid strikes and gamma-ray bursts (Bostrom and Cirkovic, 2008). Although the probability of these events varies considerably, they each present a non-zero possibility that homo sapiens might be eliminated. For this reason, existential risk researchers seek to shift the register in which threat and the possibilities of survival are understood and governed globally. As Martin Rees (2013) has suggested, IR, global politics and international policy-making should focus less on the ‘minor hazards of everyday life’, such as car accidents and carcinogens, and more on events that ‘have not yet happened but which, if they occurred even once, could cause worldwide devastation’ (Rees, 2013). Homo sapiens, however, is not the only life form thought to be facing the possibility of extinction. Since the 1980s, biologists and ecologists have warned that sharply accelerating rates of extinction may mark the beginning of a new ‘mass extinction event’. This term refers to an earth-wide pattern of extinctions – which Western science defines as death of every member of a species – that eliminates 75 percent or more of extant life forms. Unlike the previous five mass extinctions experienced by earth, which had diverse causes such as the emergence of cyanobacteria and an asteroid strike, the potential ‘sixth mass extinction crisis’ is thought to be driven by ‘anthropogenic’ change. In particular, Western scientists identify four main drivers: climate change, habitat destruction, direct killing and the transfer of life forms across the planet. Although these drivers are attributed to the activities of ‘humanity’, they are predominantly associated with Western political formations such as industrialization, colonization and extractive capitalism (Mitchell, forthcoming). In combination, these phenomena have driven the extinction rates of recorded species well above the ‘background rate’, or the presumed standard rate of extinctions before ‘human’ activities became a determinant factor. This has produced significant decreases in the diversity of life forms globally and across all major taxa. For instance, the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF, 2016) recently reported a 58 percent decrease in species diversity between 1970 and 2012 alone. Anthony Barnosky and his colleagues (2011) claim that current extinction rates could produce – within just three centuries – a magnitude of extinction last seen in the Cretaceous-Tertiary extinction event, which eliminated the dinosaurs (see also Régnier et al., 2015). Several prominent scientists and science journalists working in the area of mass extinction have offered dismal pictures of the implications of these trends for human security. They envision an ‘uninhabitable earth’ (Wallace-Wells, 2017) wracked by global crises in food security, economic collapse (Barnosky, 2014), authoritarian governance, global warfare over dwindling resources (Oreskes and Conway, 2014) and even the forced exile of humans to other planets (Newitz, 2013). Written in overtly securitizing tones intended to shape international governance and policy, these framings of radical finitude have the potential to shape IR and global theory and discourses [to] problematic ways. In the style of Western disaster or horror films (Colebrook, 2014), they adopt a position of voyeurism that borders on apocalypse porn: it exposes privileged Western readers to thrilling images of sublime destruction, while masking the inequalities of threat and responsibility, and normalizing the violences, that produce these ruptures (Mitchell and Theriault, 2018). For instance, by framing ‘humanity’ as a unitary subject and future victim of ‘extinction’, these narratives obscure the disproportionate effect of global patterns of extinction on worlds in the global south.

Moreover, by imagining the destruction of worlds as a future hypothetical, they ignore the modes of world-ending violence enacted by colonization and survived by Indigenous peoples (Whyte, 2016). However, these narratives also confront IR and global theory with irruptions of radical negativity (and possibility) with which it is ill-equipped to contend. Specifically, extinction narratives delineate the boundary conditions of IR, a discipline concerned with, and limited by, its specific concepts of survival. Despite its preoccupation with survival, no branch of IR has directly theorized extinction. In the rare cases where the actual term ‘extinction’ appears in IR discourses, it is used solely as a metaphor for the dissolution of states (see Wight, 1960; Morgenthau, 2005) and should not be interpreted literally. Some major concepts in IR and global theory have flirted with the concept of radical finitude raised by extinction narratives. For instance, the idea of ‘nuclear winter’ popularized by Carl Sagan (1983) predicted that a full-scale nuclear war would destroy life on a massive scale, and undermine the conditions for its regeneration. Remaining humans – and of course, other life forms – would face starvation, viral epidemics and a global-scale deluge of deadly toxins and ultraviolet flux (Sagan, 1983: n.p.). In a similar sense, John Somerville’s (2012 [1983]) concept of ‘omnicide’ suggests that nuclear warfare or ecological collapse could threaten the survival of all modes of life on Earth. Both of these concepts suggest the large-scale destruction of life almost to the point of total extinction.

## **FW**

#### **Our interpretation is that the aff is an object of research that must be proven ethical before weighing its hypothetical implementation, else they should be dropped.**

#### **Debating the res narrows the debate to a 10 second statement and leave the underlying assumptions of the aff unquestioned**

#### **Fiat is illusory but whether we interrogate the aff’s investments into settler-colonialism controls the out of round impacts of the knowledge we generate – at worst presume neg bc the aff does nothing.**

#### **Use the ballot to force disrupting the easy reproduction of settler-colonialism in everyday speech acts like debate.**

**Henderson 17** – Phil Henderson currently holds a Bachelor’s (Hons.) in Political Science from the University of Western Ontario and a Master’s Degree in Political Science from the University of Victoria, with a specialization in Cultural, Social and Political thought. “Imagoed communities: the psychosocial space of settler colonialism” Settler Colonial Studies, 7:1, 40-56 (2017), https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/2201473X.2015.1092194 // rose

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 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

#### **Failure to confront colonial logics that undergird educational spaces sanitizes knowledge to preserve colonial power structures.**

**Gani and Marshal 22’**

Jasmine K Gani, Jenna Marshall, 10 January 2022, The impact of colonialism on policy and knowledge production in International Relations, *International Affairs,* <https://academic.oup.com/ia/article/98/1/5/6484845#324997473>, //recut DS

In this first section we elucidate how **academia and intellectuals** have **helped to supply, shape and justify colonial and racist policies. Underpinning** all the articles in the special issue is an acknowledgement of **the racial foundations of** the discipline of **IR**, which, though formally established in IR departments in the early twentieth century, already existed in various forms such as ‘imperial’ or ‘diplomatic’ history and was rooted in Enlightenment political thought. **Scholars across academic disciplines have increasingly been confronting the erasure of the racism** that coursed through the writings and beliefs of early political theorists and the founders of their disciplines,11 and have a**rgued that this erasure forecloses greater debate about and scrutiny of racism within the discipline's mainstream and critical theories**. While this important conversation and excavation have already been under way for some time,12 we seek to take this understanding further to probe how these ideas and patterns of racism, colonialism and erasure go on to shape, and become operationalized through, policy. The research by the contributors to this special issue has exposed a long and deep history in which universities, as well as other sites of knowledge production and expertise that draw on academic insights, such as museums and think tanks, have (and had) a close entanglement with state practitioners, supplying the ideas and logic that in many instances were used to justify racist beliefs and colonial policies.13 This unsavoury ‘transmission belt’ has occurred in two forms.14

First, as a number of the contributions argue,15 academia has been a predominant influence in the production of broad epistemic communities**.** In the course of this process, academic knowledge production has acted as a **supplier of racial, civilizational and imperialist discourse**, ideology and ‘logic’ that were (and are) disseminated through research, teaching and broader public intellectualism. Bearing in mind that many **policy-makers have been taught and trained within academia,** especially elite institutions, it is necessary to recall that IR departments were founded in the early twentieth century in the United Kingdom and United States precisely to serve the purpose of informing imperial administrations.16 While this form of transmission is impossible to quantify precisely, the articles in this special issue show that nevertheless **universities,** along with think tanks and journals, **delineated the parameters of rational and acceptable debate.** That the ideas emanated (as they still do) **from so-called bastions of scholarship and rigour meant they carried greater credibility and gravitas,** and were accompanied by an assumption that they had been scientifically tested. In many cases universities and intellectuals were responsible for **upholding** the legitimacy of **racist hierarchies and the necessity of colonialism in the West against the grain of anti-colonial and anti-racist social movements** and intellectuals in the colonies, and subsequent grassroots movements for the abolition of colonialism and racism in the West. Thus, in contrast to the common refrain that academia is an ‘ivory tower’ that is disconnected from the real world, in IR it has in fact routinely demonstrated the opposite, with the capacity to embed and systematize racism, scavenging the disorganized and reactionary fears of society and refining them in such a way that they appear rational,17 indeed necessary for the sake of order, security and communal peace.

A second way in which academia has **historically fed** and continues to feed **policy** is in a more direct way**—through a supply chain of academically trained experts who go on to work in policy**, either as consultants or by holding office in government or in other state institutions such as the military. This pattern was laid down during the peak period of European colonialism, the clearest example being provided by J. S. Mill: despite being a philosopher, he was anything but detached from the ‘real world’, taking up the position of colonial officer in British-controlled India, arguing against Indian self-rule on the racist intellectual basis that the natives were still in their infancy.18 Such ‘knowledge entrepreneurs’ were at the forefront of the knowledge ordering indispensable to Britain's expansion into south Asia. These ‘epistemological invasions’, alongside the core group of ‘European explorers, diplomats, military men, and Company officials’, had the chief function of producing ‘a proto-episteme’ or ‘corpus of knowledge’ by which the region was rendered legible for imperial expansion.19 Later, the urgent **imperatives of war established the revolving door that turned scholars into practitioners** and vice versa, as witnessed, for example, in the interplay in 1930s British East Africa between colonial administrations and anthropologists to ensure indirect rule.20

## 2NC

**[1a] NL – Tariffs mean we can’t import uranium which is essential for nuclear energy**

**Miles A. Pomper 25** — (Yanliang Pan Miles A. Pomper, 3-10-2025, "Trump’s Tariffs on Canada Could Kill the U.S. Nuclear Energy Revival", World Politics Review, https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/us-nuclear-energy-tariffs/, accessed 4-4-2025)

Miles A. Pomper is a senior fellow at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies of the Monterey Institute of International Studies. He joined the Center after serving as Editor-in-Chief of Arms Control Today, a post he held from 2003 to 2009. Previously, he was the lead foreign policy reporter for CQ Weekly, where he covered the full range of foreign policy issues before Congress, including arms control and proliferation concerns. His career has also included several years spent covering national security and political issues at the Legi-Slate News Service and the publication of book chapters, analytical articles, and reports for publications, such as Foreign Service Journal, Nuclear Engineering International, and the Centre for International Governance Innovation.Before working as a full-time journalist, Miles served as a Foreign Service Officer with the U.S. Information Agency. For several years, he served as the assistant information officer and a spokesperson of the U.S. Embassy in Caracas, Venezuela. He holds a master's degree in international affairs from Columbia University and a master's degree in journalism from Northwestern University.

Yanliang Pan is a graduate student at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies and holds a master’s degree in Eurasian, Russian and East European studies from Georgetown University. His research has focused on international nuclear energy commerce, particularly as it involves the Russian and Chinese state-owned nuclear corporations. //ms

**Hopes for a U.S. nuclear energy revival may be jeopardized by the tariffs that President Donald Trump continues to threaten to impose on Canada, as well as his plans to similarly target the European Union moving forward.**  That’s because **the nuclear industry depends on a global supply chain that can take uranium concentrate from Kazakhstan**i mines, for instance, convert it to uranium hexafluoride in Canada and enrich the product in France, before finally delivering it to a U.S. fuel fabricator. Trump’s tariffs will make that exceedingly complicated, costly and precarious, to the great detriment of the U.S. nuclear sector. Flexible global market mechanisms have allowed the **U.S.**—a country with negligible uranium mining activities and limited downstream conversion and enrichment capacity—to **secure enough fuel to operate the largest fleet of nuclear reactors worldwide, producing some 20 percent of the country’s electricity. All that will change if the Trump administration follows through on its** threatened **10 percent tariff on uranium imports from Canada**, among other products—which were imposed on March 4 but subsequently removed—amid threats of broadening the trade war to the EU. **Trump left in place an additional 10 percent tariff** he announced on March 4 on Chinese uranium imports, which were already under a 17.5 percent tariff as of Feb. 4.

**[1b] Even the perception of tariffs hurts the market**

**Slav 25** — (Irina Slav, 4-1-2025, "U.S. Uranium Market Goes Radio Silent on Tariff Shock", OilPrice, https://oilprice.com/Alternative-Energy/Nuclear-Power/US-Uranium-Market-Goes-Radio-Silent-on-Tariff-Shock.amp.html, accessed 4-4-2025) Irina is a writer for Oilprice.com with over a decade of experience writing on the oil and gas industry. //ms

**Uranium purchases in the United States have slowed considerably** as power utilities process **the effect of** President Donald **Trump's tariff** offensive in the market-and that offensive may yet transform that same market. Bloomberg reported this week that **uranium purchases** by U.S. power utilities had **dropped by 50% ahead of the 10% import tariff** that Trump imposed on Canadian energy exports. The publication noted that those power utilities source more than a quarter of their uranium from Canada, which makes the potential impact of the tariffs rather palpable. If the tariffs do come into effect as scheduled and stay in place long enough, U.S. power utilities may have to replace their top source of nuclear fuel if they are to take full advantage of what many have called a nuclear Renaissance.