# Wake Round 1

## 1AC

### Contention 1: The Killing of Osama bin Laden and the War Against Natives

(Nicholas Schmidle, staff writer, “GETTING BIN LADEN: What happened that night in Abbottabad”, The New Yorker, 2011,<http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2011/08/08/110808fa_fact_schmidle?currentPage=all>d)

Shortly after eleven o’clock on the night of May 1st, two MH-60 Black Hawk helicopters lifted off from Jalalabad Air Field, in eastern Afghanistan, and embarked on a covert mission into Pakistan to kill Osama bin Laden. Inside the aircraft were twenty-three Navy SEALs from Team Six, which is officially known as the Naval Special Warfare Development Group, or DEVGRU. A Pakistani-American translator, whom I will call Ahmed, and a dog named Cairo—a Belgian Malinois—were also aboard. It was a moonless evening, and the helicopters’ pilots, wearing night-vision goggles, flew without lights over mountains that straddle the border with Pakistan. Radio communications were kept to a minimum, and an eerie calm settled inside the aircraft.¶ Before the mission commenced, the SEALs had created a checklist of code words that had a Native American theme. Each code word represented a different stage of the mission: leaving Jalalabad, entering Pakistan, approaching the compound, and so on. “Geronimo” was to signify that bin Laden had been found.¶ “On the morning of Sunday, May 1st, White House officials cancelled scheduled visits, ordered sandwich platters from Costco, and transformed the Situation Room into a war room…Obama returned to the White House at two o’clock, after playing nine holes of golf at Andrews Air Force Base. The Black Hawks departed from Jalalabad thirty minutes later. Just before four o’clock, Panetta announced to the group in the Situation Room that the helicopters were approaching Abbottabad. Obama stood up. “I need to watch this,” he said…Minutes after hitting the ground…team members began streaming out the side doors of helo one…SEALs rushed forward, ending up in an alley like driveway with their backs to the house’s main entrance…Until this moment, the operation had been monitored by dozens of defense, intelligence, and Administration officials watching the drone’s video feed…After blasting through the gate with C-4 charges, three SEALs marched up the stairs. Midway up, they saw bin Laden’s twenty-three-year-old son, Khalid…and killed him…The final person was bin Laden…Three SEALs shuttled past Khalid’s body and blew open another metal cage…The Americans hurried toward the bedroom door. The first SEAL pushed it open…A second SEAL stepped into the room and trained the infrared laser of his M4 on bin Laden’s chest. The Al Qaeda chief, who was wearing a tan shalwar kameez and a prayer cap on his head, froze; he was unarmed. “There was never any question of detaining or capturing him—it wasn’t a split-second decision. No one wanted detainees,” the special-operations officer told me…Nine years, seven months, and twenty days after September 11th, an American was a trigger pull from ending bin Laden’s life. The first round, a 5.56-mm. bullet, struck bin Laden in the chest. As he fell backward, the SEAL fired a second round into his head, just above his left eye. On his radio, he reported, “For God and country—Geronimo, Geronimo, Geronimo, “After a pause, he added, “Geronimo E.K.I.A.”—“enemy killed in action.” Hearing this at the White House, Obama pursed his lips, and said solemnly, to no one in particular, “We got him.”

#### The logic behind the assassination of Osama Bin Laden can be traced back to the colonial logic that justified the assassination of Sitting Bull. The U.S. justified this assassination by constructing all Indian Chiefs as the “ultimate enemy” to the American way of life.

[Cook-Lynn](http://muse.jhu.edu/results?section1=author&search1=Elizabeth%20Cook-Lynn) ‘05

[Elizabeth, Elizabeth Cook-Lynn is a Crow Creek Lakota Sioux editor, essayist, poet, novelist, and academic, whose trenchant views on Native American politics, particularly tribal sovereignty, have caused controversy. “The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee,” <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/wicazo\_sa\_review/v020/20.1cook-lynn04.html>//wyo-hdm]

Not long ago I made a visit to the Museum of Wounded Knee at Wall, South Dakota, located on I-90 just north of the Badlands of South Dakota and just outside of two of the largest Sioux reservations in the Northern Plains: Pine Ridge and Rosebud. This is a new museum, put together by a well-meaning and affable white man from Colorado by the name of Steve Wyant. Entering the exhibits through a turnstile (Indians don't have to pay the $6.00), I [End Page 199] saw a chart entitled "Political Structure of the Sioux Nation" and noticed that the Isianti and Ihanktowan were not among the Seven Council Fires of the Sioux Nation—the English name of the Oceti Shakowan normally made up of those two large tribes, along with the Oglalas, Hunkpati, Sicangu, Sihasapa, and Minneconjou. I suggested (facetiously) that the museum curator should change it to the Five Council Fires of the Sioux Nation. This is an indication, of course, of how Indian histories are made and told, changed, manipulated, and obscured.¶ Strolling further along the walls of the museum, I noticed another collection of pictures with the explanation: "Custer Enters the Black Hills—1874 and 1876." This "entry," of course, was several years after the Treaty of 1868 was signed by the U.S. Government and the Sioux Nation, in which it is stated that "no white man shall enter the treaty lands without the express permission of the Indians." There is no historical evidence that George A. Custer had the permission of the Sioux. I asked the museum curator to change the explanation to "Custer Invades the Black Hills in 1874 and 1876." He looked pained. But unless one understands the Treaty of Fort Laramie of 1868, the 1876 invasion of the Black Hills by Custer and nine hundred men of the U.S. military, which brought about the Battle of the Little Big Horn and death, unless one understands the subsequent 1877 theft of the Black Hills by the U.S. Congress and eventual passage of the 1887 Allotment Act, one cannot understand the Massacre at Wounded Knee in 1890.¶ Jeffrey Ostler's The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism from Lewis and Clark to Wounded Knee chronicles much of the history of that time and place and uses the same kind of apologetic and obfuscating language found in the Museum of Wounded Knee. On page 20, for example, he says: "The death—some would say murder—of yet another of the Lakotas' preeminent leaders deserves careful analysis." This is the way he introduces the assassination of Sitting Bull, the Hunkpapa, without ever using the word assassination. Instead, Ostler suggests that the reader must understand why U.S. officials ordered the Indian police to arrest Sitting Bull in the first place (Buffalo Bill Cody had orders and volunteered to arrest him because he was dangerous), then launches into several explanations: deep animosity between the police and Sitting Bull's people, hatreds and feuds among the Indians themselves, factionalism bound up in colonialism, and, of course, the inevitable Ghost Dance. Blaming the victims and blaming religion have long been the methods by which apologetic historians account for this crime. Ostler is no exception to this rule.¶ An entire chapter is devoted to this kind of internecine rationale for war and death in the Indian camp in 1890. There is no mention of the Allotment Act of 1887, the breaking up of the Sioux Treaty Homelands bitterly contested by Sitting Bull, as the major reason for the political assassination of this important leader. He had to be assassinated if Indian [End Page 200] lands were going to be occupied by whites. There is little reason to believe that religion was the major cause for the assassinations or the massacres of that period if one understands the function of colonial -intentions.¶ As I continue to read about the assassination of Sitting Bull in these kinds of histories, I am reminded of the assassination of Ahmed Yassin in 2004 by Israeli helicopter pilots, which was the deliberate assassination of a leader of a resistance movement called Hamas in the Palestinian Homelands. Both were the acts of aggressive colonists to acquire land and power. American historians and museum curators must not exempt themselves from such acts.¶ The Plains Sioux and U.S. Colonialism is a reasonably comprehensive history, well documented with a useful bibliography, written in a flourishing prose style. It is divided into three parts: "Conquest," "Colonialism," and "Anticolonialism and the State." There is little examination of the use of the term "Conquest" itself, a term that always implies defeat on the battlefield—something that did not happen in the Sioux-U.S. war theater. Consequently, this text says, for the most part, nothing new in this regard. The defeat in the Sioux-U.S. war theater happened at the negotiating table, not on the battlefield. A major criticism of this text is that it does nothing to examine the apologetic language that is always used in such histories. At the conclusion of the narrative, the ethnographic autobiography Black Elk Speaks by John G. Neihardt is trotted out so that the massacre can be called a "traumatic event" in Sioux history rather than a crime against humanity perpetrated by one of the most successful capitalistic democracies in the history of nations. Ostler tells an old and familiar story but does nothing to assist the people of the Sioux Nation in their present struggle toward autonomy and a future of well-being.

#### Our exploration of the similarities between these murders exposes the ways that colonialism has operated behind US killing policies. Western methods of thought are perpetuated through military operations, the targeted killing operation to kill Osama bin Laden was named operation Geronimo. The choice to frame bin Laden in the same method that indigenous people have been framed for assassination and extermination demonstrates the way that the logic that “Indians are enemies” still operates in our foreign policy today

Newcomb ‘11

[Steven Newcomb (Shawnee/Lenape) is co-founder and co-director of the Indigenous Law Institute, author of Pagans in the Promised Land: Decoding the Doctrine of Christian Discovery (Fulcrum, 2008), and a columnist for Indian Country Today Media Network, “Geronimo Again? The Indian Wars Continue Ad Nauseam,” 05.03.2011. <<http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/opinion/geronimo-again%3F-the-indian-wars-continue-%3Cem%3Ead-nauseam%3C/em%3E-32091>>//wyo-hdm]

In my book Pagans in the Promised Land(Fulcrum, 2008) I use the theory of the human mind (cognitive theory) to explain the "cognitive unconscious" of the United States. Certain ingrained traditions of thought, both conscious and unconscious, have been used for generations by U.S. government officials. Such thinking has resulted in the development of predominantly anti-Indian U.S. federal Indian laws and policies. The result has been laws and policies that have proven detrimental to Indian nations and peoples.¶ George Washington, in 1784, used the analogy “the savage as the wolf” to refer to our Indian ancestors as less-than-human “beasts.” As Henry Wheaton said in his Elements of International Law, “The heathen nations of the other quarters of the globe were the lawful spoil and prey of their civilized conquerors.” Thus, one of the normative American metaphors throughout the history of the United States has been "Indians Are Enemies." We’re talking about a U.S. tradition of dehumanization and dominance used against our nations and peoples.¶ From the perspective of non-Indian colonizers, our indigenous ancestors were enemies to be uprooted from the vast extent of our traditional lands and territories and con fined to “reservations” in remote areas, under U.S. control. Thus, off the reservation is a common idiom used by television journalists and commentators to refer to someone being a "renegade," with the connotation being an enemy “who chooses to live outside laws or conventions.” However, it is important to keep in mind that U.S. laws and conventions have been imposed on our nations and peoples. Someone who has gone off the reservationis considered to be an "outlaw,” which in our case is outside the bounds of imposed laws and policies of the United States.¶ Geronimo's life story is a direct result of the invasion of the Apache territory and attempts to subdue the free and independent Apache. After his family was massacred by Mexicans in 1851, Geronimo became a Chiricahua Apache leader who fit perfectly into the non-Indian metaphorical frame “Indians Are Enemies.” He and a small group of fellow Apaches brilliantly eluded capture by 5,000 United States Army soldiers, 500 Indian scouts, and 3000 Mexican soldiers. The desert terrain was steep and formidable. The temperatures were extreme: intense cold and blistering heat. Geronimo and his band had very little food or water. What those Apaches accomplished is very likely one of the most amazing physical feats of stamina in the history of the human race. He finally surrendered in 1886.¶ In the reported stories of Osama Bin Laden being killed by U.S. military forces, bin Laden was code-named “Geronimo.” According to a CBS news report, those who came up with that “inappropriate code name” apparently “thought of bin Laden as a 21st-century equivalent” of Geronimo. In other words, the code name was based on an extension of the metaphor “Indians Are Enemies” to “Geronimo was a Terrorist,” thus perpetuating the U.S. tradition of treating Indian nations and peoples as enemies.¶ Geronimo was fighting against the invasion of his country and the oppression of his people. He did not invade the United States. Rather, Spain, Mexico, and then the United States invaded the Apache Territory and the territories of hundreds of other Indigenous nations. Horrific atrocities were committed against the Apache, and men such as Geronimo, whose family was massacred by Mexicans, did not hesitate to retaliate. Geronimo died a “prisoner of war” in 1909.

#### The use of “Geronimo” by the U.S. military is a act of neocolonialism that continues a tradition of cultural genocide through operations of power, this logic fuels the expansion of militarism and the global war on terror and colonial empire of the United States

Rogers ‘11

[Indiana, Ethnic Studies department at UCSD, “Geronimo and Neocolonial Naming: When Whiteness Never Offends,”10.06.2011. <http://factasyland.wordpress.com/2011/05/06/geronimo-and-neocolonial-naming-when-whiteness-never-offends/>//wyo-hdm]

European colonists brought disease, “advanced” weaponry, and hegemony with them when they encountered Native tribes on this land. The first decimated huge quantities of Indigenous populations, making the process of conquering easier, not making the tribes themselves easier to conquer; the second made considerable power possible for the colonists, as if the possession of certain technologies gives one the right to use them for violence; the third was a justification for genocide, by constructing Indigenous peoples as “uncivilized savages” on the brink of extinction that required elimination, removal, or “education.” Colonial hegemony has long endured into the contemporary moment. This is where the use of Geronimo, in name and legacy, becomes an act of neocolonialism and whiteness by ignoring the continued existence of Indigenous peoples, appropriating certain ancestors at the government’s will, and disregarding the offensive association of a respected historical figure with a man behind organized killings. The US has its own relationship with organized killings, particularly when it involves Indigenous peoples; however, Andrew Jackson, responsible for the Trail of Tears that resulted in over 4,000 American Indian deaths, would never be equated with Osama bin Laden. After finding and assassinating the target of the most expensive manhunt in history, Winona LaDuke, Indigenous author and activist writing from the White Earth Reservation in northern Minnesota, is right to notice that the military “sees this from its own perspective.” US desires and neocolonial interests were behind both the raid that killed bin Laden and the decision to call the raid “Geronimo.” In a video broadcast from [Democracy Now](http://www.democracynow.org/2011/5/6/native_american_activist_winona_laduke_on)!, hosts Amy Goodman and Juan Gonzalez interviewed LaDuke on the military appropriation. The use of what she calls “Native nomenclature” in the military not only desecrates the unique and diverse histories of Native peoples, but also the disproportionately high past and present levels of American Indian military service and enlistment.¶ “That is the reality of Native nomenclature, and how the military uses Native people and Native imagery to continue its global war and its global empire practices.”¶ The military continues to defend US sovereignty against Indigenous peoples, as the government continues to be absent in signing the [UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/en/drip.html); both phenomena are crucial to maintaining US empire, lacking in justice and recognition. Naming an assassination raid after Geronimo is an exercise of ownership and power, a violent seizure of a name in the tradition of violent seizure of Indigenous land. As Cheyenne/Hodulgee Muscogee activist Suzan Shown Harjo said while testifying at the same Senate Commission as Harlyn Geronimo, “Our names are not our own.” ¶ When Indigenous names undergo a military transformation into government property, the pattern of [cultural genocide](http://factasyland.wordpress.com/translations/) continues. This is not only a grave injustice to Indigenous peoples, but also a tremendous disservice to those who have been rendered systemically ignorant of tribal histories, struggles, leaders, and thinkers. While an apology from Obama would be a start, it would doubtfully be enough. Hope and change were useful as campaign platforms, but instances such as these demonstrate how these platforms have sometimes failed to translate into policy. In a [letter](http://www.fortsillapache-nsn.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=61:letter-to-president-about-geronimo&catid=7:tribal-news&Itemid=13) to President Obama, Chairman Jeff Houser of the Fort Sill Apache tribe made these concluding remarks:

#### The unlimited nature of presidential war powers, the flexible definition of terrorism and the frame that places Indians as enemies makes the possibility of unending war and violence against indigenous people possible

Newcomb ‘11

[Steve, co-founder and co-director of the Indigenous Law Institute, author of Pagans in the Promised Land: Decoding the Doctrine of Christian Discovery (Fulcrum, 2008), and a columnist for Indian Country Today Media Network <<http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com/opinion/andrew-jackson-and-the-usa-global-war-bill-36691>>//wyo-hdm]

The U.S. government's attempt this past March to analogize al Queda with the Seminole people was a terrible distortion. Worse still is the parallel between Andrew Jackson charging and hanging Arbuthnot and Ambrister for "aiding the enemy" and current U.S. congressional legislation now moving quickly toward passage. Not only have US government attorneys wrongly converted Seminoles into al Qaeda, but the Congress is now about to pass legislation that would treat all humans on the planet as potential detainees for aiding those deemed by the United States to be "enemies."¶ The proposed legislation would make The Authorization for the Use of Military Force of September 2001 a permanent feature of U.S. law. It would make due process protections under the U.S. Constitution unavailable to anyone detained. The scope of the legislation appears to be anybody, anytime, anywhere.¶ A bill authorizing a regime of global war was added to the National Defense Authorization Act of 2011 (H.R. 1540) by House Armed Services Committee Chairman Howard "Buck" McKeon (R-CA). The Act passed the House last week and now moves to the U.S. Senate. Another such bill was recently put forward by U.S. Senator John McCain (R-AZ).¶ The new war authorization will allow the United States to wage war "wherever there are terrorism suspects in any country around the world without an expiration date, geographical boundaries or connection to the 9/11 attacks or any other specific harm or threat to the United States," the ACLU said recently.¶ According to a May 9 article by Laura Pitter in "The Hill" newspaper ("Proposed McKeon and McCain legislation won’t make us safer"), the bills put forward by congressman McKeon and Senator McCain "would expand who the U.S. says it is at war with and mandate military detention for broadly defined terrorist suspects based on scant evidence." Hearsay evidence will also be admissible.¶ By means of a permanent war authorization, indigenous peoples, and their allies, who advocate for self-determination and for the protection of Indigenous resources (lands, water, minerals, etc.) against colonial and corporate exploitation could be accused by the United States of "supporting terrorism," and thereby come under attack or be seized by the U.S. military and end up being held as detainees. The legislation would further ratify and intensify the U.S. policy of treating Indigenous peoples’ issues as a matter of national security

#### Colonial identity production has reduced Natives to a constant state of near-death. The impact is a state of racism and violence that is constantly renewed through forms of linguistic and physical control

Smith ‘03

[Andrea, “Not an Indian Tradition: The Sexual Colonization of Native Peoples”, Hypatia, Volume 18, Number 2, Spring, pp. 70-85]

Ann Stoler argues that racism, far from being a reaction to crisis in which racial others are scapegoated for social ills, is a permanent part of the social fabric. “[R]acism is not an effect but a tactic in the internal fission of society into binary opposition, a means of creating ‘biologized’ internal enemies, against whom society must defend itself” (1997, 59). She notes that in the modern state, the constant purification and elimination of racialized enemies within that state ensures the growth of the national body. “Racism does not merely arise in moments of crisis, in sporadic cleansings. It is internal to the biopolitical state, woven into the web of the social body, threaded through its fabric” (1997, 59). Similarly, Kate Shanley notes that Native peoples are a permanent “present absence” in the U.S. colonial imagination, an “absence” that reinforces at every turn the conviction that Native peoples are indeed vanishing and that the conquest of Native lands is justified. Ella Shoat and Robert Stam describe this absence as “an ambivalently repressive mechanism [that] dispels the anxiety in the face of the Indian, whose very presence is a reminder of the initially precarious g rounding of the American nation-state itself . . . In a temporal paradox, living Indians were induced to ‘play dead,’ as it were, in order to perform a narrative of manifest destiny in which their role, ultimately, was to disappear” (1994, 118–19). This “absence” is effected through the metaphorical transformation of Native bodies into a pollution of which the colonial body must purify itself. As white Californians described in the 1860s, Native people were “the dirtiest lot of human beings on earth.” They wear filthy rags, with their persons unwashed, hair uncombed and swarming with vermin” (Rawls 1984, 195). The following 1885 Proctor & Gamble ad for Ivory Soap also illustrates this equation between Indian bodies and dirt: We were once factious, fierce and wild, In peaceful arts unreconciled Our blankets smeared with grease and stains From buffalo meat and settlers’ veins. Through summer’s dust and heat content From moon to moon unwashed we went, But IVORY SOAP came like a ray Of light across our darkened way And now we’re civil, kind and good And keep the laws as people should, We wear our linen, lawn and lace As well as folks with paler face And now I take, wherever we go This cake of IVORY SOAP to show What civilized my squaw and me And made us clean and fair to see. (Lopez n.d, 119) In the colonial imagination, Native bodies are also immanently polluted with sexual sin. Alexander Whitaker, a minister in Virginia, wrote in 1613: “They live naked in bodies, as if their shame of their sinne deserved no covering: Their names are as naked as their bodies: They esteem it a virtue to lie, deceive and steale as their master the divell teacheth them” (Berkhofer 1978, 19). Furthermore, according to Bernardino de Minaya: “Their [the Indians’] marriages are not a sacrament but a sacrilege. They are idolatrous, libidinous, and commit sodomy. Their chief desire is to eat, drink, worship heathen idols, and commit bestial obscenities” (cited in Stannard 1992, 211). Stoler’s analysis of racism in which Native peoples are likened to a pollution that threatens U. S. security is indicated in the comments of one doctor in his attempt to rationalize the mass sterilization of Native women in the 1970s: “People pollute, and too many people crowded too close together cause many of our social and economic problems. These in turn are aggravated by involuntary and irresponsible parenthood . . . We also have obligations to the society of which we are part. The welfare mess, as it has been called, cries out for solutions, one of which is fertility control” (Oklahoma 1989, 11). Herbert Aptheker describes the logical consequences of this sterilization movement: “The ultimate logic of this is crematoria; people are themselves constituting the pollution and inferior people in particular, then crematoria become really vast sewerage projects. Only so may one understand those who attend the ovens and concocted and conducted the entire enterprise; those “wasted”—to use U. S. army jargon reserved for colonial hostilities—are not really, not fully people” (1987, 144). Because Indian bodies are “dirty,” they are considered sexually violable and “rapable.” That is, in patriarchal thinking, only a body that is “pure” can be violated. The rape of bodies that are considered inherently impure or dirty simply does not count. For instance, prostitutes have almost an impossible time being believed if they are raped because the dominant society considers the prostitute’s body undeserving of integrity and violable at all times. Similarly, the history of mutilation of Indian bodies, both living and dead, makes it clear to Indian people that they are not entitled to bodily integrity, as these examples suggest: I saw the body of White Antelope with the privates cut off, and I heard a soldier say he was going to make a tobacco-pouch out of them. (cited in Wrone and Nelson 1982, 113) Each of the braves was shot down and scalped by the wild volunteers, who out with their knives and cutting two parallel gashes down their backs, would strip the skin from the quivering [ esh to make razor straps of. (cited in Wrone and Nelson 1982, 90) One more dexterous than the rest, proceeded to [ ay the chief’s [Tecumseh’s] body; then, cutting the skin in narrow strips . . . at once, a supply of razor-straps for the more “ferocious” of his brethren. (cited in Wrone and Nelson 1982, 82) Andrew Jackson . . . supervised the mutilation of 800 or so Creek Indian corpses—the bodies of men, women and children that he and his men massacred—cutting off their noses to count and preserve a record of the dead, slicing long strips of [ esh from their bodies to tan and turn into bridle reins. (Stannard 1992, 121) Echoing this mentality was Governor Thompson, who stated in 1990 that he would not close down an open Indian burial mound in Dickson, Illinois, because of his argument that he was as much Indian as are current Indians, and consequently, he had as much right as they to determine the fate of Indian remains.1 He felt free to appropriate the identity of “Native,” and thus felt justified in claiming ownership over both Native identity and Native bodies. The Chicago press similarly attempted to challenge the identity of the Indian people who protested Thompson’s decision by stating that these protestors were either only “part” Indian or were only claiming to be Indian (Hermann 1990).2 The message conveyed by the Illinois state government is that to be Indian in this society is to be on constant display for white consumers, in life or in death. And in fact, Indian identity itself is under the control of the colonizer, subject to eradication at any time. As Aime Cesaire puts it, “colonization = ‘thingi> cation’” (1972, 21). As Stoler explains this process of racialized colonization: “[T]he more ‘degenerates’ and ‘abnormals’ [in this case Native peoples] are eliminated, the lives of those who speak will be stronger, more vigorous, and improved. The enemies are not political adversaries, but those identified as external and internal threats to the population. Racism is the condition that makes it acceptable to put [certain people] to death in a society of normalization” (1997, 85). Tadiar’s description of colonial relationships as an enactment of the “prevailing mode of heterosexual relations” is useful because it underscores the extent to which U. S. colonizers view the subjugation of women of the Native nations as critical to the success of the economic, cultural, and political colonization (1993, 186). Stoler notes that the imperial discourses on sexuality “cast white women as the bearers of more racist imperial order” (1997, 35). By extension, Native women as bearers of a counter-imperial order pose a supreme threat to the imperial order. Symbolic and literal control over their bodies is important in the war against Native people, as these examples attest: When I was in the boat I captured a beautiful Carib women . . . I conceived desire to take pleasure . . . I took a rope and thrashed her well, for which she raised such unheard screams that you would not have believed your ears. Finally we came to an agreement in such a manner that I can tell you that she seemed to have been brought up in a school of harlots. (Sale 1990, 140) Two of the best looking of the squaws were lying in such a position, and from the appearance of the genital organs and of their wounds, there can be no doubt that they were first ravished and then shot dead. Nearly all of the dead were mutilated. (Wrone and Nelson 1982, 123) One woman, big with child, rushed into the church, clasping the alter and crying for mercy for herself and unborn babe. She was followed, and fell pierced with a dozen lances . . . the child was torn alive from the yet palpitating body of its mother, first plunged into the holy water to be baptized, and immediately its brains were dashed out against a wall. (Wrone and Nelson 1982, 97) The Christians attacked them with buffets and beatings . . . Then they behaved with such temerity and shamelessness that the most powerful ruler of the island had to see his own wife raped by a Christian officer. (Las Casas 1992, 33) I heard one man say that he had cut a woman’s private parts out, and had them for exhibition on a stick. I heard another man say that he had cut the fingers off of an Indian, to get the rings off his hand. I also heard of numerous instances in which men had cut out the private parts of females, and stretched them over their saddle-bows and some of them over their hats. (Sand Creek 1973, 129–30) American Horse said of the massacre at Wounded Knee: The fact of the killing of the women, and more especially the killing of the young boys and girls who are to go to make up the future strength of the Indian people is the saddest part of the whole affair and we feel it very sorely. (Stannard 1992, 127).

#### Therefore \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and I affirm a critical interrogation of current targeted killing practices through the lens of indigenous epistemology

### Contention 2: Our Politics

#### Our use of indigenous epistemology is a act of transgression against empire that allows us to unthink our colonial roots and the way they frame social life today

Grande ‘08

[Sandy, Associate Professor of Education at Connecticut College, Ph.D., Kent State University, Fellow in the Holleran Center for Community Action and Public Policy, member of the EPA’s National Environmental Justice Advisory Council’s Indigenous People’s Work Group, “Red Pedagogy” in Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies, pg. 242-3//wyo-hdm]

From the standpoint of Red pedagogy, the primary lesson in all of this is pedagogical. In other words, as we are poised to raise yet another generation in a nation at war and at risk, we must consider how emerging conceptions of citizenship, sovereignty, and democracy will affect the (re)formation of our national identity, particularly among young people in schools. As Mitchell (2001) notes, "The production of democracy, the practice of education, and the constitution of the nation-state" have always been interminably bound together. The imperative before us as citizens is to engage a process of unthinking our colonial roots and rethinking democracy. For teachers and students, this means that we must be willing to act as agents of transgression, posing critical questions and engaging dangerous discourse. Such is the basis of Red pedagogy. In particular, Red pedagogy offers the following seven precepts as a way of thinking our way around and through the challenges facing American education in the 21st century and our mutual need to define decolonizing pedagogies: 1. Red pedagogy is primarily a pedagogical project. In this context, pedagogy is understood as being inherently political, cultural, spiritual, and intellectual.¶ 2. Red pedagogy is fundamentally rooted in indigenous knowledge and praxis. It is particularly interested in knowledge that furthers understanding and analysis of the forces of colonization.¶ 3. Red pedagogy is informed by critical theories of education. A Red pedagogy searches for ways it can both deepen and be deepened by engagement with critical and revolutionary theories and praxis.¶ 4. Red pedagogy promotes an education for decolonization. Within Red pedagogy, the root metaphors of decolonization are articulated as equity, emancipation, sovereignty, and balance. In this sense, an education for decolonization makes no claim to political neutrality but rather engages a method of analysis and social inquiry that troubles the capitalist-imperialist aims of unfettered 5. Red pedagogy is a project that interrogates both democracy and indigenous sovereignty. In this context, sovereignty is broadly defined as "a people's right to rebuild its demand to exist and present its gifts to the world... an adamant refusal to dissociate culture, identity, and power from the land" (Lyons, 2000).¶ 6. Red pedagogy actively cultivates praxis of collective agency. That is, Red pedagogy aims to build transcultural and transnational solidarities among indigenous peoples and others committed to reimagining a sovereign space free of imperialist, colonialist, and capitalist exploitation.¶ 7. Red pedagogy is grounded in hope. This is, however, not the future-centered hope of the Western imagination but rather a hope that lives in contingency with the past—one that trusts the beliefs and understandings of our ancestors, the power of traditional knowledge, and the possibilities of new understandings.¶In the end, a Red pedagogy is about engaging the development of "community-based power" in the interest of "a responsible political, economic and spiritual society. "That is, the power to live out "active presences and survivances rather than an illusionary democracy." Vizenor's (1993) notion of survivance signifies a state of being beyond "survival, endurance, or a mere response to colonization" and of moving toward "an active presence ... and active repudiation of dominance, tragedy and victimry." In these post-Katrina times, I find the notion of survivance—particularly as it relates to colonized peoples—to be poignant and powerful. It speaks to our collective need to decolonize, to push back against empire, and to reclaim what it means to be a people of sovereign mind and body. The peoples of the Ninth Ward in New Orleans serve as a reminder to all of us that just as the specter of colonialism continues to haunt the collective soul of America, so too does the more hopeful spirit of indigeneity.

#### We must decolonize debate practice itself—Education based on Western thought continue forms of colonial schooling designed to reproduce neoliberal empire. Our epistemic resistance creates the possibility for decolonizing education and challenging the processes of eurocentrism and the colonial legacy of power and knowledge

Shahjahan ‘11

[Riyad Ahmed, Assistant Professor of Higher, Adult, and Lifelong Education (HALE) at Michigan State University. Ph.D. at the OISE/University of Toronto in Higher Education. “Decolonizing the evidence-based education and policy movement:¶ revealing the colonial vestiges in educational policy, research, and¶ neoliberal reform” Online publication date: 22 March 201, Journal of Education Policy, 26: 2,¶ 181 — 206 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02680939.2010.508176>]

Revisiting histories of colonial educational policy in schooling helps us contextualize¶ and demonstrate how evidence-based education, tied to high-stakes testing and¶ neoliberalism, reproduces past colonial ideologies with respect to developing colonized¶ labor. Throughout European colonialism, schooling was not only used to colonize¶ the minds to force cultural assimilation or acceptance of colonial rule, but also to¶ produce a reservoir of subservient labor that would harvest and mine commodities for¶ the imperial economy. For instance, in North America, colonial schooling ‘introduced¶ the concept of forced labor as part of Indian education, transforming the ostensibly¶ “moral project” of civilizing Indians into a for-profit enterprise’ (Grande 2004, 13). In¶ boarding schools, part of the most important feature of the colonialist curriculum ‘was¶ the inculcation of the industrial or “Protestant” work ethic’ (13). In the Belgian¶ Congo, Darwin’s scientific racism was the dominant discourse among Belgian colonizers,¶ and it influenced their colonial educational policy. For the Belgian government¶ and leaders of industry, the Congolese was to learn in school a work ethos that clearly¶ catered to the economic endeavor, and to mold the Congolese playfulness and laziness¶ into a life of ‘progress,’ order and discipline (Seghers 2004, 465). In Hawaii, colonial¶ schools ‘became less a means of religious conversion and more a site for socializing¶ Hawaiian and immigrant children for work on the plantation’ (Kaomea 2000, 322). In¶ Africa in general, Urch notes: The demand for skilled native labor by the white settlers and commercial leaders caused¶ the colonial administrators to reevaluate the educational program of the missions.¶ Education solely for proselytization was not considered sufficient to enable the colonies’¶ economy to expand. Government officials saw the need for an educational process that¶ would help to break down tribal solidarity and force the African into a money economy.¶ (1971, 252)¶ In short, colonial schooling played a significant role in disciplining the minds and¶ bodies of the colonized for imperial profit.¶ Interestingly, when it came to ‘pillars of the curriculum,’ what was common¶ among many colonial environments, ‘were religion and the legendary “3Rs”¶ [Reading, (W)riting and “Rithmetic”]’ (Sjöström 2001, 79). These pillars of the¶ curriculum very much parallel, with a slight change, the curriculum that is tested via¶ PISA and TIMSS which concentrates on reading, math, and science. In the contemporary¶ context, science has replaced the pillar of religion in the curriculum. Also, in the¶ present context, the neoliberal economy has replaced the old imperial economy, but¶ the objective for schooling still stays the same, which is to produce a labor force for¶ the global economy. As Lipman points out, these accountability reforms ‘certify that¶ students that graduate from’ schooling ‘will have [the] basic literacies and disciplined¶ dispositions’ needed for a global workforce (2003, 340). International organizations¶ such as the OECD and the World Bank, have replaced the old adage ‘protestant work¶ ethic’ of colonial schooling, with the knowledge and skills to function in the knowledge¶ economy, such as literacy to manipulate information, problem solving, math, and¶ science (Spring 2009). In other words, like colonial schooling, education via neoliberal¶ reform is working towards reproducing a labor force and objectification of the¶ colonized. Ceasire’s argument of ‘thingification’ fits very well with the colonizing of¶ bodies in neoliberal educational reform. Teachers, students, and education in general¶ are all objectified and reduced to commodities to serve the global economy. To this¶ end, Lipman states: Students are reduced to test scores, future slots in the labor market, prison numbers, and¶ possible cannon fodder in military conquests. Teachers are reduced to technicians and¶ supervisors in the education assembly line – ‘objects’ rather than ‘subjects’ of history.¶ This system is fundamentally about the negation of human agency, despite the good¶ intentions of individuals at all levels. (2004, 179)¶ Global colonialism continues with the evidence-based education movement, as education¶ is increasingly reduced into standardized packages that can be sold in the global¶ marketplace, while at the same time promoting a system of education that is focused¶ on training a skilled workforce that will operate in the global labor market (Lipman¶ 2004; Berry 2008; Spring 2009; Rizvi and Lingard 2010). To this end, Fanon states:¶ I came into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things, my spirit filled¶ with the desire to attain to the source of the world, and then I found that I was an object¶ in the midst of other objects. (1967, 109).¶ The desires and agencies of many teachers, students, and educational leaders are being¶ stripped away, while at the same time they are turned into ‘an object in the midst of¶ other objects’ through the neoliberal logic of evidence-based education. In summary,¶ the neoliberal agenda, currently dominant in education systems around the world, reproduces¶ colonial educational policies. Within the evidence-based education movement, the epistemic and material are not separate but are intertwined in colonial discourse¶ and history. As this section demonstrates, evidence-based education not only colonizes¶ education epistemologically, but also perpetuates materialist power relations and¶ disciplines bodies of the colonized to serve the global economy.¶Concluding remarks and implications¶ [U]nless educational reform happens concurrently with analysis of the forces of colonialism,¶ it can only serve as a insufficient Band-aid over the incessant wound of imperialism.¶ (Grande 2004, 19)¶ Grande eloquently summarizes the intention behind this article, which is to offer a¶ conceptual map linking events of the colonial past with a present movement that¶ continues to perpetuate colonial discourses and practices within educational policy.¶ My hope is that the analysis presented in this paper provides an alteration in terms on¶ what is unsaid or left out in educational policy and bolsters a critical analysis of power¶ in educational policy. I argue in this paper that the evidence-based education movement¶ is very much tied to multiple colonial discourses, which can be traced back to a¶ colonial history that has simply been ignored in the literature. In other words, this article¶ challenges us to move beyond the confines of Eurocentrism and historical amnesia¶ to critically examine evidence-based education and to contextualize this movement¶ within colonial discourses and histories. It is my hope that this article demonstrates the usefulness of the anticolonial lens¶ in examining educational policy. This framework foregrounds the intersections¶ between knowledge, power, Eurocentrism, colonial history, and political economy, in¶ educational policy. The epistemic, cultural, and material perspectives in anticolonial¶ thought are applicable to policy analysis. This is evident in the way that ‘educational¶ research,’ ‘evidence,’ ‘curriculum,’ and ‘learning outcomes’ are being defined and¶ re-imagined in evidence-based education, as these are ultimately shaped by material¶ relations of power that are colonizing. For instance, common to any colonial¶ discourse is the rationale for purifying administration in the name of efficiency, and a¶ binaristic civilizing narrative is used in this regard. By naming and representing¶ education as a field in chaos, evidence-based education proponents, with good intentions,¶ are justifying actions and measures to make education systems more evidencebased¶ and in turn standardize and rationalize complex educational processes. As this¶ paper demonstrates, many proponents of evidence-based education profess an¶ educational policy with the intention of improving learning for all students (which¶ may be their full intent), but their discourse continues to perpetuate colonized power¶ relationships. In other words, they are unknowingly striving to control and ‘tame’¶ education through evidence-based education. An anticolonial lens also reminds us how social hierarchies and knowledge¶ systems were used to justify colonial interventions with the objective of reshaping¶ society in order to exploit the labor and material resources of the colonized, and allow¶ for certain power relations to be legitimized. In the evidence-based education movement,¶ we see the mobilization of colonial discourse with regard to the way ‘evidence’¶ and ‘learning’ is being constructed and used to purify the production of knowledge to¶ meet neoliberal ends of education. Furthermore, the anticolonial lens reveals the¶ commodification, objectification, and dehumanization of bodies and knowledge¶ systems in colonial processes. This article demonstrates how this ‘thingification’ occurs in evidence-based education for teachers, students, and educational leaders. An¶ anticolonial lens cannot separate the political economy from the epistemic issues. To¶ this end, this paper demonstrates how evidence-based education is part of a neoliberal¶ agenda which is also tied to global colonialism and the production of colonized labor.¶ In short, an anticolonial lens helps to bring forward the social–historical–political¶ processes that stem from colonial relations of power and informs contemporary¶ knowledge production, validation, and dissemination in educational policy. An anticolonial lens also stresses that colonial discourses and material relations of¶ power are not absolute, and that the colonized also have discursive and material¶ agency. To this end, one of the limitations of my analysis is that it overlooks the¶ agency among the colonized, and has presented evidence-based education as a monolithic¶ discourse with homogenizing effects, rather than a partial discourse that is¶ contested and lived differently from its intentions. Historically, and in present¶ contexts, imperialism and colonialism were never monolithic or unidirectional, and¶ the boundaries between colonizers and colonized were not clearly demarcated (see¶ Cooper and Stoler 1997; Young 2001; Bush 2006). Similarly, evidence-based education¶ is not an absolute, unidirectional discourse. From an anticolonial lens, we need to¶ look for those sites of resistance and discrepancies to highlight the limitations/¶ inequities of evidence-based education and bring those struggles to the foreground. To¶ this end, I will now discuss some examples of the ‘tensions’ and resistances to¶ evidence-based education. For instance, in Canada, the British Columbia Teacher’s¶ Federation has led a campaign to resist the Foundations Skills Assessment instituted¶ by the provincial government (http://www.bctf.ca/fsa.aspx). In Ontario, African-¶ Canadian parents are frustrated with the Toronto public schooling system failing to¶ respond to the needs of Black youth and are demanding Africentric schools from the¶ Toronto District School Board (Adjei and Agyepong 2009). In the USA, Fine et al.¶ (2007) describe, how schools, communities, parents, and grandparents are engaged in¶ active resistance to such accountability measures and schooling. Chicago residents of¶ Little Village have launched an organizing campaign for a local high school dedicated¶ to culture, community, and activism, which culminated in a 19-day hunger strike by¶ Latino high school students, educators, community organizers, residents, and even¶ grandmothers. Similarly, in a California community, largely populated by migrant¶ families, the school district, joined by nine other districts and civil rights organizations,¶ sued the state over the improper use of English-language assessments to test¶ English Language Learners and the sanctions they face under NCLB (Fine et al.¶ 2007). Teachers also have the agency to interpret, disseminate, and act on the information¶ based on such accountability policies (Lipman 2002; Ball 2003; Sloan 2007). Some¶ teachers have left the profession as an act of resistance because these accountability¶ trends no longer reflect their critical educational philosophy (McNeil 2000; Lipman¶ 2002; Ball 2003). Other teachers enact resistance by subverting the official test-based¶ curriculum. For instance, as one Chicago school teacher put it:¶ I think that we are having a rough time, that sometimes we may lean a little bit more¶ towards CPS policies and other times we lean a little bit more to ‘screw CPS’ and focus¶ on critical thinking skills. (Lipman 2002, 392)¶ Some still display ambivalence towards teaching for the test for the purpose of¶ surveillance: I have mixed feelings about it … I think it’s how we interpret the results. If we use it to¶ say our school is better than yours, then I don’t want to do it. If we use it so that we can¶ help the teachers program better for the kids, then that is more useful as a tool. (Canadian¶ Grade 3 teacher, cited in Childs and Fung 2009, 9)¶ In short, teachers, students, parents, families, and community activists have demonstrated¶ the agency to negotiate and contest these colonial discourses in every day¶ practice. Accountability reforms, tied with evidence-based education, depending on¶ context, have also had multiple effects on schools and curricula, and also have critics¶ from within. Scholars have noted how the colonizing effects of accountability reform¶ on schooling and resistance to these reforms depend on the context and the questions¶ of race, class, language, and localized policies (Lipman 2002, 2003; Earl and Fullan¶ 2003; Maxcy 2006). For instance, in her study on the impact of accountability reform¶ for four Chicago schools, Lipman notes how these ‘schools’ responses to accountability¶ are closely linked to past and present race and class advantages, the relative political¶ power of their communities, and new forms of racialization’ (2003, 338).¶ Moreover, in a significant minority of cases, high-stakes testing has led to curricular¶ content expansion, the integration of knowledge, and more student-centered, cooperative¶ pedagogies, such as in secondary social studies and language arts (Au 2007).¶ Hence, the nature of high-stakes-test-induced curricular control is highly dependent¶ on the structures of the tests themselves (Au 2007). In summary, high-stakes testing¶ does not produce a monolithic effect, but has heterogeneous results depending on¶ questions of social difference and context. Furthermore, proponents of evidence-based¶ education ‘are not monolithic and that at least some of them are open to dialog on the¶ issues on which we disagree’ (Maxwell 2004, 39). In short, an acknowledgment of the¶ colonial historical legacy of the evidence-based education movement may help us¶ move beyond a discourse of sameness in colonial discourse, and start thinking about¶ the possibilities, interruptions, contestations, and resistances to the colonizing effects¶ of evidence-based education. Recently, there has been growing ethnographic studies¶ that examine such sites of resistance and contradictions at the ground level. These¶ spaces are where future studies and dialog could focus their attention. In terms of policy and educational practice, an anticolonial lens motivates us to ask¶ a different set of questions and re-imagine educational research, practice, and policy.¶ For instance, what is being left out in the discussion of evidence-based education¶ movement is the glaring systemic inequities that are privileging some bodies¶ (students, teachers, and administrators) and knowledge systems (language, curricula,¶ and culture) over others (see McNeil 2000; Lipman 2004; Valuenzela 2005; Maxcy¶ 2006), that are tied to the global economy (Stewart-Harawira 2005). Rather than blaming¶ students, teachers, and administrators for progress in public tests, and working¶ from a deficit model, we need to shift our attention towards deploying significant¶ material and intellectual resources to serve diverse needs and minoritized bodies¶ (Lipman 2002, 2003), and challenge global economic systems. Furthermore, instead¶ of looking for the pitfalls of educational practice, we could ask and explore the following¶ questions (see Asa Hilliard cited in Lemons-Smith 2008; Hood and Hopson 2008):¶ How does academic excellence flourish in schools attended mostly by minoritized¶ students? How do teachers who reject the status quo and define excellence as responding¶ to community needs, find ways to promote excellence for all students regardless¶ of their circumstances? ‘Student achievement at what cost’ [Michael Dantley, personal communication]? What ideological paradigms underlie teacher education?¶ What is the role of teacher preparation programs in perpetuating and promoting these¶ values of equity and social justice?¶ Finally, in terms of educational policy, we may ask: whose cultural assumptions¶ and histories inform such accountability systems, ‘evidence,’ ‘data,’ and ‘learning¶ outcomes?’ ‘Whose notions of evidence matter most? And to whom does evidence¶ matter most?’ (Hood and Hopson 2008, 418). According to Stanfield (1999) and¶ Gillborn (2005), educational policy and research continue to impose the standards and¶ products of White supremacy on the racially minoritized. As Stanfield states:¶ Implicit White supremacy norms and values contribute … to Eurocentric concepts and¶ measurement epistemologies, techniques, and interpretations … Concretely, in the¶ United States and elsewhere in the West, … it has been considered normative to consider¶ Eurocentric notions and experiences as the baseline, as the yardstick to compare and¶ contrast the notions and experiences of people of color. This is … most apparent in¶ designing, implementing, and interpreting standardized tests and survey instruments.¶ (1999, 421)¶ I would argue that we need to ‘reappropriate’ evidence-based education to include a¶ broader array of evidence, experiences, and cultural knowledges (Luke 2003, 98; see¶ also Stanfield 1999; Valuenzela, Prieto, and Hamilton 2007). Finally, borrowing the¶ words of Asa Hilliard III, we need to ask, ‘do we have the will to educate all children’¶ (cited in Lemons-Smith 2008, 908), to respond to the needs, survival, self-determination,¶ and sovereignty of their respective communities and the planet? (see also Dei 2000;¶ Grande 2004). In an era of transnational capital, where ‘[g]lobalized discourses and agendasetting¶ and policy pressures now emerge from beyond the nation’(Rizvi and Lingard¶ 2010, 14–15), we need to have transnational dialogs (Mohanty 2003) on the impact of¶ evidence-based education and neoliberal reform across borders and social institutions.¶ This is because such transnational alliances and solidarity are needed to contest global¶ forces informed by transnational corporations as well as international organizations¶ such as the World Bank and OECD. What is noteworthy and rarely discussed, are the¶ similarities and differences in the discourses and effects of evidence-based education¶ movement across the three nation-states analyzed in this paper. Future research could¶ speculate and study how these ideas of evidence-based education circulate and move¶ across borders (see Rizvi and Lingard 2010).¶ Finally, as someone who has had the privilege to teach research methodology to¶ graduate students (including teachers, teacher educators, principals, and superintendents),¶ I am alarmed by how many of my students grumble about standardized testing,¶ and some even focus their research on such topics. What is also disconcerting is how¶ many of my students have a hard time imagining research and evidence that go¶ beyond numbers because of the ‘numbers game’ they must play in their daily working¶ lives. These trends are not a reflection of my students’ inabilities to see beyond¶ numbers, but a testament to the hegemony of the structural environment that reminds¶ them of what constitutes valid knowledge every day. Also of great concern is the¶ speed at which educational leaders, students, and teachers are being rushed through¶ standardized processes that leave little time for reflection, authenticity, and healing.¶ Many of my students have shared these accounts in my classroom, with me in person,¶ and in their reflection papers. For instance, one student who is currently a high school¶ teacher commented in a recent email: ‘The standards and objectives themselves work to eliminate any third space or anticolonial space. We read, write, process for the sole¶ purpose of testing and not for liberation.’¶ In this regard, I propose that we need to ‘slow down’ in educational practice and¶ policy. To this end, I am reminded of the words of Malidoma Some, an African Shaman¶ healer, who stated ‘while that the indigenous world looks, the industrial world over¶ looks’ (emphasis added). Educators, teachers, students, and policy-makers need time,¶ not to be given more information for decision-making or learning, but more importantly¶ to assess what we are overlooking in educating future generations. For instance, we¶ need more time to come together, dialog, heal, build reciprocity, understand difference,¶ and re-imagine educational policy and practice for the benefit of future generations. It¶ is only by slowing down that we will realize that our students, educational researchers,¶ teachers, and administrators are not ‘uncultivated soil,’ in the words of La Casas, but¶ rather seeds with the power within to germinate on their own if they are provided the¶ freedom, resources, and time. Slowing down is what I believe decolonizing education¶ means in this era of neoliberal policies and transnational capital!

#### This debate should be solely about the question of colonialism and its impact on indigenous peoples. A focus on other methodological priorities makes the task of dismantling western knowledge impossible

Byrd ‘11

[Jodi A., (Chickasaw), assistant professor of American Indian studies and English at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism, pg. xvii//wyo-hdm]

There is more than one way to frame the concerns of The Transit of Empire and more than one way to enter into the possibilities that transit might allow for comparative studies. On the one hand, I am seeking to join ongoing conversations about sovereignty, power, and indigeneity— and the epistemological debates that each of these terms engender— within and across disparate and at times incommensurable disciplines and geographies. American studies, queer studies, postcolonial studies, American Indian studies, and area studies have all attempted to apprehend injury and redress, melancholy and grief that exist in the distances and sutures of state recognitions and belongings. Those distances and sutures of recognitions and belongings, melancholy and grief, take this book from the worlds of Southeastern Indians to Hawai‘i, from the Poston War Relocation Center to Jonestown, Guyana, in order to consider how ideas of “Indianness” have created conditions of possibility for U. S. empire to manifest its intent. As liberal multicultural settler colonialism attempts to flex the exceptions and exclusions that first constituted the United States to now provisionally include those people othered and abjected from the nation-state’s origins, it instead creates a cacophony of moral claims that help to deflect progressive and transformative activism from dismantling the ongoing conditions of colonialism that continue to make the United States a desired state formation within which to be included. That cacophony of competing struggles for hegemony within and outside institutions of power, no matter how those struggles might challenge the state through loci of race, class, gender, and sexuality, serves to misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism that made the United States possible as oppressor in the first place. As a result, the cacophony produced through U.S. colonialism and imperialism domestically and abroad often coerces struggles for social justice for queers, racial minorities, and immigrants into complicity with settler colonialism. This book, on the other hand, is also interested in the quandaries poststructuralism has left us: the traces of indigenous savagery and “Indianness” that stand a priori prior to theorizations of origin, history, freedom, constraint, and difference.³ These traces of “Indianness” are vitally important to understanding how power and domination have been articulated and practiced by empire, and yet because they are traces, they have often remained deactivated as a point of critical inquiry as theory has transited across disciplines and schools. Indianness can be felt and intuited as a presence, and yet apprehending it as a process is difficult, if not impossible, precisely because Indianness has served as the field through which structures have always already been produced. Within the matrix of critical theory, Indianness moves not through absence but through reiteration, through meme, as theories circulate and fracture, quote and build. The prior ontological concerns that interpellate Indianness and savagery as ethnographic evidence and example, lamentable and tragic loss, are deferred through repetitions. How we have come to know intimacy, kinship, and identity within an empire born out of settler colonialism is predicated upon discourses of indigenous displacements that remain within the present everydayness of settler colonialism, even if its constellations have been naturalized by hegemony and even as its oppressive logics are expanded to contain more and more historical experiences. I hope to show through the juridical, cultural, and literary readings within this book that indigenous critical theory provides alternatives to the entanglements of race and colonialism, intimacy and relationship that continue to preoccupy poststructuralist and postcolonial studies.

#### And, our method is a necessary first step before any other political or critical project

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

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

## 2AC

#### The negative calling me white or not having enough Indian blood to self identify with indigenous knowledge is a form of blood quantum that allows further military conquest against indigenous peoples and masks the violence against the native who don’t fit certain stereotypes

Andrews and Chilcote ‘12

[Tria Andrews is Cherokee, Irish, and Filipina and a third-year PhD student in Ethnic Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, where she has taught Native American and Asian American Studies. She is also a Ford Foundation Predoctoral Fellow and Fulbright Scholar. Her research examines culturally relevant forms of rehabilitation for Native American youths in juvenile detention centers located on tribal grounds. This work is informed by over five years of tutoring and teaching yoga to incarcerated adolescents. Olivia Chilcote is a Payómkowishum (Luiseño) Indian and member of the San Luis Rey Band of Luiseño Indians from northern San Diego County. She is a second-year PhD student in Ethnic Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, where she is currently a Eugene Cota-Robles Predoctoral Fellow. Her research explores the interconnections between Native Californian identity, Federal Indian law and policy, and Native perspectives of California history. “Bad Blood?: The Visibility and Invisibility of Violence in the Antagonism Between Native Americans and African Americans,” 10.14.2012. <http://thefeministwire.com/2012/10/bad-blood-the-visibility-and-invisibility-of-violence-in-the-antagonism-between-native-americans-and-african-americans/>//wyo-hdm]¶ I

n Red, White, and Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms, Frank B. Wilderson III (2010) triangulates the ontological position of Native Americans with the White/Black binary. The “Settler/Master” according to Wilderson occupies the position of “life,” the “Slave” the position of “social death,” and the “Savage” the intermediary position of “half-life,” which is based on sovereignty, and “half-death,” which is based on genocide (p. 23). According to Wilderson (2010), a “Savage” film—that is, a film by a Native American director—chooses “life” by articulating itself in contradistinction to “death,” the ontological position of the “Slave” (p. 48-49). A recent YouTube video raises awareness about invisibilized violence between Native peoples and Black peoples. Blood (2012), created by Savage Media, a Native American student group at Dartmouth College, features a dialogue between a phenotypically White woman and a phenotypically Black woman.¶ In discussing the visibility and invisibility of violence, the question that often arises is, “Violence to whom”? One’s positionality shapes what forms of violence one is inclined to see or recognize. While violence may be invisible to the oppressor, the victim feels that violence acutely. In the visual realm, the individual is always objectified, a form of violence. People of color have historically been displayed for large audiences as the exotic, racialized Other (Huhndorf, 2001, p. 42), still another form of violence. Like Native scholar Shari Huhndorf (2009) in Mapping the Americas: The Politics of Contemporary Native Culture, we acknowledge the inability to fix the meaning of the visual (p. 72). As Native students ourselves, we engage with Blood because we respect the work that Savage Media is producing and that we hope they will continue to produce. While filmmakers will always be faced with the problem of audience interpretation, we believe films from a Native perspective are necessary and useful both in working to combat stereotypes and generating critical thinking. Therefore, several questions are central to this discussion: How might Blood be read as employing tactics of colonialism to make legible the violence against Native Americans? How might the film perpetuate a narrative of Native American savagery? And how might the film, while attempting to challenge the stereotypical phenotype of the Indian, also reinforce typecasts of what an Indian looks like?¶ The 59-second YouTube video Blood conveys a host of historical, political, and cultural meanings in less than a minute. The video begins with a row of clear gallon-sized jugs filled to the brim with what appears to be blood. There are signs in front of each jug that read “Full BLOOD,” “1/2 BLOOD,” “1/4 BLOOD,” and so on. Already, within the first 4 seconds of footage, there is a commentary on the politics of Indian “blood,” identity, and race. The packaging of the blood in jugs illustrates the ways in which the government has sought to commodify the Native body through blood quantum requirements in order to justify the occupation of Native land and to diminish the Native population. Representing Native Americans as few in number through blood quantum policies and the visual image has historically provided the impetus for military conquest and seizure of land (Rickard, 1998, p. 63-64). In centering the Native body in the video, however, violences to African American bodies, which have also been commodified by similar policies, are invisibilized (Biolsi, 2004, p. 406). In fact, based upon ignorance, the phenotypically African American character is aligned with the oppressor. Pitting people of color—particularly African Americans and Native Americans— against one another is a frequently employed colonial tactic that functions to divert antagonism away from the oppressor (Andrews, 2011, p.13). The video also invisiblizes the possibilities of alliances between African Americans and Native Americans. This is particularly unfortunate because outside the context of Blood, we acknowledge that the two actors may likely be friends—perhaps even both Native—working in coalition with one another.¶ Following the still shot of the jugs filled with blood, the image cuts to a college library where two young females sit next to each other studying. One is fair-skinned with dark hair and phenotypically White, while the second woman is dark-skinned with dreadlocks and phenotypically Black. While taking a study break, the two have a short conversation: Phenotypically Black woman: “Hey, what’re you doing this weekend?”¶ Phenotypically White woman: “Probably just hanging out at the Native American¶ House.”¶ Phenotypically Black woman: “Why would you do that?”¶ Phenotypically White woman: “Why wouldn’t I?¶ Phenotypically Black woman: “Isn’t that place for Native American kids?”¶ Phenotypically White woman: “Yeah, I am one.”¶ Phenotypically Black woman: “Wow…so, is like your great-great-great-grandmother¶ Indian? I mean, how much Indian blood do you even¶ have?”¶ Phenotypically White woman, who has now revealed herself as Native American, takes out a knife, cuts the palm of her hand, and holds it up revealing a bloody slash.¶ Native American woman: “I don’t know. You tell me.”¶ In slashing her hand, the Native American woman makes visible more sophisticated and largely unrecognized forms of violence. Interestingly, it is at the moment of violence that she identifies herself as a Native American woman. This is important because of the role that gender has played in colonialism. As Huhndorf (2009) notes in Mapping the Americas, images of Native women who conform to European American standards of femininity help to justify colonization (p. 58). There is also a gendered aspect to violence, which united women in the Indigenous feminist movements that began in the 1980s (Huhndorf, 2009, p. 104). On one hand, the cutting that the Native American woman commits demonstrates her strength and willingness to sacrifice her body on behalf of others who also feel similar forms of violence based on the rhetoric of blood quantum discourses. On the other hand, the slashing perpetuates a narrative of savagery since historically the dominant culture has worked to outlaw practices of self-mutilation that occur in Native American religious ceremonies such as Sun Dance (Murphy, 2007, p. 42). Yet while the video makes apparent the violence of blood quantum policies against Native Americans, it invisiblizes the violence endured by Native Americans who are phenotypically African American. ¶ In fact, within Indian Country Native Americans who are read as African American frequently experience more racism than Native Americans who resemble Whites. The video precludes the reaction from the African American character, which is replaced by the viewer when the violence is displayed. The visibility of violence against the Native American character literally invisiblizes not only the violence against African Americans, but also the African American character herself. The pairing of the phenotypically African American and White character highlights the discrepancy in which African American and Native American bodies are often read. Racially ambiguous Native peoples are usually questioned about their cultural/ethnic authenticity when they do not meet the stereotypical standards of what a Native person is supposed to look like based on images perpetuated by mass media and popular culture. Conversely, when someone who identifies as African American reveals such, they are not questioned about their identity in the same way.¶ Renée Anne Cramer (2005), in Cash, Color, and Colonialism: The Politics of Tribal Acknowledgment, discusses how race has affected the Mowa Choctaws and their quest for federal recognition. The presence of African American ancestry has stirred public thoughts and opinions that the Mowa are not “real” Indians; therefore, they should not be able to access the privileges of federal acknowledgement—which establishes a trust relationship between tribes and the U.S. government resulting in a wide range of economic, health/well-being, land, and cultural integrity benefits. The mixing of Native Americans and African Americans, especially in the South, was very prevalent and the politics of hypodescent, also referred to as the “one drop rule,” come into play in this scenario. However, Cramer points out that the Poarch Band of Creek Indians have more Euro-American heritage than the Mowa, and this has enabled them to attain federal recognition. This favoritism by the U.S. government encourages tribes to adopt political strategies that exclude individuals who have African ancestry—encouraging conflict between underrepresented groups. There are fewer stigmas around Native people who look more White than Black, and this has profoundly impacted the racial politics of federal recognition processes. Finances again underlie these logics in terms of providing tribal access to federal resources. Additionally, as discussed by Tom Biolsi (2004) in “Race Technologies,” in the U.S. the intermarriage between White males and Native American females has been largely encouraged because such unions often resulted in further acquisition of Native land (p. 407).¶ In perhaps the most notorious case of Native American and African American racial mixing is the Cherokee Freedmen. Circe Sturm (2002), in her influential book Blood Politics, posits, “When Cherokee citizens conflate blood, color, race, and culture to demarcate their sociopolitical community, they often exclude multiracial individuals of Cherokee and African ancestry, who are treated in both discourse and practice in qualitatively different ways than multiracial individuals with Cherokee and white ancestry” (p. 169-170). The Freedmen are probably the most underrepresented Native group in North America and, as Sturm argues, “their story has never received the attention it deserves, in part because many people would prefer that it remained buried” (p. 169). Hypodescent has persisted as a relic of slavery and anti-African American sentiment in the United States. Classifying the offspring of an interracial couple, in this case Native American and African American, as solely African American has resulted in negative treatment that has been historically different from those children of Native and White couples in the United States more broadly, but also within the Cherokee Nation. The absence of Native peoples who are phenotypically African American in visuality is striking. A book that is published in the U.S. of Indigenous photographers and photographs from around the world—including Palestine—entitled Our People, Our Land, Our Images is a prime example of this visible gap (Passalacqua & Tsinhnahjinnie, 2006). There are no people pictured who are phenotypically African within its pages.¶ With this in mind, does Blood effectively challenge or reinscribe the image of the stereotypical Native American phenotype? As we have pointed out, the Native person who is phenotypically African American is often either excluded from or read as non-Native in visual culture. Because of the inability to fix the meaning of the visual, Blood reinforces this unfortunate reality of Indian Country. Blood works to defy stereotypes by showing that many Native peoples do not look how we are supposed to according to “Hollywood.” However, by having a phenotypically African American woman question the Native American woman’s identity, the video also tells us what a Native American person is not supposed to look like. This contrast reinforces what groups like the Mowa Choctaws and the Cherokee Freedmen struggle with constantly. Blood makes apparent the violence against Native peoples that often goes unseen and emphasizes the problematics of visual representation. Were Blood to star a blond, White actor rather than the African American woman, it would be read—more obviously—as conflicting with the video’s message that many Native Americans do not fit the typecast. Likewise, were Blood to star a light- to medium-skinned, dark haired actor who could be read as racially ambiguous rather than the African American woman, the video might be interpreted as providing fodder for discounting Indian identity and encouraging its appropriation, since the non-Native may appear “more Indian” than the “real” Native American. In this way, Blood relies on the logics of viewing Native Americans who are phenotypically African American as non-Native to make legible the violence committed against some—but not all—Native Americans. While Blood illuminates violences against Native Americans who are phenotypically White, it unfortunately fails to address the violences committed against fellow Native Americans who often have even less privilege: those who are phenotypically African American.

#### Our Methodology is good and key, rather than beginning from an understanding of identity that perpetuates colonial structures, you should endorse a methodology which addresses the needs of colonized people and begins from Indigenous Intellectualism

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

In the first draft of the final report of the Indian Nations at Risk Task Force, Indigenous scholar and activist Michael Charleston (1994) writes of the importance of coalition and its central role in the development of effective American Indian schools and Indian-centered curricula. Rather than the abstract language of critical pedagogy, however, Charleston invokes the Lakota tradition of the Ghost Dance as a metaphor of the need for healing through community, ceremony, sacrifice, and tradition.23 He writes: The new Ghost Dance calls Native and non-Native peoples to join together and take action. It calls us to be responsible for the future of the people of our tribes. It calls us to protect, revive and restore our cultures, our Native languages, our religions and values. It calls us to heal our people, our families, our tribes, and our societies. It calls for harmony and respect among all relations of creation. It offers a future of co-existence of tribal societies with other American societies ... indeed domination, oppression, and bigotry are exactly what we are overcoming in the new Ghost Dance as we seek to establish harmony and co-existence of tribes with other societies in the modern world. (p. 28) This spirit of coalition reflects the growing desire among American Indians to work together and form alliances with Native and non-Native forces in a mutual quest for American Indian sovereignty and self-determination. Though Charleston's rendition of coalition reflects the spirit of mestizaje - that is, the blurring of political, racial, and cultural borders in the service of social justice - he carefully relegates such coalition to the realm of sociopolitical action. In other words, the new Ghost Dance calls to Indian and non-Indian peoples to take collective action against U.S. policies that continue the project of colonization and cultural genocide. It is thus not a call for the embodiment, in critical-theoretical terms, of a transcultural, transnational subject that calls into question the very notion of authentic identities (McLaren, 1997), but rather a metaphor for collective political action. This is not to say that Charleston or other American Indian scholars do not support the notion that identity is constructed through multiple, intersecting, and contradictory elements. Rather, they remain wary of constructionist understandings of identity that, in the process of providing a corrective to static notions of culture, ignore the real possibility of culture loss that is, the real existing threat of cultural genocide of Indigenous peoples. Hale (2000) is worth quoting at length: When (cultural) transformation is conflated with loss ... the collective trauma is obscured and the brute historical fact of ethnocide is softened. The culprits in this erasure are the Indians' . . . enemies, but even more centrally ... elites who embraced classic nineteenth century liberalism cast in the idiom of mestizaje. A homogeneous and individualized notion of citizenship could not be compatible with the rights of Indian communities whose collective histories and identities stood opposed to the dominant mestizo culture.Just beneath the alluring promises to Indians who would accept these individual rights of citizenship was incomprehension, invisibility, and punishing racism for those who would not. (p. 269) Again, though the contemporary critical project of mestizaje is in many ways antithetical to the Latin American one, both projects ignore the "brute historical fact of ethnocide" and the invisibility of Indians within the broader democratic project. In contradistinction to the critical notion of mestizaje, American Indian scholars seek understandings of identity that not only reflect the multiple and contradictory aspects of contemporary experience, but also maintain a sense of American Indians as historically placed, sovereign peoples. For them, sovereignty is not a political ideology but a way of life (Warrior, 1995). As Charleston (1994) writes, "Our tribes are at a very critical point in our history again. We can stand by and wait for our children and grandchildren to be assimilated into mainstream American society as proud ethnic descendants of extinct tribal peoples. . . . Or, we can protect our tribes, as our ancestors did, and ensure a future for our children and grandchildren as tribal people" (p. 28).

#### Permutation do both: American Indian veterans suffer from the worst forms of PTSD due to cultural isolation and the lack of resources by the USFG to guide them through treatment. We must focus on the FIRST Americans before we can ever begin to heal the wounds of the colonizers

Freed ‘12

[David, CHCF Center for Health Reporting “War leaves PTSD scars on Native American vets,” 5.30.2012. <http://centerforhealthreporting.org/article/war-leaves-ptsd-scars-native-american-vets906>//wyo-hdm]

Ruben Ramirez earned a Bronze Star and three Purple Hearts as a World War II infantryman fighting Nazi troops in North Africa and Italy. The physical wounds he sustained in combat eventually healed. Not so his emotional injuries.¶ To this day, Ramirez, 86, a retired diesel mechanic and American Indian who traces his roots to the Apache nation, is tormented by recurrent nightmares of having witnessed his buddies being blown apart. He gets out of bed every few hours to patrol the perimeter of his house in Fresno.¶ However, it was not until 2008, after a broken marriage, a spotty employment record and more than 60 years of suffering, that Ramirez, , finally sought treatment. Ultimately, he was diagnosed with post-traumatic stress disorder and received disability from the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.¶ "We were taught to be quiet," Ramirez said when asked to explain why it took him so long to seek counseling, which he continues to undergo weekly.¶ For a generation of older veterans like Ramirez, raised to keep their feelings in check, it is not uncommon to go years with untreated PTSD, or even to be aware that help is available through the VA.¶ But Ramirez's ethnic roots, American Indian activists say, may well have prolonged his agony.¶ While members of many American Indian tribes serve in the military in disproportionately higher numbers than other ethnic groups, studies suggest they also suffer PTSD with greater frequency.¶ A 1997 landmark study of American Indian veterans of the Vietnam War found that one-third lived with some form of PTSD a quarter-century after the war ended. That was twice the rate of white Vietnam veterans.¶ Although the study concluded that much of the difference may have resulted from American Indians' higher front-line duty in the war, it also raised the prospect that their subsequent social isolation may have played a role in the disparity.¶ Researchers have been stymied in drawing definitive conclusions about American Indians and PTSD, in part because of the relatively small numbers of Indians in the population.¶ But American Indian activists believe cultural traditions can make it particularly difficult for American Indian veterans to seek treatment for psychological issues stemming from their time in uniform.¶ Many also say the VA has been slow to expand outreach efforts and provide services that would resonate with American Indian veterans.¶ For example, the VA employs relatively few American Indians as counselors or spiritual advisers; only 28 of the VA's more than 4,600 psychologists are American Indian.¶ "The American Indian has a natural distrust of the white government," said James D. Cates, chairman of the National Native American Veterans Association. "You just can't send anyone out to educate them, either. The person who should do this should be Native American. They understand the traditions more than anyone."¶ How the government addresses PTSD victims has become more urgent with the end of the war in Iraq and President Barack Obama's plans to accelerate troop withdrawal from Afghanistan. About 30,000 U.S. forces pulled out of Iraq late last year, and Obama has said that 33,000 troops would leave Afghanistan by this summer.¶ ¶ Richard Gonzalez, center foreground, stands with other members of the American Indian Veterans Association of Central California. Gonzalez said he and others from different tribes tries to help educate others about American Indians. The group also acts as honor guard for veterans. "We do this to honor our own family as well as the departed," Gonzalez said. (Eric Paul Zamora/The Fresno Bee)¶ Of more than 1.7 million veterans who have served in Afghanistan and Iraq, about 20% have PTSD or major depression, according to an American Psychological Association report released earlier this year.¶ California is home to 52,600 American Indian veterans, more than any other state. Nearly 740,000 American Indians reside in California, by far the nation's largest American Indian population. Moreover, California has vastly more reservations and Indian rancherias, and more federally recognized tribes (107) than any other state.¶ With such a large American Indian presence, many Indian veterans say they don't understand why the VA doesn't devote more resources to helping them. But with 8.3 million enrollees in the VA health care system, including more than 1.9 million in California alone, officials point out, there are only so many resources to go around.¶ Terry R. Bentley, a member of California's Karuk tribe, is one of four specialists hired last year to work with federally recognized American Indian tribes across the country -- part of the VA's new Office of Tribal Government Relations.¶ But, working alone in an office in Roseburg, Ore., and trying to cover six Western states, is a daunting task. "There is, honestly, so much work to be done," Bentley said. "We're really at the tip of the iceberg."¶ Officials at the VA Fresno, however, say they're making progress in responding to the particular needs of American Indian veterans suffering from PTSD.¶

#### We are the first priority, we must begin to decolonize the western thought that made militarization possible in the first place- the military industrial complex is the problem- military recruitors force indigenous peoples to defend a country that commited genocide against them.

LaDuke ‘12

[Winona, Interview from Democracy Now, <http://www.democracynow.org/2011/5/6/native\_american\_activist\_author\_winona\_laduke >//wyo-hdm]

The reality is, is that the military is full of native nomenclature. That’s what we would call it. You’ve got Black Hawk helicopters, Apache Longbow helicopters. You’ve got Tomahawk missiles. The term used when you leave a military base in a foreign country is to go "off the reservation, into Indian Country." So what is that messaging that is passed on? You know, it is basically the continuation of the wars against indigenous people. Donald Rumsfeld, when he went to Fort Carson, named after the infamous Kit Carson, who was responsible for the deaths of thousands of Navajo people and their forced relocation, urged people, you know, in speaking to the troops, that in the global war on terror, U.S. forces from this base have lived up to the legend of Kit Carson, fighting terrorists in the mountains of Afghanistan to help secure victory. "And every one of you is like Kit Carson."¶ The reality is, is that the U.S. military still has individuals dressed — the Seventh Cavalry, that went in in Shock and Awe, is the same cavalry that massacred indigenous people, the Lakota people, at Wounded Knee in 1890. You know, that is the reality of military nomenclature and how the military basically uses native people and native imagery to continue its global war and its global empire practices. Well, you know, that is where the Apaches themselves were incarcerated for 27 years for the crime of being Apache. There are two cemeteries there, and those cemeteries — one of those cemeteries is full of Apaches, including Geronimo, who did die there. But it is emblematic of Indian Country’s domination by military bases and the military itself. You’ve got over 17 reservations named after — they’re still called Fort something, you know? Fort Hall is, you know, one of them. Fort Yates. You know, it is pervasive, the military domination of Indian Country.¶ Most of the land takings that have occurred for the military, whether in Alaska, in Hawaii, or in what is known as the continental United States, have been takings from native land. Some of — you know, they say that the Lakota Nation, in the Lakota Nation’s traditional territory, as guaranteed under the Treaty of 1868 or the 1851 Treaty, would be the third greatest nuclear power in the world. You know, those considerations indicate how pervasive historically the military has been in native history and remains today in terms of land occupation.¶ I must say, on the other side of that, we have the highest rate of living veterans of any community in the country. It’s estimated that about 22 percent of our population, or 190,000 of our — or 190,000 — or 190,000 living veterans in Native America today. And all of those veterans, I am sure, are quite offended by the use of Geronimo’s name, you know, in the assault on bin Laden and in the death of bin Laden.¶ The United States, you know, people — one of the reasons that it is said that native people received citizenship in 1924 was so that they could be drafted. And they have been extensively drafted. You know, for a whole variety of social, political, historic, cultural and economic reasons, native people have the highest rate of enlistment in this country, from historic to present. You know, in some places, in our Indian communities, you have very dire economic situations, and the military recruiters are very aggressive. And young people do not have a lot of choices. I mean, I had a young man from my community say, "Auntie, I joined the military." I said, "Why did you join the military?" He says, "Because I was either going to jail or going to the military." You know, and I have heard that story more than once in Indian Country.¶ So, having said that, you have a history of warrior societies, of people who are proud, who have defended our land. You know, 500 years is a long time to defend your territory. And, you know, we’re still here. And within that, our warrior societies continue, whether it is at Oka, whether it was at Wounded Knee, whether it is on the front lines of the tar sands in Alberta, Canada, or whether it is in the Grand Canyon, defending our territory. At the same time, you have a number — you know, a large rate of enlistment. And so, you have native veterans who are, in our community, highly regarded for who they are as courageous individuals and a very significant part of our communities. At the same time, there is no program to reintegrate these individuals into our society. A lot of — you know, the highest rate of homelessness is in the veterans in this country. And many other issues of PTSD and such exist widespread in our communities because of our isolation and our high rates of enlistment and our high rates of veterans. Well, you know, I think a formal apology is due to the native community, to the family of Geronimo, as requested.¶ I think that a review of the impact of militarization on Indian Country — you know, we are trying to get back some of our land that is held by the military, but it’s so darn toxic. And the military is busy making more things toxic, getting more exemptions under federal law, so that they are above any environmental laws. You know, it would be nice to get something back that was taken, and to get it back clean and to get it back good, whether Badger Munitions in Wisconsin, Fort Wingate. But we don’t want — we don’t want toxic land, you know, back, returned to our people.¶ Reviewing the military psychology of Kit Carson, you know, and using that nomenclature, how offensive it is to native people. And talking about some kind of a justice, in terms of — I don’t have an answer — it’s a tricky one — how you make justice with the military. But what I would say is that what was done historically was wrong, what was done this week was wrong, and it would be an opportunity for the Obama administration to do the right thing in relation to Indian Country, because Indian Country is not to be assaulted by the U.S. military.

#### **And, our epistemic resistance is key—Eurocentric society is built on the oppression of indigenous people and culture** **fighting coloniality must happen at the level of mind**

Warrior 11 (Zig-Zag, writer for Warrior Publications, Promoting Indigenous Warrior Culture, Fighting Spirit, & Resistance Movement, “Colonization and  Decolonization:  A Manual for Indigenous  Liberation in the 21st Century” 2011)

The structure of European society is, by its very nature, a system of¶ oppression & control. It is organized in a pyramid structure, with a small elite at¶ the top and the masses of people at the bottom. Indigenous peoples comprise¶ the bottom layer of this pyramid, and it can be said that it is literally built on top¶ of them (i.e., in Mexico City, the Presidential 'Palace is built on top of an Aztec¶ temple). The pyramid structure is one that reappears throughout civilization, reflecting the oppressive relationships &¶ patterns upon which such society's are based. The patriarchal family unit, the government, the church, the army, the¶ corporation; all share similar organizations of hierarchy, central authority, and control.¶ In society, one's position in this pyramid is determined by gender, race, and economic class; the global elite are¶ overwhelmingly rich white males. They are the descendents of the European nobility and aristocracy established after the¶ collapse ofthe Roman Empire.. Their rise to global power as a class began with the 1492 invasion ofthe Americas. This¶ class system is maintained in the interests of the rulers and is protected by national police and military forces (including¶ courts & prisons).¶ Globally, the pyramid of power exists in the relations between nations; the predominantly Euro-American Group of¶ Seven (the G7: Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom and United States. With Russia it is the 08)¶ control the international political and economic system. They are the top ofthe pyramid. Most ofthe world's countries are¶ poor and impoverished, forming the bottom layers ofthe pyramid. Following the period of military invasion, and once¶ an occupation has been established, surviving Indigenous¶ populations are then subjected to policies of assimilation. This¶ is only possible after their military defeat.¶ In many colonial situations, a first step in assimilation¶ is to contain the surviving Indigenous populations in a¶ reservation system (Le., the South African Bantustan, or¶ reserves in North America). This is necessary to 'open up¶ territory for settlement & exploitation, while providing a basis¶ for systematic indoctrination into European society.¶ In many colonial situations, it is the Church and¶ missionaries who begin the process of indoctrination. A¶ common tactic is the forcible removal of children from their¶ families and communities, and their placement in Church-run¶ schools (i.e., missions, Residential or Industrial Schools, etc.).¶ A primary target for indoctrination are chiefs or high¶ ranking families; once converted, they serve as useful¶ collaborators, able to influence their communities and to¶ mobilize resources.¶ Along with education, all aspects of the colonial¶ society are utilized in a process of assimilation, i.e., political,¶ economic, ideological, cultural, etc. The goal is to eradicate¶ as much of the Indigenous culture & philosophy as possible,¶ .and to replace these with those of European civilization.¶ Assimilation is a final phase in colonization. What distinguishes it from the previous stages of recon, invasion &¶ occupation is its primarily psychological aspects. It is not a military attack against a village, but a psychological attack against the mind & belief system of a people.¶ As a result of assimilation polices in Canada& the US, generations of Indigenous people have become increasingly¶ integrated into European society. Since the 1970s, more Indigenous people have become professionals (lawyers, doctors,¶ businessmen, etc.), and more have passed through universities or ·colleges. As a result of this increased training, band¶ councils now self-administer government policies and are more involved in business & resource exploitation that at any time¶ in the past.¶ While this is promoted as progress (and even 'decolonizaton'), it is actually greater assimilation into the colonial¶ society. Overall, today's generations ofIndigenous people show a greater degree ofassimilation than previous ones. Some¶ factors that account for this are the effects ofresidential schools, decline of culture, reduced reliance on traditional ways of¶ life, greater dependence on the colonial system, increased urbanization, and ongoing exposure to Western culture through¶ modem communications (TV, movies, music, printed material, etc.).