## ****1nc****

### 1nc

No American city of its ago has clustering around it more interesting associations than Lexington. Founded in the midst of a great revolution; built up by daring men in the heart of an almost boundless wilderness, and nur- tured and protected through years of hardship and Indian warfare, she played the most prominent part in the early and tragic days of the Dark and Bloody Ground. Lexing- ton then was substantially Kentucky herself. She was more. She was the Jamestown of the West; the advance-guard of civilization; the center from which went forth the con- querors of a savage empire.

**That’s the introduction to the seminal work on the history of Lexitngon Kentucky written by George Washington Ranck in ’72** (George Washington Ranck, “History of Lexington Kentucky,” http://books.google.com/books?id=hGR3UqPS0QEC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false)

#### The central question of the resolution forces us to confront our location within a space of papered-over racism, stolen land BEFORE anything else

#### Native Americans have always been the fodder for the post-revolutionary cannon of “civilization”

#### The city of Lexington is plagued by a colonial history of theft from Native Americans – originally built as a bulwark to fight off incursions from the savage natives, it truly was the Jamestown of the west, facilitating the conquering of the savage empire. We raise this issue as a question of the starting point for your ballot – you are an engaged member of this debate, and your ballot determines the starting point for your evaluation of it.

#### Focusing on issues of “whiteness” and the African American situation necessarily ignores the Native American and hides the fact that white imperialism was first based in dispossession and dispossessing labor

Moreton-Robinson, 08 (Aileen, “Transnational Whiteness Matters”, p. 90-93. <http://books.google.com/books?id=EjtrBRHs3QQC&printsec=frontcover&dq=%22transnational+whiteness+matters%22&source=bl&ots=D68Dy-oOgd&sig=y4piOzZ9O1lDxgVic7bnL1EYogg&hl=en&ei=8gEZTcujJYG88gaD75T0DQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CBYQ6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=informed%20the%20establishment&f=false>)

Whiteness studies proliferated in the United States during the 1990s in response to overt acts of racist violence reported in the press and the need to reconsider the persistence of racism in light of the proposition that race was socially constructed and not biologically determined. Whiteness studies scholars share in common their commitment to racial justice, anti-racism and a more humane society. In most of the literature, prescriptive politics assumes a central role; many writers are committed to the abolition of whiteness through naming it, deconstructing it, resisting it and betraying it. Their scholarship is informed by a variety of disciplines such as literary studies, cultural studies, anthropology, feminism, postcolonialism, sociology and history while their research methods include textual analysis, ethnography, interviews, surveys and the archival. Whiteness studies has entered Canada and crossed both the Pacific and Atlantic providing a new history of race and modernity in 'settler' colonies. However, the United States of America remains one of the most productive sites for whiteness studies. A field of studies that is full of contradictions and ambivalences as well as sympathetic critics. Mike Hill argues that “the contradictions surrounding whiteness studies remain one of its most salient and worthwhile features…the study of whiteness was never—and with hard enough work will never be—an unproblematically unified institutional force.” Debates about the epistemological assumptions and approaches to whiteness within the field continue to abound. Robyn Wiegman surmises that the contradictory nature of white power has been underplayed by Dyer and other white studies scholars through claiming its invisibility and universality as the source of its power Wiegman argues that the universal serves to work in the interests of white particularity. This particularity simultaneously distances itself from white supremacy and denies the benefits of white power creating a disassociation that takes the form of “liberal whiteness, a colour blind moral sameness.” Peter Kolchin critiques whiteness studies for its lack of historical specificity and the claim that whiteness is everything or nothing leads him to question whether it is a useful tool of enquiry and explanation. He argues that “underlying the new interest in white power, privilege and identity there is evident an intense discouragement over the persistence of racism, the unexpected renewal of nationalism, and the collapse of progressive movements for social change.” While Stephen Knadler cautions whiteness studies against “an increasing linguistic slippage from the fiction of race into the fiction of racism.” The pliable morphology of whiteness, its utilization of the universal, the lack of historical specificity and the linguistic slippage that fictionalizes racism as problems have shaped this paper's consideration of the relationship of this field of study to Indigenous sovereignties. The field of Whiteness studies is not a uniquely white enterprise, African Americans have commented on and written about whiteness since the early 1800s. African American scholarship has been influential, particularly the work of W. E. B. Du Bois and more recently Toni Morrison whose seminal text Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination challenged the naturalized whiteness of American literature by illuminating how the omnipresence of African Americans has historically shaped it. She exposes the embedded racial assumptions that enable whiteness to characterize itself in the literary imagination in powerful and important ways. In her analysis of Hemmingway's To Have and to Have Not, Morrison illustrates how black men and women were positioned as inferiors within his texts to prop up white masculinity. Morrison further suggests in “Black Matters” that the African American presence has also “shaped the body politic, the Constitution, and the entire history of the [USA] culture.” Indigenous peoples are outside the scope of Morrison's analysis. Through the centering of the African American presence, Native American texts that have challenged, resisted and affected the American literary imagination, politics, history and the Constitution remain invisible. This silence is an interesting discursive more considering that the best-selling novels within the USA in the late eighteenth century were captivity narratives. And as Native American legal scholar Raymond Williams argues it was the positioning of Indians as incommensurable savages within the Declaration of Independence that enabled “'the Founders' vision of America's growth and potentiality as a new form of expansionary white racial dictatorship in the world.” The most valuable contribution of Morrison's work for my purposes is her thesis that “blackness,” whether real or imagined, services the social construction and application of whiteness in its myriad forms. In this way it is utilized as a white epistemological possession. Her work opens space for considering how this possessiveness operates within the whiteness studies literature to displace Indigenous sovereignties and render them invisible. White Possessiveness. Most historians mark 1492 as the year when imperialism began to construct the old world order by taking possession of other people, their lands and resources. The possessive nature of this enterprise informed the development of a racial stratification process on a global scale that became solidified during modernity. Taking possession of Indigenous people's lands was a quintessential act of colonization and was tied to the transition from the Enlightenment to modernity, which precipitated the emergence of a new subject into history within Europe. Major social, legal, economic and political reforms had taken place changing the feudal nature of the relationship between persons and property in the 16th and 18th centuries. “These changes centered upon the rise of 'possessive individualism,' that is, upon an increasing consciousness of the distinctness of each self-owning human entity as the primary social and political value.” Private ownership of property is both tangible and intangible operated through mechanisms of the new nation state in its regulation of the population and especially through the law. By the late 1700s people could legally enter into different kinds of contractual arrangements whereby they could own land, sell their labor and possess their identities all of which were formed through their relationship to capital and the state. A new white property owning subject emerged into history and possessiveness became embedded in everyday discourse as “a firm belief that the best in life was the expansion of self through property and property began and ended with possession of one's body.” Within the realm of intra-subjectivity possession can mean control over one's being, it can mean the act or fact of possessing something that is beyond the subject and in other contexts it can refer to a state of being possessed by another. Within the law possession can refer to holding or occupying territory with or without actual ownership or a thing possessed such as property or wealth and it can also refer to territorial domination of a state. At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one's will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will, thus it is open to being possessed. This enables the formally free subject to make the thing its own. Ascribing one's own subjective will onto the thing is required to make it one's property as “willful possession of what was previously a will-less thing constitutes our primary form of embodiment; it is invoked whenever we assert: this is mine.” To be able to assert 'this is mine' requires a subject to internalize the idea that one has proprietary rights that are part of normative behavior, rules of interaction and social engagement. Thus possession that forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity is reinforced by its sociodiscursive functioning. White Writing. A number of texts have been written historicizing the acquisition of white identity and the privileges conferred by its status through a trope of migration, which is based on the assumption that all those who came after the white people had taken possession are the immigrants. White possession of the nation works discursively within these texts to displace Native American sovereignties by disavowing that everyone else within the USA are immigrants **whether they came in chains** or by choice. The only displacement that is theorized is in relation to African Americans. Theodore Allen's work on how the Irish became white in America illustrates that the transformation of their former status as the blacks of Europe relied on their displacement by African Americans in the new country. David Roediger discusses how the wages of whiteness operated to prevent class alliances between working class whites and African Americans. Karen Brodkin's excellent book on how Jews became white demonstrates that the lower status of African American workers enabled Jewish class mobility. Jacobsen illustrates that European migrants were able to become white through ideological and political means that operated to distinguish them from African American blackness. The black/white binary permeates these analyses enabling tropes of migration and slavery to work covertly in these texts erasing the continuing history of colonization and the Native American sovereign presence. Blackness becomes an epistemological possession that Allen, Roediger, Brodkin and Jacobsen deploy in analyzing whiteness and race which forecloses the possibility that the dispossession of Native Americans was tied to migration and the establishment of slaver driven by the logic of capital. Slaves were brought to America as the property of white people to work on the land that was means appropriated from Native American tribes. Subsequently, migration became a means to enhance capitalist development within the USA. Migration, slavery and the dispossession of Native Americans were integral to the project of nation building. Thus the question of how anyone came to be white or black in the United States of America is inextricably tied to the dispossession of the original owners and the assumption of white possession. The various assumptions of sovereignty beginning with British 'settlers' the formation of individual states and subsequently the United States of America all came into existence through the blood-stained taking of Native American land. The USA as a white nation state cannot exist without land and clearly defined borders, it is the legally defined and asserted territorial sovereignty that provides the context for national identifications of whiteness. In this way I argue Native American dispossession indelibly marks configurations of white national identity. Ruth Frankenberg acknowledges in the introduction to her edited collection Displaying Whiteness that whiteness traveled culturally and physically, impacting on the formation of nationhood, class and empire sustained by imperialism and global capitalism. She wrote that notions of race were tied “to ideas about legitimate 'ownership' of the nation, with 'whiteness' and 'Americanness' linked tightly together” and that this history was repressed. After making this statement she then moves on to discuss immigration and its effects. Her acknowledgement did not process into critical analysis that centered Native American dispossession, instead Frankenberg represses that which she acknowledges is repressed. Repression operates as a defense mechanism to protect one's perception of self and reality from an overwhelming trauma that may threaten in order to maintain one's self image. Repressing the history of Native American dispossession works to protect the possessive white self from ontological disturbance. It is far easier to extricate ties to its institution and reproduction. However, it is not as easy to distance one's self from a history of Indigenous dispossession when one benefits everyday from being tied to a nation that has and continues to constitute itself as white possession. Within the whiteness studies literature whiteness has been defined in multiple ways. It is usually perceived as unnamed, unmarked and invisible, and often as culturally empty operating only by appropriation and absence. It is a location of structural privilege, a subject position and cultural praxis. Whiteness constitutes the norm operating within various institutions influencing decision making and defining itself by what it is not. It is socially constructed and is a form of property that one possesses, invests in and profits from. Whiteness as a social identity works discursively becoming ubiquitous, fluid and dynamic operating invisibly through pedagogy. What these different definitions of whiteness expose is that it is something that can be possessed and it is tied to power and dominance despite being fluid, vacuous and invisible to white people. However, these different conceptualizations of whiteness, which use blackness as an epistemological possession to service what it is not, obscure the more complex way that white possession functions sociodiscursively through subjectivity and knowledge production. As something that can be possessed by subjects it must have ontological and epistemological anchors in order to function through power. As means of controlling differently racialized populations enclosed within the borders of a given society, white subjects are disciplined, through to different degrees, to invest in the nation as a white possession that imbues them with a sense of belonging and ownership. This sense of belonging is derived from ownership as understood within the logic of capital and citizenship. In its self-legitimacy, white possession operates discoursively through narratives of the home of the brave and the land of the free and through white male signifiers of the nation such as the Founding Fathers, the 'pioneer' and the 'war hero.' Against this stands the Indigenous sense of belonging, home and place in its sovereign incommensurable difference.

#### Race issues are more complex than black and white – the affirmative’s simplistic analysis of racism as predominantly an issue that effects african-americans negates the reality of other people of color and fails to take into account to colonial legacy of the space and the classroom that we inhabit RIGHT NOW

**Alcoff 03** [linda martín, syracuse university department of philosophy, latino/as, asian americans, and the black–white binary the journal of ethics 7: 5–27, 2003. ]

The discourse of social justice in regard to issues involving race has been dominated in the U.S. by what many theorists name the **“black/white paradigm,”** which operates to govern racial classifications and racial politics in the U.S., most clearly in the formulation of civil rights law but also in more informal arenas of discussion. Juan Perea defines this paradigm as the conception that race in America consists, either exclusively or primarily, of only two constituent racial groups, the Black and White . . . In addition, the paradigm dictates that all other racial identities and groups in the United States are best understood through the Black/White binary paradigm.5 He argues that this paradigm operates even in recent anti-racist theory such as that produced by Andrew Hacker, Cornel West, and Toni Morrison, though it is even clearer in works by liberals such as Nathan Glazer. Openly espousing this view, Mary Francis Berry, former chair of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, has stated that the U.S. is comprised of “three nations, one Black, one White, and one in which people strive to be something other than Black to avoid the sting of White Supremacy.”6 To understand race in this way is to **assume that racial discrimination operates exclusively through anti-black racism.** Others can be affected by racism, on this view, but the dominance of the black/white paradigm works to interpret all other effects as “collateral damage” ultimately caused by the same phenomena, in both economic and psychological terms, in which the given other, whether Latino/a, Asian American, or something else, is placed in the category of “black” or “close to black.” In other words, there is basically one form of racism, and one continuum of racial identity, along which all groups will be placed. The black/white paradigm can be understood either descriptively or prescriptively (or both): as making a descriptive claim about the fundamental nature of racializations and racisms in the U.S., or as prescribing how race shall operate and thus enforcing the applicability of the black/white paradigm.7 Several Latino/a and Asian American theorists, such as Elaine Kim, Gary Okihiro, Elizabeth Martinez, Juan Perea, Frank Wu, Dana Takagi, and community activists such as Bong Hwan Kim have argued that the black/white paradigm is not adequate, certainly not sufficient, to explain racial realities in the U.S. They have thus contested its claim to descriptive adequacy, and argued that the hegemony of the black/white paradigm in racial thinking has had many deleterious effects for Latino/as and Asian Americans.8 In this paper, I will summarize and discuss what I consider the strongest of these arguments and then develop two further arguments. It is important to stress that the black/white paradigm does have some descriptive reach, as I shall discuss, even though it is inadequate when taken as the whole story of racism. Asian Americans and Latino/as are often categorized and treated in ways that reflect the fact that they have been positioned as either “near black” or “near white,” but this is not nearly adequate to understanding their ideological representation or political treatment in the U.S. One might also argue that, although the black/white paradigm is not descriptively adequate to the complexity and plurality of racialized identities, it yet operates with prescriptive force to organize these complexities into its bipolar schema. Critics, however, have contested both the claim of descriptive adequacy as well as prescriptive efficacy. That is, the paradigm does not operate with effective hegemony as a prescriptive force. I believe these arguments will show that continuing to theorize race in the U.S. as operating exclusively through the black/white paradigm is actually disadvantageous for all people of color in the U.S., and in many respects for whites as well (or at least for white union households and the white poor).

#### The united states concept of governmental participation and activism is a clever ploy that’s true purpose is to appease rather than empower. Americans focus is drawn to the issues conveyed by the media to be important when in reality those issues couldn’t mean less compared to the ongoing genocide of both entire populations in iraq and millions of native americans here at home – the 1ac’s deployment of media news clippings focusing solely on the plight of black revolutionaries is a reason to vote neg

**Churchill 03** [ward, professor of american indian studies at university colorado – boulder, “on the justice of roosting chickens – reflections on the consequences of u.s. imperial arrogance and criminality”, pp. 7-8]

To be sure, I’ve “oversimplified,” committed “reductionism” and “compared apples and oranges” in offering the preceding analogy. That was Germany, after all, while this is the U.S. The situation here is of course much more “complex.” America today, unlike Germany a half century ago, is a “democratic,” “multicultural” society. Its courts offer a prospect of “due process” in dispute resolution absent under the Nazis. Most importantly, unlike the situation in Nazi Germany, there is discernible opposition in the U.S., an active counterforce to the status quo through which progressive social, political, and economic change can ultimately be accomplished without resort to the crudities of bullets and bombs, never mind the scale of atrocity witnessed on 9-11. These things duly remarked, it must also be said that the implications embodied in such counterforces must be tested by their effectuality rather than their mere existence. On this score, the practical distinction between formal and functional democracy has been remarked by numerous analysts over the years. As to the merits of the U.S. judicial system, one might do well to begin any assessment by asking Leonard Peltier, Mumia Abu-Jamal, Geronimo ji Jaga (Pratt), Dhoruba Bin Wahad or any of the hundreds of other political activists who have been entombed on false charges or are now serving dramatically inequitable sentences in American prisons.' One might ask as well those sent to death row on racial grounds." or who number among the two million predominately dark-skinned people-a proportion of the population larger than that of any country save Russia-consigned to the sprawling archipelago of forced labor camps forming the U.S. "prison-industrial" complex." Turning to America's vaunted "opposition," we find record of not a single significant demonstration protesting the wholesale destruction of Iraqi children. On balance, U.S. "progressives" have devoted far more time and energy over the past decade to combating the imaginary health effects of "environmental tobacco smoke" and demanding installation of speed bumps in suburban neighborhoods -that is, to increasing their own comfort level-than to anything akin to a coherent response to the U.S. genocide in Iraq. The under lying mentality is symbolized quite well in the fact that, since they were released in the mid1990s, Jean Baudrillard's allegedly "radical" screed, The Gulf War Did Not Take Place, has outsold Ramsey Clark's The Impact of Sanctions on Iraq, prominently subtitled The Children are Dying, by a margin of almost three-to-one.

#### As long as we ignore that we are on stolen land we allow for the continuation of an incalculable cultural genocide that is systematically destroying and absorbing Indian culture – approaching your decision through the starting point of the FOUNDING OF LEXINGTON KENTUCKY is critical

**Churchill 92** [Ward, codirector of the Colorado chapter of the American Indian Movement and previous professor at the University of Colorado/Boulder. 1992. “Fantasies of the Master Race.” pg. 194-195]

"We are resisting this," Means goes on, "because spirituality is the basis of our culture; if it is stolen, our culture will be dissolved. If our culture is dissolved, Indian people as such will cease to exist. By definition, the causing of any culture to cease to exist is an act of genocide. That's a matter of international law; look it up in the 1948 Genocide Convention. So, maybe this’ll give you another way of looking at these culture vultures who are ripping off Indian tradition. It's not an amusing or trivial matter, and it's not innocent or innocuous. And those who engage in this are not cute, groovy, hip, enlightened, or any of the rest of the things they want to project themselves as being. No, what they're about is cultural genocide. And genocide is genocide, regardless of how you want to 'qualify' it. So some of us are starting to react to these folks accordingly." For those who would scoff at Meanss' concept of genocide, Mark Davis and Robert Zannis, Canadian researchers on the topic, offer the following observation: If people suddenly lose their 'prime symbol/ the basis of their culture, their lives lose meaning. They become disoriented, with no hope. A social disorganization often follows such a loss, they are often unable to insure their own survival...The loss and human suffering of those whose culture has been healthy and is suddenly attacked and disintegrated are incalculable. Therefore, Davis and Zannis conclude, "One should not speak lightly of 'cultural genocide' as if it were a fanciful invention. The consequence in real life is far too grim to speak of cultural genocide as if it were a rhetorical device to beat the drums for 'human rights.' The cultural mode of group extermination is genocide, a crime. Nor should 'cultural genocide' be used in the game: 'Which is more horrible, to kill and torture; or remove [the prime cultural symbol which is] the will and reason to live?' Both are horrible."

#### Thus we affirm impossible realism and give back the land. The role is to judge is to choose the proper starting point for social change. If the judge is trying to determine how debate includes, it starts with the requirement that the community seek out Native American voices. This is the first priority to the first Americans. Until we recognize that we are currently on stolen ground and dismantle the United States all together can we liberate native America from the grip of its imperial chokehold.

**Churchill 96** [Ward, former professor of ethnic studies at university of colorado, boulder, “i am indigenist,” from a native son pgs 89-94

The question which inevitably arises with regard to indigenous land claims, especially in the United States, is whether they are “realistic.” The answer, of course is, “No, they aren’t.” Further, no form of decolonization has ever been realistic when viewed within the construct of a colonialist paradigm. It wasn’t realistic at the time to expect George Washington’s rag-tag militia to defeat the British military during the American Revolution. Just ask the British. It wasn’t realistic, as the French could tell you, that the Vietnamese should be able to defeat U.S.-backed France in 1954, or that the Algerians would shortly be able to follow in their footsteps. Surely, it wasn’t reasonable to predict that Fidel Castro’s pitiful handful of guerillas would overcome Batista’s regime in Cuba, another U.S. client, after only a few years in the mountains. And the Sandinistas, to be sure, had no prayer of attaining victory over Somoza 20 years later. Henry Kissinger, among others, knew that for a fact. The point is that in each case, in order to begin their struggles at all, anti-colonial fighters around the world have had to abandon orthodox realism in favor of what they knew to be right. To paraphrase Bendit, they accepted as their agenda, a redefinition of reality in terms deemed quite impossible within the conventional wisdom of their oppressors. And in each case, they succeeded in their immediate quest for liberation. The fact that all but one (Cuba) of the examples used subsequently turned out to hold colonizing pretensions of its own does not alter the truth of this—or alter the appropriateness of their efforts to decolonize themselves—in the least. It simply means that decolonization has yet to run its course, that much remains to be done. The battles waged by native nations in North America to free themselves, and the lands upon which they depend for ongoing existence as discernible peoples, from the grip of U.S. (and Canadian) internal colonialism are plainly part of this process of liberation. Given that their very survival depends upon their perseverance in the face of all apparent odds, American Indians have no real alternative but to carry on. They must struggle, and where there is struggle here is always hope. Moreover, the unrealistic or “romantic” dimensions of our aspiration to quite literally dismantle the territorial corpus of the U.S. state begin to erode when one considers that federal domination of Native North America is utterly contingent upon maintenance of a perceived confluence of interests between prevailing governmental/corporate elites and common non-Indian citizens. Herein lies the prospect of long-term success. It is entirely possibly that the consensus of opinion concerning non-Indian “rights” to exploit the land and resources of indigenous nations can be eroded, and that large numbers of non-Indians will join in the struggle to decolonize Native North America. Few nonIndians wish to identify with or defend the naziesque characteristics of US history. To the contrary most seek to deny it in rather vociferous fashion. All things being equal, they are uncomfortable with many of the resulting attributes of federal postures and actively oppose one or more of these, so long as such politics do not intrude into a certain range of closely guarded self- interests. This is where the crunch comes in the realm of Indian rights issues. Most non-Indians (of all races and ethnicities, and both genders) have been indoctrinated to believe the officially contrived notion that, in the event “the Indians get their land back,” or even if the extent of present federal domination is relaxed, native people will do unto their occupiers exactly as has been done to them; mass dispossession and eviction of non-Indians, especially Euro-Americans is expected to ensue. Hence even progressives who are most eloquently inclined to condemn US imperialism abroad and/or the functions of racism and sexism at home tend to deliver a blank stare or profess open “disinterest” when indigenous land rights are mentioned. Instead of attempting to come to grips with this most fundamental of all issues the more sophisticated among them seek to divert discussions into “higher priority” or “more important” topics like “issues of class and gender equality” in which “justice” becomes synonymous with a redistribution of power and loot deriving from the occupation of Native North America even while occupation continues. Sometimes, Indians are even slated to receive “their fair share” in the division of spoils accruing from expropriation of their resources. Always, such things are couched in terms of some “greater good” than decolonizing the .6 percent of the U.S. population which is indigenous. Some Marxist and environmentalist groups have taken the argument so far as to deny that Indians possess any rights distinguishable from those of their conquerors. AIM leader Russell Means snapped the picture into sharp focus when he observed n 1987 that: so-called progressives in the United States claiming that Indians are obligated to give up their rights because a much larger group of non-Indians “need” their resources is exactly the same as Ronald Reagan and Elliot Abrams asserting that the rights of 250 million North Americans outweigh the rights of a couple million Nicaraguans. Leaving aside the pronounced and pervasive hypocrisy permeating these positions, which add up to a phenomenon elsewhere described as “settler state colonialism,” the fact is that the specter driving even most radical non-Indians into lockstep with the federal government on questions of native land rights is largely illusory. The alternative reality posed by native liberation struggles is actually much different: While government propagandists are wont to trumpet—as they did during the Maine and Black Hills land disputes of the 1970s—that an Indian win would mean individual non-Indian property owners losing everything, the native position has always been the exact opposite. Overwhelmingly, the lands sought for actual recovery have been governmentally and corporately held. Eviction of small land owners has been pursued only in instances where they have banded together—as they have during certain of the Iroquois claims cases—to prevent Indians from recovering any land at all, and to otherwise deny native rights. Official sources contend this is inconsistent with the fact that all non-Indian title to any portion of North America could be called into question. Once “the dike is breached,” they argue, it’s just a matter of time before “everybody has to start swimming back to Europe, or Africa or wherever.” Although there is considerable technical accuracy to admissions that all non-Indian title to North America is illegitimate, Indians have by and large indicated they would be content to honor the cession agreements entered into by their ancestors, even though the United States has long since defaulted. This would leave somewhere close to two-thirds of the continental United States in non-Indian hands, with the real rather than pretended consent of native people. The remaining one-third, the areas delineated in Map II to which the United States never acquired title at all would be recovered by its rightful owners. The government holds that even at that there is no longer sufficient land available for unceded lands, or their equivalent, to be returned. In fact, the government itself still directly controls more than one-third of the total U.S. land area, about 770 million acres. Each of the states also “owns” large tracts, totaling about 78 million acres. It is thus quite possible—and always has been—for all native claims to be met in full without the loss to non-Indians of a single acre of privately held land. When it is considered that 250 million-odd acres of the “privately” held total are now in the hands of major corporate entities, the real dimension of the “threat” to small land holders (or more accurately, lack of it) stands revealed. Government spokespersons have pointed out that the disposition of public lands does not always conform to treaty areas. While this is true, it in no way precludes some process of negotiated land exchange wherein the boundaries of indigenous nations are redrawn by mutual consent to an exact, or at least a much closer conformity. All that is needed is an honest, open, and binding forum—such as a new bilateral treaty process—with which to proceed. In fact, numerous native peoples have, for a long time, repeatedly and in a variety of ways, expressed a desire to participate in just such a process. Nonetheless, it is argued, there will still be at least some non-Indians “trapped” within such restored areas. Actually, they would not be trapped at all. The federally imposed genetic criteria of “Indian –ness” discussed elsewhere in this book notwithstanding, indigenous nations have the same rights as any other to define citizenry by allegiance (naturalization) rather than by race. NonIndians could apply for citizenship, or for some form of landed alien status which would allow them to retain their property until they die. In the event they could not reconcile themselves to living under any jurisdiction other than that of the United States, they would obviously have the right to leace, and they should have the right to compensation from their own government (which got them into the mess in the first place). Finally, and one suspects this is the real crux of things from the government/corporate perspective, any such restoration of land and attendant sovereign prerogatives to native nations would result in a truly massive loss of “domestic” resources to the United States, thereby impairing the country’s economic and military capacities (see “Radioactive Colonialism” essay for details). For everyone who queued up to wave flags and tie on yellow ribbons during the United States’ recent imperial adventure in the Persian Gulf, this prospect may induce a certain psychic trauma. But, for progressives at least, it should be precisely the point. When you think about these issues in this way, the great mass of non-Indians in North America really have much to gain and almost nothing to lose, from the success of native people in struggles to reclaim the land which is rightfully ours. The tangible diminishment of US material power which is integral to our victories in this sphere stands to pave the way for realization of most other agendas from anti-imperialism to environmentalism, from African American liberation to feminism, from gay rights to the ending of class privilege – pursued by progressive on this continent. Conversely, succeeding with any or even all of these other agendas would still represent an inherently oppressive situation in their realization is contingent upon an ongoing occupation of Native North America without the consent of Indian people. Any North American revolution which failed to free indigenous territory from non-Indian domination would be simply a continuation of colonialism in another form. Regardless of the angle from which you view the matter, the liberation of Native North America, liberation of the land first and foremost, is the key to fundamental and positive social changes of many other sorts. One thing they say, leads to another. The question has always been, of course, which “thing” is to the first in the sequence. A preliminary formulation for those serious about achieving (rather than endlessly theorizing and debating), radical change in the United States might be “First Priority to First Americans” Put another way this would mean, “US out of Indian Country.” Inevitably, the logic leads to what we’ve all been so desperately seeking: The United States – at least what we’ve come to know it – out of North America altogether. From there it can be permanently banished from the planet. In its stead, surely we can join hands to create something new and infinitely better. That’s our vision of “impossible realism.” Isn’t it time we all went to work on attaining it?

#### **The alternative helps whiteness overcome its blind spots and address the transnational dimensions of the comprehensive nature of whiteness - discussions of whiteness without a deconstruction of colonialism still leaves the basic tenants of othering and the US colonial state intact - you cannot discuss whiteness and targeted killing without first deconstructing colonialism.** **Carey et al'9** (Jane, PhD and Monash Fellowship in Centere for Australian Indigenous Studies at the Center for Women's Studies and Gender Research at Monash University, Katherine Ellighaus, Prof in the School of Philosophical, Historical and International Studies at Monash University, and Leigh Boucher, PhD and Professor in the Department of Modern History, Politics, International Relations at Macquarie University Re-Orienting Whiteness: A New Agenda for the Field. 2009. Pg. 4-6)

Unmooring whiteness from its foundations in U.S. pasts and presents promises to overcome many of the field's conceptual blind spots. By foregrounding the importance of colonialism, our approach addresses the transnational dimensions of the historical trajectories of whiteness. Until recently, history-writing has tended to contain the past within contemporary national borders. But the unstable fiction of race was and is always generated by processes that refuse to be enclosed within such territorial boundaries, and the global reach of whiteness cannot be explained by the simple application of U.S.-centered studies. Whiteness studies must pay far greater attention to the transnational as a field of power. As Angela Woollacott's early work on transcolonial voyages so potently demonstrated, whiteness travelled, both discursively and materially, and its meaning was always reconfigured in these circulations. As Frederick Cooper argues, the study of the pre-World War II world is often transnational precisely because empires encourage border crossings. This collection explores the genealogy of whiteness once we put the transnational in, and shows how historical analysis can bring local, temporal, and spatial specificity to this project. As we are faced by a “new world” of globalized cultural, economic, and social exchange, an effective history of the ways in which whiteness—as a figuration of identity and power—has been transnationally molded could not be more needed. Comprehending the strategies and dynamics of racialization requires a transnational analytic frame—if only to comprehend the contexts in which local specificities were generated. Conversely, understanding of global whiteness can only be achieved by simultaneously paying attention to these local specificities. Historians of the outposts of European empires are often acutely aware of the ways in which local conditions are always imbricated in transnational networks of exchange. The broad scope of this collection clearly demonstrates the far-reaching, if divergent, global currency of whiteness. Indeed, the characterization of whiteness studies as predominantly U.S. phenomenon is somewhat misleading. It reflects in part a tendency among U.S. scholars not to read outside of their own national historiography, or even, in the case of labor history, outside of their particular specialist area. Overviews of the field have largely failed to take note of how whiteness is being addressed in broader historical scholarship. But he suggest that some of the most productive work on whiteness has been taking place outside of the small group of scholars specifically identified with the field, particularly those engaged in studies of colonialism and its continuing effects. Dynamics of racialization have often been maintained via the unbearable discursive weight of Othering. Like the field of whiteness studies, we seek to reverse this strategy by attending to whiteness as the sovereign—if sometimes silent—social, legal, cultural, and experiential category that the very idea of race essentially functions to privilege. Reading whiteness into the colonial in this way may prove enormously productive. Postcolonial scholarship might also benefit from whiteness studies' explicit focus on race and racial privilege, which is, paradoxically, not necessary central to this approach. Aileen Moreton-Robinson's pioneering work on contemporary Australian feminism was among the first to integrate insights of both whiteness and postcolonial studies and clearly established the need for such a dialogue. Historians are well-placed to continue this project by showing the importance of imperial networks and processes to operation of white power. Indeed, since the publication of Edward Said's Orientalism in 1978, countless historical works have explored how “white identity” was contrapuntally forged through the colonial encounter, although their terminology has been quite different. Equally, reading the colonial back into whiteness has significant implications for U.S. historiography. The effacement of the “colonial” in U.S. history, a reluctance to see the United States as a sight of empire (whether as metrople or periphery), and the isolationist tendencies of U.S. historiography have enabled a rejection (if only via a lack of interest) of the possibilities of postcolonial theory to contribute to discussions of whiteness. As Moreton-Robinson has observed, U.S. scholars have located whiteness in relation to slavery and immigration, but not the dispossession of Native American peoples. This disjunction has been further fueled by the open hostility of many U.S. labor historians toward postcolonialism. By contrast, Warwick Anderson's work on American rule in the Philipines strongly argues the significance of colonial contexts for constructions of American whiteness, as do Ann Stoler's recent reflections on the salience of postcolonial theory for approaching U.S. history. Moreover, although this is rarely acknowledged, may whiteness scholars do in fact draw heavily on frameworks first proposed by postcolonial theory, particularly the concept of "Othering” and its exclusionary functions. Both fields view white/European identity as a largely “empty” category, defined solely in relation to and against that which is not (whether “savages” or slaves). With these synergies in mind, our approach attempts to resolve the hostilities and locate the many sympathies between the work of U.S. labor scholars of whiteness and scholars who approach race through the lens of colonialism.

#### We control the uniqueness in this debate – as long as the U.S. is allowed to exist with native land it will perpetuate systems of exclusion which ensure classism, racism, sexism, and homophobia

Dr. George Tinker, 06 Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 22.2 (2006) 116-121, Response, Tink Tinker, Tink Tinker, an enrolled member of the Osage (ni u kon'shka wazhazha) Nation, is professor of American Indian Cultures and Religious Traditions at Iliff School of Theology. He serves on the leadership council of the American Indian Movement of Colorado and volunteers as director of Four Winds American Indian Council in Denver.

If we are to revision native sovereignty, attention to a few critical agenda items is absolutely necessary: 1. We need to understand that there can be no change in the native enactment of sovereignty without a concomitant shift in the euro-american vision of their own sovereignty and the privileging of White men that comes with that notion of modern nationalism and statehood. That is to say that White American males must radically challenge the heteronormative privileging of the patriarchic nuclear family. To think that somehow Indian communities can live out a new sense of our own sovereignty without radical change in the ways that the artificial nation-state around us conducts its affairs is simply shortsighted. Smith [End Page 118] makes this point, but I would emphasize it even more strongly. It is time to radically and fundamentally challenge the givenness of the modern nation-state. To borrow African American historian Vincent Harding's striking metaphor, it will never suffice simply to remodel the master's house to make room for those of us who have been historically excluded or marginalized. Merely to remodel (or reform) the colonizer's house continues to build on the colonizer's architectural imagination as somehow the normative expression of social structure at a metanarrative level. The modern state, then, becomes an immutable given, even though it is fundamentally predicated on heteronormative principles, on the deeply rooted existing racial-gender-class structures that have pervaded the emergence of politics, economics, intellectual thought, and human relationships in the modern world of late colonial capitalism.7 The question is, how can we design and build a new house, one in which everyone is fully invested, instead of simply finding ways to give the colonized Other some room in the existing big house? 2. After more than five hundred years of european colonization in the Americas (and in most of the world), native people will have to pay explicit and careful attention to the extent to which our own minds have been co-opted by the discourses of the colonizer. Too often, our own solutions tend to be new policy strategies that concede the validity of the heteronormative colonial system now in place.

#### Any critique of political freedoms must begin with a more fundamental question. Who is included in the scope of political community that they claim to liberate? The founding gesture of the United States was genocide by land deprivation. Until that question is settled, legal reform in Indian country is a continuation of oppression.

**Rogin, 88** (http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Political\_Repression/Political\_Repression\_US.html.

“Political Repression in the United States”, from the book *Ronald Reagan: The Movie and other episodes in political demonology,* Michael, Prof of Poli Sci UC Berkeley).

A history of American political suppression must attend to the repression of active, political dissent. But it must also direct attention to **prepolitical institutional settings** that have excluded some Americans from politics and influenced the terms on which others entered the political arena. An account of American political suppression must acknowledge **the suppression of politics itself**. It must notice the relations between politics and private life. Countersubversive ideologies psychological mechanisms, and an intrusive state apparatus all respond to the fear of subversion in America. We begin with the controls exercised over peoples of color. "History begins for us with murder and enslavement, not with discovery," wrote the American poet William Carlos Williams. He was calling attention to the historical origins of the United States in violence against peoples of color. He was pointing to America's origins in the origins of a capitalist world system. Indian land and black labor generated a European-American-African trade in the seventeenth century and contributed to the development of commodity agriculture, industrial production, and state power in Europe and the Americas. Karl Marx wrote, "The discovery of gold and silver in America, the extirpation, enslavement, and entombment in mines of the aboriginal population, the beginning of the conquest and the looting of the East Indies, and the turning of Africa into a warren for the commercial hunting of black-skins, signalized the rosy dawn of capitalist production. These idyllic proceedings are the chief moments of primitive accumulation." By primitive accumulation Marx meant the forcible acquisition by a mixture of state and private violence of land and labor to serve the accumulation of capital. Primitive accumulation made land, labor, and commodities available for the marketplace before the free market could act on its own. The suppression, intimidation, and control of peoples of color supplies the prehistory of the American history of freedom. People of color were important, moreover, not only at the origins of America but also in its ongoing history-through westward expansion against Indians and Mexicans, chattel slavery and the exclusion of emancipated blacks from political and economic freedom, and the repressive responses to Hispanic and Asian workers. The American economy exploited peoples of color, but American racial history is not reducible to its economic roots. A distinctive American political tradition that was fearful of primitivism and disorder developed in response to peoples of color. That tradition defines itself against alien threats to the American way of life and sanctions violent and exclusionary responses to them. Indians in early America, emblematic of chaos, were not seen through New World lenses. They rather came to embody the masterless men who appeared in Europe with the breakdown of traditional society. "Liv[ing] without government," in the words of one early report, and freed of the restraints of family, church, and village as well, the idle, wandering savages were depicted as engaging in incest, cannibalism, devil worship, and murder. Some European-Americans, to be sure, depicted savages not as monstrous but as noble. Traders, promoters of commercial ventures, settlers no longer threatened by powerful tribes, and humanists drawn to a classical or Christian golden age all imagined peaceful primitives enjoying a state of innocence. But the noble savage and his dark double were joined. Both images of primitivism appropriated Indians for white purposes. Both made the Indians children of nature instead of creators and inhabitants of their own cultures. Both ignored Indian agriculture and depicted a tribalism that menaced private property and the family. Neither the noble nor the devilish savage could coexist with the advancing white civilization. Both images rationalized the dlspossession of the tribes. Indians did not use the land for agriculture, explained Massachusetts Bay governor John Winthrop. Since the wandering tribes failed to "subdue and replenish" the earth, white farmers could acquire their land. Winthrop's principle of expropriation was an accepted tenet of international law by the early eighteenth century. It did not justify the individual acquisition of farming plots, however, but rather state action. First the colonies and the mother country, then the independent states and finally the federal government expropriated land by making treaties with Indian tribes. George Washington, justifying the treaty method, defended the propriety of purchasing their lands in preference to attempting to drive them by force of arms out of our country, which, as we have already experienced, is like driving the wild beasts of ye forests, which will return as soon as the pursuit is at an end, and fall, perhaps upon those that are left there when the gradual extension of our settlements will as certainly cause the savage, as the wolf, to retire; both being beasts of prey tho' they differ in shape. Indians were animals, but fortunately they were men as well. As men they could make contracts, accept money, and consent to the loss of their land. Treaties presented a fiction of Indian freedom to disguise the realties of coerced consent, bribery, deception about boundaries, agreements with one faction enforced on an entire tribe, and the encouragement of tribal debts-real and inflated-to be paid off by the cession of land. The policy of Indian removal conceived by Thomas Jefferson, employed in his and succeeding administrations, and forced upon the southern Indians by Andrew Jackson, offered Indians the freedom to move west if they relinquished their ancestral holdings. Although removal treaties (discussed in chapter 5) were forced upon the tribes, the treaty method allowed Indian expropriation to proceed under the color of law. It engaged Indians in consent to their own subjugation. The federal government abrogated tribal treaty-making rights in 1871. In return for depriving Indians of their collective freedom, the government promised individual freedom. The government had begun to offer freedom to individual Indians early in the nineteenth century to atomize tribes and subject their members to market pressures and state laws. The most important individual freedom offered Indians was freedom from communal land ownership. Some tribal leaders in antebellum America believed that individual allotments were the only way to preserve Indian land, but widespread fraud and intimidation quickly transferred Indian freeholds to white land companies. The Dawes Severalty Act of 1887, which Theodore Roosevelt praised as "a mighty pulverizing engine to break up the tribal mass," offered Indians the opportunity to become free Americans; the freedom that they actually acquired was the freedom to alienate their land. Railroads, mining interests, cattlemen, and land corporations acquired the land allotments granted Indians. Between 1887 and 1934 the tribes lost an estimated 60 percent of their holdings. In 1983 Secretary of the Interior James Watt proposed to grant Indians "freedom" from their "socialistic" dependence on the federal government and on their tribes; Indian spokesmen, in response, denied they were Reds. The freedom offered Indians, from Jackson to Watt, has undermined communal loyalties as sources of political resistance. American Indian policy from the beginning combined freedom with coercion, the method of the marketplace with the method of the state. Government has shown two faces to the tribes, one of violence, the other of paternal guardianship. Consider the acquisition of land. Whites claimed Indian land not only by right of treaty or proper use but also as the fruits of a just war. Conflicts over land and living space produced a series of Indian wars, beginning with Virginia's war against the Powhatan Confederacy in 1622 and with the New England Pequot War of 1636-37. White expansion provoked most of these wars; savage atrocities were cited to justify them. Wars over living space produced civilian casualties on both sides; but whereas Indian violence was attributed to primitive ferocity, the systematic destruction of Indian crops and villages was defended as a matter of deliberate policy. White victories, it was said, proved the superiority of civilization over savagery. Indian wars were important in the colonies and during the Revolution. They also promoted American continental expansion from the War of 1812 to the closing of the frontier. More than two hundred pitched battles were fought in the West during the Gilded Age, and there was also periodic guerrilla warfare in outlying regions. The history of Indian war ended at Wounded Knee, South Dakota, in 1890 with the massacre of two hundred Sioux men, women, and children, including the old warrior, Sitting Bull, after a ghost dance ceremony. Indians displaced by treaty or defeated in war were offered "paternal guardianship." Indian tribes were "in a state of pupilage," ruled the Supreme Court in Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831); "their relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian." Since the Cherokees were not a nation, they could not maintain an action in court to protect their autonomy. As the equals of whites, Indians had the freedom to lose their land; as the wards of a paternal government, Indians were confined. The government adopted a reservations policy before the Civil War and enforced it on the western tribes in the late nineteenth century. Confined to reservations, tribes were dependent on government food, clothing, and shelter. Although they were held in protective custody, their land continued to be subject to encroachments from cattle, agricultural, and mineral interests. Confinement was seen not simply as the opposite of Indian freedom but as the preparation for a new kind of liberty. "Civilized and domesticated," reservation Indians were to be freed from their tribal identities and remade as free men. "Push improvement on them by education, alienation, and individuation," urged an Osage agent in the late nineteenth century. Indian agents encouraged commodity agriculture, ignoring unsuitable topographical and cultural conditions and the presence of rapacious whites. Compulsory government boarding schools regimented children in barracks far from their parents' homes, forced them to abandon tribal dress, and punished them for using their native tongue.

## ****2nc****

### ****solvency stuff****

**The false prioritization of race and slavery Your false prioritization only masks the genocidal violence that the US war machine is founded upon and will only serve to help legitimate more global violence in the future. Our method proves that the taking of indigenous lands is the historic lens through which all American history must be examined.**   
**Churchill '3** [Ward, codirector of the Colorado chapter of the American Indian Movement and previous professor at the University of Colorado/Boulder. 2003. “Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader.” pg. xv-xvi. http://www.questia.com/read/104248319?title=Acts%20of%20Rebellion:%20The%20Ward%20Churchill%20Reader]

The question arises of how best to approach the mass of information upon which any radical (re)interpretation of “The American Experiment” must proceed. 50 The sheer volume of what has been shunted aside in canonical recountings threatens to overpower the most intrepid of counternarratives, dissolving into a fine mist of contrarian detail. How then to give shape to the whole, ordering and arranging its contents in ways that explicate rather than equivocating or obscuring their implications, making the conclusions to be drawn not just obvious but unavoidable? How, in other words, to forge an historical understanding which in itself amounts to an open demand for the sorts of popular action precipitating constructive social change? 51 There are several methodological contenders in this connection, beginning with Howard Zinn’s commendable effort in A Peoples History of the United States to more or less straightforwardly rewrite Samuel Eliot Morison’s Oxford History of the American People in reverse polarity, effigizing rather than celebrating the status quo. 52 Historical materialism, 53 functionalism, 54 structuralism, 55 hermeneutics, 56 and even some of the less tedious variants of postmodernism offer themselves as alternatives (usually as the alternative). 57 So, too, do subgenres of postcolonialism like subaltern studies. 58 Each of these “visions of history, ” at least in some of their aspects, are of utility to the development of a bona fide U. S. historical praxis. 59 At face value, however, none are able to avoid the fate of either descending into a state of hopeless atomization, 60 or, alternately, overreaching themselves to the point of producing one or another form of re-ductionist metahistorical construction. 61 Perhaps the surest route to avoiding these mirrored pitfalls will be found in the Nietzschean method of “historical genealogy” evolved by Michel Foucault in works such as The Archaeology of Knowledge. 62 This is a highly politicized endeavor in which the analyst, responding to circumstances s/he finds objectionable in the present, traces its “lineage” back in time until a fundamental difference is discerned (this “historical discontinuity” is invariably marked by an “epistemological disjuncture”). Having thus situated the source of the problem in its emergence from a moment of historical transition, the analyst can proceed to retrace the unfolding of the specific history at issue forward in time, with an eye toward what would need to be “undone”—and how—if the future is to be rendered more palatable than the current state of affairs. In this, whatever set of circumstances prevailed prior to the discontinuity is mined for its potentially corrective features. 63 Instead of condemning the barbarism of pre-modern society, its inhumanity, injustice, and irrationality, Foucault presents the difference of the pre-modern system by demonstrating that, on its own terms, it makes sense and is coherent. The reason for doing so, let it be noted, is not to present a revised picture of the past, nostalgically to glorify [its] charms…but underline the transitory nature of the present system and therefore remove the pretense of legitimacy it holds by dint of a naïve, rationalist contrast with the past.

### at: perm do both

**ANY law stemming from the USFG is a continuation of colonial domination. The system that they claim to reform is founded upon stolen land. Even if we imagine a world where every item on the progressive agenda was fulfilled, the state itself would be stronger and their project would be co-opted by the very forces that they claim to oppose.**

**Churchill, 03** (Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader. THE NEW FACE OF LIBERATION:

Indigenous Rebellion, State Repression, and the Reality of the Fourth World).

Most of us here identify ourselves as “progressives, ” so let’s start with the term “progressivism” itself. We don’t really have time available to go into this very deeply, but I’ll just observe that it comes from the word “progress, ” and that the progression involved is basically to start with what’s already here and carry it forward. The underlying premise is that the social order we were born into results from the working of “iron laws” of evolution and, however unpalatable, is therefore both necessary and inevitable. By the same token, these same deterministic forces make it equally unavoidable that what we’ve inherited can and will be improved upon. 7 The task of progressives, having apprehended the nature of the progression, is to use their insights to hurry things along. This isn’t a “liberal” articulation. It’s what’s been passing itself off as a radical left alternative to the status quo for well over a century. It forms the very core of Marx’s notion of historical materialism, as when he observes that feudalism was the social precondition for the emergence of capitalism and that capitalism is itself the essential precondition for what he conceives as socialism. Each historical phase creates the conditions for the next; that’s the crux of the progressive proposition. 8 Now you tell me, how is that fundamentally different from what Bush and Clinton have been advocating? Oh, I see. You want to “move forward” in pursuance of another set of goals and objectives than those espoused by these self-styled “centrists. ” Alright. I’ll accept that that’s true. Let me also state that I tend to find the goals and objectives advanced by progressives immensely preferable to anything advocated by Bush or Clinton. Fair enough? However, I must go on to observe that the differences at issue are not fundamental. They are not, as Marx would have put it, of “the base. ” Instead, they are superstructural. They represent remedies to symptoms rather than causes. In other words, they do not derive from a genuinely radical critique of our situation—remember, radical means to go to the root of any phenomenon in order to understand it 9 —and thus cannot offer a genuinely radical solution. This will remain true regardless of the fervor with which progressive goals and objectives are embraced, or the extremity with which they are pursued. Radicalism and extremism are, after all, not really synonyms. Maybe I can explain what I’m getting at here by way of indulging in a sort of grand fantasy. Close your eyes for a moment and dream along with me that the current progressive agenda has been realized. Never mind how, let’s just dream that it’s been fulfilled. Things like racism, sexism, ageism, militarism, classism, and the sorts of corporatism with which we are now afflicted have been abolished. The police have been leashed and the prison-industrial complex dismantled. Income disparities have been eliminated across the board, decent housing and healthcare are available to all, an amply endowed educational system is actually devoted to teaching rather than indoctrinating our children. The whole nine yards. Sound good? You bet. Nonetheless, there’s still a very basic—and I daresay uncomfortable—question which must be posed: In this seemingly rosy scenario, what, exactly, happens to the rights of native peoples? Face it, **to envision the progressive transformation of “American society” is to presuppose** that “America”—that is, **the United States—will continue to exis**t. And, self-evidently, **the existence of the United States is**, as it has always been and must always be, **predicated** first and foremost **on denial of the right of self-determining existence to every indigenous nation** within its purported borders. Absent this denial, the very society progressives seek to transform would never have had a landbase upon which to constitute itself in any form at all. So, it would have had no resources with which to actualize a mode of production, and there would be no basis for arranging or rearranging the relations of production. **All the dominoes fall from there**, don’t they? In effect, the progressive agenda is no less contingent upon the continuing internal colonial domination of indigenous nations than that advanced by Bill Clinton. 10 Perhaps we can agree to a truism on this score: Insofar as progressivism shares with the status quo a need to maintain the structure of colonial dominance over native peoples, it is at base no more than a variation on a common theme, **intrinsically a part of the very order it claims to oppose**. As Vine Deloria once observed in a related connection, “these guys just keep right on circling the same old rock while calling it by different names. ” Since, for all its liberatory rhetoric and sentiment, even the self-sacrifice of its proponents, **progressivism replicates the bedrock relations** with indigenous nations marking the present status quo, its agenda can be seen as serving mainly to increase the degree of comfort experienced by those who benefit from such relations. Any such outcome represents a **continuation and reinforcement of the existing order**, not its repeal. Progressivism is thus one possible means of consummating that which is, not its negation. 12

**The sin of omission is exactly what allowed for mass extermination of indigenous peoples. North America was seen an empty land, despite its 80 million inhabitants. Simply adding indigenous issues to existing agendas reproduces the dominant narrative and renders Native Americans a mere a footnote.**

**Martinez, 96** (Elizabeth, Chicana writer, activist and teacher, December, Reinventing "America",

http://www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/dec96martinez.htm).

Every society has an origin narrative which explains that society to itself and the world with a set of mythologized stories and symbols. The origin myth, as scholar-activist Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz has termed it, defines how a society understands its place in the world and its history. The myth provides the basis for a nation's self-defined identity. Ours begins with Columbus "discovering" a hemisphere where some 80 million people already lived (but didn't really count since they were just buffalo-chasing "savages" with no grasp of real estate values and therefore doomed to perish). It continues with the brave Pilgrims, a revolution by independence-loving colonists against a decadent English aristocrat, and the birth of an energetic young republic that promised democracy and equality (that is, to white male landowners). In the 1840s the new nation expanded its size by almost one third, thanks to a victory over that backward land of little brown people called Mexico. Such has been the basic account of how the nation called the United States of America came into being as presently configured. **The myth's omissions are grotesque**. It ignores three major pillars of our nationhood: genocide, enslavement, and imperialist expansion (such nasty words, who wants to hear them?--but that's the problem). The massive extermination of indigenous peoples provided our land base; the transport and enslavement of African labor made our economic growth possible; and the seizure of half of Mexico by war, or threat of renewed war, extended this nation's boundaries to the Pacific and the Rio Grande. Such are the foundation stones of the U.S. along with an economic system that made this country the first in world history to be born capitalist. Those three pillars were, of course, supplemented by great numbers of dirt-cheap workers from Mexico, China, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, etc. all kept in their place by varieties of White Supremacy. They stand along with millions of less-than-Supreme white workers and share-croppers. Any attempt to modify the present origin myth provokes angry efforts to repel such sacrilege. In the case of Native Americans, scholars will insist that they died from disease, or wars among themselves, or "not so many really did die." At worst it was a "tragedy," but never deliberate genocide, never a pillar of our nationhood. As for slavery, it was an embarrassment, of course, but do remember that Africa also had slavery and anyway enlightened white folk finally did end the practice here. In the case of Mexico, reputable U.S. scholars still insist on blaming that country for the 1846-48 war, although even former U.S. President Ulysses Grant wrote in his memoirs that "We were sent to provoke a fight [by moving troops into a disputed border area] but it was essential that Mexico should commence it [by fighting back]." President James Polk's 1846 diary openly records his purpose in declaring war as "acquiring California, New Mexico, and perhaps other Mexican lands." To justify what could be called a territorial drive-by, the Mexican people were declared inferior; the U.S. had a "Manifest Destiny" to bring them progress and democracy. **Even when revisionist voices have exposed particular evils** of Indian policy, slavery, or the war on Mexico, those evils remained **little more than unpleasant footnotes**; the core of the dominant myth stands intact. PBS's recent 8-part documentary series entitled "The West" is a case in point. It devotes more than the usual attention to the devastation of Native America, but still centers on Anglos. Little attention is given to why their domination evolved as it did and so the West remains the physically gorgeous backdrop for an ugly, unaltered origin myth. In fact, our myth is strengthened by "The West" series. For White Supremacy needs the brave but ultimately doomed Indians to silhouette its own superiority.

**Our demand is separation from the law, the permutation, not matter how radically phrased, is merely assimilationist and will prop up the legitimacy of the existing order.**

**Moriwake, 98** (JD, Issac, 20 Hawaii L. Rev. 261, COMMENT: Critical Excavations: Law, Narrative, and the Debate on Native American and Hawaiian "Cultural Property" Repatriation, Summer/Fall).

Furthermore, on a conceptual level, legal solutions based on critical frameworks flirt with self-contradiction. Based on legal concepts, procedures, and dispute resolution methods alien to Native cultures, these solutions risk **perpetuating or repeating the injustices** they seek to remedy. By casting Native claims as purely "legal" rather than "political" or "moral," **these solutions also accept as a basic premise the legitimacy of the dominant order.** Law-based avenues of change thus selectively ignore the "informative" and "transformative" aspects of the Native framework -- granting **token benefits to Native communities, but preserving the cultural and socio-political hierarchy**. They confront Native advocates with the threat of assimilation and co-optation with little assurance of genuine results in return. Beyond the confines of "the law," or at least the law as contemplated by the sovereign power, the Native analytical framework also suggests other solutions that some may term "political" or "extra-legal." Based on various models for Native political restoration, these solutions offer wide-ranging responses to the equally expansive implications of the Native framework. Unlike piecemeal legal changes, they avoid artificial distinctions between issues of cultural identity and political sovereignty. At least conceptually, therefore, "political" solutions more faithfully capture the entire vision of the Native framework.

## 1nr

### 1nr cards

**Kentucky, specifically Lexington, should be returned – it was once a metropolis of the Elkhorn, now it is white wasteland**

**Ranck in ’72** (George Washington Ranck, “History of Lexington Kentucky,” http://books.google.com/books?id=hGR3UqPS0QEC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false)

The city now known as Lexington, Kentucky, is built of

the dust of a dead metropolis of a lost race, of whose

name, and language, and history not a vestigo is left.

Even the bare fact of tho existence of such a city, and such

a people, on the site of tho present Lexington, would never

have been known but for the rapidly decaying remnants

of ruins found by early pioneers and adventurers to tho

“ Elkhorn lands.”

But that these remains of a great city and a might}'

people did exist, there can be not the shadow of a doubt.

Tho somewhat notorious Ashe, who published a volume of

travels in 1806, says: “ Lexington stands on the site of an

old Indian town, which must have been of great extent

and magnificence, as is amply evinced by the wide range of

its circumvallatory works and the quantity of ground it

once occupied.” These works he declares were, at tho time

he saw them (1806), nearly leveled with the earth by the

ravages of time and the improvements that had been made

by the settlers. The testimony of the learned Prof. C. S.

liafinesque,\* of Transylvania University, fully corresponds

with this, and proves the former existence in and about the

present Lexington of a powerful and somewhat enlight-

ened ante-Indian nation. Other proofs are not wanting.

….

Until the year 1775, no white man is positively known to

have visited the place now called Lexington, but in that year,

says General Robert McAfee, in his history of the war of

,1812, “Robert Patterson, Simon Kenton, Michael Stoner,

John Iliiggin, John and Levi Todd, and many others took

possession of the north side of the Kentucky river, includ-

\ing Lexington. ” Fortunately the names of a few of those

included in the indefinite phrase, “many others” are pre-

served. They were John Maxwell, Hugh Shannon, James

Mnsterson, William McConnell, Isaac Greer, and James

Dunkin. \* They were sent out from the fort at Ilarrods-

burg. Clothed in their quaint pioneer style of buckskin

pantaloons, deerskin leggii s, linsey hunting-shirt, and

peltry cup, and armed each with a trusty flint-lock rifle, a

hatchet and scalping-knife, they toiled through the track-

less woods and almost impenetrable cane-brakes in the

direction of the future Lexington. Oil or about tho 5th of

June, the approach of night ended one of their solitary

and dangerous marches; and glad to rest, the tired hunters

camped on a spot afterward known successively as McCon-

nell’s Station, Royal’s Spring, and the Ileadly distillery prop-

erty. It is only a few steps from the present “ Old Frank-

fort road,” and is nearly opposite the beautiful Lexington

Cemetery.f The spring from which the pioneers drank

and watered their horses still exists, with a stream as cool,

clear, and grateful as then. After posting one of their

number on the “look out” for the “redskin varmints,”

who were ever on the alert to slay the “ paid-face,” the

rest seated themselves around a blazing brush-heap on logs

and buffalo hides, and, with hunger for sauce, supped with

gusto upon the then inevitable ‘‘jerk” and parched corn.

Dr. George Tinker, 06 Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 22.2 (2006) 116-121, Response, Tink Tinker, Tink Tinker, an enrolled member of the Osage (ni u kon'shka wazhazha) Nation, is professor of American Indian Cultures and Religious Traditions at Iliff School of Theology. He serves on the leadership council of the American Indian Movement of Colorado and volunteers as director of Four Winds American Indian Council in Denver.

If we are to revision native sovereignty, attention to a few critical agenda items is absolutely necessary: 1. We need to understand that there can be no change in the native enactment of sovereignty without a concomitant shift in the euro-american vision of their own sovereignty and the privileging of White men that comes with that notion of modern nationalism and statehood. That is to say that White American males must radically challenge the heteronormative privileging of the patriarchic nuclear family. To think that somehow Indian communities can live out a new sense of our own sovereignty without radical change in the ways that the artificial nation-state around us conducts its affairs is simply shortsighted. Smith [End Page 118] makes this point, but I would emphasize it even more strongly. It is time to radically and fundamentally challenge the givenness of the modern nation-state. To borrow African American historian Vincent Harding's striking metaphor, it will never suffice simply to remodel the master's house to make room for those of us who have been historically excluded or marginalized. Merely to remodel (or reform) the colonizer's house continues to build on the colonizer's architectural imagination as somehow the normative expression of social structure at a metanarrative level. The modern state, then, becomes an immutable given, even though it is fundamentally predicated on heteronormative principles, on the deeply rooted existing racial-gender-class structures that have pervaded the emergence of politics, economics, intellectual thought, and human relationships in the modern world of late colonial capitalism.7 The question is, how can we design and build a new house, one in which everyone is fully invested, instead of simply finding ways to give the colonized Other some room in the existing big house? 2. After more than five hundred years of european colonization in the Americas (and in most of the world), native people will have to pay explicit and careful attention to the extent to which our own minds have been co-opted by the discourses of the colonizer. Too often, our own solutions tend to be new policy strategies that concede the validity of the heteronormative colonial system now in place.

#### Understanding of space is key to positioning ourselves as scholar-activists

**Gilmore** prof geography @ USC **2k5** (Ruth Wilson, “The role of geography in public debate” Eds Alex Murphy Prog Hum Geogr 2005 29: 165)

When I set out in 1993 to earn the PhD, a bookseller acquaintance praised my choice of field, saying 'Geography is the last materialist discipline'. Colleagues across the political spectrum generally bristle at his assertion, while I have cherished it as one of two mantras I use when the going gets tough. The second, dating from the same week in 1993, is an exchange I had with a former student who was completely perplexed by my decision. When she asked why an activist lecturer on race, culture, and power would go study 'Where is Nebraska?' I replied that actually I was going to study 'Why is Nebraska?'. This explanation was such a hit among geographers that it turned up, without attribution, in the Lingua Franca guide to graduate school. Motivated to learn how to interpret the world in order to change it (cf Marx, 1845), I found in Geography ways to contemplate and document the vibrant dialectics of objective and subjective conditions that, if properly paid attention to, help reveal both opportunities for and impediments to human liberation. **Space always matters, and** **what we make of it in thought and practice determines, and is determined by, how we mix our creativity with the external world to change it and ourselves in the proces**s (cf Marx, 1867). In other words, one need not be a nationalist, nor imagine self-determination to be fixed in modern definitions of states and sovereignty, to conclude that, at the end ofthe day, freedom is a place. How do we find the place of freedom? More precisely, how do we make such a place over and over again? What are its limits, and why do they matter? What, in short, is the mix? In this brief paper I wish to outline how the lively hyphen that articulates 'scholar and 'activist may be understood, and enacted, as a singular identity. These pages are not prescriptive but rather suggestive. If they serve to raise Geography's profile in public debate, that will be great, because my interest is in proliferating, rather than concentrating, ways of thinking. The debates that most concern me center on how organizations and institutions craft policies that result in building social movement (through nonreformist reforms) rather than in areal redistribution of harms and benefits. The projects from which I have derived these lessons all involve novel practices of place-making that revise understandings and produce new senses ofpurpose. For example, in the effort to dismantle the prison industrial complex, one trajectory frames prisons as new forms of environmental racism which are equally, if differently, destructive of the places prisoners come from and the places prisons are built (Gilmore and Gilmore, 2004). Such destruction shortens lives, and all people caught in prison' gravitational field are vulnerable to its ambient material and cultural toxicities. Through forging links across enormous social and geometric distances, this activism extends the potential array of campaigns that abandoned rural and urban communities may design in their demand for both living and social wages. What rises to the surface is how people who are skeptical of 'the government' begin to engage in what I call 'grassroots planning'a future orientation driven by the present certainty of shortened lives. Moving to another example, which approaches the problem of 'planning' for those specifically excluded by state practices, organizations in urban and rural California are beginning to examine, through community design workshops, forums, and other means, the continuum (rather than the difference) between undocumented workers and documented felons. Both groups are equally unauthorized to make a living and participate fully in the institutions of everyday life (cf Hugo, 1862). All these projects have the potential for fostering previously unimagined or provisionally forgotten alignments (cf Linebaugh and Rediker, 2000), and they are connected by the likelihood that the folks who are becoming activists or reviving activism will die prematurely of preventable causes (cf Greenberg and Schneider, 1994; Gilmore, 2002). Engaged scholarship and accountable activism share the central goal ofconstituting audiences both within and as an effect of work based in observation, discovery, analysis, and presentation. Persuasion is crucial at every step. Neither engagement nor accountability has meaning, in the first instance, without potentially expanded acknowledgement that a project has the capacity to flourish in the mix. **As a result, and to get results, scholar-activism always begins with the politics of recognition.** Whether a project is compensatory, interventionist, or oppositional, the primary organizing necessary to take it from concept to accomplishment (and tool) is constrained by recognition. Recognition, in turn, is the practice of identification, fluidly laden with the differences and continuities of characteristics, interests, and purpose through which we contingently produce our individual and collective selves (Hall, 1994; Gilmore, 1999). Such cultural (or ideological) work connects with, reflects, and shapes the material (or politicaleconomic) relations enlivening a locality as a place that necessarily links and represents other places at a variety of time-space resolutions (Massey, 1994). Consistently, then, the scholar-activist works in the context of ineluctable dynamics that force her - deliberately yet inconsistently - at times to confirm and at times to confront barriers, boundaries, and scales (Gilmore, 1999; Katz, 2001a; 2001b). This is treacherous territory for all of us who wish to rewrite the world. There is plenty of bad research produced for all kinds of reasons (engaged or not), and lousy activism undertaken with the best intentions. In the following pages I will highlight what I have found to be key conceptual problems and perils, and end by suggesting some promising pathways that might be introduced into the mix.

#### Understanding spatial organization is key to the performance of positions

**Meusberger** senior prof geography @ University of Heidelberg **2k8** (Peter, “The Nexus of Knowledge and Space1” Chapter two of Clashes of Knowledge. Springerlink book)

Given the prospects of the Internet and other digital information systems, and the emergence of a borderless world, access to certain forms of knowledge is arguably easier and faster than ever before. Some observers (Cairncross, 1997; Knoke, 1996; Naisbitt, 1995; Negroponte, 1995; Relph, 1976; Toffler, 1980; Webber, 1964, 1973) have gone as far as to predict that advances in communication technology will lead to the death of distance, imperil locational advantages of cities, and make spatial disparities of knowledge irrelevant. Some people assume that scientific results can be generated everywhere, that “objective” scientific results are quickly accepted universally, that knowledge can be easily and rapidly disseminated throughout the world, and that everybody is able to gain access to the knowledge he or she needs. Others argue that knowledge is situated in space and time; that the generation and diffusion of knowledge is affected by the spatial context; that knowledge is built through acts of social interaction; that various types of knowledge spread at different speeds; that knowledge is not only in the heads of individuals but also represented in rules, routines, and architectures of organizations; that knowledge is reified in scientific instruments, machines, and research infrastructure; and that the various carriers of knowledge are never equally distributed in space. Spatial disparities in knowledge, professional skills, and technology can be traced back to early human history. New communication technologies—from the creation of the first scripts to the invention of paper, the construction of the first printing machine, the innovation of the telephone, and the introduction of digital information systems—facilitated and accelerated access to freely offered and easily understandable information. They also changed the spatial division of labor, the structure and complexity of organizations, the asymmetry and spatial range of power relations, and the ways in which social systems and networks are coordinated and governed in space. But none of these inventions ever abolished spatial disparities pertaining to the production, dissemination, and use of knowledge. Centers of power and knowledge have shifted, but spatial disparities of knowledge have never disappeared. On the contrary, most of these communication techniques enlarged the disparities between the centers and peripheries of national or global urban systems with regard to the distribution of workplaces for highly and marginally skilled persons. The proliferation of printing, the telephone, and electronic communication devices made much of former face-to-face contact dispensable but simultaneously created a demand of new face-to-face contact. Improved communication technology “will lead to more relationships and subsequent face-to-face meetings, as long as some relationships still use face-to-face meetings” (Panayides & Kern, 2005, p. 165; see also Gaspar & Glaeser, 1998). Many authors have predicted an unproblematic diffusion of codified knowledge through new information technologies or even a notable decrease in spatial disparities of knowledge in the context of globalization and a decline in the importance of proximity (Altvater & Mahnkopf, 1996, p. 269; Henkel & Herkommer, 2004; Machlup, 1962, p. 15; McLuhan, 1964; Radner, 1987, p. 737; Singh, 1994, p. 174; Stehr, 1994a, p. 343; 1994b; Werlen, 1997c, pp. 234, 384; Zare, 1997). However, I argue in this chapter that observers making these attempts to presume or predict the emergence of spatially ubiquitous knowledge make at least one of the following mistakes: ● They overlook the spatial consequences of the vertical division of labor, which become manifest in a spatial bifurcation of skills between centers and peripheries. ● They do not distinguish between knowledge and information and between different categories of knowledge; the distinction between codified and tacit knowledge or between individual and collective knowledge is not sufficient. ● They overlook the importance of the spatial context and spatial interactions in the generation, justification, diffusion, and application of new knowledge. ● They base their empirical evidence about the changing functions of cities on the resident population instead of on the places of work as recommended and demonstrated elsewhere (Meusburger, 1978, 1980, 1996b, 2000, 2001b). ● They disregard the findings of organization theory and underestimate the close affiliation between power and various categories of knowledge. They fail to acknowledge that a spatial system’s asymmetry of power relations between center and periphery continually prompts the migration of talent and thus produces, or reproduces, spatial disparities of knowledge. ● They apply a naïve model of linear communication between the sender and receiver of information. When analyzing the process of communicating knowledge from A to B, they overemphasize the producer and codifier of knowledge and neglect the cognitive processes taking place in the receiver of information. They overlook the importance that prior knowledge has for the ability, willingness, or reluctance of potential receivers to accept and integrate certain kinds of information into their knowledge base. They focus on codified knowledge as a tradable commodity and fail to notice that the acquisition and application of knowledge is primarily a cognitive process. ● They undervalue the importance of the time dimension in a competitive society. Success in a competitive situation does not depend on knowledge or information per se but on having knowledge before another competitor (agent) does or on receiving information earlier than others. Some of the standard views that mainstream neoclassical economists had on knowledge were that most of it could be codified and transformed in information, that codified knowledge was a public, tradable, and spatially very mobile commodity, that new communication and transport technologies would diminish spatial disparities of knowledge, that homo oeconomicus had access to the knowledge he or she needed for rational decision-making, and that spatial disparities of knowledge were only short-lived. In the last 20 to 30 years, most of these ideas have been largely discredited, not only in science studies, geography of knowledge, and actor-network theory, but also in economics, where they have been gradually replaced by concepts of bounded rationality, evolutionary economics, behavioral economics, learning organizations, new theories of the firm, and the strategic management approach (for an overview see Amin & Cohendet, 2004; Gigerenzer, 2001; Gigerenzer & Selten, 2001; Simon, 1956). The classical thinkers in sociology, too, once believed that scientific truths are generated independent of any local context. Durkheim (1899/1972) distinguished religion from science precisely in terms of the situatedness of the former and the placelessness of the latter (Gieryn, 2002c, p. 45)

#### making this debate a question of who was here first or what our identity is PAPERS OVER the fact that GENOCIDE OCCURRED ON THIS LAND – their appropriation of Native African identity REINFORCES THE LOGIC of the “Real Indians” that agencies such as the BIA use to enforce the continuing colonization of this argument

**Craven, ‘7** http://lists.econ.utah.edu/pipermail/a-list/2007-January/028559.html

Adolf Eichmann could have written that. And the Vichy Indians would have us accept that the very agencies set up to facilitate and cover-up genocide against Indigenous Peoples, and the very policies they set up to facilitate Indians being "defined" or exterminated "out of existence", are the very ones to be used to determine who and what is a "Real Indian". And further they have nothing to say about the clear corruption routinely going on in official BIA/DIA enrollments in the US and Canada with propertied whites being enrolled as "real Indians", while even "full-bloods", born and raised on the Rezes, without a clear one-quarter from a given Nation, are denied enrollment in order to limit the claims on shrinking pies of lands and resources. In fact, when you see some of the grants and papers that these academic types questioning Ward's background produce, when you have been to as many conferences with these sycophantic creatures (I was with a bunch of them not long ago in China) as I have, it should come as no surprise that they question Ward Chruchill's background as they certainly typically lack the preparation and intellect to take on, God forbid, the actual content of his highly distrubing--to their interests and those of their patrons--work. Now the issue of theft, misappropriation of Indian "Identity" and "Voice", in academia and elsewhere is an important one on several levels. First of all, narrow, often sujperficial, identity politics, along with some of the narrow identity-based programs in academia, often push the notion that to be truly "qualified" in some identity-based academic program, one must necessarily be from the group on which specialized research is being conducted. The presumption is that merely "being" whatever (Native, African-American, LGBT etc) is not only a credential in and of itself to be in that narrow identity-based program, but a necessary one at that to be taken as "credible" and, with the notions and criteria of who and what is a "real..? "themselves "being" quite superificial and suspect. We just had many Blackfoot, born and raised on Blackfoot Rezes, fluent in Blackfoot language, staunch practioners of traditional Blackfoot Spirituality, who have never betrayed Blackfoot People, notify DIA in Canada that they are not to be considered "DIA/Indian Act Indians", will not carry or recognize DIA ID cards and will not accept "Treaty 7 Money". Are they no longer "Real Blackfoot" while members of Blackfoot DIA/BIA Tribal Councils, under heavy investigation for apparent rampant corruption and collusion with genocide are the "Real Blackfoot"?