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Settler Colonialism K

#### Settler colonialism is the permeating structure of the nation-state which requires the elimination of indigenous life and land via the occupation of settlers---it turns Natives into ghosts and chattel slaves into excess labor.

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)

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 overlap - 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, 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.

#### Uranium mining is an extension of the global imperial project designed to genocide indigenous communities and expand US military dominance.

Mateer ’21 [Jennifer Mateer, Post-Doctoral Fellow at the University of British Columbia in the Department of Geography, Lecturer in the Department of Geography at the University of Victoria, Canada, Simon Springer, Professor of Human Geography, Head of Discipline for Geography and Environmental Studies, and Director for the Centre of Urban and Regional Studies at the University of Newcastle, Australia, Martin Locret-Collet, Post-Doctoral Fellow at the University of Birmingham, Research Associate for the Liveable Cities Project, and Maleea Acker, Lecturer in the Department of Geography at the University of Victoria, 2021, “Introduction: The Political Ecology of Resource and Energy Management beyond the State,” *Energies Beyond the State: Anarchist Political Ecology and the Liberation of Nature*, ISBN: 978-1-53815-917-0] sumzom

In 2014, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Nuclear Energy Agency stated in a report titled ‘Managing Environmental and Health Impacts of Uranium Mining’: Uranium mining and milling has evolved significantly over the years. By comparing currently leading approaches with outdated practices, this report demonstrates how uranium mining can be conducted in a way that protects workers, the public and the environment. Innovative, modern mining practices combined with strictly-enforced regulatory standards are geared towards avoiding past mistakes committed primarily during the early history of the industry when maximising uranium production was the principal operating consideration. (n.p.)

Although I do believe in safer, more ecological safe methods and practices in min- ing, including that of uranium, I am highly sceptical of the ability of hierarchical, centralized models of organizations such as capitalism and the state to carry out such methods in a way that benefits humanity. Most people in positions of power are removed from the consequences of their actions, or at least the social and environ- mental consequences; in a centralized, bureaucratic and hierarchical organization, those with the power to make decisions are only able to see costs and benefits in terms of finance and statistics, never in terms of vital resources and human beings. Without decentralized, participatory planning and execution of plans, it is almost certain that somebody is going to get the short end of the stick, which is especially worrying in situations involving human lives and the health of the planet. For these reasons, the management of uranium would be best informed by an anarchist model, which would provide the best possible ethical and ecological outcomes.

From the 1930s to the 1970s, Navajo people, Hopi people and Mormon people were used by mining companies to mine for uranium in the four corners region of the United States (Arizona, New Mexico, Utah and Colorado). The miners, who were largely indigenous, were not informed of the dangers of working in such close proximity to uranium without proper protection by the mining companies nor by the US government. Uranium tailings were left uncovered and unmarked all over the region near the mines. The leftover ore was used to build houses for the miners and their families in the area. The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) was aware of the dangers posed to uranium miners prior to uranium mining due to the studies of uranium miners in Europe that had previously taken place, and throughout the 1950s, the commission oversaw uranium mining in the region without informing miners of the dangers of uranium (McLeod 1983). During this period, the Navajo people mined about 4 million tonnes of uranium, largely used by the US govern- ment in the production of nuclear weapons during the Cold War, and there are now 259 abandoned uranium mines in the state of New Mexico alone (Frosch 2009).

Ever since the uranium mining in the four corners region and the Navajo nation, uranium has contaminated the water that the peoples of the region use for drink- ing, cleaning and cooking. The people that work and live near old uranium mines, tailings and downstream from them end up consuming high amounts of uranium throughout their life, which causes sickness and early death among them. It should be noted that the children of dead parents in these situations often are taken by the government and put in the foster care system, robbing the children of their families and cultural identities (Spitz 2009). In addition to contaminating the drinking water, the uranium contaminated the every brick that people’s homes were built out of, and living in one of the uranium houses could be up to the equivalent of receiving 553 chest X-rays per year (McLeod 1983). The radiation in the region dramatically increased the rates of birth defects among infants in the Navajo nation as well.

In 1997, the United States Environmental Protection Agency finally measured the levels of radiation in Monument valley and discovered that many water sources had been contaminated due to the waste being piled up along the Colorado River, just as the indigenous peoples had been saying for years, and that in some areas the radia- tion was around eighty times the federally designated dose limit for human beings (Spitz 2009). The 2000 documentary The Return of Navajo Boy was finally able to assist in triggering a federal investigation into uranium houses in the four corners region. The federal government has even promised reparations to all those affected by uranium mining, though they often will refuse to help lung cancer patients due to the use of traditional tobacco (ibid.). In the year 2008, the US EPA finally made a five-year plan to clean up all Cold War uranium contamination on Navajo land, though vast areas of land and many families have still been left out of this plan. Federal and tribal scientists tested radioactivity over the 27,000 square miles of the reservation, searching for the lung-cancer-causing mineral, radium (Frosch 2009).

In a personal account, Bertha Nez, a resident of the southeastern edge of the Navajo nation, said that ‘I’m sandwiched between these tailings piles. The kids have asthma, my sister had cancer – lymphoma – then my dad, and some people that worked in the uranium mine, they have respiratory problems and some have kidney problems’. ‘There were a lot of things people weren’t told about the plight of Navajos and uranium mining’ (Stephen B. Etsitty, executive director of the Navajo Nation Environmental Protection Agency) said, ‘These legacy issues are impacting genera- tions. At some point people are saying, ‘It’s got to end’ (Jung 2013).

This internal colonialism by the United States was used during the Cold War for multiple purposes. The first and foremost was the development of a large and sophisticated nuclear arsenal for use in intimidating the rest of the world into sub- mission for (neo)colonialism and imperialism abroad. The second was the deliberate destruction of native homelands in an attempt to force the indigenous peoples of the region to either assimilate into the culture of the United States, or to leave and no longer be a bother to the white colonizers. The third was an attempt by the state and capitalism to further reduce the health and population of the indigenous peoples of North America by inflicting the horrible diseases and conditions that come along with living in uranium mining waste. And yet these practices are on the rise again in recent years, as several multinational corporations have begun to mine in Mount Taylor, a site considered sacred to the Navajo people and many other surrounding peoples, referred to as Tsoodził by the Navajo people. The project is called the Roca Honda Mine and it is the largest mine in the nation. It has the potential to pollute local groundwater sources and destroy culturally significant sites, but it is also esti- mated to create 2,400 jobs and over $1 billion in economic activity, an offer hard to refuse in a state that ranks third in poverty. However, the mine is predicted to affect up to 70 acres of land designated by the forest service to be a traditional cultural property (ibid.).

Investors are beginning to take notice of uranium mining lately, despite uranium mining was never really recovering from a crash in the early 1980s, likely due to the recent surge in desire for alternative energy sources. The project has been taken over by the Canadian-based company Energy Fuels, and, using the underground mining method, they hope to extract 1,000 tonnes of uranium every day for 9 years. Jackie Jefferson, a neighbour of Bertha Nez, has said about the mine, ‘We just don’t want no other uranium stuff coming to us. We don’t want to be a dumping ground’ (ibid.)

Despite the negative stigma around uranium, the world continues mining it to use for the production of energy and, in a more sinister vein, weapons. Over two- thirds of the world’s production of uranium comes from Kazakhstan, Canada and Australia, with a rapidly increasing amount extracted using ISL. Uranium produc- tion overall has also been increasing in recent years, rising from 41,282 tonnes in 2007 to 60,496 tonnes in 2015; Kazakhstan’s production has increased by approxi- mately 300 per cent since 2007; Canada’s has increased by about 50 per cent; and while Australia has actually decreased production by about a third. The United State’s uranium production has remained about the same over the past decade, but it would not be surprising if it were to begin rising again. Currently, over half of uranium mining is handled by state-owned mining companies, which generally prioritize secure supplies of uranium over actual market considerations. Uranium production from mines took a serious downturn in the late 1980s and early 1990s but has been steadily on the rise ever since. Recently, in 2012, uranium supply hit the highest it had been since 1988, and over the next few years could easily surpass its peak in 1980. The largest producing mine in 2015 was McArthur River mine in Canada (7,354 tonnes of uranium), followed by Cigar Lake, Canada (4,345 tonnes of uranium) and Tortkuduk & Myunkum, Kazakhstan (4,109 tonnes of uranium). The United States has approximately 207,400 tonnes of known recoverable uranium resources, 4 per cent of the world’s known uranium resources (World Nuclear Asso- ciation, n.d.).

The environmental aspects of uranium mining are largely the same as other metal-liferous mining, especially that of heavy metals which are generally highly toxic, but the radioactivity of uranium and other related ores is what makes uranium mining especially worrisome compared to other forms of mining. ISL runs the extra risk of polluting groundwater if done improperly. Mining equipment used for uranium mining generally cannot be sold once it is being used due to exposure to radiation, so it has to be buried along with the rest of the waste. Uranium mining sites must get prior approval from the governing bodies with jurisdiction over the land before being used, they must comply with all environmental standards of those governing bodies and they are subject to international standards and external audits. This is not to say that it is not possible to ignore regulations, or that the regulations are com- mensurate to the risk posed to workers, communities and the environment, but there are at least some general standards of safety that prevent disaster, and the regulations are almost always getting better (ibid.). One could hope that a solution would be to control over industry and energy production in a communal, democratic manner so that the people most affected by any mining or milling may make the decisions as to whether and how they want to operate these facilities, as people with decision- making power would be those affected, and could weigh the benefits and costs (which are social, personal and environmental, not simply monetary as viewed by central organizers such as businesses and governments).

An environmental engineer working for the New Mexico Mining & Minerals

Division (MMD), James Smith, said, ‘Total mines that have been really well cleaned up? Ummm. One. You can’t see uranium. You don’t know that it’s there. So, it’s really hard to be able to recognize what to do.’ Cleaning up uranium mining sites may sound easy in theory, but in practice it is very difficult to determine exactly what the impact of the mine has been, and to what extent it is necessary to cover it up.

Covering old uranium mines can range from piling rocks and topsoil over it to fill- ing an entire mine shaft with concrete, it really depends on the particular site. Juan Velasquez, senior vice president of environmental affairs at Strathmore Minerals, one of the companies involved with the Roca Honda Mine project, easily admits that industry has had bad practices in the past, but also insists that things have changed and that they know better now. The New Mexico Mining Act of 1993 introduces very strict regulations on mining in the state, and they have more regulations requir- ing companies to clean up any damage they do to the environment. Eric Jantz, a lawyer with the New Mexico Environmental Law Center, said that ‘the single big- gest problem environmentally is the water situation’, he continued, ‘In order to start mining, the company is going to have to de-water the mine, which means they’re going to have to pump out millions of gallons of groundwater from the mine area’ (Jung 2013). Especially with ISL, there is extra risk of releasing heavy metals into local water sources. ‘For the communities most immediately impacted, the benefits are negligible and the costs are huge’, Jantz said, and for the ones with the power to carry out the deeds, the costs are negligible and the benefits are huge (ibid.).

NUCLEAR WEAPONS

The story of the capacity for uranium to produce high quantities of energy, which would be used both in nuclear weapons and in nuclear power, begins with the dis- covery of the neutron. In 1932, English physicist James Chadwick discovered the neutron, a particle theorized by Ernest Rutherford a decade earlier. Neutrons have no charge (as opposed to the +1 charge of the proton and −1 charge of the elec- tron), and can only be detected by the way they cause other particles around them to move. Rutherford would comment soon after the discovery that anyone who thought that neutron collisions could provide any sort of useful power was ‘talking moonshine’ (Zoellner 2009). But perhaps the story starts earlier with a book written in 1914 by socialist and science-fiction author H. G. Wells: The World Set Free. The book described a mineral that could use radioactivity to set off a chain reaction to liberate the binding energy of atoms and create an explosion; destruction on a global scale would then ensue. Leo Szilard, another physicist, was annoyed by Rutherford’s comments and, inspired by what he feared after having read Wells’ book, decided that he needed to make sure that this idea of such a weapon never became public. Szilard patented the idea in the name of the British Admiralty and it was promptly forgotten. Not long after this, a new form of uranium, U-235, would be discovered by physicists at the University of Chicago, a much rarer form that could be used for nuclear fission (ibid.).

In September of 1938, Adolf Hitler annexed the Sudetenland, a region of Czechoslovakia with an ethnic German majority, and consequently gained control of the mining town of St. Joachimsthal, one of the world’s only known sources of uranium at the time. Fears grew that if Germany were to gain control of Belgium, then they would have control over Shinkolobwe, and the United States and Britain would have little-to-no access to uranium supplies, while thousands of tonnes would be necessary to crush, separate and enrich to get enough U-235 to create a uranium bomb. Luckily (though unsure at the time), the likelihood of the Ger- mans developing a nuclear bomb was slim due to Hitler’s distrust of technology, and his dismissal of the uranium bomb as the ‘Spawn of Jewish pseudo-science’ (ibid.). The US government on the other hand decided to go ahead with the project and ordered the purchase of a depopulated piece of land in Washington state near the Columbia River. This became the Hanford Site, where the govern- ment would secretly manufacture plutonium, and it would turn into one of the most polluted sites on the Earth. George B. Kistiakowsky, present for the Trinity explosion, the first nuclear weapon ever detonated, described the explosion as ‘the nearest thing to Doomsday that one could possibly imagine. I am sure that at the end of the world – in the last millisecond – the last man will see what we have just seen’ (ibid.).

Nuclear weapons were developed during Second World War by the United States under the Manhattan Project and were designed to serve one purpose and one purpose only: to destroy cities and population centres. A common trend of US military tactics is the use of what was once referred to as ‘irregular warfare’, attack- ing cities, villages, food and water sources, and trade routes, as opposed to attacking the enemy’s soldiers (‘regular warfare’). This ‘irregular’ warfare became the regular form of warfare for the United States when colonizing the continent and wiping out indigenous populations. This style of warfare is designed not for the winning of battles and defeating armies, but for the total destruction of the enemy’s civilization. The goal of ‘irregular’ warfare is to win wars by any means necessary, through the elimination of other civilizations from the face of the planet if necessary, which is exactly what nuclear weapons do. Nuclear bombs would serve no better than regu- lar bombs in attacking soldiers or battleships or airplanes, they are only useful for destroying population centres and killing civilians. It is exactly this type of warfare that the United States perfected as means for committing genocide against indig- enous peoples, and it is exactly this type of warfare that the United States used to let loose the most dangerous weapon in the history of Japan in 1945.

Because nuclear weaponry is a tool for ‘irregular’ warfare, and the goal of ‘irregu-lar’ warfare is the absolute destruction of your enemy’s civilization, it should be the logical conclusion that a war between multiple nuclear powers where nuclear weapons were used would signal the end of civilization as a whole, and that was the fear from the end of Second World War until the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991. The world was dominated by two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, with vast nuclear arsenals, and every time the two superpowers clashed there was a risk of nuclear war. This was prevented by the two superpowers exploiting the conflict in the global south to be used as proxy wars, such as the Korean War, the Vietnam War and countless others, in order to gain an advantage over the other in control of the world’s people and resources. It was the Cold War and imperialism that fuelled the drive for uranium mining in the four corners region. It was the conflict between capitalism and socialism that created the incentive for capitalists to mine uranium, and it was the very techniques of warfare used for the genocide of indigenous peoples that created the weapons that their mined uranium would build. Japan, as a country that has been a victim of nuclear weapons, and its three non- nuclear principles (non-production, non-possession and non-introduction of nuclear weapons) give it a unique role in the movement against nuclear weapons, yet it has consistently been pro-nuclear, both energy and weapons. Many of Japan’s post–Sec- ond World War prime ministers have been pro-nuclear or had pro-nuclear cabinet members. This has led to Japan’s inclusion in the United States ‘nuclear umbrella’. The core of Japan’s defence policy is nuclear weapons; the weapons themselves will be American, but their purpose is clear: the defence of Japan. Much like the United States, Japan’s non-proliferation policy turns a blind eye to US-favoured countries such as India and Israel, while denouncing unfavoured countries such as Iran and North Korea (Abramsky 2010).

The United Kingdom, France, China and Russia are all engaging in nuclear weap- ons modernization programmes, meanwhile Israel maintains a nuclear force, and Pakistan and India are building up nuclear forces. The United States claims to be ‘revising’ its nuclear arsenal to be more effective in a ‘Post-Cold War security envi- ronment’ (ibid.). The fact that countries such as the United States are modernizing their arsenals serves as encouragement to those states without nuclear programmes or with relatively weak ones to develop their arsenals, especially those of which the United States may be unfriendly towards, such as Iran. Peer de Rijk, director of the World Information Service on Energy, said that everything [Iran] has done in past years is legal under any international treaty. Yet, the simple fact that it is not considered an ally of the Western world and its interests mean that the US and others have been considering a war against Iran. (Ibid.)

Among uranium-exporting countries, two of the largest exporters, Australia and Canada, have strict guidelines to ensure that the exported uranium is used for peace- ful purposes only and not used for the development of weapons or in ways that could support the development of weapons. Over the past few decades, the concern has been that uranium intended for civilian fuel use will be used for the development of weapons; however, the opposite has come true: surplus weapons-grade uranium and plutonium have increasingly been used for fuel production rather than for weapons. Military uranium has become an increasingly large portion of the uranium used for commercial fuel productions, and will likely increase as the governments of the United States and former Soviet countries continue to follow through on disarmament trea- ties that have been being put in place since 1987 (World Nuclear Association n.d.).

NUCLEAR ENERGY

Nuclear energy is a type of energy that uses heat generated by splitting atom nuclei in order to generate steam to turn turbines, similar to fossil fuel energy. However, there are some key differences between fossil fuels and nuclear energy. The first is that fossil fuels generate greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide when they are burned, causing a multitude of environmental and health problems such as global warming, ocean acidification and increased respiratory diseases. Nuclear energy releases little greenhouse gas throughout the process, and absolutely none during the actual pro- duction of energy. Fossil fuels are far less efficient than nuclear energy (though the issue of nuclear waste is still important).

Uranium is generally found in two types, U-238 and U-235, the latter of which makes up approximately 0.7 per cent of natural uranium. U-235 is the main type of uranium that is ‘fissile’. The process of ‘enrichment’ separates the isotopes in order to concentrate certain isotopes. Most reactors require the amount of U-235 to increase from about 0.7 per cent to 3-5 per cent. By firing a neutron into the nucleus of a U-235 atom, it will split, producing more neutrons that hit the nuclei of surround- ing uranium atoms and the process is repeated, producing vast quantities of heat energy. The heat energy then is used to turn water into steam, which turns turbines and generates electrical energy. This process is far more efficient than fossil fuels, as it uses far less fuel to produce more energy and less waste, and more reliable and consistent than other forms of alternative energy such as solar and wind.

In 1954, the AEC announced that nuclear energy would soon be ‘too cheap to meter’, opening the possibility of a future in which energy could be free for all to use. Nuclear energy would soon become a standard method of energy production and penetrate every household and industry in the country. By the late-1960s, every European country had a nuclear power programme, but also by that time the voices in opposition to nuclear power were also making themselves heard. Opposition to the development of nuclear energy, due to the risks of meltdowns and troubles with nuclear waste, continued for the next decade until, in 1979, the worst nuclear disas- ter in the US history occurred at the Three Mile Island Generating Station, an acci- dent that would ultimately cost $1 billion in clean-up. The nuclear industry never recovered from the events of Three Mile Island, as 110 orders for nuclear power plants were cancelled after that, and the last order for a nuclear reactor actually built in the United States was placed in 1974.

At the present time, thirty-one countries have operating nuclear power stations; however only six of these are responsible for about 75 per cent of production: France, Germany, Japan, Russia, South Korea and the United States. A new reactor has been designed, called the ‘European Pressurised Reactor’ (EPR), to produce cost-effective nuclear energy at the two sites France and Finland, where they have been under construction, however they have proven to be incredibly costly and serious concerns over safety have been raised. Designers hope that the reactor will usher in a new ‘nuclear renaissance’ and make nuclear energy more competitive. It has been pro- posed by the United States that only a few selected countries be allowed to produce nuclear energy: China, France, Germany, India, Japan, the Netherlands, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States. The list excludes all Islamic countries and most of the global south (and the only countries of the global south on the list are generally the US friendly). The countries excluded from the list would have to buy their nuclear energy from those who are privileged enough to produce it (Abramsky 2010). Bernard Weinstein, an energy economist at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, Texas, said about nuclear reactors that China is pushing ahead big time with nuclear. They’ve got 26 gigawatts of nuclear plants under construction (Jung 2013). On top of that, ten plants are being built in Russia and six are being built in India. This recent increase in nuclear reactor construction has slightly increased demand for uranium, ‘So if someone was looking to invest in mining uranium ore in the United States, it’s probably going to be for markets abroad’, said Weinstein (Jung 2013).

According to the OECD’s ‘World Energy Outlook’, a significant increase in nuclear energy to replace fossil fuels would be required to maintain greenhouse gases below 450 ppm. Many environmental groups view 450 ppm as too high and hope to keep them below 350 ppm, which has already been surpassed and will require the removal of greenhouse gases from the atmosphere. One way to combat the release of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere is to replace fossil fuels with nuclear energy, because nuclear does not release any greenhouse gases during the energy production process (though mining and transportation and such do release gases). Throughout the whole process, including extraction, milling, enrichment, transportation and energy production, less greenhouse gases are released than in the life cycle of solar power production.

Despite its lack of greenhouse gas emissions, nuclear does present some very harmful and infamous problems to the environment. I’ve already talked about ura- nium mining and its effects on the environment and human health, but there are also problems with nuclear energy such as reactor meltdowns and leaks. Accidents such as the Three Mile Island disaster in 1979, the Chernobyl disaster in 1986 and the Fukushima disaster of 2011 are a few examples, and while nuclear disasters are not commonplace, the infrequency of their occurrence is perhaps outweighed by the severity of the disasters they cause. Nuclear meltdowns and reactor leaks cause serious environmental destruction and are harmful to human health in a capacity that is hardly seen anywhere else. In addition to this, nuclear waste has to be kept in isolation for anywhere from tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of years. Ten thousand years ago we were just developing agriculture, can we imagine where we will be 10,000 years from now? The possibility of future societies not knowing the dangers of nuclear waste is why we have developed symbols for radioactivity and biohazards that we hope would be effective in warning future peoples of danger without having to use written language that they may not understand.

Currently, nuclear energy production, though rising, is not rising as fast as energy consumption, and as the climate worsens due to overuse of fossil fuels, the need for a form of energy that produces at the rate of fossil fuels is growing more and more. However, it is hardly possible to maintain the percentage of energy that nuclear energy makes up as energy demands increase, it is estimated that over the next ten years, eighty new reactors would have to be built simply to maintain its current share, let alone begin replacing fossil fuels. Further, as oil supplies decrease (though we are in no danger of running out before we experience ecological col- lapse), competition for such resources grows fiercer. And any model for increasing nuclear energy production has to take into account uranium supplies and current reactor capacity. It is estimated that sometime between now and 2030, uranium stockpiles will be depleted, and production cannot increase at a fast enough rate to make up for the increase in demand for energy. About 2.3 Mt of uranium have been produced and known remaining reserves are generally of lower quality and lower concentration so they may not be worth the energy it takes to extract them. If estimates of undiscovered uranium from the Nuclear Energy Agency are included, reserved double or quadruple, which gives some hope to the prospect of a uranium- fuelled future, but not much. The likelihood of these reserves being found is less than the likelihood of not being found, and they are far too speculative for any seri- ous planning of what the future of energy is going to look like (Abramsky 2010).

The life cycle of a nuclear power plant is a long one, including several years of planning and at least five years of construction. The plant may then operate for sev- eral decades, with estimates being around forty years. Some 45 per cent of reactors have been operating for over twenty-five years, and about 90 per cent have been operating for more than fifteen. Current nuclear reactors should begin reaching the end of their lifetime around 2030, at which time they will need be replaced in order to maintain productive capacity, but serious planning for this time has yet to have taken place (ibid.).

Twelve countries – Argentina, Bulgaria, Congo, Czech Republic, France, Gabon, Germany, Hungary, Portugal, Romania, Spain and Tajikistan – have all depleted their uranium supplies, and the bulk of known uranium supplies remain in Kazakh- stan, Canada and Australia. Only if we can construct adequate nuclear breeding reactors (which generate more fissile material than they consume) can we ensure that uranium supplies do not run out over the next twenty years. However, neither nuclear breeding reactors nor thorium reactors, which will be discussed further in this chapter, can be built in time to be cost-efficient and competitive in the market. Other forms of alternative energy exist beyond nuclear that many readers will be aware of, and certainly they will play an increasing role in the future of our energy system, but as of now they all have problems that need to be solved before they can be put into use on the scale that we currently require. Solar power as a technology is consistently getting better but it has some serious drawbacks that get forgotten by people when imagining a green energy future. First, the mining of rare earth miner- als for solar panels is especially harmful to the environment, as any mining is, and some minerals are scarce. The second reason is solar panels last only for a few years before they need to be replaced and are difficult to recycle. Finally, solar panels get incredibly hot, which can be seriously harmful to animals and plants near the solar farms. Another possible alternative is geothermal energy, which harnesses the earth’s internal heat to use underground steam to turn turbines to generate electricity. Pockets of underground steam are rare though and can be created by injecting water into the ground, but this also has the possibility of creating many of the problems associated with hydraulic fracturing.

Even with these critiques, renewable energy future is not impossible; however, two things must be done in order to ensure that these forms of energy don’t end up causing more damage. The first is that we must invest more time and energy into the research and development of renewable energy technology in order to produce it in ways that will be sustainable and environmentally friendly. The second is that we must make sure that while we are implementing these technologies, we must do it in ways that are safe for the communities they are providing for and extracting from, the people working to produce the energy and the planet as a whole. The capitalist drive to cut costs causes us to overlook safety and environmental impact in exchange for saving money, costs that can be externalized are thrust upon the most vulnerable communities. Centralized control over resources, present in hierarchical institutions, especially in capitalism, allows those with power to affect change to ignore the con- sequences of their actions while many suffer.

Since the birth of nuclear energy in the late 1940s and early 1950s, it has been proposed by scientists that we could produce nuclear energy with materials other than uranium, notably thorium. The idea to use thorium instead of uranium to produce energy was originally proposed in the late-1940s, but the government refused to fund research into it because the process burned excess plutonium, while the government needed the plutonium to build nuclear weapons during the Cold War. However, as the climate crisis grows more direr and alternative energy sources are not progressing fast enough to replace fossil fuels soon, we need to find a way to power our civilization that is both ecologically friendly and can meet our energy demands. Thorium-based nuclear energy solves these problems and more.

The first advantage of thorium is that it is abundant in nature. It is estimated that three times as much thorium on earth than uranium is available, and currently we have few uses for it, and it mostly ends up as a waste product, contaminating rivers after mining rare earth metals. The second advantage to thorium, especially considering how abundant it is, is that it produces far more energy than any other current energy source. One tonne of thorium can produce as much energy as 200 tonnes of uranium, or 3.5 million tonnes of coal. Also, all thorium is usable for energy, as opposed to the small percentage of uranium that is usable, and therefore does not require enrichment, which also saves time and energy in producing the fuel. Additionally, the waste produced by thorium-based nuclear power needs to be kept isolated only for a few hundred years, unlike waste products from uranium reactors which have to be kept isolated for up to hundreds of thousands of years. Thorium’s melting point is also approximately 500°C higher than that of uranium, which provides an extra margin of safety against meltdowns in reactors. There are still the issues of the immense initial investment in the construction of power plants, and the issues of the impact of mining (though mining is likely to continue, so we might as well use the upturned thorium rather than let it contaminate rivers), but a dialogue around thorium and nuclear energy should be happening.

CONCLUSION

Capitalism has turned uranium from a nuisance into a valuable commodity. The capitalist drive for cheap sources of energy turned uranium into nuclear energy, but the need for profit kept capitalism from turning nuclear energy into a practically free, practically limitless resource for the people to use. Capitalist cost-cutting and externalizing damages have turned nuclear energy into one of the most taboo forms of energy in the world. The need to exploit impoverished peoples for cheap labour fuelled colonialism in the four corners region of the United States. Capitalism and production for profit have turned uranium, and all sources of energy, into questions of cost-efficiency and marketability rather than a question of resource-efficiency, safety and human need.

The ‘irregular warfare’ of American colonialism led to the creation of nuclear weapons out of uranium. The possibility of nuclear immolation is all-too-real of a fear, and it is one that is the culmination of over 500 years of colonialism. And not only did colonialism fuel the conception of the weaponry, but it is through colonial- ism that people were able to obtain the uranium to build the weaponry. Exploiting the labour of Navajo people in the four corners and of African people in Shinkol- obwe would fuel the uranium bombs that would be dropped on Japan in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as well as the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers that played a danger- ous game of chess with ‘third world’ countries during the Cold War.

Uranium has the potential for so much good and so much harm to the biosphere. The radioactivity and chemical toxicity of uranium requires that it be carefully handled and used so that it does not cause damage to ecological and human health. But currently the prospects of replacing fossil fuels otherwise are looking slim. Insti- tutions such as capitalism and the state have made nuclear power dangerous and destructive, by producing power for profit rather than for safety, to meet human needs and to liberate us from the chains of fossil fuels. If we wish to develop other forms of alternative energy to their fullest capacity, and if we wish to use nuclear energy to safely power our civilization, we must abandon centralization and the profit motive, and we must produce communally, through participatory planning, and for human need.

Uranium has a long, complex and dark past: a past of colonialism, imperialism and environmental destruction. But uranium is not inherently evil, it is merely a radioactive element with ninety-two protons and isotopes ranging from U-233 to U-238. It is through the process of commodification and exploitation for the ben- efit of the few at the expense of the many that uranium, like many other things, becomes a tool for evil. Uranium may have a dark past, but if we can move past capitalism and promote ideas of non-hierarchical social organization and ecologi- cal principles, perhaps it can have a better future (or perhaps it will be abandoned altogether, but a dialogue must happen, and we must think outside of capitalism while it happens).

#### Viewing nuclear energy as a common good defines what is “common” and what is “good” in a way that erases subaltern indigenous epistemes deemed uncredible by nuclear environmentalists.

Romy Opperman 23 11/1/23 (Romy Opperman is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at the New School for Social Research, NYC. Romy’s research centers on feminist Africana, Indigenous, and decolonial thinkers to foreground issues of racism and colonialism for environmental and climate ethics and justice and to highlight the importance of marginalized perspectives for liberated climate futures. Specifically, her work is oriented by philosophies that trouble theories of justice inherited from liberal political philosophy, and by practices of freedom operative in Black ecologies, place-based movements, and struggles overland and ecological issues. “Anti-Nuclear Anti-Colonial Feminism” Women in Philosophy https://blog.apaonline.org/2023/11/01/anti-nuclear-anti-colonial-feminism/)//evw

My use of the term anti-colonial is informed by Max Liboiron (Red River Métis/Michif and settler) in Pollution is Colonialism, as well as my long-standing engagement with anti-colonial thinkers and militants such as Frantz Fanon. Despite the differences between them, both approaches start with accounts of colonial land relations, as opposed to intentions. On Liboiron’s view, the features of colonial land relations always have pollution as the outcome, are marked by fantasies of disposability and containment, and are therefore predicated on access to Indigenous lands and bodies. Starting with colonial land relations allows us to see how colonialism reproduces itself (and our role in it) despite well-intentioned efforts (such as environmentalism) that seek to treat its worst effects. On my view, nuclear environmentalism is a great example of this phenomenon, and thus the need for ecological approaches that start with an understanding of colonial land relations. Starting with colonial land relations entails carefully moving between different scales, to trace the afterlives and radioactive nodes of nuclear—(whether weapons or energy)—that link those living with nuclear in a virtual web of what Lou Cornam calls “the irradiated international.” The term anti-colonial stresses a political commitment and shared project, one that is profoundly informed by the insights, demands, and struggles of Indigenous and other people subject to colonialism, imperialism, and racism, but is not confined to members of such groups. An anticolonial approach also does not claim to be doing “Indigenous” philosophy—a claim that often effectively amounts to erasure and appropriation (or unintentional reproduction of colonialism).

Why anti-colonial feminist? Understanding of colonialism as land relations cannot be disentangled from the imposition of a system of gender-sexuality as a crucial tactic in land expropriation, dispossession, and genocide. Default (white) ecofeminist approaches to nuclear have focused on the intergenerational and reproductive ethics of nuclear weapons. Anti-colonial feminist perspectives, however, are longer and wider. Longer, since unlike approaches that consider nuclear “risks” as a theoretical future or one-off event, anti-colonial feminists work with the fact of continual and widespread nuclear use and often live with its past, present, and perilous future. They are wider since they include the whole nuclear fuel chain, as well as analyses of heteropatriarchal power that begin with racial capitalism, (settler) colonialism, and imperialism, and because they reflect on a different set of issues and values (such as land-based relations and spiritual obligations) targeted by nuclear. These wider and longer perspectives offer important lessons for all of us and our shared nuclear climate future.

As Winona LaDuke and Ward Churchill warned in 1985:

The new colonialism knows no limits. Expendable populations will be expended. National sacrifice areas will be sacrificed. New populations and new areas will be targeted, expended and sacrificed. There is no sanctuary. The colonialism is radioactive; what it does can never be undone. Left to its own dynamics to run its course, it will spread across the planet like the cancer it is. It can never be someone else’s problem; regardless of its immediate location at the moment, it has become the problem and the peril of everyone alive, and who will be alive. The place to end it is where it has taken root, where it disclosed its inner nature. The time to end it is now.

We would do well to listen now. Let’s be clear. Nuclear energy = extractivism or colonial land relations + imperialism. We cannot divorce nuclear weapons from nuclear power. As Anne Sisson Runyan notes: “the same nuclear fuel chain upon which weapons rely would remain intact and balloon as more and more non-nuclear weapon states adopted nuclear power. That nuclear fuel chain runs from uranium mining to nuclear power and weapons production and testing as well as the resulting nuclear waste. While apocalyptic visions of nuclear war suggest indiscriminate destruction, the relatively non-spectacular field chain is highly discriminatory.” Starting with the mines, with the denuded, disemboweled, irradiated land and the near decimation of all it sustains, we cannot forget that nuclear entails the extraction of a finite resource that remains radioactive for at least 100,000 years. Reckoning with the abandoned mines and the uncountable open piles and streams of radioactive tailings, reckoning with the man camps, the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, and other related forms of gender-based and sexual violence, reckoning with the global trails of inter-species/generational illness, the premature and often horrific death, it’s hard to know whether to laugh or cry in the face of claims that nuclear is a “green” “sustainable” net zero energy source that some philosophers have concluded we are “ethically mandated” to endorse. How is this possible? How did they reach this conclusion? And how is nuclear environmentalism becoming a commonsense solution for climate futures?

One explanation is that from Niger to India to Canada, uranium is on Indigenous land. In addition to mines, facilities at various stages of the nuclear cycle are overwhelmingly sited within or near BIPOC communities. Discounting those worst affected by the nuclear fuel chain is a prerequisite for greenwashing nuclear. The agency, resistance, and knowledge of the BIPOC womxn who have resisted and chronicled its effects are erased and forgotten. Luckily for the industry, this erasure is relatively easy in a world that disqualifies such womxn from epistemic credibility.

The view that nuclear is best for the common good presupposes constricted notions of the common and the good. Indeed, the fallout of nuclear on BIPOC womxn and children is not coincidental. Nuclearism is inextricable from the reproductive futurity of colonialism and imperialism. Nuclear has been tied to the imposition of dimorphic gender, a narrow model of (nuclear) family life, and associated patterns of proper conduct and consumption (patterns that require abundant energy—energy that is supposedly supplied by nuclear power). As the reproduction of a colonial regime of gender-sexuality, nuclear kills two birds with one stone: (1) dispossession: gaining land for use as “sinks,” buffer, or sacrifice zones that (radioactive) colonialism is predicated on. This serves the end of (2) genocide: by attacking and undermining Indigenous and non-normative forms of kinship, gender-sexuality, community power, and organization, as well as associated forms of land tenure and relative autonomy, and through wildly harmful and intergenerational and reproductive health effects, nuclear is effectively a eugenic measure that supplements others strategies such as forced sterilization and family separation.

#### Thus, the only alternative is decolonization.

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, 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.

#### The role of the ballot is to embody refusal of settler logics that get normalized within the settler psyche and naturalize dispossessive violence. Settler colonialism is reliant on the everyday reiteration of ‘settler common sense.’

Rifkin 13 – [Mark, Associate Professor of English & WGS @ UNC-Greensboro. "Settler common sense." Settler Colonial Studies 3.3-4 (2013): 322-340 http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2013.810702] ansh

* Spec – rob > theory, offense is a rejection of set col ideologies, operates prefiat. We’ll defend reasonable preferences on specificity in CX.

This affective experience productively can be characterized as an instantiation of what more broadly may be characterized as settler common sense. The phrase suggests the ways the legal and political structures that enable non-Native access to Indigenous territories come to be lived as given, as simply the unmarked, generic conditions of possibility for occupancy, association, history, and personhood. Addressing whiteness in Australia, Fiona Nicoll argues that “rather than analysing and evaluating Indigenous sovereignty claims…, we have a political and intellectual responsibility to analyse and evaluate the innumerable ways in which White sovereignty circumscribes and mitigates the exercise of Indigenous sovereignty”, and she suggests that “we move towards a less coercive stance of reconciliation with when we fall from perspective into an embodied recognition that we already exist within Indigenous sovereignty”. 2 Addressing the question of how settlement as a system of coercive incorporation and expropriation comes to be lived as **quotidian** forms of non-Native being and potential, though, may require tactically shifting the analytical focus such that Indigenous sovereignties are **not at the center** of critical attention, even as they remain crucial in animating the study of settler colonialism and form its ethical horizon. “An embodied recognition” of the enduring presence of settler sovereignty, as well as of quotidian non-Native implication in the dispossession, effacement, and management of indigeneity, needs to attend to everyday experiences of non-relation, of a perceptual engagement with place, various institutions, and other people that takes shape around the policies and legalities of settlement but that do not specifically refer to them as such or their effects on Indigenous peoples. In order to conceptualize the mundane dynamics of settler colonialism, the quotidian feelings and tendencies through which it is continually reconstituted and experienced as the horizon of everyday potentiality, we may need to shift from an explicit attention to articulations of Native sovereignty and toward an exploration of the processes through which settler geographies are lived as **ordinary**, non-reflexive conditions of possibility. In Marxism and Literature, Raymond Williams argues for the necessity of approaching “relations of domination and subordination” as “practical consciousness” that saturat[es] … the whole substance of **lived identities and relationships**, to such a depth that the pressures and limits of what can ultimately be seen as a specific economic, political, and cultural system seem to most of us the pressures and limits of simple experience and **common sense**.3 Understanding settlement as, in Williams’s terms, such a “structure of feeling” entails asking how emotions, sensations, psychic life take part in the (ongoing) process of realizing the exertion of non-Native authority over Indigenous peoples, governance, and territoriality in ways that saturate quotidian life but are not necessarily present to settlers as a set of political propositions or as a specifically imperial project of dispossession. In the current scholarly efforts to characterize settler colonialism, the contours of settlement often appear analytically as clear and coherent from the start, as a virtual totality, and in this way, the ongoing processes by which settler dominance actively is **reconstituted** as a set of actions, occupations, deferrals, and potentials **slide from view**. We need to ask how the regularities of settler colonialism are materialized in and through quotidian non-Native sensations, inclinations, and trajectories. Moreover, administrative initiatives and legalities become part of everyday normalizations **of state aims and mappings** but in ways that also allow for an exceeding of state interests that potentially can be turned back against the state, giving rise to oppositional projects still given shape and momentum by the framings that emerge out of the ongoing work of settler occupation – such as in Walden. The essay will close with a brief reading of Thoreau’s text that illustrates how its ethical framing emerges out of, and indexes, everyday forms of settler feeling shaped by state policy but not directly continuous with it. 1. **The figure of the** vanishing Indian still remains prominent within US popular and scholarly discourses, both explicitly and implicitly. Within this narrative, Native peoples may have had prior claims to the land, but they, perhaps tragically, were removed from the area, or died out, or ceased to be “really” Indian, or simply disappeared at some point between the appearance of the “last” one and the current moment, whenever that may be.4 As against this tendency, scholars who seek to track the workings of settler colonialism face an entrenched inattention to the ways non-Native conceptions and articulations of personhood, place, property, and political belonging coalesce around and through the dispossession of Native peoples and normalization of (the) settler (-state’s) presence on Native lands. Insistence on the systemic quality of such settler seizures, displacements, identifications responds to this relative absence of acknowledgment by emphasizing its centrality and regularity, arguing that the claiming of a naturalized right to Indigenous place lies at the heart of non-Native modes of governance, association, and identity. However, such figurations of the **pervasive** and enduring quality of settler colonialism may shorthand its workings, producing accounts in which it appears as a fully integrated whole operating in smooth, consistent, and intentional ways across the socio-spatial terrain it encompasses. Doing so, particularly in considering the exchange between the domains of formal policy and of everyday life, may displace how settlement’s histories, brutalities, effacements, and interests become quotidian and common-sensical. Looking at three different models, I want to sketch varied efforts to systemize settler colonialism, highlighting some questions that emerge when they are read in light of issues of process and affect.

#### Our interpretation is that the judge ought to evaluate the aff as a research project – they don’t get to weigh the material implementation of the case.

## 2NC

### Framework---2NC

### AT: TFW

#### 8. APATHY---fiat iteratively individuates us and trains us to defer to a higher authority for change to ever take place.

Mitchell 98 [Gordon Mitchell, Associate Professor of Communication and Director of Debate at the University of Pittsburg, The Rostrum, p.11-12, 1998, we don’t endorse gendered language] suits

Most mainstream conceptions of fiat contain a common structural feature the idea that fiat is a construction which affords debaters the latitude to make assumptions about external actors. The assumption that a specified agent will “carry out the plan” if the affirmative team proves its desirability inscribes this externality by structurally separating the advocate from the specified agent of change. Likewise, the idea that the negative team “has the power” to mandate an alternative course of action by the same (or another) external actor endorses this same kind of structural separation between debater and agent of change. Advocacy , under this view of fiat, takes place on this plane of simulation. The power that backs a debaters’ command that “we mandate the following…” is a mirage a phantasm allowed to masquerade as genuine for the purpose of allowing the game of political simulation to take place. Debaters have no real authority over the actors they employ to implement their ideas in plans and counter-plans, yet the simulation of such authority is recognized as an essential fiction necessary to allow the game of policy debate to unfold. One problem with such approaches to fiat which feature such a structural separation between advocate and agent of change is that such approaches ten to instill a spectator mentality. The function of fiat which gives debaters simulated political control over external actors coaxes students to gloss over consideration of their concrete roles as involved agents in the controversies they research. The construct of fiat, in this vein serves as a political crutch by alleviating the burden of demonstrating a connection between in round advocacy and the action by external actors defended in plan or counter-plan mandates. A second manner in which the structural features of this sort of fiat tend to circumscribe active political involvement is through the containment of fiat action within the spatio-temporal boundaries of the contest round. The fiction of simulated authority evaporates when the judge issues his/her decision and the debaters disband and head to the next round. Advocacy, resting on the ephemeral foundation of simulation is here a causal and fleeting phenomenon that carries with it few significant future ramifications or responsibilities. By cultivating an ethic of detachment from the actual polis this view of advocacy introduces a politically regressive dynamic into the academic debate process.

### AT: Fairness – 2NC

#### 1 – Procedural fairness should be rejected when it is used to sustain indigenous genocide.

Stanley 21– (Michelle A. Stanley (Coharie) is a graduate student in the Public Administration Master’s program at UNC Charlotte, where she also works as a University Program Associate in the Office of Institutional Research. She received a post-baccalaureate graduate certificate in gender, sexuality, and women’s studies and a BA in Sociology and Psychology, with a Minor in HGHR Studies, from UNC Charlotte. "Beyond erasure: Indigenous genocide denial and settler colonialism." Denial: The Final Stage of Genocide. Routledge, 2021. 131-147, HKR-AS)   
Despite the importance of acknowledging Indigenous genocide within the U.S., acknowledgment is insufficient to challenge settler colonialism. Settler colonial ideology is internalized and naturalized among non-Native and Indigenous communities through internal modes of colonialism. **Settler colonialism moves beyond a re-telling of history to establish policies and procedures that uphold the settler state and ensure settler futurity**. Due to the pervasiveness of settler colonialism, settlers do not have a framework for “another” way within the U.S. Settler colonial ideals and values including, private property, individualism, Christianity, patriarchal systems, lineage, and governance, medicalized healing, and capitalism **are embedded within U.S. policies**, structures, families, schools, churches, **and every space within the settler state.**

Further, the pervasiveness of settler colonial ideology is most clearly demonstrated by the presence of these ideals within Indigenous communities. Within Indigenous tribal nations, settler colonial ideals have infiltrated traditions and have become naturalized as the “way it’s always been.” For instance, heteropatriarchal ideals have supplanted Indigenous traditions of gender and sexuality diversity within many Indigenous communities. The same-sex marriage bans within the Cherokee and Navajo Nations demonstrates the pervasiveness of heteropatriarchal settler colonial ideals (Nenetdale, 2017, Justice, 2010). Additionally, the discrimination against Indigenous Two-Spirits within their own communities/nations demonstrates the infiltration of heteropatriarchal settler colonial ideals (Gilley, 2006). These examples of heteropatriarchal ideals within Indigenous tribal nations represents the internalization of settler colonial ideals. **However, Indigenous Peoples have and continue to be pressured to conform to settler colonial culture in order to gain legitimacy and to be perceived as “civilized.”**

The internalization and naturalization of settler colonial ideals is not the only issue associated with simply acknowledging Indigenous genocide. Many Indigenous scholars argue that “genocide” is inadequate to acknowledge the continuation of colonial processes within the U.S. and Canada. Essentially, Indigenous scholars argue that genocide framework often positions harm in the past, ignoring the ongoing settler colonial structures and processes (Simpson, 2014). The U.S. and Canada already position harms to Indigenous Peoples as situated in the past as evidenced by Canadian Prime Minister, Stephen Harper’s apology in 2008 and the U.S. apology written in 2009. Both apologies refer only to past events, ignoring the ongoing settler colonial processes and structures. While neither Canada nor the U.S. formally acknowledge Indigenous genocide, the naming of Indigenous genocide would not change the ways these settler states navigate their relationships with Indigenous Peoples. Specifically, the designation of genocide would likely prompt more apologies for past actions, after all, the Canadian apology only referred to the harms associated with the residential school system and not any other settler colonial actions. These apologies fail to address the ongoing settler colonial policies and structures that continue to harm Indigenous Peoples. Further, they continue to position Indigenous Peoples in the past when referring to their relationships with land, traditions, and sovereignty. **Any acknowledgment of Indigenous genocide must address settler colonialism, or it will further perpetuate settler colonialism**. Simply, settler colonialism will not disappear just from the inclusion of Indigenous genocide in the U.S. and Canadian narratives.

### AT: Clash – 2NC

### Ballot---2NC

#### 1. NEUROLOGY---fMRI proves habituated engagement with their rhetoric causes pre-conscious brain trauma.

Jewel ’17 [Lucy; 2017; Professor of Law and Director of Legal Writing @ the University of Tennessee College of Law; Maryland Law Review, “Neurorhetoric, Race, and the Law: Toxic NeuralPathways and Healing Alternatives,” vol. 76, no. 3] jchen

I. DEVELOPING THE DISCIPLINE OF NEURORHETORIC

A. The Foundation: Conceptions of Rhetoric

Neurorhetoric is a new discipline that applies neuroscience to understand how rhetoric stimulates activity that can actually change the shape and form of the brain. To set the foundation, it is useful to return to the original understanding of the term rhetoric. Ancient Greek rhetoricians defined rhetoric as the art of persuasion and/or a process for discovering truth by argumentation.' This conception of rhetoric is fairly narrow, in contrast to the word's original etymology. Rhetoric derives from the Greek word "eird," or "I say." Rhetoric could mean "[a]lmost anything related to the act of saying something to someone . ... The point here is that rhetoric relates to language, conversation, words, and even images. A broader conception of rhetoric complements the ideas in this Essay, which addresses how words and phrases become cemented inside the brain in such a way as to influence thoughts and beliefs.

<<CONDENSED, NONE OMITTED>>

As a matter of orientation, neurorhetoric sits within the discipline of modem rhetoric, the study of persuasion and communication in a variety of contexts-ancient narratives, poetry, literature, popular culture, film, television, and the news media. Modem rhetoric is also interdisciplinary, engaging with social and scientific theories to understand how people are persuaded. Legal rhetoric, described more fully below, studies persuasion in a legal advocacy setting. This Essay draws upon both modem rhetoric studies and legal rhetoric disciplines. B. The Mind: Cognitive Rhetoric and Cognitive Science Neurorhetoric descends from cognitive rhetoric, the application of cognitive science, or the study of "how people conceptualize the world[,]" to rhetoric. Cognitive rhetoric might be understood as the generalized study of how the human mind responds to persuasive stinuli.8 Cognitive rhetoric is often focused on two fundamental concepts-metaphors and categories. Metaphors and categories are devices that help humans streamline thoughts when confronted with complex information.' A metaphor allows the human mind to connect one concept to another in an automatic and embodied way.o The metaphor of more correlating with up (positive) and less correlating with down (negative) exemplifies a concept that has become deeply connected to the mind, the body, and the physical environment." When we remark that things are "looking up" to express a positive outlook, we are expressing an embodied metaphor, without realizing the connection between the positivity and the upwards direction. Moreover, the directional shifts, up or down, reflect the physical way that the metaphor bridges connections between our minds and our physical bodies. Categories are often comprised of one or more associative metaphors. We "pick out parts of our experience and treat them as discrete entities or substances of a uniform kind."1 2 For instance, when we categorize someone as motherly or maternal, we apply widely shared physical experiences to give a category a metaphorical meaning. The understanding that a maternal person is a warm and caring person stems from early childhood experiences that have become deeply embodied. As infants (for most but not all individuals), we associated our mother with warmth, food, and nurturance. This example illustrates how the connectedness of the two conceptsmotherhood with warmth and caring-arose from our bodily experiences.13 Like metaphors, categories function unconsciously and rapidly. 14 Lakoff and Johnson explain: Understanding our experiences in terms of objects and substances allows us to pick out parts of our experience and treat them as discrete entities or substances of a uniform kind. Once we can identify our experiences as entities or substances, we can refer to them, categorize them, group them, and quantify them-and, by this means, reason about them." When we are confronted with a category, our mind quickly grasps the complexity of the concept. We simplify complex information when the various parts of the concept come together in one unified whole. Further, categories do not always reflect objective truths about the material world; rather, they may be based on subjective choices that reflect one's culture or individual experience.' 6 Culture can produce unified categories that function as metaphorical "code" for more implicit concepts. 17 For example, when we use the category "unwed mother" or "working mother," our mind quickly latches onto the majoritarian cultural values associated with these categories.' 8 Both of these categories imply that the mother is less than ideal. Social stereotypes cognitively function as coded categories, collectively understood to refer to negative generalizations about a social or racial group.' 9 Social and racial stereotypes rely on metonymy, the concept that some or a few attributes of a category stand for the whole. 2 0 In her masterful article, Deadbeat Dads & Welfare Queens: How Metaphor Shapes Poverty Law, Professor Ann Cammett utilizes cognitive rhetoric to explain the "Welfare Queen" epithet, which conveyed a powerful, racially coded message generating political disfavor for social welfare legislation in the 1970s.21 The Welfare Queen trope developed out of a 1970s news story concerning an unmarried mother who fraudulently used aliases to obtain welfare benefits in the 1970s, abusing the benefits system to amass cash and wealth.2 2 Ronald Reagan repeatedly popularized the term in stump speeches, raising ire directed toward the Welfare Queen, her cash, and her Cadillac.23 The fraudulent practices of one welfare recipient became, in metynomic fashion, the category that stood for all mothers on welfare. The Welfare Queen term relied on the metaphorical category of mother, but defined mother in the alterity, as an exemplar of a mother with loose morals and little virtue. 2 4 The reference to other attributes of category membership-the Cadillac for instance-functioned to cement an implicit and collective understanding that mothers on welfare were primarily black, even though the majority of those on public assistance at the time were white.25 With one shot over the bow, the Welfare Queen rhetoric generated a synthesis of negative racial stereotypes about struggling mothers living in poverty. In historical context, the Welfare Queen example illustrates the socalled "Southern Strategy," a new type of racially coded rhetoric deployed by conservative politicians after the civil rights movement when it became impolite to display overt racism. In an infamous recorded interview, Lee Atwater, an architect of the Southern Strategy, explained that in lieu of using racial epithets to foment support (as had been the practice in the 1930s and 1940s), it was much more effective to utilize abstract categories like "forced busing, states' rights, and all that stuff," which functioned as code words indicating the superior interests of white citizens over those of black 26 citizens.

<<PARAGRAPH BREAKS RESUME>>

C. The Brain: Neuroscience

Building upon cognitive rhetoric, neurorhetoric expands our understanding of how persuasion works, studying how informational stimuli interact within the neural pathways of the brain. Neuroscience explains that when we think, electrochemical reactions fire and are conducted from one place to another in our synapses, the connective spaces between two neuron cells in our brain. 2 7 This activity occurs through neural circuits or networks.28 Whereas cognitive rhetoric might be conceived as the study of how persuasion works in the mind, neurorhetoric looks at how persuasion works in a biological sense, in the brain.29

Thus, neurorhetoric seeks to connect neuroscientific understandings of cognition and thought to rhetoric, adding another layer of understanding for how meaning is created in the brain. Central to neurorhetoric are the concepts of neuroplasticity, mapping, and canalization/attenuation. Neurorhetoric's biggest takeaway is the idea that discursive stimuli (such as words or categories) can actually impact the structure of the brain, individually and on a mass scale.

Neuroplasticity is the concept that the structure of one's brain can be altered by one's experience. When we think a certain thought or perform a physical action, our brain's neuron cells fire in different areas, coming together to complete the task. As we repeat a mental operation, these neurons continue to fire in different areas and eventually become fused together in a network or circuit.3 0 "Cells that fire together wire together" is a pithy quote that captures the idea of various neural electrical pathways forging together in a single circuit based on repeated triggering.

This process of welding different neural paths into one connected path is also known as mapping.3 2 For an example, let us return to the discussion of the mother metaphor, discussed above. When parts of a baby's brain dealing with appetite, physical temperature, and affection are triggered in the presence of the mother, a network of connected neural pathways fuse together, linking concepts of warmth and sustenance with the concept of the child's mother.33 As the infant is repeatedly exposed to the mother who feeds and provides comfort, these previously separate neural networks become more connected and entrenched. Eventually, the biological association of "mother" with warmth, nurturance, and caring gives rise to an abstract metaphor, seen in concepts like "he's a warm person," or "she's a block of ice." 34

The deepening of neural pathways in response to repeated exposure to a stimulus can be understood as a process of canalization occurring in the plastic brain. Our brains become "perpetually altered" by every encounter and every interaction. Canalization of neural paths has been analogized to what happens when sledding on a snowy hill. The first time one sleds down a hill, new tracks are made. In subsequent trips down the slope, more likely than not, one selects a path that has already been forged. The more sledding that occurs, the deeper the existing tracks become.36 Once we have created these tracks in the brain, they become "'really speedy' and very efficient at guiding the sled down the hill."37 Once a thought becomes cemented in the brain, that thought appears with great rapidity and arises unconsciously.

Once a concept has been synaptically cemented by continued activation of the same neural pathways by the same stimulus, it becomes highly difficult to undo. 39 Through a process of attenuation, alternative pathways in the brain can become cut off.40 This happens because the development of neural pathways is "a competitive process, one in which the connections that are used are kept and those that go unused are eliminated."41 Thus, "[o]nce a particular plastic change occurs in the brain and becomes well established, it can prevent other changes from occurring." 42

Canalization and attenuation explain how ideas get stuck in our brains. When mental concepts become canalized, they become deep-seated habits of thought, which then cut off competing thought patterns.43 The more a neural pathway becomes entrenched in the brain, the more certainty we have with respect to the associated thought.4 4 And these ideas can be good or bad. We have all heard the term "toxic brain loop." In neuroscience parlance, that concept refers to an entrenched neural pathway that has cut off more positive thought patterns. But there is also the possibility that healthy thought patterns can become canalized, which would implant positive pathways in the brain but weaken more negative patterns.

II. GETTING HIGH: RHETORIC INSIDE OUR BRAINS AND BODIES

As a stimulus that triggers thought, rhetoric can change the brain's structure, both individually and collectively.45 When we are asked to consider a thought pattern over and over again (a common rhetorical strategy), we are left with a mark in our brains. 46 Contrary to the deeply held Western belief that there is a separation between the mind and the body, rhetoric can get inside our brains and bodies and make us think and feel things without the intervention of conscious rationality. In a nutshell, neurorhetoric challenges traditional conceptions of reason and choice.4 7

The embodied nature of thought helps explain how deeply rhetoric influences us. Thought is embodied; our thoughts are deeply interconnected to our physical bodies.48 For instance, when we read something that asks us to imagine a scene or when we view a film, we use the same neural structure of our brain that we use when living out that scene.4 9 As George Lakoff and Mark Johnson describe, "When we imagine seeing a scene, our visual cortex is active. When we imagine moving our bodies, the pre-motor cortex and motor cortex are active. "50

The concept of having a "gut feeling" about a particular outcome reflects the embodied nature of thought. Neuroscientist Antonio Damasio devised the term "somatic marker" to highlight this relationship-soma coming from the Greek word for body and marker reflecting the impact that previous thought experiences have had on our brains.5 Somatic markers represent canalized thought patterns that guide the direction, rapidly and unconsciously, of our thought processes. Rather than functioning as a form of "high reason," somatic markers highlight some options, rapidly eliminating the negative and favoring the positive.5 2 They operate at a preconscious and unconscious level. 5 3 Somatic markers "do not deliberate for us[;]" rather, they function as a "biasing device."5 4

Somatic markers are generated when we engage with a certain thought over and over again. The common rhetorical strategy of repetition seems designed to help entrench a thought or conclusion in the brain. Moreover, collective cultural experiences can produce somatic markers.55 Political scientist William Connolly has applied Damasio's somatic marker thesis and argued that with respect to culture, the rhetoric we are exposed to in television, film, and journalism can produce somatic markers that affect our thinking and judgment in an unconscious way. 56 Through mass culture, somatic markers become carved out in our brains as early as childhood, be coming "filtered into [our] mode of being" before we even develop language skills.57

Further, rhetoric's emotional aspects tend to deemphasize our critical thinking faculties. When we are presented with a stimulus that promotes emotion, it becomes difficult to think with our higher order faculties. Instead, our circuits become focused on the threatening situation and the flight or fight response.s Emotional rhetoric releases chemical reactions in our brain that subdue and dampen the part of our brain (the prefrontal cortex) that controls higher order thinking. 59 The end result is a state of mindlessness, which is analogous to a drug-induced state. 60 Emotional rhetoric is also more memorable and powerful than non-emotional rhetoric, because emotional rhetoric activates more systems in the brain, the arousal is greater, and larger neural networks become forged.61 In other words, we engage more deeply with emotional rhetoric and it feels great.

Rhetoric-induced mindlessness often happens in a collective ritualistic setting, such as when we attend a rally for our preferred political candidate or a sports game for our favorite professional or college team.6 2 In this situation, our brain dampens our critical thinking and ratchets up its emotional side.63 These situations

all involve a sublimation of individuality caused by the dampening of general neuronal communication, coupled with the intensification of the activity of a few specific neural networks. The flood of neurotransmitters that produces pleasure puts brain cells on alert, making them more receptive to signals from other neurons. Consequently, our receptivity to sensual interactions with the environment and other people is increased, but our cognitive capacity is reduced.'

In this way, rhetoric fosters communal bonds by fueling intragroup intimacy in a pleasurable way.65

A study from Emory neuroscientist Drew Westen further supports the rhetoric/drug analogy. In this brain imaging study, subjects viewed a favored political candidate making a clearly inconsistent statement. During this scenario, areas of the subjects' brains related to unpleasant distress lit up.66 The subjects then attempted to rehabilitate their candidate by applying faulty and illogical reasoning to rationalize the inconsistency; their brains were looking for "ways to turn off [this] spigot of unpleasant emotion."67 When the subjects engaged in this flawed reasoning, the brain scans indicated that the subjects were able to turn off the neural areas associated with unpleasantness and instead trigger areas of pleasure.6 8 The faulty and illogical reasoning triggered a state of pleasure in the brain, "activating reward circuits that [gave] partisans a jolt of positive reinforcement for their biased reasoning."69 The illogical reasoning provided a neural "fix" similar to what drug addicts experience.70

Viewed through the lens of neuroscience, rhetoric is like a drug-it functions beyond consciousness, heightens emotional reactions, and can produce a state of mindlessness. The Greek Sophist Gorgias believed that "persuasive discourse has effects on the human soul that, like drugs or physical force, overwhelm and cancel out the possibility of individual agency.7 1 Thus, the Greeks categorized the rhetorician in the same class as a medical doctor or mystic. 72 Ancient Greek sages feared the embodied power of rhetoric, and, as a precursor to Descartes, exhorted individuals to try to separate the mind from the body, so as to not succumb to rhetoric's powerful spell.73 Here, the ancient idea that rhetoric intrudes into and interacts with the body aligns with modern neuroscientific and cognitive theories that support an embodied approach to rhetoric.

#### 5. CONFRONTATION---positively affects spectators and judges.

Wedell et al. 22, [Emma Wedell (Graduate Student at UConn's Department of Psychological Sciences), Cheryl L. Dickter (Cheryl L. Dickter is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology and a Faculty Affiliate of the Neuroscience Program at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, VA, USA. Ph.D. in Social Psychology from the University of North Carolina.), Adrian J. Bravo (PhD in Applied Experimental Psychology from Old Dominion University), "The effects of antiracism education on intended confrontation of institutional discrimination: A game theory approach," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, pp. 377, 2022] suits

When people observe expressions of bias, they may choose to confront the perpetrator’s prejudicial speech or actions by expressing their disapproval through verbal or nonverbal behavior (e.g., Chaney & Sanchez, 2018; Dicker & Newton, 2013; Kawakami et al., 2019; Swim et al., 2003; Woodzika & LaFrance, 2001) Confronting has many intrapersonal and interpersonal benefits, one of which is to reduce perpetrators’ expressions of prejudice. For example, when White people are confronted after they demonstrate racial bias, they use self- regulatory techniques to inhibit their reliance on negative stereotypes (Chaney et al., 2020; Czopp et al., 2006; Monteith et al., 2002); this has been shown to last at least seven days after the confrontation (Chaney & Sanchez, 2018). Being confronted also leads perpetrators to engage in compensatory behaviors in future interactions, which culminate in more mutual liking between confronters and perpetrators (Mallett & Wagner, 2011). Confrontation can also have benefits for bystanders who watch the confrontation, as it establishes norms of egalitarianism (Becker & Swim, 2011; Blanchard et al., 1994). Finally, confrontation has benefits for confronters, as they feel better after doing so than when they fail to confront (Dickter et al., 2012). Together, these findings demonstrate that confrontation is a powerful tool for calling attention to the socially inappropriate and offensive nature of prejudice and discrimination.

### Link---Extinction

#### Their invocation of extinction is an empty superlative that masks structural culpability with settler logics, ensuring extinction.

Audra Mitchell 17, CIGI Chair in Global Governance and Ethics, Balsillie School of International Affairs, and Associate Professor at Wilfrid Laurier University, former Senior Lecturer in International Relations, department of Politics, University of York, Ph.D. Queen’s University of Belfast; 2017; “Decolonizing against extinction part II: Extinction is not a metaphor – it is literally genocide,” Worldly, https://worldlyir.wordpress.com/2017/09/27/decolonizing-against-extinction-part-ii-extinction-is-not-a-metaphor-it-is-literally-genocide/ - BS

Extinction has become an emblem of Western, and white-dominated, fears about ‘the end of the(ir) world’. This scientific term is saturated with emotional potency, stretched and contorted to embody almost any nightmare, from climate change to asteroid strikes. In academic and public contexts alike, it is regularly interchanged with other terms and concepts – for instance, ‘species death’, global warming or ecological collapse. Diffused into sublime scales – mass extinctions measured in millions of (Gregorian calendar) years, a planet totalized by the threat of nuclear destruction – ‘extinction’ has become an empty superlative, one that gestures to an abstract form of unthinkability. It teases Western subjects with images of generalized demise that might, if it gets bad enough, even threaten us, or the figure of ‘humanity’ that we enshrine as a universal. This figure of ‘humanity’, derived from Western European enlightenment ideals, emphasizes individual, autonomous actors who are fully integrated into the global market system; who are responsible citizens of nation-states; who conform to Western ideas of health and well-being; who partake of ‘culture’; who participate in democratic state-based politics; who refrain from physical violence; and who manage their ‘resources’ responsibly (Mitchell 2014). Oddly, exposure to the **fear of extinction** contributes to the **formation** and bolstering of contemporary Western subjects. Contemplating the sublime destruction of ‘humanity’ offers the thrill of abjection: the perverse pleasure derived from exposure to something by which one is revolted. Claire Colebrook detects this thrill-seeking impulse in the profusion of Western blockbuster films and TV shows that imagine and envision the destruction of earth, or at least of ‘humanity’. It also throbs through a flurry of recent best-selling books – both fiction and speculative non-fiction (see Oreskes and Conway 2014; Newitz 2013; Weisman 2008). In a forthcoming intervention, Noah Theriault and I (2018) argue that these imaginaries are a form of porn that normalizes the profound violences driving extinction, while cocooning its viewers in the secure space of the voyeur. Certainly, there are many Western scientists, conservationists and policy-makers who are genuinely committed to stopping the extinction of others, perhaps out of fear for their own futures. Yet extinction is not quite real for Western, and especially white, subjects; it is a fantasy of negation that evokes thrill, melancholy, anger and existential purpose. It is a metaphor that expresses the destructive desires of these beings, and the negativity against which we define our subjectivity. But extinction is not a metaphor: it is a very real expression of violence that systematically destroys particular beings, worlds, life forms and the relations that enable them to flourish. These are real, unique beings, worlds and relations – as well as somebody’s family, Ancestors, siblings, future generations – who are violently destroyed. Extinction can only be used unironically as a metaphor by people who have never been threatened with it, told it is their inevitable fate, or lost their relatives and Ancestors to it – and who assume that they probably never will. This argument is directly inspired by the call to arms issued in 2012 by Eve Tuck and Wayne K. Yang and more recently by Cutcha Risling-Baldy. The first, seminal piece demonstrates how settler cultures use the violence of metaphorical abstraction to excuse themselves from the real work of decolonization: ensuring that land and power is in Indigenous hands. Risling-Baldy’s brilliant follow-up extends this logic to explain how First People like Coyote have been reduced to **metaphors** through **settler appropriation**. In both cases, **engagement** with Indigenous peoples and their relations masks **moves to innocence**: acts that make it **appear** as if settlers are engaging in decolonization, while in fact we are **consolidating the power structures** that privilege us. In this series, want to show how Western, and white-dominated, discourses on ‘extinction’ appear to address the systematic destruction of peoples and other beings while enacting moves to innocence that mask their culpability and perpetuate structures of violence. As I argued in Part I of this series, extinction is an expression of colonial violence. As such, it needs to be addressed through direct decolonization, including the dismantling of settler colonial structures of violence, and the resurgence of Indigenous worlds. Following Tuck, Yang and Risling-Baldy’s lead, I want to show how and why the **violences that drive extinction** have come to be **invisible** within mainstream discourses. Salient amongst these is the practice of genocide against Indigenous peoples other than humans. …it is literally genocide. What Western science calls ‘extinction’ is not an unfortunate, unintended consequence of desirable ‘human’ activities. It is an embodiment of particular patterns of structural violence that disproportionately affect specific racialized groups. In some cases, ‘extinction’ is directly, deliberately and systematically inflicted in order to create space for aggressors, including settler states. For this reason, it has rightly been framed as an aspect or tool of colonial genocides against Indigenous human peoples. Indeed, many theorists have shown that the ‘extirpation’ of life forms (their total removal from a particular place) is an instrument for enacting genocide upon Indigenous humans (see Mazis 2008; Laduke 1999; Stannard 1994). Specifically, the removal of key sources of food, clothing and other basic materials makes survival on the land impossible for the people targeted. Nehiyaw thinker Tasha Hubbard (2014) makes a qualitatively distinct argument. She points out that the Buffalo are First People, the elder brothers of the Nehiyaw people (and other Indigenous nations – see Benton-Banai 2010). Starting in the mid-1800s, the tens of millions of buffalo that ranged across Turtle Island were nearly eliminated through strategic patterns of killing carried out by settler-state-sponsored military and commercial forces. Their killing was linked to governmental imperatives to clear and territorially annex the Great Plains by removing its Indigenous peoples. As Hubbard points out, methods of destroying buffalo herds included large-scale killing, but also the disruption of their social structures, the destruction of the ecosystems on which they rely, and the removal of calves. These acts involve each of the components of the definition of genocide enshrined in the UN Genocide Convention: (a) Killing members of the group; (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. From Hubbard’s viewpoint, rooted in Nehiyaw philosophy and ethical-legal principles, the systematic destruction of the buffalo is not like genocide, nor is it exclusively a tool for carrying out genocide against human peoples. It is genocide in its own right: an attempt to destroy a particular First People and the possibilities of its continuity. In other words, the deliberate and systematic attempt to eliminate the buffalo, enacted by settler states, simultaneously enacted genocide against Indigenous peoples and their nonhuman relatives. Genocides of Indigenous peoples (human and otherwise) continue apace in contemporary settler states, transformed into multiple manifestations. For instance, they are integral to ‘biosecurity’ strategies designed to police the biological boundaries of these states and their citizens. Laced with racializing and xenophobic rhetoric (Subramaniam 2001), strategies such as culling or planned eradications are intended to remove ‘invasive’ or ‘foreign’ life forms in order to protect ‘Native’ ones. Many of the ‘invasive’ life forms targeted for destruction were transported to unfamiliar lands through colonial patterns of settlement and global trade flows. However, this logic of elimination (Wolfe 2006) is often perverted, turned against Indigenous\* beings whose flourishing impedes the expansion or consolidation of the colonial state. For instance, Deborah Bird Rose (2011 a, 2011 b) shows how this form of violence is continually waged against flying foxes, who are framed by the settler state as “pest[s] whose extinction is [deliberately] sought”. This act of elimination involves explicit genocidal ideation, or the imagination of the destruction of a people. Rose characterizes it as a “matter of imagining a world without [dingoes or flying foxes], then setting out to create it” (Rose 2011a). The Australian settler state has used multiple tactics to induce terror and preclude flourishing amongst flying foxes, from the emission of high-pitched electronic signals to smearing trees with python excrement (Rose 2011b). Indeed, in 2014, I lived near to the roosting site of a group of flying foxes in Turrbal and Jagera Country (suburban Brisbane to settlers). Such nesting places are called ‘colonies’ , reflecting a Western scientific rhetoric that frames Indigenous peoples as ‘invaders’ of the settler state. The trees that housed the nesting site backed onto a municipal facility, whose fence had been covered with barbed wire, in which many of the bats snared their wings and starved to death. This ‘security’ measure – designed to protect the facilities relied upon by urban settlers from the intrusion of flying foxes – is a powerful weapon for precluding ongoing flourishing of Indigenous other-than-human peoples. I learned from neighbours that this ‘colony’ had previously been ‘moved’ from several other sites around the city, suffering significant declines in population each time. Indeed, despite reported declines of 95% in flying fox communities in Queensland and neighbouring New South Wales, the Queensland settler state legalized the shooting of the bats in 2012 by fruitgrowers. Of course, in some cases, the elimination of life forms is not as targeted or intentional – it may take the form of land-based extractive violence, the creep of ocean acidification, the decimation of rainforests by climate change. Proponents of a Eurocentric definition of genocide could argue that these events lack intention. Indeed, within international law, intention to commit genocide is a necessary criteria for conviction. However, theorists of critical genocide studies have long argued that this definition is inadequate: it brackets out a great many of the acts, logics and structures that produce the destruction of unique peoples. According to Tony Barta, definitions of genocide that focus on ‘purposeful annihilation’, and in particular on physical killing, have “devalu[ed] all other concepts of less planned destruction, even if the effects are the same” (Barta 2000, 238). For this reason, he shifts the focus from ‘genocidal intention’ to ‘genocidal outcome’ – that is, from the abstract assignation of genocidal agency to the felt and embodied effects of eliminative violence. It is the focus on intent, he contends, that allows white Australians to imagine that their relationship with Aboriginal people is non-genocidal despite overwhelming evidence of systematic and deliberate racialized destruction over several centuries. In contrast, an approach based on ‘genocidal outcomes’ makes it possible to account for complex causality and weak intentionality – that is, for myriad acts mediated by subtle, normalized structures that, together, work to eliminate a people. I want to argue that the same logic applies to nonhuman peoples: the destruction of a life form, its relations with other beings and its possible futures is a genocidal outcome, whether or not intention can be identified. Similarly, Christopher Powell (2007) argues that, since a ‘genos’ is a “network of practical social relations, destruction of a genos means the forcible breaking down of those relationships…these effects could be produced without a coherent intent to destroy. They could result from sporadic and uncoordinated actions whose underlying connection is the production of a new society in which there is simply no room for the genos in question to exist. They might even result from well-meaning attempts to do good” (Powell 2007, 538) As I have argued elsewhere, extinction is defined by the breaking of relations and the systematic destruction of the conditions of plurality that nurture co-flourishing worlds. Whether inflicted out as a deliberate act of extirpation, or as the convergent effect of eliminative logics expressed over centuries and enormous spatial scales, extinction is the destruction of relations and the heterogenous societies they nurture. Understood in this way, ‘extinction’ is not a metaphor for genocide or other forms of large-scale violence: it is a distinct manifestation of genocide. Masking the genocidal logics that drive extinction involves several moves to innocence (Tuck and Yang 2012). Treating extinction as something short of genocide entrenches Eurocentric understandings of personhood that are limited to homo sapiens, which is itself an act of violence against these peoples. Ironically, the entrenchment of this dichotomy also enables the logic of ‘dehumanization’, in which human communities are likened to reviled nonhumans (for instance, cockroaches) in order to motivate violence against them. As I have argued elsewhere (Mitchell 2014), the logic of generalised ‘dehumanisation’ is uniquely effective in Western frameworks in which the lack of ethical status for beings other than humans removes obstacles to their mass destruction. Within worlds in which human and nonhuman persons are linked through complex systems of law, treaties, protocols and long-standing relations, this claim is illogical. Within Western settler states, however, it functions as a means of justifying ongoing violence against Indigenous peoples and their relations. In addition, by framing extinction as a problem for a universal figure of ‘humanity’ (more on this to follow…) mainstream discourses of extinction obscure its profound entwinement with race and racializing structures. These examples make it clear that eliminative violence is targeted on specific groups of people and their other-than-human relations, as defined by the aggressors. Indeed, patterns of genocidal violence extend racializing categories, hierarchies and eliminative impulses to other-than-human peoples. Just as approaching gender violence separately from race effaces their intersection, understanding extinction as distinct from race is deeply misleading. This is not only because racialized people are more likely to suffer from the effects of ‘extinction’ and other forms of environmental racism (which they are). It is also because the eliminative violence that drives extinction extend and enact race beyond the category of homo sapiens by defining particular groups against white settler norms and as threats to the settler society. To approach extinction separately from issues of race is, therefore, to miss one of its most defining features. Extinction is not a metaphor – in many cases, it is quite literally genocide enacted against Indigenous peoples and their other-than-human relations. To treat it as a metaphor is to obscure and participate in the structures of violence that drive it. From this perspective, in addition to active decolonisation efforts, and the resurgence of Indigenous peoples, addressing extinction also requires attacking the genocidal, racializing, eliminative logics that are diffused throughout settler (and other) states. It also requires honouring the unique relations, worlds and peoples that are targeted by these discourses and practices.

### Link---Economy

#### Pursuit of economic development is an attempt to further settler dominion over capitalist production. Their valorization of the economy is an attempt to justify the expansion of settler society which can only be made possible through the erasure of indigenous ways of life.

**Veracini 13** — [Veracini, Lorenzo. Lorenzo Veracini is Associate Professor in history and politics at Swinburne’s Institute for Social Research. His research focuses on the comparative history of colonial systems and settler colonialism. Dr Veracini has authored publications including Israel and Settler Society (2006), Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview (2010), and The Settler Colonial Present (2015). He has also co-edited the Routledge Handbook of the History of Settler Colonialism (2016) and is Editor in Chief of Settler Colonial Studies. “‘Settler colonialism’: Career of a concept." The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History 41.2 (2013): 313-333] ansh \*\*brackets in original text  
A focus on the economies of the settler polities characterised the historiography of settler colonial phenomena during the late 1970s and 1980s.34 This was certainly not a new development: the ‘staple theory’ of economic development had emphasised since the 1930s that settler peripheries and metropolitan cores were closely integrated.35 According to this theory, Canada (and by implication Australia and New Zealand) and Great Britain had not grown apart – a protracted/ongoing institutional relationship was therefore explained via this link.36 During this new phase, while the area studies focus shifted again, from the colonial world to the analysis of what will be defined as a global settler ‘Second World’, economic history and sociology also became crucial disciplinary sites in the consolidation of ‘settler colonialism’.37 A number of comparative economic histories of settler colonial polities appeared during this decade, most notably Donald Denoon’s Settler Capitalism (Philip McMichael’s work was also crucial in theorising a specific form of settler capitalism: in Settlers and the Agrarian Question he had detailed the ways in which an original Australian colonial capitalism had by the 1860s been turned into settler capitalism).38 Denoon proceeded from an appraisal of a fundamental divide: ‘there is something distinctive about settler societies’, he noted, ‘marking them off from metropolitan societies on the one hand, and the rest of the ‘third world’ on the other’. 39 He thus introduced a critical analytical distinction: the settler world was neither constituted by European (or neo-European) fragments, as Hartz had argued, nor a subset part of the colonial world, as those concerned with decolonising struggles involving settler minorities had postulated. As such, settler colonialism demanded a third conceptual space. Denoon insisted on an economic definition of settler colonial forms (he was implicitly criticising a previous comparative historiography of settler societies for failing to understand how capitalism should be the ‘central consideration’). ‘An overview of these societies in the first half of the nineteenth century’, he noted, would reveal a considerable number of common features. First, they were selfconsciously European, but separated from Europe by great distances and expensive transport. Second, metropolitan strategists and capitalists saw them as way-stations en route to more lucrative opportunities in the tropical world – India and China particularly. Third, they were all concentrated around the harbours, the termini of their European life-lines, and the essential markets for the produce of the hinterlands. Fourth, the temperate grass-lands behind these ports enabled them to grow crops and raise stock in much the same way as Europeans did, though it was difficult to market these products in bulk. Fifth, labour was provided either by the settlers themselves, or by slaves or convicts, or by wage labour; but very rarely by squeezing indigenous communities.40 Most crucially, he noted, they ‘were highly dependent, highly successful economically, and as thoroughly enmeshed in capitalist international trade as they were permeated with capitalist relations within’.41 Their current (and past) prosperity and political stability (as opposed to chronic underdevelopment and political fragmentation) made them inherently different from the rest of the colonial and postcolonial world. Their dependency on external finance and trade, on the other hand, made them also different from the metropolitan cores. More generally, this interpretative tradition was a response to Immanuel Wallerstein world-systems theory: while According to Wallerstein, a hierarchical articulation between peripheral and core regions and associated relations of unequal exchange were producing weak states and fragmented political institutions at the margins, the settler polities, Denoon argued, were obviously upsetting this interpretation.42 In the context of these debates, Argentina was seen as a liminal case between two types – the prosperous/stable, albeit dependent, and the underdeveloped/subaltern.43 As such, Argentina became a crucial and recurring test case for comparative analysis (especially in comparative relation to Australia and Canada). Carter Goodrich had already set the comparative tone in a 1964 Comparative Studies in Society and History essay: As a new country of settlement origins Argentina, like the United States, belongs to a small group of historically favored nations. Since its economic development has differed to a considerable degree from that of others of the group, an examination of Argentina’s experience and relative position may serve to raise questions of interest to students of comparative history.44 Where was Argentina to be located in the context of this interpretative pattern; how could its ‘deviant’ trajectory be explained; had it ever been an (albeit informal/‘honorary’) British Dominion? Organised primarily in accordance with a register of difference, an extensive comparative literature in English focused on class composition, the elites, the state, the allocation/misallocation of property rights, the failure to develop industrially, tariffs, institutional and business styles, migratory patterns, the labour movements, and other features characterising Argentina’s ‘divergent’ development.45 Crucial to these approaches was the possibility of reading Argentinean history according to a ‘normalcy to deviance’ narrative structure. When was it that a settler colonial context had turned into a colonial one? Positions varied, and identified the point of divergence at different passages, from Rosas’ ascendancy in the early 19th century, to Peron’s in the 1950s. Crucial to these approaches was also the more or less explicit anxiety pertaining to the possibility that a similar ‘deviance’ could manifest itself in other semi-dependent, semiperipheral settler colonial polities – that Argentina was not only deviant, but a precursor as well. These were years of sustained crisis; were Australia, New Zealand, and Canada also at risk of turning into economically fragile and politically unstable settings? During this phase, as mentioned, another area studies shift can be detected in discussions involving ‘settlers’ and ‘settler colonialism’. No longer a form involving Africa in particular, settler colonialism was now seen as characteristic of the southern hemisphere (it is significant that ‘settler colonialism’ is a largely Australian developed category; elsewhere scholarly debate focused on ‘settler society’, which obscures ‘colonialism’, or simply referred to ‘colonialism’, which neglects ‘settler’).46 It was still the ‘global’ South, but a South that was now seen as inherently diversified in its relationship with the metropolitan cores. There was a colonial/postcolonial South and a settler colonial South (and an intermediate Argentinean case). And yet, as ‘settler colonialism’ was being conceptually ‘brought home’ to the non-European developed countries (and while disciplinarily it was now economics that took the lead), the emphasis on ‘colonialism’ was implicitly dropped from the interpretative frame. Definitions of ‘settler’ or ‘dominion’ capitalism now implied sustained high levels of economic performance together with the sudden and irretrievable disappearance of indigenous polities and agency. Both these characteristics contributed to making reflection on colonialism marginal. True, this interpretative tradition still used ‘colonialism’ as a conceptual category, but crucially in order to emphasise settler dependent development, and not to refer to indigenous subjugation. The very notion of ‘settler capitalism’, with its emphasis on an order that is established ex novo without ‘Old World’ restraints and without sustained conflict with surviving indigenous polities, demanded that indigenous people be deemed insignificant both at the moment of the settler polity’s foundation and thereafter. Denoon, it should be noted, had crucially based his analysis on the type of indigenous presences and their impact in determining the possibility of instituting a specific type of colonial domination rather than another. ‘[I]t is the qualities of the indigenous society which profoundly influenced the kind of settler society which could be superimposed upon it, or which might entirely replace it’, he had concluded.47 This was a crucial concession, but also a preemptive consideration (and at exception anyway, most scholars continued to disregard all indigenous inputs). References to ‘settler capitalism’ were effectively writing indigenous people and indigenous history off the conceptual map. As displacement was redressed, disavowal became reactivated. Colonialism within ‘Settler Colonialism’: Settler Colonial Studies The indigenous peoples of the white settler nations – the ‘Fourth World’ – eventually began to militantly demand recognition and self-determination. 48 In the context of renewed political contestations, another phase in the development of ‘settler colonialism’ as a concept thus began. If previous historiograpical traditions in settler colonial polities had focused on ‘virgin lands’ and ‘quiet continents’ (the Americanists of the ‘myth- symbol’ school of interpretation, for example, had focused on a prototypical American Self [i.e., the American Adam], on a specific quest [i.e., the Errand into the Wilderness], and on the process of acquisition/liberation of the land [i.e., a Virgin Land] against all sorts of indigenous and exogenous challenges), a new interpretative trend now emphasised violence, theft, wastefulness, classism, and racism.49 At the same time, ethnohistory, anthropology, indigenous studies, and especially history became crucial disciplinary sites in the development of ‘settler colonialism’ as a conceptual category.