# Set Col Main

## FW

#### Our interpretation is that the aff is an object of research that must be proven ethical before weighing its hypothetical implementation.

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

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

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

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

Facing assertive indigenous presences within settler colonial spaces, settlers must answer the legitimate charge that their daily life – in all its banality – is predicated upon the privileges produced by ongoing genocide. The jarring nature of such charges offers an irreconcilable challenge to settlers qua settlers.64 Should these charges become impossible to ignore, they threaten to explode the imago of settler colonialism, which had hitherto operated within the settler psyche in a relatively smooth and benign manner. This explosion is potentiated by the revelation of even a portion of the violence that is required to make settler life possible. If, for example, settlers are forced to see ‘their’ beach as a site of murder and ongoing colonization, it becomes more difficult to sustain it within the imaginary as a site of frivolity.65 As Brown writes, in the ‘loss of horizons, order, and identity’ the subject experiences a sense of enormous vulnerability.66 Threatened with this ‘loss of containment’, the settler subject embarks down the road to psychosis.67 Thus, to parlay Brown’s thesis to the settler colonial context, the uncontrollable rage that indigenous presences induce within the settler is not evidence of the strength of settlers, but rather of a subject lashing out on the brink of its own dissolution.

This panic – this rabid and insatiable anger – is always already at the core of the settler as a subject. As Lorenzo Veracini observes, the settler necessarily remains in a disposition of aggression ‘even after indigenous alterities have ceased to be threatening’. 68 This disposition results from the precarity inherent in the maintenance of settler colonialism’s imago, wherein any and all indigenous presences threaten subjective dissolution of the settler as such. Trapped in a Gordian Knot, the very thing that provides a balm to the settler subject – further development and entrenchment of the settler colonial imago – is also what panics the subject when it is inevitably contravened.69 We might think of this as a process of hardening that leaves the imago brittle and more susceptible to breakage. Their desire to produce a firm imago means that settlers are also always already in a psychically defensive position – that is, the settler’s offensive position on occupied land is sustained through a defensive posture. For while settlers desire the total erasure of indigenous populations, the attendant desire to disappear their own identity as settlers necessitates the suppression of both desires, if the subject’s reliance on settler colonial power structure is to be psychically naturalized.

Settlers’ reactions to indigenous peoples fit, almost universally, with the two ego defense responses that Sigmund Freud observed. The first of these defenses is to attempt a complete conversion of the suppressed desire into a new idea. In settler colonial contexts, this requires averting attention from the violence of dispossession; as such, settlers often suggest that they aim to create a ‘city on the hill’. 70 Freud noted that the conversion defense mechanism does suppress the anxiety-inducing desire, but it also leads to ‘periodic hysterical outbursts’. Such is the case when settlers’ utopic visions are forced to confront the reality that the gentile community they imagine is founded in and perpetuates irredeemable suffering. A second type of defense is to channel the original desire’s energy into an obsession or a phobia. The effects of this defense are seen in the preoccupation that settler colonialism has with purity of blood or of community.71 As we have already seen, this obsession at once solidifies the power of the settler state, thereby naturalizing the settler and simultaneously perpetuating the processes of erasing indigenous peoples. Psychic defenses are intended to secure the subject from pain, and whether that pain originates inside or outside the psyche is inconsequential. Because of the threat that indigeneity presents to the phantasmatic wholeness of settler colonialism, settlers must always remain suspended in a state of arrested development between these defensive positions. Despite any pretensions to the contrary, the settler is necessarily a parochial subject who continuously coils, reacts, disavows, and lashes out, when confronted with his dependency on indigenous peoples and their territory. This psychic precarity exists at the core of the settler subject because of the unending fear of its own dissolution, should indigenous sovereignty be recognized.72

Goeman writes as an explicit challenge to other indigenous peoples, but this holds true to settler-allies as well, that decolonization must include an analysis of the dominant ‘self-disciplining colonial subject’. 73 However, as this discussion of subjective precarity demonstrates, the degree of to which these disciplinary or phenomenological processes are complete should not be overstated. For settler-allies must also examine and cultivate the ways in which settler subjects fail to be totally disciplined. Evidence of this incompletion is apparent in the subject’s arrested state of development. Discovering the instability at the core of the settler subject, indeed of all subjects, is the central conceit of psychoanalysis. This exception of at least partial failure to fully subjectivize the settler is also what sets my account apart from Rifkin’s. His phenomenology falls into the trap that Jacqueline Rose observes within many sociological accounts of the subject: that of assuming a successful internalization of norms. From the psychoanalytical perspective, the ‘unconscious constantly reveals the “failure”’ of internalization.74 As we have seen, within settler subjects this can be expressed as an irrational anxiety that expresses itself whenever a settler is confronted with the facts regarding their colonizing status. Under conditions of total subjectification, such charges ought to be unintelligible to the settler. Thus, the process of subject formation is always in slippage and never totalized as others might suggest.75 Because of this precarity, the settler subject is prone to violence and lashing out; but the subject in slippage also provides an avenue by which the process of settler colonialism can be subverted – creating cracks in a phantasmatic wholeness which can be opened wider. Breakages of this sort offer an opportunity to pursue what Paulette Regan calls a ‘restorying’ of settler colonial history and culture, to decanter settler mythologies built upon and within the dispossession of indigenous peoples.76 The cultivation of these cracks is a necessary part of decolonizing work, as it continues to panic and thus to destabilize settler subjects.

Resistance to settler colonialism does not occur only in highly visible moments like the famous conflict at Kanesatake and Kahnawake,77 it also occurs in reiterative and disruptive practices, presences, and speech acts. Goeman correctly observes that the ‘repetitive practices of everyday life’ are what give settler spaces their meaning, as they provide a degree of naturalness to the settler imago and its psychic investments.78 As such, to disrupt the ease of these repetitions is at once to striate radically the otherwise smooth spaces of settler colonialism and also to disrupt the easy (re)production of the settler subject. Goeman calls these subversive acts the ‘micro-politics of resistance’, which historically took the form of ‘moving fences, not cooperating with census enumerators, sometimes disrupting survey parties’ amongst other process.79 These acts panic the subject that is disciplined as a product of settler colonial power, by forcing encounters with the sovereign indigenous peoples that were imagined to be gone. This reveals to the settler, if only fleetingly, the violence that founds and sustains the settler colonial relationship. While such practices may not overthrow the settler colonial system, they do subvert its logics by insistently

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

**Gani and Marshal 22’**

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

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

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

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

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.

#### Expanding nuclear energy invades and pollutes indigenous communities and their lands with nuclear waste, a project of colonialism which locks in endless violence.

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.

#### Hegemony’s belief in its own superiority produces settler sovereignty as justified and inevitable, creating reiterative practices of genocide

**Bruyneel 15** (Kevin, Professor of Politics at Babson College. He wrote The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations, “Codename Geronimo: settler memory and the production of American statism,” Settler Colonial Studies, Issue Number, No.4, pp. 4-6)//vikas

In moving swiftly from the so-called War on Terror, to the US-Dakota War and its aftermath, to the US Civil War and its notable moments my introductory narrative intentionally blurs the boundaries between past and present, between colonialist and imperialist state violence, and between the mutually constitutive practices of liberal nationalism and colonial settlement in US political development. To blur boundaries is not to imply that they do not exist, as there are important distinctions and definitions worth maintaining here. Rather, the aim is to draw attention to the intimate, constitutive relationship among these categories so as to see, for example, the active settler logic at the core of American collective memory that habitually justifies and authorizes US imperialist violence in the contemporary period, just as theseimperialist actions and their justifications reinforce the liberal legitimation of persistent settler dispossession, violence, and incarceration. It is not a mere matter of political incorrectness that name of Geronimo, the legendary Chiricahua Apache leader, became military code for identifying Bin Laden. Nor is it just a coincidence that the Emancipation Proclamation was signed only six days after the mass execution of the Dakota 38. And it is not a case of amnesia that leads President Obama to ask the nation to remember the actions of President Lincoln as it concerns liberating enslaved Black Americans while staying silent on Lincoln's role in the execution of the Dakota 38, let alone even mentioning these men at all. What links these all is that they are different forms of evidence of the important relationship between settler memory and statism in the development and maintenance of US liberal colonialism. Settler memory refers to the mnemonics – that is, the functions, practices, and products of memory – of **colonialist dispossession and settlement** **that shape settler subjectivity and governmentality in liberal colonial contexts such as the USA**. By ‘liberal colonial’ I mean polities comprised of institutions, norms, and practices that reflect a compatible encounter between liberal-democracy and colonialism in the political development and contemporary formations of nations such as the USA. In short, liberal-democracy and settler colonialism are not mutually exclusive or contradictory. In contexts such as the USA they are mutually reinforcing; liberal democracy legitimates settler dispossessions while these very dispossessions provide the territorial and ideological context for liberal democratic political life. And in liberal colonial contexts such as the USA, settler mnemonics – such as codename Geronimo, Black Hawk helicopters, places and teams named after Indigenous peoples, and calendric commemorations such as Columbus Day and Thanksgiving – are so ubiquitous and habitual that they become both simultaneously present and absent in American collective memory. This is settler memory at work, habitually invoking settler colonialism in a manner that blurs the line between past and present, thus further re-inscribing the practices of present day settler violence and dispossession. That is, these settler memories are both there and not there at the same time, before our eyes but also dispossessed of active political meaning in and by the settler imaginary. This is a cycle that replays dispossession and settlement on a mnemonic loop. Political efforts to challenge the meaning of, for example, codename Geronimo, Columbus Day, or the Washington football team's name seek to intervene and upset this mnemonic loop so as to unsettle this memory and refuse this ongoing dispossession. During political conflicts over these settler designations we see that settler memory is not a forgetting of colonialism and settlement. This is not a condition of collective amnesia in which nations conveniently forget those aspect of the past that do not shed a positive light on the nation.6 In contrast to the amnesia diagnosis, I argue that the problem with America's relationship with its past is not a matter of forgetting, but rather is the manner in which the nation remembers its past, as facts and myths, and the important role of this remembering in the re-legitimation of contemporary violence, dispossession, and appropriation.7 In this regard, I offer up the concept of settler memory to refer to the way in which a settler society habitually articulates collective knowledge of the past and present of settler colonial violence and dispossession and in the same moment disavows the political relevance of this memory by refusing and absenting the presence of Indigenous people as contemporary agents. Furthermore, settler memory is always at work in this way because securing settlement is a persistent American state practice. As such, a contemporary anti-colonial politics needs to attend to the working of settler memory as central to the reproduction of settler ideology and hegemony in our time, including legitimating the status and role of the settler state. I argue that American state practices and institutions function and are legitimated, especially in their most warlike functioning, through settler memory. When one accounts for the history and present of American violence toward Indigenous people and dispossession of Indigenous lands it is fair to say that the USA has always been in a warlike state; that this is not a new phenomenon of the post-World War II era. In this regard, settler memory as an active practice, not a reference to dislocated past. Just as an individual cannot act ably without the active function of memory, neither can institutions nor communities such as the American settler state and nation. States and nations are embodied structures that function, develop, and transform through the expression of individual and collective agency over time. They do not have a life on their own without people maintaining them, developing and adapting them, and articulating their power. **The** **American** **effort to legitimate** settlement **requires persistent articulation, especially as it concerns statist power** **that enforces and naturalizes Indigenous territorial dispossession and** Indigenous people's **disempowerment**. This essay offers a way to imagine decolonization and unsettlement through a critique of statism by deconstructing it as produced through the intersected practices of memory and settlement. I turn next to explain why memory is an important analytical site of political intervention here, in particular in its relationship to settler statism. Building upon this discussion, the essay then assesses the case of Codename Geronimo, moving back and forth between historical and contemporary events with a specific focus on how the mnemonic figure of Geronimo offers insight on the mnemonic practices central to the persistence of US liberal colonialism and settler statism.

#### 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.