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

#### 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.

#### The aff's securitization of ecological stress reflects a colonial research paradigm that authorizes land grabs and armed intervention.

Billings 24, Master of Science Thesis, Community and Environmental Sociology; Research Assistant @ University of Wisconsin-Madison. (Kristen R., 8-23-2024, “Resilient Empire: The Coloniality of U.S. Climate Securitization and Abolitionist Countertopographies Of Militarism,” p. 12-18, http://digital.library.wisc.edu/1793/85692)

**From Environmental Warfare to Environmental Security**

**In the 1990s,**western security analysts adopted neo-Malthusian warnings that ecological stress would damage U.S. **national security** interests**, spurred by a confluence of factors, including the end of Cold War tensions and newly felt criticism of excessive U.S. military presence and spending, as well as growing environmental consciousness and efforts to address ecological exigencies in international forums (McDonald 2021).**This signaled a**n important**shift from**mid-century military interests in**the weaponization of environmental and climate change to**late-century interests in**their **securitization**, a **discursive process** by which security actors articulate**the urgency of political issues** and **remove them from politics** to a **state of exception, where security actors are the responsible party for defining and responding to threats (Waever 1995; Buzan et al. 1998).**Ecological concerns**spotlighted by the environmental movement**became the purview of **military and security planners,**lifting them from the realm of **civilian influence—as security studies scholar Simon Dalby argues, securitization** of the environment**“ultimately disenfranchises** the majority, **stripping**environmental ‘speech’ from its**more emancipatory projects” (Dalby 2002). The U.S. and its allies, seeking to manage a new unipolar world order and justify peacetime military spending, folded the environment into national security planning; the new focus on environmental security was fueled by the “global managerialist ambitions of some northern planners,” who sought to engage in neo-colonial governance of natural resources and environmental problems (Dalby 1999:26). During the postCold War moment, very legitimate public concerns**about the environment**, such as ozone depletion and air pollution,**were **transmogrified** into a scarcity-conflict model that built**“**an image of an **overpopulated, environmentally degraded**and violent **Third world” (Hartmann 1998:114). The void left by the Cold War was quickly filled by an**environmental**security 13**agenda that offered **renewed purpose** to the **m**ilitary **i**ndustrial **c**omplex**and “mask[ed] the tragic human consequences of US support for military regimes and Duvalier-style dictatorships” (Hartmann 1998:114).**

**Environmental security research, which formed the basis of emergent environment security discourse in the late 20th century, was quickly absorbed and reinforced both through abundant funding and circulation of its findings amongst the U.S. State Department and Department of Defense, private foundations, and non-governmental organizations. Researchers, though, have been writing about the relationship between environment and security since at least the 1940s, illustrated by the 1948 publication “Our Plundered Planet” by Fairfield Osborn, a book that inspired Paul Erlich’s “Population Bomb” and helped to revive Malthusian thinking in post-WWII environmental research (Rønnfeldt 1997). As early as the 1950s, military planners and scientists helped to pioneer environmental modeling with an eye towards the implications of ecological stress on conflict and geopolitical tensions. These methods of prediction were later reproduced in the influential publications of Erlich and the Club of Rome, which sat at the center of civil scientific and public narratives of imminent ecological collapse in the 1970s (Hamblin 2013). However, it was not until the 1980s and the arrival of the so-called “first generation of environment and security research” that scholars began to push for the integration of environmental factors into the study and conceptualization of national security (e.g., Ullman 1983), a call that was eventually heeded by the United States, the U.N. Security Council, and other geopolitical actors.**

**Seeking to substantiate the claims of early environmental security proponents, a second generation of environment-security research emerged in the 1990s, most prominently associated with “the Toronto Group,” led by political scientist Thomas Homer-Dixon (Rønnfeldt 1997). Alongside his research team at the Project on Environment, Population and Security at the University of Toronto, Homer-Dixon sought to conduct rigorous, empirically grounded research on the relationship between resource scarcity and violent conflict in developing countries. His**publications**(1991; 1994), built from a series of case studies of states in the Global South,**posited**that environmental scarcity (**e.g., limited access to**cropland, water, fish stocks)**was a **causal predictor** of conflict**and instability. These studies became influential among researchers, policymakers, and journalists, significantly shaping mainstream and academic security discourse. In 1994, citing Homer-Dixon’s environment-conflict thesis, Robert Kaplan published his seminal article, “The Coming Anarchy” in the Atlantic Monthly. Kaplan warned, in alarmist terms, that population growth and environmental degradation would lead to social disintegration and political chaos, significantly raising the profile of environmental security. Allegedly, his writings were popular amongst foreign policy professionals in Washington D.C. and captured the attention of then-President, Bill Clinton who was “so gripped by many things that were in that article”—Homer-Dixon was later invited to provide White House briefings on resource scarcity and acute conflict (Dalby 1996). Ultimately, the popularity of Homer-Dixon’s research and the scarcity-conflict thesis contributed to the rise and institutionalization of environmental and climate security studies within academia, policy think tanks, and governmental bodies (McDonald 2021).**

**Race, Colonialism, and the Scarcity-Conflict Nexus**

**While the work of the Toronto Group helped to solidify the place of environmental security in research and government agendas,**their methods**were widely accused of renewing long-discredited environmental**determinist thinking and perpetuat**ing racialized stereotypes** of**“**uncivilized**”**developing countries (**Smil 1997). Climatic and environmental determinism** were **central** to European **imperial intellectual traditions and the spread of colonialism in the 15th century;**colonizers attributed racial and cultural differences to **climatic and environmental conditions, advancing a pseudo-scientific theory of the Western European superiority**that was used to justify **colonization** and **slavery (Livingstone 1991). In the 18th and 19th centuries, climatic determinism shaped ideas about labor, health, and medicine, and were used to advance, for example, the idea that the climate of the Tropics naturally gave rise to laziness and disease (Livingstone 1999; Harrison 1996). Though**environmental determinism**waned in popularity, eventually becoming marginalized in the early 20th century, its influence continues to shape ideas about the relationship between society and the environment today. Notably, it**has been**potently revived** in the **environment-security literature with its naturalization of scarcity and conflict in the “darker nations” of the world (Lipschutz 1997).**

**Opponents of the environment-conflict thesis accuse the literature of being ahistorical and decontextualizing its case studies, leading to the invisibilization of historical factors and economic inequalities that structure scarcity and environmental degradation. As Barnett argues,**not only does the environment-conflict lit**erature**reproduce**colonial logics of**climatic determinism, it fails to consider the**“**broader social and ecological degradation wrought by modernity**which is the overriding context for any discussion of security” (2000:284). As others point out, conspicuously absent in Homer-Dixon’s analyses**are the roles of**multinational corporations, international financial institutions,**and colonial legacies**in shaping renewable resource availability; for example,**stress on crop production is not**analytically**linked to**the role of**agribusiness and land enclosure**,**or**the influence of uneven trade relationships that displace subsistence farming in favor of export-oriented crop cultivation, thereby erasing external pressures that are at the root cause of food shortages (Barnett 2000; Dalby 1996; Hartmann 2014). In addition to historical erasures of colonialism and imperialism,**scholarly circulation of the **scarcity-conflict thesis** and its **uptake in policy and public**discourse reinforces **neocolonial power relations** by legitimizing the security agendas and military spending of Global North countries**(Barnett 2000; Selby 2014).**

**In Homer-Dixon’s writings and the grey literature of environmental security it informs, “developing countries'' are “vulnerable” to environmental conflict for a variety of reasons, including resource mismanagement and political instability, framings that both naturalize colonial and imperial legacies and justify neo colonial governance. State fragility, natural**scarcity**, and population growth,**which are considered primary contributors to conflict**in Western environmental security risk assessments,**are rooted in **imperial discursive traditions** that **authorize neocolonial management, bearing close resemblance to the notion of the white man’s burden and its civilizing mission.**Colonial claims that non-white populations were incapable of self-governance and inherently susceptible to violence and disorder motivated**both martial** and **humanitarian interventions** and were **central** to U.S. **empire-building** and wars of **territorial expansion, both domestically—against Native nations—and abroad, as was the case in the Philippine-American War (Immerwahr 2019). These racialized, colonial claims are now manifest in the discourse of state fragility, which originated in the field of international relations and is treated as an independent variable in many empirical studies of environmental security. As international relations scholar Gruffydd Jones argues,**the conceptual language of state fragility**and failure must be understood as a successor of imperial discourses and a commonsense form of “modern racialized international thought” that**reinforces hierarchy between European and non-European states**(Gruffydd Jones 2013:53). Assessments of state fragility also conceal many postcolonial nations’ inheritance of anemic systems of colonial governance, as well as attempts to thwart the development of sovereign governments by external actors through a variety of coercive means—ranging from economic to military interventions (Táíwò 2021). In addition to naturalizing imperial legacies, Gruffydd Jones argues**invocations of **fragility** and instability help to**“legitimize** the spectrum of **Western intervention** in Africa**and other non-western societies,**from governance reform to military intervention**,”**reinforcing colonial power in the **present (Gruffydd Jones 2013:62).**

**Natural scarcity, at the heart of the neo-Malthusian thinking that provoked the environmental fears of activists, researchers, and military planners in the mid-20th century, is reproduced in Homer’s environmental-conflict thesis. Amidst oil shocks and the publication of the Club of Rome’s The Limits to Growth, resource scarcity enjoyed heightened political attention in the 1970s, leading to critical debates about scarcity and abundance in the global economy (Mehta et al. 2019). Critics argue that**scarcity**, conceptually derived from modern economics,**is**socially and politically constructed,**often utilized by state and other powerful actors to obscure**deeply**unequal **distribution of resources and sustain capitalist power (Luks 2010; Mehta 2010).**Scarcity, rather than being a product of **uncontrollable ecosystem pressures,**such as **drought** or disease, is more often the result of **uneven power relations**that**selectively limit access to resources and**create **artificial supply shortages (Mehta et al. 2019). Historically, this phenomenon is potently demonstrated by the Bengal famine of 1943, as Amartya Sen argues in his seminal essay, Poverty and Famines—food shortages were not caused by drought, but by British colonial policies that authorized resource hoarding and the continued export of rice that made purchasing food impossible for many Bengalis living in poverty (Mukherjee 2015).**

**As alarm over environmental change took center stage in the late twentieth century, the discourse of natural scarcity was powerfully renewed. However, scholars maintain that resource distribution, rather than availability, largely determines scarcity in a globalized economy—and that**scarcity is mobilized to **legitimize land** and water **grabs** and **authorize external management** of**ostensibly**vulnerable resources**(Gilbert 2016; Borras et al. 2012). Further,**invocations of **natural scarcity often**reproduce colonial imaginaries of **racialized, primitive others,**incapable of responsibly managing land and **sustainably using resources (Sasser 2014; Hartmann 1998).**Narratives of environmental decline and resource **mismanagement, much like earlier degradation narratives of the colonial era (Davis 2007),**position Indigenous, nomadic, and non-western populations as **responsible** for unsustainable extraction and desertification, masking the role of (neo)colonial extractivism**and uneven development in producing environmental crises.**

#### The affirmative’s defenses of nuclear testing – are the means through which the First World justifies an ongoing extermination waged against indigenous people and the fourth world under the pretense of “developing new technologies”

Kato 93 (Masahide, “Nuclear Globalism: Traversing Rockets, Satellites, and Nuclear War via the Strategic Gaze”, Alternatives, 18:3 [1993:Summer], pg. 347-349, IWren/JT)

Let us recall our earlier discussion about the critical historical conjuncture where the notion of "strategy" changed its nature and became deregulated/ dispersed beyond the boundaries set by the interimperial rivalry. Herein, the perception of the ultimate means of destruction can be historically contextualized. The only instances of real nuclear catastrophe perceived and thus given due recognition by the First World community are the explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which occurred at this conjuncture. Beyond this historical threshold, whose meaning is relevant only to the interimperial rivalry, the nuclear catastrophe is confined to the realm of **fantasy**, for instance, apocalyptic imagery. And yet how can one deny the crude fact that nuclear war has been taking place on this earth in the name of "nuclear testing" since the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo in 1945? As of 1991, 1,924 nuclear explosions have occurred on earth. 28 The major perpetrators of nuclear warfare are the United States (936 times), the former Soviet Union (715 times), France (192 times), the United Kingdom (44 times), and China (36 times). 29 The primary targets of warfare ("test site" to use Nuke Speak terminology) have been invariably the sovereign nations of Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples. Thus history has already witnessed the nuclear wars against the Marshall Islands (66 times), French Polynesia (175 times), Australian Aborigines (9 times), Newe Sogobia (the Western Shoshone Nation) (814 times), the Christmas Islands (24 times), Hawaii (Kalama Island, also known as Johnston Island) (12 times), the Republic of Kazakhstan (467 times), and Uighur (Xinjian Province, China) (36 times).30 Moreover, although I focus primarily on "nuclear tests" in this article, if we are to expand the notion of nuclear warfare to include any kind of violence accrued from the nuclear fuel cycle (particularly uranium mining and disposition of nuclear wastes), we must enlist Japan and the European nations as perpetrators and add the Navaho, Havasupai and other Indigenous Nations to the list of targets. Viewed as a whole, nuclear war, albeit undeclared, has been waged against the Fourth World, and Indigenous Nations. The dismal consequences of "intensive exploitation," "low intensity intervention," or the "nullification of the sovereignty" in the Third World produced by the First World have taken a form of nuclear extermination in the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations. Thus, from the perspectives of the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations, the nuclear catastrophe has never been the "unthinkable" single catastrophe but the real catastrophe of repetitive and ongoing nuclear explosions and exposure to radioactivity. Nevertheless, ongoing nuclear wars have been subordinated to the imaginary grand catastrophe by rendering them as mere preludes to the apocalypse. As a consequence, the history and ongoing processes of nuclear explosions as war have been totally wiped out from the history and consciousness of the First World community. Such a discursive strategy that aims to mask the "real" of nuclear warfare in the domain of imagery of nuclear catastrophe can be observed even in Stewart Firth's Nuclear Playground, which extensively covers the history of "nuclear testing" in the Pacific: Nuclear explosions in the atmosphere ... were global in effect. The winds and seas carried radioactive contamination over vast areas of the fragile ecosphere on which we all depend for our survival and which we call the earth. In preparing for war, we were poisoning our planet and going into battle against nature itself.31 Although Firth's book is definitely a remarkable study of the history of "nuclear testing" in the Pacific, the problematic division/distinction between the "nuclear explosions" and the nuclear war is kept intact. The imagery of final nuclear war narrated with the problematic use of the subject ("we") is located higher than the "real" of nuclear warfare in terms of discursive value. This ideological division/hierarchization is the very vehicle through which the history and the ongoing processes of the destruction of the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations by means of nuclear violence are obliterated and hence legitimatized. The discursive containment/obliteration of the "real" of nuclear warfare has been accomplished, ironic as it may sound, by nuclear criticism. Nuclear criticism, with its firm commitment to global discourse, has established the unshakable authority of the imagery of nuclear catastrophe over the real nuclear catastrophe happening in the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations almost on a daily basis.

#### The discursive relation between First and Fourth World enabled by the representations of nuclear war expose indigenous persons to ontological violence and Otherization—the foundations of all manifestations of physical violence.

Kato 93 (Masahide, “Nuclear Globalism: Traversing Rockets, Satellites, and Nuclear War via the Strategic Gaze”, Alternatives, 18:3 [1993:Summer], pg. 354-355, IWren/JT)

The latest form of domination through the mimetic relationship between (the First World) self and matter via technosubjectivity unveils its uniqueness in the mode of propertization. Technosubjectivity materializes the condition in which the First World self establishes property relationship with what has not been coded in the conventional space and time parameters (e.g., the earth, the ecosphere, life, environment, the unborn, the future). For example, by using apocalypse, nuclear critics set up a privileged discursive position whereby the First World self is authorized to speak for amorphous "future" generations. This discursive position entails a colonization of temporality by the First World self. The colonization of "future" has an immediate effect: the preservation of unborn generations as a case against extinction endorsed by some nuclear critics, for instance, cannot be isolated from the extension of patriarchal self over women's bodies.50 In a similar vein, the nuclear critics' assertion regarding the preservation of the ecosphere or the identification of an individual with the earth as an antithesis to extinction betrays the extension of the First World self over the space configured by the image of the globe. One should not, on the one hand, discount the political significance of the environmentalism emerged from the nuclear discourse; on the other hand, however, one should also be alert to the fact that such environmentalism and also the notion of "futurity" discussed earlier are a structural counterpart of the globalization of space and time by capital (both are linked through technosubjectivity). The extension and propertization in terms of both time and space proceeds instantaneously from the micro level to the macro level and vice versa: "the earth, like a single cell or a single organism, is a systemic whole." 51 The holism reconstructed here is a discursive translation of the instantaneous focal change (from the image of the whole to the image of the spot) from the point of the absolute strategic gaze. Overall, the nuclear critics' position in freezing the status quo—that is, the existing unequal power relationship—produces nothing short of an absolute affirmation of the latest forms of capitalist domination mediated by mechanically reproducible images.52 Thus dissolution between self and matter via technosubjectivity demarcates the-disappearance of the notion of territoriality as a boundary in the field of propertization/ colonization of capital. The globe represented as such in the age of technosubjectivity clearly delineates the advent of nonterritorial space which distinguishes it from the earlier phas0.es of capitalism. According to David Harvey, the Enlightenment conceptualization of the globe had a territorial demarcation, which corresponds to the hierarchical division between self and the other: I do want to insist that the problem with the Enlightenment thought was not that it had no conception of "the other" but that it perceived "the other" as necessarily having (and sometimes "keeping to") a specific place in a spatial order that was ethnocentrically conceived to have homogeneous and absolute qualities. 53 Therefore, what is so characteristic of the global spatial order in late capitalism is a total eradication of "the other" by abolishing the notion of territory. As I have already discussed, what matters for the First World is no longer the relationship between self and other but self and matter, which is nothing but a tautological self-referential relation with self. This ontological violence against "the other" underwrites the physical violence against the Third World, Fourth World, and Indigenous Peoples.

#### Thus, the only alternative is refusal. While an aff ballot can only reinforce the anti-native and imperial violence endemic to the ideology of set col, a negative ballot disrupts production by refusing the aff.

Kato 93 (Masahide, “Nuclear Globalism: Traversing Rockets, Satellites, and Nuclear War via the Strategic Gaze”, Alternatives, 18:3 [1993:Summer], pg. 356-357, IWren/JT)

The dialectic (if it can be still called such) should be conceived in terms of resistance to and possibly destruction of global space, time, perception, and discourse for the possibility of reinventing space. The nuclear warfare against the Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples should be viewed in this context. It is not their expendability or exclusion from the division of labor; rather it is their spatial-temporal construction that drives transnational capital/state to resort to pure destruction. In other words, what has been actually under attack by the nuclear state/capital are certain political claims (couched in the discourse of "sovereignty") advanced by the Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples for maintaining or recreating space against the global integration of capital. The question now becomes: Can there be a productive link between the struggles of the Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples against the exterminating regime of nuclear capital/state, and First World environmentalist and antinuclear social movements? This link is crucial and urgent for a subversion of the global regime of capital/state. Nevertheless, we have not yet seen effective alliances due to the blockage that lies between these social movements.56 The blockage, as I have shown in this article, is produced primarily by the perception and discourse of the social movements in the North, which are rooted in technosubjectivity. The possibility of alliances, therefore, depends on how much First World environmentalist and antinuclear movements can overcome their globalist technosubjectivity, whose spatio-temporality stands in diametrical opposition to the struggles of the Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples. In other words, it is crucial for the former to shatter their image-based politics and come face to face with the "real" of the latter. 57