### 1AC – Trail

#### This debate actually began over a hundred years ago in the state of Georgia; at a time when the president circumvented a judicial restriction to stop the introduction of US Army forces into hostilities, with the decree “John Marshall has made his decision; now let him enforce it.” Informed by a cosmological understanding of land that viewed it as empty space, the violent dispossession known as the Trail of Tears began as thousands of natives were killed and relocated to the land called Oklahoma where we now find ourselves.

Peterson 2010 (Herman, Associate Professor Library Affairs, Southern Illinois University, *The Trail of Tears: An Annotated Bibliography of Southeastern Indian Removal*, Introduction, Vance)

The other major tribes of the southeast—the Choctaw, Chickasaw, and¶ Creek and Seminole Confederacies—all have narratives of their own in which they found meaning in their relationship to the land. That meaning¶ certainly has emotional and psychological elements, but at root their relationship to the land is spiritual. That spiritual relationship was probably the¶ most misunderstood aspect of their attachments to their homelands.¶ It was certainly not understood by President Andrew Jackson, the architect of Indian Removal, as seen in the following excerpt from his second¶ State of the Union address: Doubtless it will be painful [for them] I to leave the graves of their fathers, but¶ what do they more than our ancestors did or than our children are now doing? To better their condition in an unknown land our forefathers left all that was dear in earthly objects. Our children by thousands yearly leave the land¶ of their birth to seek new homes in distant regions. Does Humanity weep at these painful separations from everything, animate and Inanimate, with which¶ the young heart has become entwined? Far from it. It is rather a source of joy that our country affords scope where our young population may range¶ unconstrained in body or in mind, developing the power and faculties of man¶ in their highest perfection. These remove hundreds and almost thousands¶ of miles at their own expense, purchase the lands they occupy, and support¶ themselves at their new homes from the moment of their arrival. Can it be cruel in this Government when, by events which it cannot control, the Indian is made discontented in his ancient home to purchase his lands, to give him a new and extensive territory, to pay the expense of his removal, and to support¶ him a year in his new abode? How many thousands of our own people would gladly embrace the opportunity of removing to the west on such conditions!¶ If the offers made to the Indians were extended to them, they would be hailed¶ with gratitude and joy.2¶ On the surface Jackson’s words suggest a lack of understanding or a lack of imagination, but if analyzed closely a certain cultural arrogance on a¶ spiritual level can be found. His use of the phrase earthly objects” at the¶ end of the second sentence is a subtle use of the Christian dichotomy of¶ earthly things over and against heavenly things often identified with St.¶ Paul’s dichotomy of flesh and spirit. To leave one’s homeland, for Jackson, is to leave behind earthly things, things of the flesh, with the direct¶ implication that one is not leaving behind heavenly things or things of the¶ spirit. He denies that the Indian could possibly have a spiritual relationship¶ to the land. His dismissal needs no defense because no one in his audience,¶ not even his political opponents, would question its validity. The Christian¶ categories are self-evident to them all. Probably the most eloquent denial of the self-evidence of this Christian¶ construct has come from Sioux author Vine Deloria Jr., in his seminal¶ book, God Is Red. In the fourth chapter, ‘Thinking in Time and Space.” he¶ sharply contrasts the American Indian tendency to think (and find meaning)¶ spatially with the European and Christian tendency to think chronologically. In illustrating this difference, Deloria describes the clash of cultures that resulted in the Trail of Tears.¶ American Indians hold their lands—places—as having the highest possible meaning and all their statements are made with this reference point in mind.¶ Immigrants review the movement of their ancestors across the continent as a¶ steady progression of basically good events and experiences, thereby placing history—time—in the best possible light. When one group is concerned with¶ the philosophical problem of space and the other with the philosophical problem of time, then the statements of either group do not make much sense when transferred from one context to the other without the proper consideration of¶ what is taking place.3 The Euro-Americans wanted the Indians to accept the benefits of time, that¶ is, the good things to come in the future, by giving up their place, but for the Indians benefits did not come from time, only from place. Without the ability to understand and respect this clash of cultural categories, tragedy was the inevitable outcome for the Indian. One of the primary purposes of studying history is to call attention to situations where understanding and respect could have averted tragedy. It¶ is my hope in compiling a reference book such as this that I can contribute¶ to the further study of this tragic situation. While there is no way to redress¶ the wrongs that were done, descendants of the peoples who were treated¶ this way are still deserving of understanding and respect. Studying and¶ expanding the store of human knowledge about the Trail of Tears can aid¶ in this endeavor.

#### Forgetting was not an option for us. Indian wars continue 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 the Trial of Tears.

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, the 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.

#### Native Americans are the original enemy combatants—discourses of security are grounded in violence against the indigenous “Other”

Byrd 11 [Jodi A., Associate Professor of English and American Indian Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*, 2011, p. xviii] // myost

The stakes could not be greater, given that currently U.S. empire has manifested its face to the world as a war machine that strips life even as it demands racialized and gendered normativities. The post-9/11 national rhetorics of grief, homeland, pain, terrorism, and security have given rise to what Judith Butler describes as a process through which the Other becomes unreal. “The derealization of the ‘Other’” Butler writes, “means that it is neither alive nor dead, but interminably spectral. The infinite paranoia that imagines the war against terrorism as a war without end will be one that justifies itself endlessly in relation to the spectral infinity of its enemy, regardless of whether or not there are established grounds to suspect the continuing operation of terror cells with violent aims.”4 But this process of derealization that Butler marks in the post-9/11 grief that swept the United States, one could argue, has been functioning in Atlantic and Pacific “New Worlds” since 1492. As Geonpul scholar Aileen Moreton-Robinson argues, discourses of security are “deployed in response to a perceived threat of invasion and dispossession from Indigenous people,” and in the process, paranoid patriarchal white sovereignty manages its anxiety over dispossession and threat through a “pathological relationship to indigenous sovereignty.”5 In the United States, the Indian is the original enemy combatant who cannot be grieved.

#### The premise of the resolution enframes war powers, defining the violence against Natives out of existence. This is symptomatic of a form of temporal thinking that relegates indigenous peoples to the past, victims to the inevitable progress of history. 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."

#### Assaults on indigenous populations at home set the foundation for serial policy failure in imperialist campaigns abroad

Street 4 [Paul, writes on imperialism, racism, and thought control for ZNet, “Those Who Deny the Crimes of the Past,” 11 March 2004, <http://www.zcommunications.org/those-who-deny-the-crimes-of-the-past-by-paul-street>] // myost

It is especially important to appreciate the significance of the vicious, often explicitly genocidal "homeland" assaults on native-Americans, which set foundational racist and national-narcissist patterns for subsequent U.S. global butchery, disproportionately directed at non-European people of color. The deletion of the real story of the so-called "battle of Washita" from the official Seventh Cavalry history given to the perpetrators of the No Gun Ri massacre is revealing. Denial about Washita and Sand Creek (and so on) encouraged US savagery at Wounded Knee, the denial of which encouraged US savagery in the Philippines, the denial of which encouraged US savagery in Korea, the denial of which encouraged US savagery in Vietnam, the denial of which (and all before) has recently encouraged US savagery in Afghanistan and Iraq. It's a vicious circle of recurrent violence, well known to mental health practitioners who deal with countless victims of domestic violence living in the dark shadows of the imperial homeland's crippling, stunted, and indeed itself occupied social and political order. Power-mad US forces deploying the latest genocidal war tools, some suggestively named after native tribes that white North American "pioneers" tried to wipe off the face of the earth (ie, "Apache," "Blackhawk," and "Comanche" helicopters) are walking in bloody footsteps that trace back across centuries, oceans, forests and plains to the leveled villages, shattered corpses, and stolen resources of those who Roosevelt acknowledged as America's "original inhabitants." Racist imperial carnage and its denial, like charity, begin at home. Those who deny the crimes of the past are likely to repeat their offenses in the future as long as they retain the means and motive to do so. It is folly, however, for any nation to think that it can stand above the judgments of history, uniquely free of terrible consequences for what Ward Churchill calls "imperial arrogance and criminality." Every new U.S. murder of innocents abroad breeds untold numbers of anti-imperial resistance fighters, ready to die and eager to use the latest available technologies and techniques to kill representatives - even just ordinary citizens - of what they see as an American Predator state. This along with much else will help precipitate an inevitable return of US power to the grounds of earth and history. As it accelerates, the U.S. will face a fateful choice, full of potentially grave or liberating consequences for the fate of humanity and the earth. It will accept its fall with relief and gratitude, asking for forgiveness, and making true reparation at home and abroad, consistent with an honest appraisal of what Churchill, himself of native-American (Keetoowah Cherokee) ancestry, calls "the realities of [its] national history and the responsibilities that history has bequeathed": goodbye American Exceptionalism and Woodrow Wilson's guns. Or Americans and the world will face the likely alternative of permanent imperial war and the construction of an ever-more imposing U.S. fortress state, perpetuated by Orwellian denial and savage intentional historical ignorance. This savage barbarism of dialectically inseparable empire and inequality will be defended in the last wagon-train instance by missiles and bombs loaded with radioactive materials wrenched from lands once freely roamed by an immeasurably more civilized people than those who came to destroy.

#### The practice of education is inseparable from the notion of decolonial justice—dominant pedagogies repeat genocide against indigenous peoples through structural violence

Courtney-Lawson 2013 (Summerbrook, Elon University, “The Cultural Decline of Native Americans”, <http://www.elon.edu/e-web/academics/writing_excellence/contest/Contest%20Entry%20Courtney-Lawson%20Essay.xhtml>, Vance)

Since the arrival of the Europeans, Native Americans have struggled to maintain ownership of their land and sacred burial grounds. American Indian author, Vine Deloria, Jr., author of “God is Red”, wrote about the Aboriginal World and Christian History. He explained that, “The status of native peoples around the globe was firmly cemented by the intervention of Christianity into the political affairs of exploration and colonization. They were regarded as not having ownership of their lands, but as merely existing on them at the pleasure of the Christian God who had now given them to the nations of Europe”. (Deloria, 255) The Spanish, upon meeting tribes recited their “requirement” which included the Creation and Garden of Eden, and ending with the pope sitting on the throne in Rome. The indigenous people were asked to surrender to Christianity and if they did not, the Spanish said it was legal to wage war and “an act of religious piety for the Europeans to wage war to wrest the lands from the people. Consequently, by the time the other European nations began to discover the Western Hemisphere, the struggle for recognition of native legal rights had disappeared.” (256-257) This article recognizes the take over of European religion and forcing Native Americans to practice Christianity instead of being free to practice Native American spirituality. Native Americans were being deprived of their land, their rights, and their culture. ¶ “The United States of America was founded on the principle of religious freedom, yet the indigenous peoples whose land was used to establish this country were denied this freedom.” (Locust, 315) Native American spirituality has declined drastically due to Europeans forcefully trying to convert Native Americans to Christianity. Research conducted by Carol Locust from the Harvard Educational Review reported, “American Indians were not granted religious freedom until 1978, when Congress passed the American Indian Religious Freedom Act.” (316). This proves that even after the passing the Bill of Rights and the banning of slavery, it still took over two hundred years for Native American to be granted religious freedom. On the other hand, this “cannot bring change quickly after decades of discrimination; racist attitudes toward traditional Indian religions still exist.” (316) In addition, even though religious freedom became law in 1978, religious freedom and religious customs still have been denied. In 2003, the North Carolina Prison system denied Dayle Rousey, death row inmate, a traditional spiritual advisor, ceremony, and his medicine bag. A Baptist minister was assigned to Rousey. The Baptist minister commented, “Dayle was void of any spirituality, but he (the minister) was sure he could convert him (Rousey) when he got to the death chamber.” (Cooper, 12). Dayle Rousey’s wife was informed that if she brought his medicine bag to the death chamber, she would not be granted permission to have his final moments with him. There is no program for those facing execution who seek to maintain their traditional ceremonies. Outside of death row, the general population, are not given an opportunity to worship as well. They are only allowed to receive a minimum amount of traditional articles—a feather, a few headbands, and pipe that can only be purchased. Even if this were not insult enough, these items must be purchased only through an approved vendor by the state. (12) These material items are not the basics of traditional spirituality. It is depressing to think that the dominant culture feels that Native American spirituality can be shaved down to the possession of just a few material articles. Professor, and scholars, Theda Perdue and Michael Green state, “The United States insisted that the right of conquest doctrine, which had required England to surrender its claims to the United States, also applied to the tribes. By this reasoning, the tribes had no rights to the land and could expect to receive no compensation for the county they had to relinquish.” (Perdue, 22-23) In addition, Patrick Minges from the American Indian Quarterly stated that, “Even into the nineteenth century, the Cherokees were noted for their cultural accommodation. Only years later, following the introduction of Christian traditions and the ideology of race as a component within human interactions, would a Cherokee myth of multiple origins and racial hierarchy be developed.” (Minges, 456) Due to the influence of Christianity and the government forcing Native Americans to live on reservations, cultural expansion has been restricted and limited. In several situations, school systems have deprived Native Americans of their culture and forbidden to speak their own language. “Discrimination against persons because of their beliefs is the most insidious kind of injustice; Ridicule of one’s spiritual beliefs or cultural teachings wounds the spirit, leaving anger and hurt that may be masked by a proud silence. American Indians\* experience this discrimination in abundance for the sake of their traditional beliefs, especially when such beliefs conflict with those of the dominate culture’s educational systems.”(Locust, 315) The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 created a negative label for some Native American children. “It caused multitudes of children to be labeled mentally retarded or learning disabled who up until that time were not considered handicapped in their own cultures.” (Locust, 326) Psychological evaluation tests have been viewed as bias because the process does little to accommodate Native American language or “cognition styles” of other cultures. (326)¶ Another issue that has been disregarded in the school systems is traditional Native American ceremonies. Locust goes on to say, “School calendars include holidays based on Christian tradition and on national historical events. In most school systems, American Indian children do not enjoy religious freedom, but are penalized for being absent from classes while participating in traditional tribal ceremonies.” (327) In some situations, Native American students would have to suffer humiliation by the teachers to make up for their absences. In addition, Native American students have been restricted in the past to participation in academics, clubs, and athletics. “Indian students may not participate in group sports that require uniforms or equipment that they must purchase, for the school’s money spent on those things means that someone else must go without.” (328) Locust provides a strong statement, “We remain positive that, once understanding has been established between tribal cultures and educational systems, discrimination will cease.” (329) Even in today’s society these rash actions impact the progression and teaching of Native American culture.¶ Discrimination towards Native Americans reaches further back into American history. In times of war, Native American soldiers were not considered equal to white soldiers. During the Civil War, as white soldiers began to die by the thousands, the military began to accept Native Americans. Ely Parker, a Seneca Indian, became an aide to Ulysses S. Grant. Parker was ordered by Grant to draw up the articles of surrender for Robert E. Lee. At the surrender at Appomattox, Lee remarked, “I am glad to see one real American here,” to which Parker replied, “We are all Americans, Sir.” (Sutton and Latschar, 19) After the Civil War, the North discarded Parker’s brilliance and he died penniless. Ely Parker was discriminated against by the North because he was Native American. Parker stated, “I have little or no faith in the American Christian civilization methods of healing the Indians of this country. It has not been honest, pure or sincere. Black deception, damnable frauds and persistent oppression has been its characteristics, and its religion today is that the only good Indian is a dead one.” (19) The affiliation between Americans and Ely Parker (Native American) demonstrated the manipulation used for the selfishness of the Americans. Consequently, another innocent Native American life was lost. Following the Civil War, atrocities towards Native Americans continued. The Sand Creek Massacre in 1864 was one of the most brutal events for Native Americans. Colonel Chivington and 700 troops slaughtered over 500 Cheyenne and Arapahos who believed they were under the protection of the US Army. The majority of the dead were women, children, and elderly. (132) Many of the Cheyenne in the camp came out waving American flags, yelling, “don’t shoot”, but they were killed. The wife of Chief Black Kettle was shot nine times. Many of the survivors dragged themselves fifty miles over frozen ground to reach safety. (154-155) It was noted that, “By the time Lee surrendered to Grant, the groundwork for the final military defeat of American Indian nations had largely been laid.” (181) It can be concluded, if this group of people had been the “same” as the Europeans, tragic events such as The Sand Creek Massacre would not have even occurred. The United Methodist Church finally acknowledged their role in the Massacre (Chivington was a Methodist minister), in 1996 and as the 150th anniversary of the Massacre approaches the church is focusing on making amends to the Native people by making financial contributions towards the tribes. (Bloom, 1) The notion of white dominance continued and was displayed in horrible context during the rounding up of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole tribes, forcing them on the Trail of Tears in 1838. A direct account came from a Cherokee widow named Ooloocha. “The soldiers came and took us from home. They first surrounded our house and they took the mare while we were at work in the fields and they drove us out of doors and did not permit us to take anything with us not even a second change of clothes, only the clothes we had on, and they shut the doors after they turned us out.” (Perdue, 124) White ascendancy was sustained during the round up of the Cherokee. “A deaf man failed to respond to the soldiers’ commands, and they shot him dead. Greedy whites often witnessed these scenes because they had flocked to the Cherokee Nation ‘to seize whatever property they could put their hands.’” (125) The Cherokee widow and the deaf man are prime examples of how Native Americans have been discriminated against and abused. Professor and author, Henry Shapiro, explains the mindset and behavior of the European settler. Many of them lived on tiny plots of land in Europe or Great Britain, where they barely eked out an existence. Others had never owned land. They lived at the mercy of huge landowners. Upon their arrival to the new world, “vacant” land was everywhere. The new arrivals assumed that since it was not being occupied by the Indians, it was not being used. They had no concept of stewardship of lands or maintaining a balance in hunting grounds. They also had no intention of keeping treaties or agreements. (Shapiro 42-55) Historian James C. Klotter states that in Kentucky, “From the first pioneer settlement in 1774 to statehood in 1892, white and red men battled over the hunting grounds…” (Klotter, 291)¶ The discovery of oil on Indian Reservations has once again created explosive situations endangering the land and Native Americans. The oil companies are releasing waste water onto tribal land. Duke University environmental scientist, Robert Jackson, stated he was very surprised that this was allowed because we should know better from previous experience (Shogren,2) In addition, non-Indians are moving onto Reservation land to work the oil fields. The rise in violence has escalated and tribal officers are often powerless to stop it. Freelance journalist, Sierra Crane-Murdoch reports, “In 1978 the Supreme Court case Oliphant v. Suquamish stripped tribes of the right to arrest and prosecute non-Indians who commit crimes on Indian land.” (2) Prosecuting crimes committed in Indian country is extremely difficult. “In 2011, the U.S. Justice Department did not prosecute 65 percent of rape cases reported on reservations. According to department records, one in three Native American women are raped during their lifetimes-two-and-a-half times the likelihood for an average American woman-and in 86 percent of these cases, the assailant is non-Indian.” (2-3) In April 2012, the Senate added a new provision to the Violence Against Women Act, which was first passed in 1994. This would allow tribal courts to prosecute non-Indians who sexually assaulted tribal members on Indian Land. Unfortunately the bill has stalled and set on a back shelf since House Republicans opposed the measure as “a dangerous expansion of tribal independence.” (Crane-Murdoch, 3) The movement of non-Indians onto reservations continues, as greedy corporate America drills for oil. Sadie Young Bird, director of the Fort Berthold Coalition Against Violence shared, “When the oil boom’s over, what’s it going to be like here? My staff talks about this a lot because we all want to know. They’re not going to take their trailers with them. It’ll just be deserted, with a lot of broken people.” (7)¶ Since the arrival of Europeans, Native American people suffered a great loss overall from the exposure of diseases that was carried over from Europe. They had never been exposed to measles or small pox. The impact of these diseases devastated tribes, wiping some out entirely. During the trade process, Europeans acted maliciously by trading blankets that had been infected with small pox to unsuspecting Indians. Scholar, Ann Ramenofsky noted that, disease contact in the Americas has had its cultural consequences (Ramenofsky, 242) Similarly, the Pacific Coast people were forced from their ancestral lands to a reservation by the government, after their tribe was significantly reduced from epidemics. (Ruby, 185) As a result of disease and related deaths, tribes have become extinct and a considerable amount of Native American culture has been lost forever. Despite the recent emphasis on health care, the “health status disparities for many racial and ethnic minorities is not new in the U.S., especially among America’s Native American population.” (Grossm an, 579)¶ Discrimination towards Native Americans has seeped into professional football and is currently being brought to the forefront. The Washington Redskins, named in 1932, has a legacy and history rooted in racism and discrimination including the name of the team. Thirty years after the race-based name was selected, the owner of the Redskins was forced to hire its first black football player in 1962, the last NFL team to do so. Dictionaries describe Redskin as offensive, taboo, disparaging, and to avoid using the word in public usage. President Barack Obama said, “I have to say that if I were the owner of the team and I knew that there was a name of my team—even if it had a storied history—that was offending a sizable group of people, I’d think about changing it.” (Newell) Attorney Gyasi Ross, a member of the Blackfeet Indian Nation asked, “Would it be acceptable to name a professional sports team according to the color of someone else’s skin? Would it ever be cool to have a sports team called the Washington Blackskins…San Francisco Yellowskins?” Ross goes on to explain, that the term Redskin predates the current conversation dating back to when white bounty hunters were paid for scalps only when they provided proof by showing the redskin.” (Ross) Owners and fans of the Redskins have consistently maintained that Native Americans should be proud that the team is honoring them. Ross states that this debate is frustrating. He shares, “We Native people, the folks who are the only meaningful stakeholders in this debate—are not allowed to have a voice in the matter. Correct that: We can have an opinion so long as it is pro-Redskin. Otherwise, we’re being ‘too sensitive.’” (Ross) This on-going controversy has created an impact for some Native Americans because of the lack of interest for others to understand. Until recently, the majority of books written, research conducted, directors appointed to Native American museums, and university courses relating to Indian studies, have been conducted by whites. Native Americans are gradually filling these much-needed spaces. It is imperative that Native American children are encouraged to further their education. For instance, the State of North Carolina has the largest population of Native Americans east of the Mississippi (122,000; eight state recognized tribes and one federally recognized tribe). However, it wasn’t until the 1970s that the first Native American became a lawyer after graduating from UNC-Chapel Hill. A question no one is asking is how do we recruit Native Americans to become active citizens in politics, education, and diplomatic careers, medical and legal fields? I predict that in the next two generations, tribes such as the Eastern Band of the Cherokee will cease to exist. There are few jobs available in or near the reservations. Tribes are moving away from what is left of the remnants of Native culture in order to find jobs and better their lives. It is important that today’s Americans know about their fellow Native American citizens. History does repeat itself, therefore, it is important that Americans understand the horrible actions taken towards Native Americans in order for Americans to respond to future events and challenges.

#### In response to the resolution: Austin and I affirm a critical indigenous reading of the topic that restricts the United States federal government from conducting hostilities against indigenous peoples.

#### Our critical indigenous reading of the topic engages settler ideology by starting at the point of place which allows us to deconstruct violent colonialism.

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 Oklahoma, 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. Indeed, even before UCO could be founded, Muskogee and Seminole claims to this land were exterminated. At the same time, this place is our home, a place we love, and therefore, the right place to begin a project of decolonization.

#### 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 the topic 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 quickly 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 seriously 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.

#### The War Powers Authority of the President is merely the logical conclusion of a process of expropriation first practiced on Native bodies.

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.217-220; kdf)

From its drone bases across the breadth of this militarized archipelago, the US is conducting globalized shadow wars in Central and Western Asia, the Arabian Peninsula, and Africa. Situated in this geopolitical arena, drones emerge as the new weapon of choice for the globalized maintenance and extension of US empire. In the words of the US military, drones 'provide global vigilance, global reach, and global power.'130 In this alliterative summation of the power of drones, the global is framed as coextensive with the US state: the inside (US state) has encompassed its outside (the rest of the world). The US speaks in the name of the global precisely because it now enfolds it as an extension of its sovereign domain. As I move toward my conclusion, it is this very enmeshing of the inside/outside that I want to examine in more detail. The transnational dimensions of this imperial drone archipelago are foundationally enabled by domestic policies of imperial expropriation of Native American lands for the location of drone ground control stations. As I discussed in Chapter l, one of the key sites for the conduct of the drone killings in Afghanistan and Pakistan, Nellis Air Force Base (AFB), Nevada, occupies expropriated Western Shoshone land. The drone archipelago, then, must be seen in terms of a trans/national matrix of imperial state violence that inextricably binds an ensemble of diverse subjects (Native Americans and Afghans) and seemingly unrelated geographical sites (Western Shoshone country/Nellis AFB and the Afghan tribal lands). The US state's intensive deployment of drones along its Mexican and Canadian borders in order to surveil and capture its other alien 'patterns of life' - 'illegal aliens' - underscores the need continually to reassert its sovereignty over those expropriated spaces of the nation that are constituted by borders that cut across Native American homelands. These militarized borders dismember and efface First Nation constituencies and peoples that fail to conform to the hegemonic cartographies of the imperial state. In his unpacking of the double logic that constitutes the exercise of state sovereignty, Jens Bartleson writes that 'Without a "foreign policy" there can be nothing domestic, since the former has as its task precisely to define the latter by domesticating what initially was foreign to it, buried in the depths of its violent prehistory and inserted as a state of nature in its contractual justification.' 131 In contemporary formations of state sovereignty, Bartleson adds, 'what is now Other to the state is not primarily contained in its own prehistory, but temporally simultaneous yet spatially distinct from it.' t:l2 I want to flesh out Bartleson's theoretical unpacking of state sovereignty by transposing it to the concrete territorial operations of the US state. The US state's foreign policy on imminent threat and preventative wars, as conducted through the war on terror/al-Qaeda, re-enacts the violent domestication of what was 'foreign' to it even prior to its formal, constitutional establishment: Native Americans. The 'violent prehistory' that comes before the enunciative foundation of the US state through its formal Declaration of lndependence figures precisely as a time synchronous with 'a state of nature' in which Native Americans are made, through the violence of the biopolitical caesura, coextensive with nature and are thereby relegated to the vestibule of 'the culture' where, as animals and lawless savages, they are compelled to undergo the colonial practices of 'violent domestication.' From the depths of this violence, the imperial domestication of the internal other works to establish the political and territorial sovereignty of the US state. Only after this fact can the US state delineate its territorial sovereignty, proceed to name its external/foreign others, and work to manage and control them through its foreign policies- all the while relegating its Indigenous peoples to the 'spatially distinct' zones of reservations, where a range of militarized and ecocidal practices can be performed by the imperial state with impunity. These two indissociable time-spaces, as chronotopes that found imperial state sovereignty, continue to inscribe the present: they topologically conjoin the violent 'prehistory' of the US state to contemporary trans/national iterations of state violence. The topological fold enabled by the prosthetics of drones evidences the indissociable conjoining of inside/ outside in the conduct of the US state's declared and shadow wars. In the exercise of sovereignty, Bartleson contends that a state's foreign policy is 'as much a policy for dealing with a traumatic past, as it is a policy for dealing with a spatial outside.' 1:13 The topological fold that inscribes this particular exercise of imperial sovereignty instantiates the conjoined double movement of deploying foreign policy in order to deal with the internal trauma of the past and the trauma of an alien exteriority. The unresolved trauma of the US state's Native American past is sutured to its contemporary trauma of alien exteriority in the conduct of the war on terror/ al-Qaeda. The topological manifestation of this sovereign double trauma is graphically emblematized by the double execution of Geronimo/bin Laden that, in one killer instant, synchronizes the trauma of past and ongoing domestic Indian wars and the extra-national war on terror/al-Qaeda. The contemporized double killing of Geronimo as revenant attests to the failure of the US state to deal with a past trauma that, in fact, cannot be relegated to the past because it continues to inform the present. As an emblem of Native American resistance and of a history of colonial violence that has not been nationally acknowledged or overcome, Geronimo is the figure of internal alterity and unresolved trauma that, as spectre, cannot be 'killed': that is, he cannot be dialecticized and sublated through the murderous operations of imperial state violence. At the close of 2011, the Obama administration signed into law the National Defense Authorization Act that, among other things, effectively codifies indefinite military detention without trial, ensures that Guantanamo will remain open indefinitely, expands and integrates the drone program into the system of US national airspace, and that, in the words of Senator Lindsey Graham, 'basically say[s] in law for the first time that the homeland is part of the battlefield' of the ongoing war on terror, as it enables the imprisonment without charge or trial of US citizens. 134 For Native Americans, the homeland has been part of the battlefield for hundreds of years, and the wars of terror that have ensued have been enabled by nothing less than the arsenal of white law and the violence of its 'contractual justification.' The fiction of the inaugural status of this momentous 'first time,' as identified by the said senator, can only be maintained by continuing to bury in the depths of prehistory all the other battles, past and present, that have harrowed the homelands of Native Americans.

#### Our affirmative is a call for rhetorical sovereignty which undermines the rhetorical imperialism that erases indigenous culture

Lyons 0 (Scott Richard, “Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?”, College Composition and Communication, Vol. 51, No. 3 (Feb., 2000), pp. 447-468, Vance) \*Counting Coup to Plains Indians means to win honor through battle

That laughter, which is not in Standing Bear's book but remains my guess, my desire, would nonetheless be short-lived, as is known by anyone familiar with the boarding school story. As David Wallace Adams tells it in Education for Extinction, this tale "constitutes yet another deplorable episode in the long and tragic history of Indian-white relations"-specifically, the development of education designed to promote "the eradication of all traces of tribal identity and culture, replacing them with the commonplace knowledge and values of white civilization" (336, 335). This forced re-placement of one identity for another, a cultural violence enabled in part through acts of physical violence, was in so many ways located at the scene of writing. More horrific than most scenes of writing, however, the boarding school stands out as the ultimate symbol of white domination, even genocide, through assimilation in the American Indian experience. And although Standing Bear and others would recall multiple forms of Indian resistance, from torching schools to running away to counting coup on the Western text, the duplicitous interrelationships between writing, violence, and colonization developed during the nineteenth-century-not only in the boarding schools but at the signings of hundreds of treaties, most of which were dishonored by whites-would set into motion a persistent distrust of the written word in English, one that resonates in homes and schools and courts of law still today. If our respect for the Word remains resolute, our faith in the written word is compromised at best. What do Indians want from writing? Certainly something other than the names of white men sewn to our backs. And for its part, resistance to assimilation through the acts of writing should entail something more than counting coup on the text (or for that matter, torching the school). I suggest that our highest hopes for literacy at this point rest upon a vision we might name rhetorical sovereignty. Sovereignty, of course, has long been a contested term in Native discourse, and its shifting meanings over time attest to an ongoing struggle between Americans and the hundreds of Indian nations that occupy this land. Our claims to sovereignty entail much more than arguments for tax-exempt status or the right to build and operate casinos; they are nothing less than our attempt to survive and flourish as a people. Sovereignty is the guiding story in our pursuit of self-determination, the general strategy by which we aim to best recover our losses from the ravages of colonization: our lands, our languages, our cultures, our self-respect. For indigenous people everywhere, sovereignty is an ideal principle, the beacon by which we seek the paths to agency and power and community renewal. Attacks on sovereignty are attacks on what it enables us to pursue; the pursuit of sovereignty is an attempt to revive not our past, but our possibilities. Rhetorical sovereignty is the inherent right and ability of peoples to determine their own communicative needs and desires in this pursuit, to decide for themselves the goals, modes, styles, and languages of public discourse. Placing the scene of writing squarely back into the particular contingency of the Indian rhetorical situation, rhetorical sovereignty requires of writing teachers more than a renewed commitment to listening and learning; it also requires a radical rethinking of how and what we teach as the written word at all levels of schooling, from preschool to graduate curricula and beyond. In what follows, I hope to sketch out some preliminary notes toward the praxis that is rhetorical sovereignty. I begin with a discussion of the concept of sovereignty, followed by a dialogue between the fields of composition and rhetoric and Native American studies, concluding with some very general recommendations for expanding our canons and curricula. My argument is motivated in part by my sense of being haunted by that little boy's backward glance to those other Indian children: Is it right for me to take a white man's name? Sovereignty is (also) rhetorical Sovereignty, as I generally use and understand the term, denotes the right of a people to conduct its own affairs, in its own place, in its own way. The concept of sovereignty originated in feudal Europe, and as a term it arrived to the English language by way of France; sovereign signified a ruler accountable to no one save himself or God (Duchacek 47). Early modern European monarchs employed the language of sovereignty to secure their grip on state power in the face of a threatening nobility and papacy. A declaration of one's right to rule, a monarch's claim to sovereignty "stood as a ringing assertion of absolute political authority at home, one that could imply designs on territory abroad" (Fowler and Bunck 5). As modern nations and states underwent their various forms of development, the concept was consistently deployed to address not only domestic authority at home but a state's relative independence from and among other states; thus, sovereignty came to mean something systemic and relational. A sovereign's power was generally a force understood in relation to other sovereigns in the emerging international scene; hence, "a sovereign was to respect the sovereignty of its peers" (Fowler and Bunck 6). As political institutions continued to develop under modernity, the meanings of sovereignty changed with them, signifying such matters as the right to make and enforce laws, notions of political legitimacy and international recognition, and national self-determination. While the meanings of sovereignty have shifted and continue to shift over time, the concept has nonetheless carried with it a sense of locatable and recognizable power. In fact, the location of power has depended upon the crucial act of recognition-and vice versa. From the early moments of first contact on this continent, the construction of Indian and non-Indian senses of sovereignty was a contested and contradictory process. It was also a rhetorical one. Although there is no possible way to describe its many and complicated logics in necessary detail here, we can see that for at least two centuries following Columbus, "European states were compelled to recognize and engage Indian nations as political actors in their diplomatic activities" (Berman 128). They did this in large part through making treaties with Indian nations, a process that created a relationship between groups of an international rather than internal character":' even in sites of severe colonizing activity (Berman 129). This acknowledged sense of Indian national sovereignty was so strong among European states that it actually became a means of legitimizing European claims to new world resources; a territorial dispute between the English and the Dutch, say, might be settled by one side producing a treaty with the sovereign nation who actually owned the land (Berman 132). After the American revolution, the United States maintained the practice of treaty-making with Indian nations begun by European powers, and "from the beginning of its political existence, recognized a measure of autonomy in the Indian bands and tribes" (Prucha, Treaties 2). During the years 1778-1868, the U.S. signed and ratified some 367 treaties with Indian nations, all of which presumed a sense of sovereignty on the part of Indian groups. About two-thirds of those treaties were land deals, and as Prucha points out, "cession of Indian lands ... was an indication of Indian sovereignty over those lands, and the recognition by the United States of Indian ownership to the lands remaining strengthened the concept" (Treaties 4). You can't give up what you don't own, after all; nor can you buy what's already yours. However, the Americans would gradually assume a dominant stance in Indian-white relations, leading to an erosion of Native sovereignty that Prucha credits to over-whelming American military strength, growing Indian economic dependence on white goods, and treaty provisions that left stipulations to be carried out by Congress (Prucha, Treaties 6-7). After the American revolution, it wasn't long before the nation-to-nation stance Indians and their interlocutors had operated from was simultaneously attacked and affirmed in a couple of landmark U.S. Supreme Court cases concerning the Cherokee of Georgia facing removal in the early nineteenth century. In Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831), Chief Justice John Marshall's famous pronouncement of the Cherokees as a "domestic dependent nation" constituted the United States' first major, unilateral reinterpretation of Indian sovereignty, one further tinkered with a year later by the same court in Worcester v. Georgia (1832). In the former opinion, Marshall deemed the Cherokees limited in their claim to sovereignty, seeing them as a nation not-quite-foreign, but suggested nonetheless that the Cherokees still formed "a dis-tinct political society, separated by others, capable of managing its own affairs and governing itself" (Prucha, Documents 58). This somewhat glaring contradiction was explained in the latter decision, where Marshall opined that "Indian nations had always been considered as distinct, independent political communities, retaining their original natural rights, as the undisputed possessors of the soil, from time immemorial, with the single exception imposed by irresistible power" (Prucha, Documents 60; emphasis mine). In other words, while recognizing Indian sovereignty in terms we can fairly describe as eternal and absolute, the Supreme Court's decisions on the Cherokee cases ultimately caved in to what would become a persistent, uniquely American, and wholly imperialist notion of recognition-from-above. The United States could limit Cherokee sovereignty simply because it could, and it could because it is the United States. American exceptionalism won the day, thanks to its "irresistible power," and while U.S. plenary power wouldn't become fully articulated in a legal sense until United States v. Kagama in 1886, it found its rhetorical groundwork laid solidly in the Chero-kee cases of the 1830s. In a sense, these cases exemplify what we might call rhetorical imperialism: the ability of dominant powers to assert control of others by setting the terms of debate. These terms are often definitional-that is, they identify the parties discussed by de-scribing them in certain ways. Take, for example, Marshall's rather self-reflective analysis of the language of sovereignty in his Worcester v. Georgia opinion: ... 'treaty' and' nation' are words of our own language, selected in our diplomatic and legislative proceedings having each a definite and well-understood meaning. We have applied them to Indians, as we have applied them to the other nations of the earth. They are applied to all in the same sense. (Prucha, Documents 60) In short, Indians are defined here as fellow nations requiring treaties. Yet in Cherokee Nation v. Georgia, Marshall wrote that "the term foreign nation" wasn't quite applicable to Indian nations, suggesting instead that the Cherokee Nation's "relation to the United States resembles that of a ward to his guardian." This was because Indians-"savages" newly arrived on "civilization's" fresh path-were "in a state of pupilage" (Prucha, Documents 59). More than an agonistic legal contest over sovereign rights, the language of this decision shows Indian people being completely redefined by their interlocutors: a ward or pupil-that is, a child-is quite a different animal than a fellow nation in the community of sovereigns. As the exercise of rhetorical imperialism, Marshall's metaphors effectively paved the way for the United States to assume a position of political paternalism over Indian nations that has thrived up to this very day-chalk one up for the "Great White Father." The lesson here seems obvious: namely, he who sets the terms sets the limits. And likewise the rewriting of Indian sovereignty would continue over time. As Prucha points out, the word "tribe" increasingly came to replace" nation" in treaties, substituting one highly ideological European word for another, and with the Abolition of Treaty-Making Act of 1871, a powerful little rider tacked on to an Indian appropriations bill that formally ended the practice of treaty-making," treaties" henceforth came to be called "agreements" by the authoring Americans (Prucha, Treaties4 , 211-13). From "sovereign" to "ward" from "nation" to "tribe” and from "treaty" to "agreement," the erosion of Indian national sovereignty can be credited in part to a rhetorically imperialist use of writing by white powers, and from that point on, much of the discourse on tribal sovereignty has nit-picked, albeit powerfully, around terms and definitions.