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### 1

#### OUR INTERPRETATION: The resolution asks a yes/no question as to the desirability of the United States Federal Government action. The role of the ballot should be to affirm or reject the actions and outcomes of the plan.

#### 1. THE TOPIC IS DEFINED BY THE PHRASE FOLLOWING THE COLON – THE UNITED STATES FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS THE AGENT OF THE RESOLUTION, NOT THE INDIVIDUAL DEBATERS

Webster’s Guide to Grammar and Writing 2K

<http://ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/marks/colon.htm>

Use of a colon before a list or an explanation that is preceded by a clause that can stand by itself. Think of the colon as a gate, inviting one to go on… If the introductory phrase preceding the colon is very brief and the clause following the colon represents the real business of the sentence, begin the clause after the colon with a capital letter.

#### 2. “RESOLVED” EXPRESSES INTENT TO IMPLEMENT THE PLAN

American Heritage Dictionary 2K

[www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved](http://www.dictionary.com/cgi-bin/dict.pl?term=resolved)

To find a solution to; solve …

To bring to a usually successful conclusion

#### 3. “SHOULD” DENOTES AN EXPECTATION OF ENACTING A PLAN

American Heritage Dictionary – 2K

[www.dictionary.com]

3 Used to express probability or expectation

#### 4. THE U.S.F.G. is the three branches of government

Dictionary.com 2k6 [<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/united+states+government>]

|  |
| --- |
| noun |
| the executive and legislative and judicial branches of the federal government of the United States |

#### Discussion of specific policy-questions is crucial for skills development---we control uniqueness: university students already have preconceived and ideological notions about how the world operates---government policy discussion is vital to force engagement with and resolution of competing perspectives to improve social outcomes, and it breaks out of traditional pedagogical frameworks

Esberg and Sagan 12

(Jane Esberg is special assistant to the director at New York University's Center on. International Cooperation. She was the winner of 2009 Firestone Medal, AND Scott Sagan is a professor of political science and director of Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation “NEGOTIATING NONPROLIFERATION: Scholarship, Pedagogy, and Nuclear Weapons Policy,” 2-17-12 The Nonproliferation Review, 19:1, 95-108 Taylor and Francis Online DA: 5-23-13//wyoccd)

These government or quasi-government think tank simulations often provide very¶ similar lessons for high-level players as are learned by students in educational simulations.¶ Government participants learn about the importance of understanding foreign perspectives, the need to practice internal coordination, and the necessity to compromise and¶ coordinate with other governments in negotiations and crises. During the Cold War,¶ political scientist Robert Mandel noted how crisis exercises and war games forced¶ government officials to overcome ‘‘bureaucratic myopia,’’ moving beyond their normal¶ organizational roles and thinking more creatively about how others might react in a crisis¶ or conflict.6¶ The skills of imagination and the subsequent ability to predict foreign interests¶ and reactions remain critical for real-world foreign policy makers. For example, simulations¶ of the Iranian nuclear crisis\*held in 2009 and 2010 at the Brookings Institution’s Saban¶ Center and at Harvard University’s Belfer Center, and involving former US senior officials¶ and regional experts\*highlighted the dangers of misunderstanding foreign governments’¶ preferences and misinterpreting their subsequent behavior. In both simulations, the¶ primary criticism of the US negotiating team lay in a failure to predict accurately how other¶ states, both allies and adversaries, would behave in response to US policy initiatives.7¶ By university age, students often have a pre-defined view of international affairs,¶ and the literature on simulations in education has long emphasized how such exercises force students to challenge their assumptions about how other governments behave¶ and how their own government works.8¶ Since simulations became more common as a¶ teaching tool in the late 1950s, educational literature has expounded on their benefits,¶ from encouraging engagement by breaking from the typical lecture format, to improving¶ communication skills, to promoting teamwork.9¶ More broadly, simulations can deepen¶ understanding by asking students to link fact and theory, providing a context for facts¶ while bringing theory into the realm of practice.10 These exercises are particularly valuable¶ in teaching international affairs for many of the same reasons they are useful for policy¶ makers: they force participants to ‘‘grapple with the issues arising from a world in flux.’’¶ 11¶ Simulations have been used successfully to teach students about such disparate topics¶ as European politics, the Kashmir crisis, and US response to the mass killings in Darfur.12¶ Role-playing exercises certainly encourage students to learn political and technical facts\*¶ but they learn them in a more active style. Rather than sitting in a classroom and¶ merely receiving knowledge, students actively research ‘‘their’’ government’s positions¶ and actively argue, brief, and negotiate with others.13 Facts can change quickly;¶ simulations teach students how to contextualize and act on information.14¶

#### Enagage kritikally

#### Engaging the state is critical to the ability of citizens to break into the project of solving global challenges: Engagement relies on an existing internationalist state and refocuses its energies through citizen participation in national institutions that solve for war as well as environmental and social challenges

Sassen 2009

[ColumbiaUniversity, istheauthorof TheGlobalCity (2ndedn, Princeton, 2001), Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages (Princeton, 2008) and A Sociology of Globalisation (Norton,2007), among others, 2009, The Potential for a Progressive State?, uwyo//amp]

Using state power for a new global politics These post-1980s trends towards a greater interaction of national andglobal dynamics are not part of some unidirectional historical progres-sion. There have been times in the past when they may have been as strong in certain aspects as they are today (Sassen, 2008a: chapter 3). But the current positioning of national states is distinctive precisely because 270 Saskia Sassen the national state has become the most powerful complex organizational entity in the world, and because it is a resource that citizens, confined largely to the national, can aim at governing and using to develop novel political agendas. It is this mix of the national and the global that is so full of potential. The national state is one particular form of state: at the other end of this variable the state can be conceived of as a technical administrative capability that could escape the historic bounds of narrow nationalisms that have marked the state historically, or colonialism as the only form of internationalism that states have enacted. Stripping the state of the particularity of this historical legacy gives me more analytic freedom in conceptualising these processes and opens up the possibility of the denationalised state.As particular components of national states become the institutional home for the operation of some of the dynamics that are central to glob-alisation they undergo change that is difficult to register or name. In my own work I have found useful the notion of an incipient denation-alising of specific components of national states, i.e. components that function as such institutional homes. The question for research then becomes what is actually ‘national’ in some of the institutional compo-nents of states linked to the implementation and regulation of economic globalisation. The hypothesis here would be that some components of national institutions, even though formally national, are not national in the sense in which we have constructed the meaning of that term overthe last hundred years.This partial, often highly specialised or at least particularised, dena-tionalisation can also take place in domains other than that of economic globalisation, notably the more recent developments in the humanrights regime which allow national courts to sue foreign firms and dictators, or which grant undocumented immigrants certain rights. Denationalisation is, thus, multivalent: it endogenises global agendas of many different types of actors, not only corporate firms and financial markets, but also human rights and environmental objectives. Those confined to the national can use national state institutions as a bridge into global politics. This is one kind of radical politics, and only one kind, that would use the capacities of hopefully increasingly denationalized states. The existence and the strengthening of global civil society organ-isations becomes strategic in this context. In all of this lie the possibilities of moving towards new types of joint global action by denationalized states–coalitions of the willing focused not on war but on environmental and social justice projects.

### 2

#### The silence of the aff on the question of how colonialism produced and conditioned politics condemns their project to reifying colonialism- the call to come before decolonization bases the aff’s moral system on the continued benefit of genocidal occupation AND it’s a sequencing question- identity must FIRST be informed by the historical, material, and fixed realities of the Native subject

Morgensen 2010

[Morgensen, Scott, 2k10, GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, Volume 16, Number 1-2, “Settler Homonationalism: Theorizing Settler Colonialism within Queer Modernities, 2010.]

Denaturalizing settler colonialism will mark it as not a fait accompli but a process open to change. While settlement suggests the appropriation of land, that history was never fixed: even the violence of allotment failed to erase collective Native land claims, just as land expropriation is being countered by tribal governments reacquiring sovereign land. In turn, as Thomas King and Paul Carter suggest, settlement narrates the land, and, as storytelling, it remains open to debate, End Page 122 such as in Native activisms that sustain Indigenous narratives of land or tell new stories to denaturalize settler landscapes. The processes of settler colonialism produce contradictions, as settlers try to contain or erase Native difference in order that they may inhabit Native land as if it were their own. Doing so produces the contortions described by Deloria, as settler subjects argue that Native people or their land claims never existed, no longer exist, or if they do are trumped by the priority of settler claims. Yet at the same time settler subjects study Native history so that they may absorb it as their own and legitimate their place on stolen land. These contradictions are informed by the knowledge, constantly displaced, of the genocidal histories of occupation. Working to stabilize settler subjectivity produces the bizarre result of people admitting to histories of terrorizing violence while basing their moral systems on continuing to benefit from them. The difference between conservative and liberal positions on settlement often breaks between whether non-Natives feel morally justified or conscionably implicated in a society based on violence. But while the first position embraces the status quo, the second does nothing necessarily to change it. As Smith pointedly argues, "It is a consistent practice among progressives to bemoan the genocide of Native peoples, but in the interest of political expediency, implicitly sanction it by refusing to question the illegitimacy of the settler nation responsible for this genocide." In writing with Kehaulani Kauanui, Smith argues that this complicity continues, as progressives have critiqued the seeming erosion of civil liberties and democracy under the Bush regime. How is this critique affected if we understand the Bush regime not as the erosion of U.S. democracy but as its fulfillment? If we understand American democracy as predicated on the genocide of indigenous people? . . . Even scholars critical of the nation-state often tend to presume that the United States will always exist, and thus they overlook indigenous feminist articulations of alternative forms of governance beyond the United States in particular and the nation-state in general. Smith and Kauanui remind us here that Indigenous feminists crucially theorize life beyond settler colonialism, including by fostering terms for national community that exceed the heteropatriarchal nation-state form. Non-Natives who seek accountable alliance with Native people may align themselves with these stakes if they wish to commit to denaturalizing settler colonialism. But as noted, their more frequent effort to stabilize their identities follows less from a belief that settlement is natural than from a compulsion to foreclose the Pandora's box of contradictions End Page 123 they know will open by calling it into question. In U.S. queer politics, this includes the implications of my essay: queers will invoke and repeat the terrorizing histories of settler colonialism if these remain obscured behind normatively white and national desires for Native roots and settler citizenship. A first step for non-Native queers thus can be to examine critically and challenge how settler colonialism conditions their lives, as a step toward imagining new and decolonial sexual subjectivities, cultures, and politics. This work can be inspired by historical coalition politics formed by queers of color in accountable relationship to Native queer activists. Yet this work invites even more forms, particularly when Native queers choose to organize apart. White queers challenging racism and colonialism can join queers of color to create new queer politics marked explicitly as non-Native, in that they will form by answering Native queer critiques. As part of that work, non-Native queers can study the colonial histories they differently yet mutually inherit, and can trouble the colonial institutions in which they have sought their freedom, as steps toward shifting non-Native queer politics in decolonizing directions.

#### Rejecting Identity is based on western conceptions of individual freedom that ignore the way that Indigenous peoples form their identity ties with the land, causes same forms of colonial domination

Sandy Grande. “American Indian Geographies of Power: At the Crossroads of Indigena and Mestizaje.” Harvard Educational Review, 70:4. Winter 2000.

In addition, the undercurrent of fluidity and sense of displacedness that permeates, if not defines, mestizaje runs contrary to American Indian sensibilities of connection to place, land, and the Earth itself. Consider, for example, the following statement on the nature of critical subjectivity by Peter McLaren: The struggle for critical subjectivity is the struggle to occupy a space of hope - a liminal space, an intimation of the anti-structure, of what lives in the in-between zone of undecidedability - in which one can work toward a praxis of redemption .... A sense of atopy has always been with me, a resplendent placelessness, a feeling of living in germinal formlessness .... I cannot find words to express what this border identity means to me. All I have are what Georgres Bastille (1988) calls mots glissants (slippery words). (1997, pp. 13-14) McLaren speaks passionately and directly about the crisis of modern society and the need for a "praxis of redemption." As he perceives it, the very possibility of redemption is situated in our willingness not only to accept but to flourish in the "liminal" spaces, border identities, and postcolonial hybridities that are inherent in postmodern life and subjectivity. In fact, McLaren perceives the fostering of a "resplendent placelessness" itself as the gateway to a more just, democratic society. While American Indian intellectuals also seek to embrace the notion of transcendent subjectivities, they seek a notion of transcendence that remains rooted in historical place and the sacred connection to land. Consider, for example, the following commentary by Deloria (1992) on the centrality of place and land in the construction of American Indian subjectivity: Recognizing the sacredness of lands on which previous generations have lived and died is the foundation of all other sentiment. Instead of denying this dimension of our emotional lives, we should be setting aside additional places that have transcendent meaning. Sacred sites that higher spiritual powers have chosen for manifestation enable us to focus our concerns on the specific form of our lives.... Sacred places are the foundation of all other beliefs and practices because they represent the presence of the sacred in our lives. They properly inform us that we are not larger than nature and that we have responsibilities to the rest of the natural world that transcend our own personal desires and wishes. This lesson must be learned by each generation. (pp. 278, 281) Gross misunderstanding of this connection between American Indian subjectivity and land, and, more importantly, between sovereignty and land has been the source of numerous injustices in Indian country. For instance, I believe there was little understanding on the part of government officials that passage of the Indian Religious Freedom Act (1978) would open a Pandora's box of discord over land, setting up an intractable conflict between property rights and religious freedom. American Indians, on the other hand, viewed the act as a invitation to return to their sacred sites, several of which were on government lands and were being damaged by commercial use. As a result, a flurry of lawsuits alleging mismanagement and destruction of sacred sites was filed by numerous tribes. Similarly, corporations, tourists, and even rock climbers filed suits accusing land managers of unlawfully restricting access to public places by implementing policies that violate the constitutional separation between church and state. All of this is to point out that the critical project of mestizaje continues to operate on the same assumption made by the U.S. government in this instance, that in a democratic society, human subjectivity - and liberation for that matter - is conceived of as inherently rightsbased as opposed to land-based.

#### Lack of decolonization results in ongoing genocide, assimilation and annihilation of indigenous peoples and culture- k2 solve environmental degradation, heterosexism, classism, racism, sexism and militarism

Churchill 96 (Ward, Prof. of Ethnic Studies @ U. of Colorado, Boulder BA and MA in Communications from Sangamon State, “From a Native Son”,mb)

I’ll debunk some of this nonsense in a moment, but first I want to take up the posture of self-proclaimed leftist radicals in the same connection. And I’ll do so on the basis of principle, because justice is supposed to matter more to progressives than to rightwing hacks. Let me say that the pervasive and near-total silence of the Left in this connection has been quite illuminating. Non-Indian activists, with only a handful of exceptions, persistently plead that they can’t really take a coherent position on the matter of Indian land rights because “unfortunately,” they’re “not really conversant with the issues” ( as if these were tremendously complex ). Meanwhile, they do virtually nothing, generation after generation, to inform themselves on the topic of who actually owns the ground they’re standing on. The record can be played only so many times before it wears out and becomes just another variation of “hear no evil, see no evil.” At this point, it doesn’t take Albert Einstein to figure out that the Left doesn’t know much about such things because it’s never wanted to know, or that this is so because it’s always had its own plans for utilizing land it has no more right to than does the status quo it claims to oppose. The usual technique for explaining this away has always been a sort of pro forma acknowledgement that Indian land rights are of course “really important stuff” (yawn), but that one” really doesn’t have a lot of time to get into it ( I’ll buy your book, though, and keep it on my shelf, even if I never read it ). Reason? Well, one is just “overwhelmingly preoccupied” with working on “other important issues” (meaning, what they consider to be more important issues). Typically enumerated are sexism, racism, homophobia, class inequities, militarism, the environment, or some combination of these. It’s a pretty good evasion, all in all. Certainly, there’s no denying any of these issues their due; they are all important, obviously so. But more important than the question of land rights? There are some serious problems of primacy and priority imbedded in the orthodox script. To frame things clearly in this regard, lets hypothesize for a moment that all of the various non-Indian movements concentrating on each of these issues were suddenly successful in accomplishing their objectives . Lets imagine that the United States as a whole were somehow transformed into an entity defined by the parity of its race, class, and gender relations, its embrace of unrestricted sexual preference, its rejection of militarism in all forms, and its abiding concern with environmental protection (I know, I know, this is a sheer impossibility, but that’s my point). When all is said and done, the society resulting from this scenario is still, first and foremost, a colonialist society, an imperialist society in the most fundamental sense possible with all that this implies. This is true because the scenario does nothing at all to address the fact that whatever is happening happens on someone else’s land, not only without their consent, but through an adamant disregard for their rights to the land. Hence, all it means is that the immigrant or invading population has rearranged its affairs in such a way as to make itself more comfortable at the continuing expense of indigenous people. The colonial equation remains intact and may even be reinforced by a greater degree of participation, and vested interest in maintenance of the colonial order among the settler population at large. The dynamic here is not very different from that evident in the American Revolution of the late 18th century, is it? And we all know very well where that led, don’t we? Should we therefore begin to refer to socialist imperialism, feminist imperialism, gay and lesbian imperialism, environmental imperialism, African American, and la Raza imperialism? I would hope not. I would hope this is all just a matter of confusion, of muddled priorities among people who really do mean well and who’d like to do better. If so, then all that is necessary to correct the situation is a basic rethinking of what must be done., and in what order. Here, I’d advance the straightforward premise that the land rights of “First Americans” should serve as a first priority for everyone seriously committed to accomplishing positive change in North America. But before I suggest everyone jump off and adopt this priority, I suppose it’s only fair that I interrogate the converse of the proposition: if making things like class inequity and sexism the preeminent focus of progressive action in North America inevitably perpetuates the internal colonial structure of the United States, does the reverse hold true? I’ll state unequivocally that it does not. There is no indication whatsoever that a restoration of indigenous sovereignty in Indian Country would foster class stratification anywhere, least of all in Indian Country. In fact, all indications are that when left to their own devices, indigenous peoples have consistently organized their societies in the most class-free manners. Look to the example of the Haudenosaunee (Six Nations Iroquois Confederacy). Look to the Muscogee (Creek) Confederacy. Look to the confederations of the Yaqui and the Lakota, and those pursued and nearly perfected by Pontiac and Tecumseh. They represent the very essence of enlightened egalitarianism and democracy. Every imagined example to the contrary brought forth by even the most arcane anthropologist can be readily offset by a couple of dozen other illustrations along the lines of those I just mentioned. Would sexism be perpetuated? Ask one of the Haudenosaunee clan mothers, who continue to assert political leadership in their societies through the present day. Ask Wilma Mankiller, current head of the Cherokee nation , a people that traditionally led by what were called “Beloved Women.” Ask a Lakota woman—or man, for that matter—about who it was that owned all real property in traditional society, and what that meant in terms of parity in gender relations. Ask a traditional Navajo grandmother about her social and political role among her people. Women in most traditional native societies not only enjoyed political, social, and economic parity with men, they often held a preponderance of power in one or more of these spheres. Homophobia? Homosexuals of both genders were (and in many settings still are) deeply revered as special or extraordinary, and therefore spiritually significant, within most indigenous North American cultures. The extent to which these realities do not now pertain in native societies is exactly the extent to which Indians have been subordinated to the mores of the invading, dominating culture. Insofar as restoration of Indian land rights is tied directly to the reconstitution of traditional indigenous social, political, and economic modes, you can see where this leads: the relations of sex and sexuality accord rather well with the aspirations of feminist and gay rights activism. How about a restoration of native land rights precipitating some sort of “environmental holocaust”? Let’s get at least a little bit real here. If you’re not addicted to the fabrications of Smithsonian anthropologists about how Indians lived, or George Weurthner’s Eurosupremacist Earth First! Fantasies about how we beat all the wooly mammoths and mastodons and saber-toothed cats to death with sticks, then this question isn’t even on the board. I know it’s become fashionable among Washington Post editorialists to make snide references to native people “strewing refuse in their wake” as they “wandered nomadically about the “prehistoric” North American landscape. What is that supposed to imply? That we, who were mostly “sedentary agriculturalists” in any event. Were dropping plastic and aluminum cans as we went? Like I said, lets get real. Read the accounts of early European arrival, despite the fact that it had been occupied by 15 or 20 million people enjoying a remarkably high standard of living for nobody knows how long: 40,000 years? 50,000 years? Longer? Now contrast that reality to what’s been done to this continent over the past couple of hundred years by the culture Weurthner, the Smithsonian, and the Post represent, and you tell me about environmental devastation. That leaves militarism and racism. Taking the last first, there really is no indication of racism in traditional Indian societies. To the contrary, the record reveals that Indians habitually intermarried between groups, and frequently adopted both children and adults from other groups. This occurred in precontact times between Indians, and the practice was broadened to include those of both African and European origin—and ultimately Asian origin as well—once contact occurred. Those who were naturalized by marriage or adoption were considered members of the group, pure and simple. This was always the Indian view. The Europeans and subsequent Euroamerican settlers viewed things rather differently, however, and foisted off the notion that Indian identity should be determined primarily by “blood quantum,” an outright eugenics code similar to those developed in places like Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa. Now that’s a racist construction if there ever was one. Unfortunately, a lot of Indians have been conned into buying into this anti- Indian absurdity, and that’s something to be overcome. But there’s also solid indication that quite a number of native people continue to strongly resist such things as the quantum system. As to militarism, no one will deny that Indians fought wars among themselves both before and after the European invasion began. Probably half of all indigenous peoples in North America maintained permanent warrior societies. This could perhaps be reasonably construed as “militarism,” but not, I think, with the sense the term conveys within the European/Euro-American tradition. There were never, so far as anyone can demonstrate,, wars of annihilation fought in this hemisphere prior to the Columbian arrival, none. In fact, it seems that it was a more or less firm principle of indigenous warfare is not to kill, the object being to demonstrate personal bravery, something that could be done only against a live opponent. There’s no honor to be had in killing another person, because a dead person can’t hurt you. There’s no risk. This is not to say that nobody ever died or was seriously injured in the fighting. They were, just as they are in full contact contemporary sports like football and boxing. Actually, these kinds of Euro- American games are what I would take to be the closest modern parallels to traditional inter-Indian warfare. For Indians, it was a way of burning excess testosterone out of young males, and not much more. So, militarism in the way the term is used today is as alien to native tradition as smallpox and atomic bombs. Not only is it perfectly reasonable to assert that a restoration of Indian control over unceded lands within the United States would do nothing to perpetuate such problems as sexism and classism, but the reconstitution of indigenous societies this would entail stands to free the affected portions of North America from such maladies altogether. Moreover, it can be said that the process should have a tangible impact in terms of diminishing such oppressions elsewhere. The principle is this: sexism, racism, and all the rest arose here as a concomitant to the emergence and consolidation of the Eurocentric nation-state form of sociopolitical and economic organization. Everything the state does, everything it can do, is entirely contingent on its ongoing domination of Indian country. Given this, it seems obvious that the literal dismemberment of the nation-state inherent to Indian land recovery correspondingly reduces the ability of the state to sustain the imposition of objectionable relation within itself. It follows that the realization of indigenous land rights serves to undermine or destroy the ability of the status quo to continue imposing a racist, sexist, classist, homophobic, militaristic order on non-Indians.

#### Our first priority is to give back the land—even a war was fought by mexicanos but a genocide was faced by natives.

#### Decolonization must be our ethical first priority, any form of liberation that perpetuates the occupation of Indigenous territory is only colonialism in another form. The demand to end the occupation of First American lands is a necessary prerequisite to solving other forms of oppression and any form of positive social change

Churchill 96 (Ward, Prof. of Ethnic Studies @ U. of Colorado, Boulder BA and MA in Communications from Sangamon State, “From a Native Son”,mb)

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 non- Indians 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 selfinterests. 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 of 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 discussion into “higher priority” or “more important” topics like “issues of class and gender equality” in with “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 (continues). 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. Non-Indians 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 leave, 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-Indian 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 progressives 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 with the consent of Indian people. Any § Marked 20:55 § 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 be the first in the sequence. A preliminary formulation for those serious about radical change in the United State 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 all together. From there is 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 worked on attaining it?

#### Deploying native intellectuism within this space and within this community is key to strengthen native identity, values, and spirit that have been long marginalized by people in debate and in the western institutions we all belong to

Kawakami et al. ‘07

[Alice J. Kawakami, Kanani Aton, Fiona Cram, Morris K. Lai, and Laurie Porima, University of Hawaii–mänoa, “Improving the Practice of Evaluation Through Indigenous Values and Methods: Decolonizing Evaluation Practice—Returning the Gaze From Hawaiÿi and Aotearoa” <<http://www.ksbe.edu/spi/Hulili/vol_4/improving_the_practice_of_evaluation_through_indigenous_values_and_methods.pdf>>//wyo-hdm]

To promote an indigenous worldview, projects in indigenous communities must be initiated by the community, and evaluations of those projects should focus on variables that the community hopes to change in positive ways. Sometimes § Marked 20:56 § these projects are well thought out and planned with evaluation in mind. At other times projects and services are initiated by indigenous communities when they see that there is a need for them, and the first thoughts are to fill this need rather than attending to the methods of a “scientific intervention” (Pipi et al., 2003). Evaluations that promote indigenous epistemology must be innovative and creative, including data that extend beyond conventional constructs. Those variables may include certain impacts as proof of attainment of project objectives as well as clarification and strengthening indigenous identity, values, and spirituality. Contextual variables such as location and relationships are features that are essential to understanding and participating in a cultural community. Contextual information and insider views must be used as data to assess value within the realities of the community (Cram et al., 2001). Both project design and evaluation phases must be conducted by individuals (including community members) with familiarity and competence in cultural and academic realms; however, because of the systematic historical dismantling of indigenous cultures, there is a “gap” generation of indigenous people who have lost much of their language and culture as they gained skills that allowed them to navigate successfully in Western society (Lai, Cram, Kawakami, Porima, & Aton, 2005). These individuals may have been raised by grandparents and parents who had been punished for practicing their culture and speaking their language (Simon & Smith, 2001). Or, as responsible caretakers of the young, they refused to pass on these practices, believing that a successful future for their children lay in assimilation into the dominant culture. Instead of learning and practicing their culture in the home and community, the “gap group” was groomed for success in the Western world of school and commerce. Many have indeed achieved success in academia and mainstream life and have recently begun to acknowledge the value of their indigenous culture and language. Lost cultural practices are now being acquired as knowledge and skills through formal instruction instead of through family lifestyle and practice. Conversely, “lucky ones” have learned their mother tongue and native culture through immersion in culture practices with guidance by elders or expert teachers who had the wisdom, foresight, and opportunity to resist Western domination and colonization. In the acquisition and maintenance of cultural knowledge, these lucky ones have had the advantage of learning the full range of nä mea Hawaiÿi a me ngä mea Mäori (things Hawaiian and things Mäori), behaviors and skills and, most importantly, understanding of the spiritual dimension of cultural life. Projects and evaluations in indigenous communities will benefit from collaborations of individuals who bring together both the indigenous cultural and Western perspectives. The “gap group” has the kuleana (obligation) to learn about the cultural practices of their ancestors and in return must use their positions and skills in predominantly Western institutions to create a place and space for the practice of indigenous protocols, to acknowledge indigenous points of view, and to promote and protect the value of the “lucky ones,” who are obligated to guide and teach the gap group so that indigenous ways become standard procedure. Evaluation in indigenous communities needs collaborative teams of indigenous people with both types of knowledge and skills. To empower indigenous communities to determine what is valuable in projects conducted in their midst, evaluation designs need to be viewed in broad and complex ways that begin with the essential cultural factors. Again we acknowledge that not all Western methodologies are as culturally insensitive as the evaluation practice construct we are arguing against; however, there are a plethora of examples of culturally inappropriate evaluations. The following framework is proposed to facilitate discussion of an expanded perspective on evaluation in indigenous communities.

### case

#### Retreat into grand theory is abandonment of solving social problems and constitutes an ideological retreat

Mir and Mir, 2002

[Raza, Raza Mir is Assistant Professor of Management at Monmouth University, Ali Mir is Assistant Professor of Management at Monmouth University, “The organizational imagination: From paradigm wars to Praxis.” Organizational Research Methods5. 1 (Jan 2002): 105-125, Access online via proquest] /Wyo-MB

In his analysis, technically efficient organizations do not serve their function, unless they play a socially constitutive role as well. In the face of this assault on freedom, the grand theoretical and abstracted empirical approach of social scientists represents an abdication of responsibility, a systematic withdrawal from the tasks of social science, and a betrayal of its promise. Mills's critique is directed both against what he sees as a theoretical imperialism as well as against the methodological premise that refuses to acknowledge that a pluralistic vision is essential for any comprehension of social conditions. In this manner, inappropriate theory is coupled with inappropriate method in an abandonment of what ought to be the rightful concerns of social scientists. This is, in essence, an ideological retreat. Reflecting on this in a later work, Mills (1960, p. 147) chastises this "refusal to work out an explicit political philosophy" and insists that "the end of ideology is an ideology-the ideology of an ending-the ending of political reflection."
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## Explanation

#### Merriam Webester’s Dictionary, 13

#### Chi·ca·no

 noun \chi-ˈkä-(ˌ)nō also shi-\

: an American (especially a man or boy) whose parents or grandparents came from Mexico

#### American heritage dictionary, 2k

Az·tlán  (äz-tlänhttp://img.tfd.com/hm/GIF/prime.gif)

**1.**In Aztec legend, the original home of the Aztec people, held to have been located in northwest Mexico.

**2.**The American Southwest, specifically the territory of northern Mexico ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848. The term is used especially by Chicano-rights activists.

## 2NC Impact Calc

#### Ow/s the aff- violence committed against Native people must be understood as qualitatively different than the marginalizations that occur to other minority groups- key to recognizing the colonialist privilege these groups seek to attain on stolen land

Sandy Grande. “American Indian Geographies of Power: At the Crossroads of Indigena and Mestizaje.” Harvard Educational Review, 70:4. Winter 2000.

In this article, Sandy Marie Anglas Grande outlines the tensions between American Indian epistemology and critical pedagogy. She asserts that the deep structures of critical pedagogy fail to consider an Indigenous perspective. In arguing that American Indian scholars should reshape and reimagine critical pedagogy, Grande also calls for critical theorists to reexamine their epistemological foundations. Looking through these two lenses of critical theory and Indigenous scholarship, Grande begins to redefine concepts of democracy, identity, and social justice. Until Indians resolve for themselves a comfortable modern identity that can be used to energize reservation institutions, radical changes will not be of much assistance. (Deloria & Lytle, 1984, p. 266) Our struggle at the moment is to continue to survive and work toward a time when we can replace the need for being preoccupied with survival with a more responsible and peaceful way of living within communities and with the everchanging landscape that will ever be our only home. (Warrior, 1995, p. 126) Broadly speaking, this article focuses on the intersection between dominant modes of critical pedagogy' and American Indian intellectualism.2 At present, critical theories are often indiscriminately employed to explain the sociopolitical conditions of all marginalized peoples. As a result, many Indigenous scholars view the current liberatory project as simply the latest in a long line of political endeavors that fails to consider American Indians as a unique populations Thus, while critical pedagogy may have propelled mainstream educational theory and practice along the path of social justice, I argue that it has muted and thus marginalized the distinctive concerns of American Indian intellectualism and education. As such, I argue further that the particular history of imperialism enacted upon Indigenous peoples requires a reevaluation of dominant views of democracy and social justice, and of the universal validity of such emancipatory projects - including critical pedagogy. It is not that critical pedagogy is irrelevant to Indigenous peoples, as they clearly experience oppression, but rather that the deep structures of the "pedagogy of oppression" fail to consider American Indians as a categorically different population, virtually incomparable to other minority groups. To assert this is not to advocate any kind of hierarchy of oppression but merely to call attention to the fundamental difference of what it means to be a sovereign and tribal people within the geopolitical confines of the United States.

**The alt is the first priority and the very existence of the U.S. makes their impacts inevitable**

Churchill ‘03

[Ward, Codirector of the Colorado Chapter of the American Indian Movement. Prof. of Ethnic Studies and American Indian Studies @ U. of Colorado, Boulder BA and MA in Communications from Sangamon State, “Acts of Rebellion: The Ward Churchill Reader”, p 263-5//wyo-hdm]

I am here, however, as may have been gleaned from my opening quotation of George Manuel, to discuss a reality left unmentioned not only by Mao, but by analysts of almost every ideological persuasion. This is **the existence of** yet another world, a world composed of **a plethora of indigenous peoples**, several thousand of us, **each of whom constitutes a nation** in our own right. 3 Taken together, these nations **comprise a** nonindustrial “**Fourth World**,” a “Host World” **upon whose territories and** with whose **natural resources each of the other three**, the **worlds of** modern **statist sociopolitical and economic organization**, **have been constructed**. 4 In substance, the very existence of any state—and it doesn’t matter a bit **whether it is fascist, liberal**. To put it another way, the denial of indigenous rights, both national and individual, is integral to **the** creation and **functioning of the world** order which has evolved over the past thousand years or so, and which democratic, or marxist in orientation—**is** absolutely **contingent upon usurpation of the material and political rights of every indigenous nation within its boundaries**—is even now projecting itself in an ever more totalizing manner into our collective future. 5 We say, and I believe this includes all of us here, that we oppose this prospect, that we oppose what was once pronounced by the papacy to be the “Divine Order” of things, what England’s Queen Victoria asserted was the worlds “Natural Order, ” what George Bush, following Adolf Hitler, described as a “New World Order, ” what Bill Clinton and Newt Gingrich have sought to consummate behind alphabet soup banalities like GATT and NAFTA and the MAI. In other words, we are opposed to the entire system presently “coordinated” by bodies like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and the Trilateral Commission. 6 We say we oppose all of this, and, with at least equal vehemence, **we announce our opposition to** more **particularized byproducts of the trajectory** of increasingly consolidated corporate statism, or statist corporatism, or whatever else it might be more properly called, that we as a species are presently locked into. The litany is all too familiar: an increasingly **rampant** homogenization and **commodification of** our **culture**s and communities; the ever more **wanton devastation** and toxification **of our environment**; **a**n already overburdening, highly **militarized and** steadily **expanding police apparatus**, **both public and private**, attended by an historically unparalleled degree of social regimentation and an astonishingly rapid growth in the prison-industrial complex; **conversion of** our **academic institutions into** veritable **“votechs” churning out little more than military/corporate fodder**; unprecedented concentration of wealth and power…. We say we oppose it all, root and branch, and of course we are, each of us in our own way, entirely sincere in the statement of our opposition. But, with that said, and in many cases even acted upon, what do we mean? 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 solutions. This will remain true regardless of the fervor with which progressive goals and objectives are embraced on, 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 exist**. 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**.

#### The alternative sparks global decolonization movements that are critical to averting environmental collapse and extinction

Tinker ‘96

[George E. Tinker, Iliff School of Technology, 1996, Defending Mother Earth: Native American Perspectives on Environmental Justice, ed. Jace Weaver, p. 171-72//wyo-hdm]

My suggestion that we take the recognition of indigenous sovereignty as a priority is an overreaching one that involves more than simply justice for indigenous communities around the world. Indeed, such a political move will necessitate a rethinking of consumption patterns in the North, and a shift in the economics of the North will cause a concomitant shift also in the Two-thirds World of the South. The relatively simple act of recognizing the sovereignty of the Sioux Nation and returning to it all state-held lands in the Black Hills (for example, National Forest and National Park lands) would generate immediate international interest in the rights of the indigenous, tribal peoples in all state territories. In the United States alone it is estimated that Indian nations still have legitimate (moral and legal) claim to some two-thirds of the U.S. land mass. Ultimately, such an act as return of Native lands to Native control would have a significant ripple effect on other states around the world where indigenous peoples still have aboriginal land claims and suffer the ongoing results of conquest and displacement in their own territories. American Indian cultures and values have much to contribute in the comprehensive reimagining of the Western value system that has resulted in our contemporary ecojustice crisis. The main point that must be made is that there were and are cultures that take their natural environment seriously and attempt to live in balance with the created whole around them in ways that help them not overstep environmental limits. Unlike the West’s consistent experience of alienation from the natural world, these cultures of indigenous peoples consistently experienced themselves as part of the that created whole, in relationship with everything else in the world. They saw and continue to see themselves as having responsibilities, just as every other creature has a particular role to play in maintaining the balance of creation as an ongoing process. This is ultimately the spiritual rationale for annual ceremonies like the Sun Dance or Green Corn Dance. As another example, Lakota peoples planted cottonwoods and willows at their campsites as they broke camp to move on, thus beginning the process of reclaiming the land humans had necessarily trampled through habitation and encampment. We now know that indigenous rainforest peoples in what is today called the state of Brazil had a unique relationship to the forest in which they lived, moving away from a cleared area after farming it to a point of reduced return and allowing the clearing to be reclaimed as jungle. The group would then clear a new area and begin a new cycle of production. The whole process was relatively sophisticated and functioned in harmony with the jungle itself. So extensive was their movement that some scholars are now suggesting that there is actually very little of what might rightly be called virgin forest in what had been considered the “untamed” wilds of the rainforest. What I have described here is more than just a coincidence or, worse, some romanticized falsification of Native memory. Rather, I am insisting that there are peoples in the world who live with an acute and cultivated sense of their intimate participation in the natural world as part of an intricate whole. For indigenous peoples, this means that when they are presented with the concept of development, it is sense-less. Most significantly, one must realize that this awareness is the result of self-conscious effort on the part of the traditional American Indian national communities and is rooted in the first instance in the mythology and theology of the people. At its simplest, the worldview of American Indians can be expressed as Ward Churchill describes it: Human beings are free (indeed, encouraged) to develop their innate capabilities, but only in ways that do not infringe upon other elements – called “relations,” in the fullest dialectical sense of the word – of nature. Any activity going beyond this is considered as “imbalanced,” a transgression, and is strictly prohibited. For example, engineering was and is permissible, but only insofar as it does not permanently alter the earth itself. Similarly, agriculture was widespread, but only within norms that did not supplant natural vegetation. Like the varieties of species in the world, each culture has contributed to make for the sustainability of the whole. Given the reality of eco-devastation threatening all of life today, the survival of American Indian cultures and cultural values may make the difference for the survival and sustainability for all the earth as we know it. What I have suggested implicitly is that the American Indian peoples may have something of values – something corrective to Western values and the modern world system – to offer to the world. The loss of these gifts, the loss of the particularity of these peoples, today threatens the survivability of us all. What I am most passionately arguing is that we must commit to the struggle for the just and moral survival of Indian peoples as peoples of the earth, and that this struggle is for the sake of the earth and for the sustaining of all life. It is now imperative that we change the modern value of acquisitiveness and the political systems and economics that consumption has generated. The key to making this massive value shift in the world system may lie in the international recognition of indigenous political sovereignty and self-determination. Returning Native lands to the sovereign control of Native peoples around the world, beginning in the United States, is not simply just; the survival of all may depend on it.

### Link

#### The affirmative leaves democracy and citizenship as sites of domination unquestioned which turns case, decolonization requires a wholesale refusal of these values

Sandy Grande. “American Indian Geographies of Power: At the Crossroads of Indigena and Mestizaje.” Harvard Educational Review, 70:4. Winter 2000.

Previous examinations of the potential for critical theory to inform Indigenous pedagogy (Grande, 1997, 2000) expose significant tensions in their deep theoretical structures. For instance, insofar as critical theorists retain "democracy" as the central struggle concept of liberation, they fail to recognize Indigenous peoples' historical battles to resist absorption into the "democratic imaginary"4 and their contemporary struggles to retain tribal sovereignty. In fact, it could be argued that the forces of "democracy" have done more to imperil American Indian nations then they have to sustain them (e.g., the extension of democracy in the form of civil rights and citizenship has acted as a powerful if not lethal colonizing force when imposed on the intricate tribal, clan, and kinship systems of traditional Native communities).

#### The notion of fragmented culture prevents the possibility of fighting for a radically better future

Teuton, 2001 (Sean, “Placing Ancestor’s postmodernism, realism and American Indian identity in James’s Welch’s winter in the blood” AIQ Vol 25, #4, 2001, project must, mb)

But Owens also recognizes the limitations of postmodernism. His struggle with contemporary theory peaks, it seems to me, when he tries to explain how an extremely colonized Native person regains a place in her or his culture. On this issue, he speaks directly to American Indians and addresses the responsi- bility of how best to secure Native freedom. Owens’s reading of Winter in the Blood reveals his desire for a theory to make sense of the cultural development of the novel’s Blackfeet narrator, beginning with the postmodern problem of the concept of recovery itself. Owens approaches the problem of cultural re- covery through the account of postmodernism produced by David Harvey: We can no longer conceive of the individual as alienated in the classical Marxist sense, because to be alienated presupposes a coherent rather than a fragmented sense of self from which to be alienated. It is only in terms of such a centred sense of personal identity that individuals can pursue projects over time, or think cogently about the production of a future significantly better than time present and time past. . . . Postmodernism typically strips away that possibility by concentrating upon the schizophrenic circumstances induced by fragmentation and all those instabili- ties . . . that prevent us even picturing coherently, let alone devizing strategies to produce, some radically different future.23 The postmodernist’s claim is most shocking because it denies oppressed people hope for a better future; the postmodern condition, according to Harvey, obviates human agency by controlling, in often unknown ways, virtually all aspects of our lives. In § Marked 20:02 § this view, the alienated “postcolonial” self can no longer even be considered as such because the colonized individual cannot identify the “center” from which she or he is alienated.24 This lack of self-knowledge locates the problem of uncertainty not in the alienation of the self from one’s culture but in the very absence of a recognizable center or collection of cultural norms of behavior and beliefs against which to compare our selves as we form our ideas of how those selves function within our cultures. For this reason, the postmodern individual—and certainly a colonized individual struggling under the conflicting demands of tribal and assimilated senses of self—cannot plan a future. One cannot project or chart one’s moral, spiritual, or cultural growth because one has no normative, central concept of identity by which to build and measure one’s development.
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#### Switch side debate is good-direct engagement, not abstract relation, with identities we do not identify with is critical to us to overcome the existential resentment we feel towards those with whom we disagree. Lack of switch-side facilitates a refusal to accept that our position is within question

Glover 10

[Robert, Professor of Political Science at University of Connecticut, Philosophy and Social Criticism, “Games without Frontiers?: Democratic Engagement, Agonistic Pluralism, and the Question of Exclusion”, Vol. 36, p. asp uwyo//amp]

In this vein, Connolly sees the goal of political engagement as securing a positive ‘ethos of engagement’ in relation to popular movements which alter existing assumptions, that is, a positive attitude towards attempts at pluralization. Connolly suggests we do so through thecultivation of two essential virtues: agonistic respect and critical responsiveness. 88 Agonistic respect is defined as a situation whereby each political actor arrives at an appreciation for the fact that their own self-definition is bound with that of others, as well as recognition of the degree towhich each of these projections is profoundly contestable. 89 While Connolly notes that agonistic respect is a ‘kissing cousin’ of liberal tolerance, he distinguishes it by saying that the latter typically carries ‘the onus of being at the mercy of a putative majority that often construes its own position to be beyond question.’ 90 Thus, agonistic respect is a reciprocal democratic virtue meant to operate across relations of difference, and Connolly deploys it as a regulative ideal for the creation agonistic democratic spaces. 91 In a somewhat related way, the virtue of ‘critical responsiveness’ also attempts to move beyond liberal tolerance. 92 Critical responsiveness entails ‘ careful listening and presumptive generosity to constituencies struggling to move from an obscure or degraded subsistence below the field of recognition, justice, obligation, rights, or legitimacy to a place on one or more of those registers.’ 93 Critical responsiveness is not pity, charity, or paternalism but implies anenhanced degree of concern for others, driven by the cultivation of reciprocal empathic concern 21 for that which you are not. 94 This attitude cannot be developed in an abstract relation to thesenew and existing forms of radical cultural, political, religious, and philosophical difference. Critical responsiveness above all requires that one ‘get[s] a whiff of experiences heretofore aliento [us]’, recognizing that while this may be unsettling or cause discomfort, direct engagement isthe means by which you, ‘work tactically on yourself and others to overcome existential resentment of this persistent condition of human being.’

#### CRITICAL DISTANCE & \*PUBLICLY\* ADVOCATING ARGUMENTS WITH WHICH YOU DISAGREE ARE ETHICALLY IMPORTANT:

Dennis G. **Day**, Professor, Speech, University of Wisconsin-Madison, CENTRAL STATES SPEECH JOURNAL, February 19**66**, p. 7.

All must recognize and accept personal responsibility to present, when necessary, as forcefully as possible, opinions and arguments with which they may personally disagree.   
To present persuasively the arguments for a position with which one disagrees is, perhaps, the greatest need and the highest ethical act in democratic debate. It is the greatest need because most minority views, if expressed at all, are not expressed forcefully and persuasively. Bryce, in his perceptive analysis of America and Americans, saw two dangers to democratic government: the danger of not ascertaining accurately the will of the majority and the danger that minorities might not effectively express themselves. In regard to the second danger, which he considered the greater of the two, he suggested:   
The duty, therefore, of a patriotic statesman in a country where public opinion rules, would seem to be rather to resist and correct than to encourage the dominant sentiment. He will not be content with trying to form and mould and lead it, but he will confront it, lecture it, remind it that it is fallible, rouse it -out of its self-complacency   
To present persuasively arguments for a position with which one disagrees is the highest ethical act in debate because it sets aside personal interests for the benefit of the common good. Essentially, for the person who accepts decision by debate, the ethics of the decision-making process are superior to the ethics of personal conviction on particular subjects for debate. Democracy is a commitment to means, not ends. Democratic society accepts certain ends, i.e., decisions, because they have been arrived at by democratic means. We recognize the moral priority of decision by debate when we agree to be bound by that decision regardless of personal conviction. Such an agreement is morally acceptable because the decision-making process guarantees our moral integrity by guaranteeing the opportunity to debate for a reversal of the decision.   
Thus, personal conviction can have moral significance in social decision-making only so long as the integrity of debate is maintained. And the integrity of debate is maintained only when there is a full and forceful confrontation of arguments and evidence relevant to decision. When an argument is not presented or is not presented as persuasively as possible, then debate fails. As debate fails decisions become less "wise." As decisions become less wise the process of decision-making is questioned.

And finally, if and when debate is set aside for the alternative method of decision-making by authority, the personal convictions of individuals within society lose their moral significance as determinants of social choice.