#### This debate actually began hundreds of years ago with the war that is now known as the Northwest War of 1785, which set the stage for the clearing of indigeneity that made this debate possible. The place we now occupy must be the focal point of the debate, as a settler epistemology structures this space.

#### While some nations have been dispossessed from this land, many remain to this day. However, settler society selectively grants recognition of Native populations in this place, erasing the indigenous status of many. For example, while the Pokagon Band of Potawotami are federally recognized, the Miami Nation of Indiana and the Wea Tribes are not.

(http://www.manataka.org/page237.html#indiana)

#### This politics of recognition merely works to affirm the generative structures of colonialism while upholding the inferior position of colonized peoples.

Coulthard 13 [Glen, Dene activist, professor of First Nations Studies and Political Science at University of British Columbia, “Indigenous Peoples and the ‘Politics of Recognition,’” 23 Mar 2013, <http://www.newsocialist.org/685-indigenous-peoples-and-the-politics-of-recognition>] // myost

Fanon's insights here immediately expose the limits of the politics of recognition for restructuring indigenous-state relations in Canada. This project has largely been conceived of in terms of reformist state redistribution schemes like granting certain "cultural rights" and concessions to indigenous communities through self-government and land claims processes. Although this approach may alter some of the effects of colonial-capitalist exploitation and domination, it does little to address their generative structures - in this case the racist capitalist economy and the colonial state. Seen from this angle, the contemporary politics of recognition simply leaves one of the two operative levels of colonial power identified by Fanon untouched. The second key problem with the politics of recognition's proposed remedy for colonial injustice has to do with the subjective realm of colonial power. Here it is important to note that most recognition-based proposals - whether we're talking about the recommendations of Charles Taylor or the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples - rests on the assumption that the flourishing of indigenous peoples as distinct and self-determining agents is dependent on their being granted recognition and institutional accommodation by and within the settler-state apparatus. As sociologist Richard Day has put it, under these models, recognition is conceived of as a "gift" bestowed from a superior identity to an inferior one. For Fanon, there are at least two problems underlying the idea that freedom and independence can be achieved via a gift of recognition. The first involves the relationship that he draws between struggle and the disalienation of the colonized individual. Simply stated, for Fanon it is through struggle and conflict (and for the later Fanon, violent struggle and conflict) that the colonized come to be rid of the "arsenal of complexes" driven into the core of their being through the colonial process.

#### Rather than meekly submitting ourselves to a society that depends on Native oppression, we would seek to challenge that society itself. The politics of recognition is premised on a logic on mastery. This is symptomatic of a form of temporal thinking that relegates indigenous peoples to the past, as either victims to the inevitable progress of history or bodies waiting to be assimilated into Western “civilization.” Never are affs forced to confront targeted killing, indefinite detention, and hostilities against native bodies – colonialism begins at this point of exclusion.

**Marzec 2001** (Robert, Teaches Postcolonial Studies @ State U of New York @ Fredonia, An Anatomy of Empire, symploke 9.1-2 (2001) 165-168, muse)

Retrieving crucial foundational shifts in history that determine the order of existence in our present marks the first aspect of this archival study of empire, or, to use Spanos's term, "anatomy." The second involves the interrogation of not only accepted discourses, but cutting-edge movements of critical thought as well, an aspect of scholarship that good cautious scholars take as a principal charge. In the work of Edward Said, for instance, Spanos traces a movement of thought that inadvertently leads to a major oversight in the field of postcolonial criticism empowered by Said's insights. Fleshing out the influence of colonization along the full continuum of being, Spanos throws into relief the repercussions of Said's emphasis on geopolitical imperialism and subsequent failure to give full weight to the ontological origins of occidental imperialism. This gesture enables Spanos to reveal the extent to which **the relay of imperial ideologies is enabled by a** centuries-long **colonization of the notion of "truth" itself**, a colonization governed **by a logic of mastery** that stems from Imperial Rome and **that "derives from thinking being** meta-ta-physica ["**above**," "beyond," or "outside" **things in** contextual, **temporal flux**]." Similarly, Spanos finds it highly disabling that **critics have come to take** Foucault's emphasis on the period of **the Enlightenment as** evidence for concluding this moment in history to be **a "mutation" in thinking resulting in Western Imperialism** proper." Consequently, **postcolonial theory** in general heedlessly **contributes to a failure to consider the full jurisdiction of imperialism**. The widespread impulse to emphasize the period of the Enlightenment as if it were the cradle of true imperial practices is symptomatic of the very disciplinarity that Foucault calls into question. This reconfiguration of critical thought enables Spanos to "unconceal" the ontological force of American contemporary imperialism, and to resituate the war in Vietnam as an event that reveals the violent metaphysical imperative of "mastering" informing the idea of America. In constructing his counter-memory archive, Spanos finds the origins of this impulse to master reality in the Roman transformation of Greek thinking. **The** early Greek **thinking of being as temporal and groundless** (notable in philosophers such as Parmenides and Anaxemander) **undergoes a hardening process that results in the colonization of lived events for purposes of intellectual manipulation**: the Greek logos as legein (words) is transformed into Logos as Ratio (the Word of Reason); **the agonistic** Greek [End Page 166] **understanding of truth** as a-letheia **is annulled in favor of** the Roman circumscription of **truth as correctness** (veritas). More than a challenge to accepted periodizations of imperialism, Spanos's compelling insight here shows how **colonization begins at the site of thought itself**, that it has been a way of thinking holding dominion for far longer than commonly considered. **Thinking**, he reveals, **has come to be governed by an impulse to reify being as a** thoroughly controlled **spatial image**, "a 'field' or 'region' or 'domain' to be comprehended, mastered, and exploited" (191). **This change naturalizes** and universalizes **an instrumentalism that transforms the "uncalculability of being" into a** utility, into a **"world picture"** that can be grasped in a technological age that conceals the nothing at the heart of the social order for purposes of reducing being to a disposable commodity. Consequently, the instability and **the antagonism offered by** the heterogeneity disseminated by **the movement of temporality is re-presented as a problem to be surmounted** and eventually "solved" with the imposition of "a final and determinate solution" (191). **The power** of this triumph **of instrumentalist thinking lies in its ability to throw** all **foundational inquiry into oblivion**. In its ubiquity, this instrumentality affects the very people attempting to offer opposition to the dominant order, for within the problematic of contemporary criticism, **one is** either characterized as **engaging in** a form of **"high theory" that** uses a language that **fails to speak to the world** at large, **or one resists by taking "real political action."** Thus, ontological analyses are doubly ostracized. This constitutes an incredible handicap to oppositional thinking in the post-Cold War era. Spanos writes: [F]or an opposition that limits resistance to the political, means a time of defeat. But **for the oppositional thinker** who is **attuned to** the **ontological exile** to which he/she has been condemned by the global triumph of technological thinking **it also means the recognition that this exilic condition of silence constitutes an irresolvable contradiction in the "Truth" of instrumental thinking** --the "shadow" that haunts its light--that demands to be thought. In the interregnum, **the primary task of the** margin-alized **intellectual is the re-thinking of thinking itself** . . [I]t is the event of the Vietnam War--and the dominant American culture's inordinate will to forget it--that provides the directives for this most difficult of tasks not impossible. (193) This "silencing" of an ontological engagement--what Heidegger referred to as "the forgetting of being"--parallels the silence surrounding the event of Vietnam on the part of American media and the intellectual deputies of the dominant Cold-War culture. If represented at all in the dominant American imaginary, the war appears as an embarrassment, a failure on the part of America to maintain its exceptionalist national self-image that has been part of the character of American identity as far back [End Page 167] as the Puritan "errand in the wildnerness." This prevailing view of Vietnam--made manifest most explicitly when President George Bush announced that the American people had "kicked the Vietnam syndrome" by "winning" the Gulf War--is part and parcel of the reigning philosophical view of the American order: **the Hegelian-informed view that we have reached the "end of history" with** the form of **democracy** known **as "free-market" capitalism** (an economy of ordering that not only governs Western nation-states, but seeks to rule "Third World" cultures as well). Having "reached the end" **implies that one has** solved and **mastered the contradictions hindering the socio-political domain**, that one "stands above" the fray and movement of difference. It is at this point that we come to see Spanos's most significant contribution to critical inquiry. His building of a counter-memory archive, through **the refusal to separate the ontological from the sociopolitical, enables him to reveal the full reign** and power **of** an **American exceptionalism** that presents itself as benign. **The power of this current order** of reality **lies in its ability to separate the many "sites" that constitute the continuum of being**. By presenting Vietnam, free-market democracy, Puritanism, the Hegelian "end of history," and the Roman transformation of Greek thinking as unrelated, the order disables the critical thinker from "unconcealing" the depth of its control. **This disciplined split**--the logic of the "interregnum"--**continues to consume** and disable **the full potential of resistance**. The split afflicts the most formidable thinkers, even Spanos's own intellectual master guides, Heidegger (who's emphasis on ontology overlooks the socio-political) and Foucault (who's primary focus on the socio-political register generates its own blindness to the power of ontological domination). **Questioning this logic of the interregnum demands** what one would hope scholarly research to always offer as a matter of course--**a reconsideration of the ways in which we think in the present**. **This requires that the scholar who wishes to rub against the imperatives of the interregnum rethink the very movement of thought**. In that rethinking we must confront without apology the increasing rapaciousness of not only the self-congratulatory nature of American rhetoric, but the growing, insidious neo-imperial movement of transnational corporations that have come to extend the logic of mastery beyond national borders. As such, living in the interregnum presents the critical scholar with a singular intellectual burden--one, according to Spanos, "most difficult but not impossible."

In particular, colonization relies on a racialization and minoritization of indigenous peoples. For example, in 2007, Indiana University, constructed The First Nations Educational and Cultural Center, supposedly for the advancement of cultural understanding.

The press release stated:

“Bloomington will celebrate the opening of a new center for American Indians, Alaska Natives and Native Hawaiians…”\*

And continued later with

 “It joins the Neal-Marshall Black Culture Center, La Casa and the Asian Culture Center as campus resource centers serving students of color.”\*

#### This process of racialization acts as a cover for occupation, recasting the US polity into a nation of immigrants rather than a nation of settlers.

Byrd 2011 (Jodi, Transit of Empire, Pg. 171-174, Vance)

The effect of these kinds of reinscriptions, in which Indians as “Native American” are always already naturalized as internal, colonized, abjected, and defeated, is that they erase the larger historical processes that are still at work in maintaining U.S. hegemonic control over the continent by reproducing through force the discursive juridical fiction of “domestic dependent.” Forced via the same U.S. colonial grinding engine to inhabit a parallax gap, Indianness, as it is projected out into the Pacific by¶ the United States to facilitate U.S. military occupations and conspicuous¶ touristic consumption, transits empire and, as a result, that Indianness serves as the faciality of the vested interests of a settler colonialism that dresses itself in democratic, rehabilitating clothes. Hawaiians, faced with¶ the paradigmatic Indianness that seems to justify U.S. illegal occupations, resist Indianness as a way to resist U.S. imperialism. It is a move that makes¶ complete sense—Hawaiians are not Indians—but that leaves us with the¶ unnamed American Indian man at the Akaka hearings saying in response:¶ “Why you would want to be Indian, I do not know” in a moment of selfdenial¶ that stands as a haunting indictment of the discourses of genocide and empire that have signified Indianness as radical alterity, oppression,¶ and death of agency.¶ From the North American continent, indigenous nations appear in and¶ around the edges where the machinations of settler colonialism are revealed in distortive parallactic effects as the sticky, affective, and lingering¶ planetary stretches of the truth of colonization that are the cascading effect of the Indian transit. Within that transit of U.S. empire, Indianness in dialectical relation to Hawaiian creates a Mobius strip of parallelisms that¶ never intersect, that mirror but remain in competition even as they are forced into a flattened horizon through juridical, legislative, and executive processes. U.S. colonialism enforces affinities between indigenous nations¶ on the continent and in the Pacific that those nations might not have chosen¶ for themselves, and anticolonial resistances create responsibilities to¶ the other as those nations colonized by the United States throughout its imperium struggle to overturn, end, and dismantle the lived conditions¶ that consume human life, land, resources, languages, and cultures in the name of capitalistic production and profit.¶ Always Look a Trojan Horse in the Mouth¶ When Republican governor of Hawai'i Linda Lingle testified in front of¶ the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs on March 1, 2005, she asserted¶ that Native Hawaiians, by not being incorporated into federal Indian law,¶ have been historically excluded from the benefits American Indians receive¶ from the government trust relationship. “There are three groups of indigenous people in America,” she argued. “Two of the groups have been recognized by the American Government, and one has not. The failure to pass this bill will continue the discrimination that exists against Native¶ Hawaiian peoples.”56 The collapsing of hundreds of disparate and distinct American Indian nations, each with their own histories of extensive treaty relations with the U.S. government, into one group and then making that¶ group indistinctly equivalent to a similarly collapsed grouping of Alaska¶ Native villages and corporations that are then parallel to the singular¶ Hawaiian kingdom to compose the “three groups of indigenous people in¶ America” commits a logical fallacy of epic proportions. Not only does it take 565 American Indian nations and Alaska Native villages to equal one “group” of Native Hawaiians, but these newly constituted “three groups” racialize indigeneity into minority groups within the United States whose injury can and will somehow then be remedied by the colonizing states recognition in spite of the fact that such recognitions do not end colonialism but rather enact it again and repeatedly. Lingle’s testimony gestures¶ towards a common discursive argument that circulates among Hawaiian,¶ haole, and American Indian supporters of the bill—that the problem of¶ Hawaiian status within the United States can be resolved by transforming¶ Hawaiians into American Indians. She further evokes some of the nineteenth¶ century’s rhetoric of “saving the Indian” when she observes that¶ residents of the state of Hawai'i must support the Akaka bill as a means¶ to “preserve the Native Hawaiian culture, which is the foundation for our¶ being in Hawaii. It is the essence of who we are as a people and a State. It is¶ also an economic imperative to our State because our State’s largest industry,¶ the tourist industry, is really dependent upon the preservation of Native¶ Hawaiian culture.”57 Lingle here performs in conservative, egregious¶ excess the ventriloquism of the speaking subaltern as she argues against¶ the injurious discrimination Hawaiians will continue to face if they are excluded¶ from the recognitions and “benefits” the other two groups enjoy.58¶ She then code-switches back to white possession to reveal the true stakes:¶ the continued economic profit off of Hawaiians as exotic tourist capital¶ that is the foundation for “our" being in Hawai'i.¶ The discourses of Indianness around the Akaka bill and federal recognition¶ of Native Hawaiians discussed in this chapter have prompted¶ those opposed to continued U.S. military occupation in Hawai'i to assert¶ in response that they are not Indians, did not live in tribes, did not hunt¶ buffalo, and do not want to be treated as such as if all indigenous peoples¶ on the North American continent did hunt buffalo and deserve to be colonized.¶ The distancing from the rhetoric Senators Inouye and Akaka evoke¶ to transform Hawaiians into “Native Americans” is absolutely necessary¶ to resist the discursive “Manifest Destiny” that has Inouye arguing that¶ the founding fathers and Chief Justice Marshall prognosticated control of¶ all indigenous peoples whose lands the United States may one day invade¶ by designating such people “Indians.” However, arguments that transform American Indians into always already “domestic dependent nations” internal to the United States reify the boundaries of U.S. expansion into the¶ now contiguous 48 states. From Hawai'i, looking across the ocean to the North American continent, the borders of the United States are consolidated, and the colonization and encapsulation of American Indian nations within the United States are complete.¶ During the Indian Affairs committee meeting at the beginning of March¶ 2005, Senator Daniel Akaka acknowledged that “some of my colleagues¶ have expressed concern that providing Federal recognition will be harmful¶ to American Indians and Alaska Natives” as he turned the floor back to¶ the participants.59 Though Governor Lingle, Jade Danner, and representatives¶ for the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, the Council for Native Hawaiian¶ Advancement, the National Congress of American Indians, and the Alaska¶ Federation of Natives testified that no BIA funding would be diverted¶ into the structures the bill proposes and assured the committee, in the words of Tex Hall, then president of NCAI, that “federal recognition, selfdetermination clearly is great,” the concern still stands.60 While the effect on Indian Country may not be monetary, there are significant discursive, cultural, and legal issues that impact how sovereignty, self-determination, and decolonization are framed both within the United States and within¶ the international courts. Arguments for and against the Akaka bill hinge¶ on historical and legal distortions of federal Indian law and reflect competing¶ understandings of what self-determination and sovereignty really¶ mean within the colonizing logics of U.S. juridical biopolitics. Given that¶ states are continually trying to assert jurisdiction over Indian nations¶ within their “borders” while conservative politicians of both parties attack¶ treaty rights and sovereignty on the basis that they are un-American and¶ discriminatory, it seems to me that whittling away at terminologies and¶ structures to further colonize Hawaiians culturally and legally can only be¶ detrimental to all nations currently occupied by the United States. In fact,¶ the Akaka bill, if passed, will put into Indian law a dangerous precedent,¶ particularly in the ways in which it positions the state of Hawai'i as having¶ a prominent and controlling role in how and what the Native Hawaiian¶ Governing Entity will be allowed to govern.

**Forgetting was not an option for us. Indian wars continue even today as the War Powers are deployed to defend the innocence of the settler state. The structural violence against native populations did not end with removal.**

**Pugliese 13** (Joseph [Associate professor of cultural studies @ Macquarie University]; State Violence and the Execution of Law Biopolitical Caesurae of Torture, Black Sites, Drones; p. 48-55; kdf)

Paglen's concept of 'relational geographies' can be productively amplified by conjoining it with the concept of 'relational temporalities,' that is, diachronic relations that establish critical connections across historical time and diverse geographies. **Relational temporalities draw lines of connection between seemingly disparate temporal events**: for example, t**he US state's genocidal history against Native Americans and the killing of civilians in places such as Iraq, Afghanistan or Pakistan.** In her tracking of the violent history of attempted genocide against Native Americans, **Andrea Smith writes:** **'the US is built on a foundation of genocide, slavery, and racsism.** '66 Situated in this context, what becomes apparent in **the scripting of the 9/11 attacks as the worst acts of terrorism** perpetrated on US soil **is the effective erasure of this foundational history of state-sponsored terrorism against Native Americans.** **This historicidal act of whitewashing effectively clears the ground for contemporary acts of violence against the United States to be chronologically positioned as the 'first' or hierarchically ranked as the 'worst' in the nation's history**. **The colonial nation-state deploys**, in the process, **a** type of **Nietzschean 'active forgetting' that ensures the obliteration of prior histories of massacre and terror such as** the catastrophic Trail of Tears that resulted from the Indian Removal Act of 1830. This Act enabled the forced removal of a number of Native American nations and their relocation to Oklahoma; in the process, at least four thousand Native Americans died. **The Trail of Tears** **has been described as 'the largest instance of ethnic cleansing in American history**.'67 This example of state terror **is what must be occluded in order to preserve the 'innocence' of the nation so that it can subsequently claim, post 9/11, to have lost the very thing it had betrayed long ago**. Jimmie Durham remarks on the repetition of this national ruse: 'The US, because of its actual guilt ... has had a nostalgia for itself since its beginnings. Even now one may read editorials almost daily about America's "loss of innocence" at some point or other, and about some time in the past when America was truly good. That self-righteousness and insistence upon innocence began, as the US began, with invasion and murder **Such acts of white historicide are constituted by a double logic of taken-for-grantedness and obsessive repetition**. Steve **Martinot and** Jared **Sexton, in their forensic analysis of the operations of white supremacy, articulate the seemingly contradictory dimensions of this double logic: It is the same passive apparatus of whiteness that in its mainstream guise actively forgets that it owes its existence to the killing and terrorising of those it racialises for that purpose**, expelling them from the human fold in the same gesture of forgetting. **It is the passivity of bad faith that tacitly accepts as 'what goes without saying' the postulates of white supremacy**. And it must do so passionately since 'what goes without saying' is empty and can be held as a 'truth' only through an obsessiveness. The truth is that the truth is on the surface, flat and repetitive, just as the law is made by the uniform.1"l **The it 'goes without saying' is the moment in which the very ideology of white supremacy is so naturalized as to become invisible: it is the given order of the world**. Yet, **in order to maintain this position of supremacy, a logic of tireless iteration must be deployed in order to secure the very everyday banality, and** thus **transparency, of white supremacy's daily acts of violence**. For those in a position to exercise these daily rounds of state violence, their performative acts are banal because of their very quotidian repetition; yet, because their racialized targets continue to exercise, in turn, acts of resistance and outright contestation, these daily acts of state violence must be obsessively reiterated. **Underpinning such acts of white supremacist violence and historicidal erasures is the official - government**, media **and academic - positioning of Native Americans as a 'permanent "present absence" 'that**, in Smith's words, **'reinforces at every turn the conviction that Native peoples are indeed vanishing and that the conquest of Native lands is justified.**'70 **Precisely what gets erased in the process are the contemporary Indian wars that are being fought across the body of the US nation. These are wars that fail to register as 'wars' because the triumphant non-indigenous polity controls the ensemble of institutions** - legal, military, media and so on - **that fundamentally determines what will count as a 'war' in the context of the nation**.

**Our critical indigenous reading engages settler ideology by starting at the point of place which allows us to deconstruct violent colonialism to affirm what should have always been known – there are 565 sovereign nations on Turtle Island.**

**Byrd 2011** (Jodi, Transit of Empire, Pg. xxix – xxx, Vance)

Although the United Nations’ Working Group on Indigenous Peoples¶ and the 2007 Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples have resisted¶ defining “indigenous peoples” in order to prevent nation-states from¶ policing the category as a site of exception, Jeft Corntassel (Cherokee) and¶ Taiaiake Alfred (Kahnawake Mohawk) provide a useful provisional definition¶ in their essay “Being Indigenous”:¶ **Indigenousness is an identity constructed**, shaped, and lived **in the politicized context of** contemporary **colonialism.** The **communities, clans, nations and tribes we call Indigenous peoples are** just that:¶ **Indigenous to the lands they inhabit, in contrast to** and in contention¶ with **the colonial societies and states that have spread** out from¶ Europe and other centres of empire. **It is this oppositional, place based existence**, along **with the consciousness of** **being in struggle against** the **dispossessing** and demeaning fact **of colonization** by¶ foreign peoples, **that fundamentally distinguishes Indigenous peoples** from other peoples of the world.32¶ In their definition there emerges a contentious, oppositional identity¶ and existence to confront imperialism and colonialism. Indigenousness¶ also hinges, in Alfred and Corntassel, on certain Manichean allegories¶ of foreign/native and colonizer/colonized within reclamations of “placebased¶ existence,” and these can, at times, tip into a formulation that does¶ not challenge neoliberalism as much as it mirrors it. But despite these¶ potential pitfalls, **indigenous critical theory** could be said to **exist in its best form when it centers itself within indigenous epistemologies and the specificities of the communities** and cultures from which it emerges **and then looks outward to engage European philosophical, legal, and cultural traditions in order to build upon all the allied tools** available. **Steeped in anticolonial consciousness that deconstructs and confronts the colonial logics of settler states carved out of** and on top of **indigenous** usual and accustomed **lands**, **indigenous critical theory has the potential** in this mode¶ **to offer a transformative accountability**.¶ **From this vantage, indigenous critical theory** might, then, **provide a diagnostic**¶ **way of reading and interpreting the colonial logics that underpin**¶ **cultural, intellectual, and political discourses.** But **it asks** that **settler, native,**¶ **and arrivant each acknowledge their own positions within empire and**¶ **then reconceptualize space and history to make visible what imperialism**¶ and its resultant **settler colonialisms** and diasporas **have sought to obscure**.¶ Within the continental United States, **it means imagining an entirely different**¶ **map and understanding of territory and space**: a map constituted by¶ over 565 sovereign indigenous nations, with their own borders and boundaries,¶ **that transgress what has been naturalized as contiguous territory divided**¶ into 48 states.33 “**There is always**,” Aileen **Moreton-Robinson writes**¶ of indigenous peoples’ incommensurablity within the postcolonizing settler¶ society, “**a subject position that can be thought of as fixed in its inalienable**¶ **relation to land. This subject position cannot be erased by colonizing**¶ **processes which seek to position the indigenous as object, inferior, other**¶ **and its origins are not tied to migration**.”34

**We hear a lot about the “debate space” these days. Every tournament we attend becomes undifferentiated, an empty and neutral space devoid of history and content. As Oklahomans, debating in Indiana, Austin and I demand that debate confront the ways that the activity perpetuates regimes of domination visited upon this place and every place we visit. The primary question of this debate must be our ongoing occupation of Native lands and how the clearing of indigeneity is the condition of possibility for our activity.**

**Dominant understanding of space encourages a nomadic approach to life. In order to have a connection with place we must start with historical understanding of the land we find ourselves.**

**Deloria 99** [Vine, badass, For This Land, p. 253-255, Vance]

When non-Indians admire or try to emulate the Indian love of land, they generally think of the reflective emotions that Indians¶ about lands and places. Unfortunately, **most whites lack** the **historical perspective of places** simply because they have not lived on the land long enough. In addition, **few whites preserve stories about the land, and very little is passed** down **which helps people identify the special aspect of places**.¶ A popular old story makes this point eloquently. A Crow chief told¶ that the government owned his land, said that they could not own it¶ because the first several feet down consisted of the bones of his ancestors¶ and the dust of the previous generations of Crow people. If the government wanted to claim anything, the chief continued, it would have to¶ begin where the Crow people’s contribution ended. This feeling of unity¶ with the land can only come through the prolonged intimacy of living¶ on the land. Now, **there is no question** in my mind that a good **many non-Indians have some** of **the same** emotional **attachment to land that most Indians do**. For example, **the land has impressed itself upon** rural **whites in**¶ Appalachia, the South, **parts of the Great Plains**, and other isolated areas,¶ **and made indelible changes in the way the people perceive themselves.** **One could not read The Grapes of Wrath** or Raintree County **without encountering** such **deep feelings**. And critical to the recognition of this attachment is the family, the community, as functioning parts of the landscape. It is not too much to argue that **without** the group of **people sharing a sense of history on the land, there can be nothing more for the individual than a tourist’s** aesthetic feeling of **beauty, which is** but a **temporary** reflection of the deeper emotion to be gained from the land.¶ **The first dimension of Indian feeling about the land is** therefore an¶ mission that **we are part and parcel of it physically**. However, our real contribution makes sense only because our **memory of land is a memory of ourselves** and our deeds **and experiences**. These memories I experiences are always particular. **One thinks of Gettysburg and** President **Lincoln’s** magnificent **speech** **recognizing that** **the sacrifice of** so many **lives hallowed the ground beyond our power to add or detract.** **When asked where his lands were, Crazy Horse replied** that his lands were **where his dead lay buried**. He was not thinking of the general condition of flesh made by generations of Sioux to the Great Plains, but of¶ immediate past deeds of his generation. These had imprinted on **the**¶ new **stories and experiences** that **gave the Sioux a moral title to the lands**. Luther Standing Bear once remarked that a people had to be born, reborn, and reborn again on a piece of land before beginning to come to grips with its rhythms. Thus, in addition to the general contribution of occupation, comes the coincident requirement that **people must freely given of themselves to the land at specific places in order to understand it.** One major difficulty which non-Indians face in trying to make an imprint on the North American continent is the absence of any real or lasting communities. **Non-Indian Americans**, not the Indians, **are the real nomads**. White Americans **are rarely buried in the places they were born**, and most of them migrate freely during their lifetimes, living in as many as a dozen places and having roots in and accepting responsibility for none of these locations. There is, consequently, no continuing community to which they can pass along stories and memories. Without a continuing community one comes from and returns to, land does not become personalized. The only feeling that can be generated is an aesthetic one. **Few non-Indians find satisfaction in walking along a river bank or on a bluff and realizing that their great-great-grandfathers once walked that** very **spot** and had certain experiences. The feeling is one of lack of community and continuity. **When non-Indians live on a specific piece of land for a number of generations, they also begin to come into this reflective** kind of **relationship**. The danger, however, is that **non-Indian society** as it is **presently** constituted **encourages the abandonment of land and community**. Further, **it fails to provide a human context within** **which** appreciation for and **understanding** **of land can take place.** A good deal of what constitutes present-day love of and appreciation for land is aesthetic, a momentary warm feeling that is invoked by the uniqueness of the place. This warmth does inspire the individual, but it does not sustain communities and therefore a prolonged relationship with the land is forfeited. When we discuss revelatory experiences we enter an entirely different realm of discourse Holy places connected with revelation art exceedingly rare. If we carefully analyze Indian stories about religious experiences, we discover that many things we believed at first to be revelations are in fact reflections of or experiences directed by religious training and supervision. What then are revelatory experiences? first characteristic is that the **old categories of space and time vanish. New realities take their places** and suggest dimensions of life **far beyond what we are normally able to** discern and **understand.** **Suddenly the everyday world does not exist because it is**, in a fundamental sense, **a predictable world which we can control**. But **in revelatory experience find that we are objects within a place and no longer acting subjects capable of directing events**. Some of the medicine men and women describe their feelings as intense dread and foreboding.

**The role of the ballot is to endorse the team with the best epistemological approach to this place. Only epistemologies centered on place can resolve the soul wound of American modernity which would otherwise guarantee violence**

**Greenwood 9** [David A., Washington State University, “Place, Survivance, and White Remembrance: A Decolonizing Challenge to Rural Education in Mobile Modernity,” *Journal of Research in Rural Educatio* 24.10 (2009): n/p, <http://www.jrre.psu.edu/articles/24-10.pdf>] // myost

The term survivance is used in Native American Studies to describe the self-representation of Indigenous people against the subjugations, distortions, and erasures of White colonization and hegemony (Grande, 2004; Stromberg, 2006; villegas, Neugebauer & venegas, 2008; vizenor, 1994, 2008). Gerald vizenor (2008) calls Native survivance “an active sense of presence over absence, deracination, and oblivion; survivance is the continuance of stories, not a mere reaction….Survivance, then, is the action, condition, quality, and sentiments of the verb survive” (pp. 1, 19). Like the construct of “place” itself, the idea and experience of survivance opens space in educational scholarship for a determined resistance to violence toward a storied, living landscape and Indigenous ways of being that are rooted in place, land, and community; **survivance in place is both to survive and resist** the **placelessness** of schooling **and all of its violent erasures and enclosures**—**including the erasure of the land’s history and of Indigenous presence, and the enclosure of everyone’s experience of the land**, what Jay Griffiths (2006) calls “the deforestation of the human mind” (p. 25). I use the term here to refer both to Native survivance, and to other forms of resistance to erasure that allow one to survive and maintain presence in ways that are counter to dominant cultural narratives. **It is not uncommon to speak of colonization and cultural violence** among my academic colleagues, **but the objects of violence in these contexts are usually** the “**subaltern others**” who stand in binary opposition to the White, privileged, or educated class of “mobile modernity.” **It is more difficult** to acknowledge what Indigenous scholars Redbear and Marker asked their mainly White audiences **to consider**: **that all of us carry a** psychic or **soul-wounding inherited by the colonial mindset**, which is **the foundation of our** formal **educational systems. White people need to acknowledge this wound** in order **for it to be healed in themselves as well as in space and time**. This sentiment is evident in the worldwide movement for reparations from genocide, slavery, displacement, apartheid, and other forms of colonization and oppression. Similarly, Freire (1970/2005) insists that the oppressor is no more free than the oppressed: “As the oppressed, fighting to be human, take away the oppressors’ power to dominate and suppress, they restore to the oppressors the humanity they had lost in the exercise of oppression” (p. 56). While Freire’s work may be rightly criticized for its own colonizing potential and for reproducing simplistic binaries (e.g., oppressor/oppressed relations), the idea here is that **Native survivance is a place-based** “**pedagogy of the oppressed**,” and that survivance can refer also to recovering and maintaining other ways of being and knowing that schooling threatens to eliminate. To speak of colonization, soul-wounding, healing, and the struggles of resistance among the Native people I know is to speak the obvious. By suggesting that non-Native people, even White people, share an analogous wounding and need for healing, I do not mean to equate Native and non-Native experience or to minimize in any way **the trauma of 500 years of forced displacement and violence against Native people**. Indeed, it is precisely this history, and the history of Native survivance, that I believe **needs to be remembered in any conversation about place and education** that is **literate about the historical record of the land and its peoples. If we are** at all **interested in place, pursuing the questions—What happened here? What needs to be remembered, restored, or conserved?—needs to become a prominent feature of educational inquiry. Such an inquiry does not only suggest learning from Indigenous people’s relationship to places over time** and into the present; **it must also probe the dissonance between Indigenous and settler epistemologies**, the thinking and deeper assumptions behind relationships with place. Cultural assumptions or “**root metaphors**” **like individualism, anthropocentrism, and faith in progress** are common to the dominant culture (Bowers, 1997) and they **are now common to a commodified American landscape** (Kunstler, 1993). Yet **insecurities lurk behind the ideology of progress**, which **in the age of climate change, economic collapse, and other** related ecological and cultural **crises**, many are beginning to question.2 Cultural institutions such as schools are built on the ideology of progress, the story of which is rarely examined even among educators interested in place. **Place-conscious education**, however, **can** potentially **challenge learners to consider where they are, how they got there, and to examine the tensions between different cultural groups’ inhabitation across time. In every case, in every place, this would mean** listening for the voice of Native survivance, with an ear for **learning from the relationship between Indigenous ways of knowing and local and global narratives of colonization and contestation**. In the context of this remembering, place-consciousness also suggests a reassessment of all current inhabitants’ relationships with land and people, near and far, now and in the future.

**Rather than an affirmation of a singular idea of the resolution, we open this debate to alternative visions of possibility, disrupting the hegemony of Western thought**

**Deloria 99** [Vine, Jr., Sioux scholar, “On Liberation,” *For This Land: Writings on Religion in America*, p. 105-107] // myost

An old Indian saying captures the radical difference between Indians and Western peoples quite adequately. The white man, the Indians maintain, has ideas; Indians have visions. **Ideas have a single dimension and require a chain of connected ideas to make sense**. The connections that are made between ideas can lead to great insights on the nature of things, or they can lead to the inexorable logic of Catch-22 in which the logic inevitably leads to the polar opposite of the original proposition. **The vision**, on the other hand, **presents a whole picture of experience and has a central meaning** that stands on its own feet **as an independent revelation**. It is said that Albert Einstein could not conceive of his problems in physics in conceptual terms but instead had visions of a whole event. He then spent his time attempting to translate elements of that event that could be separated into mathematical and verbal descriptions that could be communicated to others. It is this difference, **the change from inductive and deductive logic to transformation of perceived realities**, that **becomes** the **liberating** factor; **not** additional information or **continual replacement of data** and concepts **within the traditional framework of interpretation**. Let us return, then, to our discussion of the manner in which racial minorities have been perceived by the white community, particularly by the liberal establishment, in the past decade and a half. Minority groups, conceived to be different from the white majority, are perceived to be lacking some critical element of humanity that, once received, would bring them to some form of equality with the white majority. The trick has been in identifying that missing element, and each new articulation of goals is immediately attributed to every minority group and appears to answer the question that has been posed by the sincere but unreflective liberal community. Liberation is simply the manner in which this missing element is presently conceived by people interested in reform. It will become another social movement fad and eventually fade away to be replaced with yet another instant analysis of the situation. **Until** fundamental questions regarding the assumptions that form the basis for Western civilization are raised and **new articulations of reality are discovered**, the impulse to grab **quick**ly **and** apparently **easy answers will continue**. Social **conditions will continue to be described in a cause-and-effect logic** that has dominated Western thinking for its entire intellectual lifetime. **Programs will** be designed that **fail to account for** the **change in conditions that occurs continually** in human societies. **Ideas will continue to dominate our concerns and visions will not come. If we are** then to talk **serious**ly **about** the necessity of **liberation**, we are talking about the destruction of the whole complex of Western theories of knowledge and the construction of a new and more comprehensive synthesis of human knowledge and experience. This is no easy task and it cannot be accomplished by people who are encompassed within the traditional Western logic and the resulting analyses such logic provides. If **we change the very way that** Western **peoples think, the way they collect data, which data they gather; and how they arrange that information**, then we are speaking truly of liberation. For **it is the manner in which people conceive reality that motivates them to behave in certain ways, that provides them with a system of values, and that enables them to justify their activities**. A new picture of reality, a **reality conceived as a vision** and not as a series of related or connected ideas, **can accomplish** over a longer period of time many **changes we have been unable to effect while conceiving solutions as short-term remedies**. More important for our discussion is the recognition that **all parts of** human **experience are related** and the proposed solution to any particular problem overlooks the changes that will occur in related activities because of their relationship. **Fundamental changes initiated by a** new picture of reality **will create a transformation, and** will **avoid the** traditional **replacement of words with new words**. In summary we now challenge the basic assumptions of Western man. To wit: 1) that time is uniform and continuous; 2) that our species originated from a single source; 3) that our descriptions of nature are absolute knowledge; 4) that the world can be divided into subjective and objective; 5) that our understanding of our species is homogeneous; 6) that ultimate reality, including divinity, is homogeneous; 7) that by projection of present conditions we can understand human history, planetary history, or the universe; 8) that inductive and deductive reasoning are the primary tools for gaining knowledge. As we create a new set of propositions that transcend these theses we will achieve liberation in a fundamental sense and the synthesis that emerges will be a theology. But it will transform present feelings of sympathy to shared experiences, it will transform tolerance to understanding, and it will transform appreciation of separate cultural traditions into a new universal cultural expression. And everyone will become liberated.