#### Curriculums against settler colonialism and critiquing oppressive power structures is key to change — disrupting cycles of colonization in the educational setting is the only way for social change to occur
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The Roots of Social Justice Pedagogy Social justice education is…aout the goal of transformation. (Chapman & Hobbel, 2009, p. 4). Social justice pedagogy is rooted in the educational frameworks of multicultural education and critical pedagogy (Cammarota, 2011; Chapman & Hobbel, 2009). Multicultural education includes multiple dimensions that aim to support the practical component of providing equitable learning opportunities for all students through the curriculum and affirming diverse student identities and experiences (Grant & Sleeter, 2007). Critical pedagogy critiques the dominant knowledge within curriculum, critically examines inequities in society, and focuses on the analytical tools to advance the development of a critical consciousness, agency, and empowerment through a problem-posing approach to teaching and learning (Freire, 1970/2002). Problem-posing education is a pedagogical approach that critically examines issues and concerns in a learningb context**. Within the educational context that cultivates a critical consciousness, students question and critique oppressive power structures in society and envision the potential for change. The analytical tools and methods of critical pedagogy include reflection, praxis, and dialogues. By drawing on critical pedagogical methods and tools, students begin to attain a critical consciousness to enact social change and transformation in their communities and schools. Therefore, social justice educators implement curriculum that aims to combat discrimination, prejudice, and oppression based on race, class, gender, sexuality, language, ability, etc. In this process, educators enact a problem-posing approach to engage young people in a critical examination of such injustices and inequities while facilitating pedagogical experiences and opportunities that promote “the goal of transformation” (Chapman & Hobbel, 2009, p. 4).** In the next section, I contextualize social justice pedagogy within Indigenous settings. Indigenous Social Justice Pedagogy Indigenous social justice pedagogy is a framework for rethinking the process of schooling for Indigenous students. Its primary focus is on reframing curriculum and pedagogy that aims to preserve and privilege Indigenous epistemologies while promoting nation-building in Indigenous communities. **When educators privilege these two aspects in the classroom (or in a specific learning context), they are intentional in building curriculum around Indigenous issues and concerns in hopes to bring about positive social change in Indigenous communities. Indigenous communities have been faced with various social, environmental, and political issues (which have strong ties to colonialism) that have affected the livelihood and well-being of Indigenous peoples today. If educators can integrate such issues into the curriculum for youth to investigate, they will be preparing students to not only envision alternative possibilities to sustain their communities, but also empowering them to protect their land, cultures, and people. Pedagogically, educators can draw on the framework of ISJP to facilitate the process of: 1) deconstructing and disrupting the cycle of colonization in Indigenous communities; 2) promoting, revitalizing, and protecting Indigenous[end of page 2] languages and knowledge systems; and 3) envisioning ways to inspire youth to employ transformative possibilities that contribute to nation-building. Thus, central to ISJP are decolonizing processes that foster empowerment and activism in youth.** In what follows, I describe the central components of ISJP: decolonization, Indigenous epistemology, and nation-building. Decolonization: Teaching into the Risks Over the years, colonization has become endemic to Indigenous communities (Brayboy, 2005). The cycle of colonization, with its historical legacy and present-day infiltration, is entrenched in our Indigenous communities (mentally and structurally), and many of the social issues and concerns within Indigenous communities are linked to colonialism, which McCaslin and Breton characterize as “the root harm” (2008, p. 512*).* ***It becomes essential that educators begin to understand, deconstruct, and disrupt this cycle of colonization in the educational setting in order for social change to occur.* As Mary Hermes (2015) posited, “Structures seem to influence what we do on a daily basis and…we need to build and act within structures that have their roots in Indigenous life” (p. 273). Schools, as a structure, has historically implemented colonial policies and practices that aimed to assimilate Indigenous peoples; and as a result such policies and practices have pushed our Indigenous knowledges, languages, cultures and identities to the margins in our own communities. In order to build schooling structures rooted in Indigenous life, schools would need to be restructured to center and promote Indigenous knowledge and values. Decolonization becomes an essential component in the process of restructuring because it is the avenue by which we can challenge colonialism and begin to envision and create structures rooted in Indigenous life. The process of decolonization is worth noting at length: A large part of decolonization entails developing a critical consciousness about the cause(s) of our oppression, the distortion of history, our own collaboration, and the degrees to which we have internalized colonialist ideas and practices. Decolonization requires auto-criticism, self-reflection, and a rejection of victimage. Decolonization is about empowerment—a belief that situations can be transformed, a belief and trust in our own peoples’ values and abilities, and a willingness to make change.** It is about transforming negative reactionary energy into the more positive rebuilding energy needed in our communities. (Wheeler as cited in Wilson, 2004, p. 71) An essential first step in decolonization requires the rediscovery of our histories (Laenui, 2000) in order to examine and uncover the project of colonization and reveal its effect on Indigenous peoples’ histories, cultures, languages, identities, land and resources. **Consequently, much of Indigenous histories is silenced and excluded in curriculum documents; therefore, educators would need to seek alternative resources that include the voices and perspectives of Indigenous peoples’ around various historical events. Such truth-telling practices reveals stories of injustices and trauma within Indigenous histories and thus exposes how power and knowledge have worked to oppress Indigenous peoples. Truth-telling within decolonization initiates the development of a critical consciousness as it works to reveal the hidden histories and social realities of colonialism in our Indigenous communities.** The practice of truth-telling, however, comes with the risks of students feeling angry, offended, and hurt by the stories of trauma and injustice experienced by their ancestors. When educators teach into these risks that move students into an emotional space where the stories of oppression stir up such emotions, it is crucial for educators to consider the Critical Questions in Education (Special Issue) 8:2 Spring 2017 167 ways in which they can navigate youth through this emotional space. I propose that educators draw on Indigenous epistemologies to direct youth toward the process of healing. Within decolonization, there should also be emphasis on rejecting the notion of victimage and to move into a space of transformation and empowerment to change the oppressive circumstances in our communities; thus we must rely on our own Indigenous values, knowledge and abilities to initiate healing, (re)affirm our identities, and instill a commitment to improving our communities. Cultivating the Heart: Promoting, Revitalizing, and Protecting Indigenous Epistemology In ISJP, Indigenous epistemologies are purposefully infused in the daily structure of the learning environment—from curriculum and pedagogy to the classroom community—drawing on Indigenous knowledge systems to create an environment where young people begin to privilege, promote, revitalize and center their Indigenous ways of thinking and being. To build and create structures rooted in Indigenous life, the learning environment is essentially infused with Indigenous philosophies, values, language, songs, stories, histories, and respectful relationships. Considering that the deconstruction of colonialism engenders feelings of anger and frustration when truthtelling uncovers stories of injustice and trauma, I propose educators draw on aspects of Indigenous epistemology to cultivate the heart toward healing and empowerment. Cultivating the heart toward empowerment is an essential step that sets the stage for students to consider the ways in which they can contribute to the betterment of both their classroom community and their Indigenous community in general. For example, in the particular study that I describe below, I draw on the Diné epistemological concept of hozhó. Hozhó is a philosophical concept in Diné teachings that is essentially about maintaining balance and harmony in life. Diné scholar Herbert Benally defined hozhó as “the state of much good, leading to a peaceful, beautiful and harmonious life” (1994, p. 23). This philosophical aspect is contextualized within the highly complex Diné epistemology of Sa’ah Naagháí Bik’eh Hozhóón and has many (hozhóoji) stories associated with it.3 Many stories within our epistemology teach us about life and it is through these stories we gain the power of true Diné identity (Begay, 2002). Cultivating the heart through Indigenous epistemological aspects is necessary when educators teach into the risks by exposing the oppressive present-day conditions linked to colonialism (such as the exploitation of sacred sites like Oak Flat). In ISJP, it is important to ensure the students’ epistemologies are reflected in the curriculum as well as in the overall classroom community and interactions between the students. Fostering relationships built on Indigenous aspects of respect, reciprocity and responsibility offers a unique way to incorporate Indigenous epistemologies in learning environments. To illustrate this, I draw on the work I conducted with Diné youth. My interactions with the student participants in my study began with an initial introduction of ourselves through our clans. The purpose of starting with introducing ourselves with our clans was to establish k’é (kinship). Our clans are the core aspects of our Diné identity as our clan affiliations place us in context to the family from which we come (the first clan is the mother’s clan, the second is the father’s clan, the third is the maternal grandfather’s clan, and the fourth clan is the paternal grandfather’s clan) and places us in relationship to other Diné people. Once kinship was established, I began a discussion of the deep meaning of k’é by explaining the process of developing and maintaining respectful relationships with others and 3. Sa’ah Naaghai Bik’eh Hozhoon is the journey toward living a balanced and harmonious life. According to Miranda Haskie (2002) it is “a system from which the Navajo people gain teachings and learn how to achieve a healthy well-being throughout life” (p. 32). 168 Shirley—Indigenous Social Justice Pedagogy nature. 4 The ways in which we practice k’é is reflected in how we treat and interact with one another grounded in respect, care, and compassion for self and others. Developing explicit connections to k’é meant that in order to move forward in sharing our internal thoughts, ideas, and feelings, we needed to establish trust with one another to be able to express our deep and vulnerable thoughts and emotions. Establishing this foundation was a crucial step in our dialogues. By drawing upon the fundamental Diné value of k’é, I was able to create an environment where trust was established, respect was enacted, and taking care of one another became a priority. The relationships and values embedded within the practice of k’é were important in moving into deep conversations about identity, as “the deep caring and healing process rooted in kinship, family, compassion, respect and cooperation” (Lee, 2016, p. 102) was essential. Evident in Diné youths’ interactions, they remind us that having healthy relations with others based on Indigenous notions of respect, compassion, empathy, and care is essential when engaging in dialogue and interacting with others. **Cultivating the heart with Indigenous epistemologies is a core component within a space of learning where social issues and concerns are discussed and is fundamental within the practice of nurturing and guiding students through the process of critically examining issues and effects of colonialism, exploitation, oppression, inequity, and injustice on students’ lives and communities. In other words, colonialism has contributed to disrupting the lives, livelihood, and well-being of Indigenous peoples; it is Indigenous epistemologies that will contribute to the healing of our community members.** By cultivating the heart through enacting decolonization in educational contexts, it provides youth with opportunities to examine core aspects of their Indigenous identity in addition to acquiring knowledge and skills required for protecting, promoting, and preserving Indigenous people, language, culture, and land. These processes contribute to rigorous academic work that are intellectually engaging and empowering as they provide young people with real opportunities to “reject victimage” and to begin working for social change and nation-building in their communities. Nation-building In ISJP, educators are fundamentally preparing young people to contribute to nation-building. Nation-building in Indigenous communities is about sustaining our sovereignty in ways that are beneficial to our own community needs and aspirations. This process requires “generations of Indigenous peoples to grow up intimately and strongly connected to our homelands, immersed in our languages and spiritualities and embodying our traditions of agency, leadership, decision making and diplomacy” (Simpson, 2014, p. 1). By drawing on sovereignty and self-determination rights, schools can engage in this process. **As Brayboy, Fann, Castagno & Solyom state, however, “Indigenous nations cannot successfully engage in nation-building projects that are driven by sovereignty and self-determination unless they develop independence of the mind by taking action to restore pride in their traditions, languages, and knowledge” (2012, p. 15)**. Developing independence of the mind is linked to what Tiffany Lee (2006) refers to as critical Indigenous consciousness, which is the process of liberating the mind from dominant hegemony and cultivating the mind toward indigenization where individuals are guided by Indigenous epistemologies to transform Indigenous communities. **Understanding the impacts of colonialism, schools can be the site by which nation-building is rooted. When schools and educators restructure their curriculum and pedagogy to address nation-building, it raises unique and critical levels of responsibility and accountability**. It requires educators to engage in a self-reflective process that recognizes teaching Indigenous students is not just about high stakes testing and standards; but embodies expectations of sustaining and privileging Indigenous knowledge as the source of decision making, leadership, advocacy, and agency. Educators are pressed to answer the question of how they will have prepared Indigenous youth, such as Naelyn, to be of service to their communities. Importantly, what dialogues and projects can educators facilitate that create opportunities for youth to begin contributing to notions of nation-building? In ISJP, cultural regeneration through the curriculum and pedagogy must involve the incorporation of Indigenous values, stories, and language as the source for understanding nationbuilding. The next section is a case example of how aspects of ISJP (decolonization, Indigenous epistemology, and nation-building) come together in a tribal community school located on the Diné Nation.

#### 

#### Settler colonialism is not an event, but a structuring ontological position from a logic of elimination through the imposition of will on the thing which is perceived to lack will.

**Rifkin ‘14** - Mark Rifkin, Ph.D. University of Pennsylvania-2003, M.A. University of Pennsylvania-1999, B.A. Rutgers University-1996 Dr. Rifkin’s research primarily focuses on Native American writing and politics from the eighteenth century onward, exploring the ways that Indigenous peoples have negotiated U.S. racial and imperial formations. His work explores the roles of gender, sexuality, affect, and eroticism in those processes, addressing legal and administrative frameworks, textual representations, and forms of everyday experience. Director of the Women's and Gender Studies Program and Professor of English at the University of North Carolina (‘Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance,’ June 2014 pages 7-8)//Kian

If nineteenth-century American literary studies tends to focus on the ways Indians enter the narrative frame and the kinds of meanings and associations they bear, recent attempts to theorize settler colonialism have sought to shift attention from its effects on Indigenous subjects to its implications for nonnative political attachments, forms of inhabitance, and modes of being, illuminating and tracking the pervasive operation of settlement as a system. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—**invasion is a structure not an event**” (2).6 He suggests that a “logic of elimination” drives settler governance and sociality, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an **organizing principle of settler-colonial society** rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence” (388). Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/ period of conquest, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settlercolonial society” (390). In Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work, whiteness func - tions as the central way of understanding the domination and displacement of Indigenous peoples by nonnatives.7 In “Writing Off Indigenous Sovereignty,” she argues, “As a regime of power, patriarchal white sovereignty operates ideologically, materially and discursively to reproduce and maintain its investment in the nation as a white possession” (88), and in “Writing Off Treaties,” she suggests, “At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession occurs through **the imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will**, thus it is open to being possessed,” such that “**possession** . . . **forms** part of **the ontological structure of white subjectivity**” (83–84). For Jodi Byrd, the deployment of Indianness as a mobile figure works as the principal mode of U.S. settler colonialism. She observes that “colonization and racialization . . . have often been conflated,” in ways that “tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion” and that “misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism” (xxiii, xvii). She argues that settlement works through the translation of indigeneity as Indianness, casting place-based political collectivities as (racialized) populations subject to U.S. jurisdiction and management: “the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself ”; “ideas of Indians and Indianness have served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself ” (xix).

#### Settler colonial sovereignty creates endless violence that scripts Native genocide into the future – makes war, famine, massacre, starvation, disease and slow death inevitable

**Schotten 16** Massachusetts, University PoliSci Associate Professor **2016** C. Heike, “Queering Sovereignty, Decolonizing Desire.” Mills College. Carnegie Hall, Oakland, California. 4 March 2016. Spatializing Sovereignty organized by The Society for Radical Geography, Spatial Theory, and Everyday Life. Conference Presentation. http://www.ustream.tv/recorded/84081898. 8:07 - 19:56 //jazmyn

Okay so in the state of nature, which Hobbes defines as a place where there's no security, there is, in Edelman's terms, no future. This is true not only because we are responsible solely for our own survival, an endeavor we cannot possibly succeed at on our own, but it is also because given this radical insecurity, we are incapable of imagining any other moment or time than now. Hobbes himself acknowledges there is no "accounting of time" in the state of nature, which of course makes sense; in a condition of perpetual war, the future is unimaginable because it is so tenuous. As well, the past becomes effectively irrelevant, hence the institution of sovereignty in Hobbes' version secures our physical preservation and I’m arguing that it does so by bringing temporality itself into existence and producing a future. Okay, so that's the first point. The second point is that, in this act, the sovereign establishes the very meaning and content of life itself. For understood temporally, there is a way in which there is no distinction between life and death in the state of nature, in so far as there is no way to tell present from future. The state of nature's enduring present entails that life there is a kind of limbo-like existence, a suspension of living or perpetual near-death experience wherein we can never be certain of anything. This may be why it is so important to Hobbes to establish the commonwealth in the first place: Not simply to preserve life, as he explicitly suggests, but actually more primarily to definitively demarcate life as life and differentiate it from death. I mean, there's a normative enterprise going on here, right? Indeed, although the sovereign is the beacon of peace, war and death are just as must a byproduct of the institution of sovereignty as life and peace are. So what I take from this is that sovereignty, in short, is the definitive bio-political regime, in so far as it constitutes and determines life as such, distinguishing it from what only becomes subsequently recognizable as death. The third point is that sovereignty institutes this life-death distinction via a moralized logic that relegates life to the domain of civilization and value, and death to the domain of savagery and nihilism. This becomes clear in the conflicted and confusing ways Hobbes characterizes the state of nature as simultaneously a time, a place, and a condition. Now as I just argued that the state of nature is a time — like if it is an era or an epoch — it's a time with no time, a moment that is completely timeless, an era lacking any dynamism or principle of change. If the state of nature is instead a condition, which he also claims, he is clear that it is one of savagery, writing "It may peradventure be thought there never was such a time nor condition of war as this; and I believe it was never generally so over all the world, but there are many places where they live so now," and he cites as an example, "the savage people in many places of America." Bolstering the view that the state of nature is a story about humanity's pre-history, Hobbes here rehearses the enlightenment trope of indigenous peoples as European humanity's ancestors and/or pre-modern childhood. Savagery is, therefore, associated with solid temporality, timelessness, and the failure of forward movement or progress. Conclusively, when referencing a geographical location, the state of nature is America, and the 17th-century European notion of the new world, an empty land ripe for exploration and conquest. These specifications of the state of nature in Hobbes make clear that establishment of sovereignty imposes a clear distinction not simply between peace and war, life and death, but also between modernity and backwardness, civilization and savagery. Each of these categorical pairs functions as a surrogate for the others. Taken together, they suggest the deep implications of the categories of life and death with colonization and conquest for European politics and political theory. The fourth point is that the commonwealth, or sovereign or sovereignty, can't actually solve the problem Hobbes says it does. So if there's no state and we're all going to murder each other, the solution is obviously a really big bad, coercive state, right? And that's going to solve the problem? It can't solve the problem, and that's because it can't solve the problem of desire, which has futurism built into its very structure. Hobbes actually gets short shrift as a psychologist. He actually talks quite a bit about desire and affect. So desire, according to Hobbes, is a voluntary motion of the body, whose aim, regardless of object, is attainment — possession, consumption, enjoyment. Yet this attainment poses a dilemma, for as he says, the aim of desire is "not to enjoy once only and for one instant of time, but to assure forever the way of one's future desire." According to Hobbes, in other words, desire seeks perpetuity of enjoyment. It aims at a consumption that can never fully completed. The fifth point — we're almost done — is that Hobbes asserts, therefore, that human beings are perpetual power-seekers, not because we want more and more, but because we want to preserve what we have now forever. His claim is that mere maintenance of the present requires accumulation, undertaking a perpetual reference to an unknown future. Thus, even despite the security from physical violence the sovereign provides, he cannot alleviate the anxiety that runs apace with desire. Everything we do today is undertaken for the sake of a future, which, if we're successful, will be no different from the present. But the sovereign can't guarantee that, right? Sixth then, and finally, this means that Hobbes' colonial story of the emergence of life and death from the state of nature is based on an underlying logic of desire that explains why settler colonial societies transform into expansionist security states. Hobbes' understanding of desire and its dilemmas elaborates George W. Bush's doctrine of preemptive warfare, the logic of Israeli self-defense in the face of so-called "existential threats," and the rationale behind stand-your-ground laws that exonerated the murderer of Trayvon Martin. The fact of this logic's hegemony in economics and political science as rational-choice theory or in international relations as Big R Realism make clear that futurist temporality is the unquestioned philosophical foundation of the U.S. economic and political order, as well as the obviously imperial investments of these economic disciplines. In short, it is the temporalization of desire itself that explains both the settler colonial foundations of survival, life and the value of life, as well as its transformation into an expansionist imperial project. Okay, that was part one. Part two: settlement and the global war on terror. So how does this reading of Hobbes through Edelman help us understand the emergence of empire? Lorenzo Veracini has argued that **settler colonialism is distinct from other types of colonialism in so far as it seeks to erase itself as settler colonialism**. Following Patrick Wolf's argument that settler colonialism pursues a logic of elimination, whereby settlers seek to replace the native and indigenize themselves post-facto, Veracini argues that because it aims at the elimination of the native, settler colonization necessarily aims at its own elimination. The truly successful settler colonial project, then, would therefore efface the native entirely, whether through genocide or assimilation or some other form of disappearance, the politics of recognition as Glen Coulthard has recently argued. Unless and until elimination is accomplished, settler states will engage in all sort of contortions, both political and ideological, to obscure the native in order to naturalize the conquest. Veracini represents this future of settler colonialism as either conceptually embedded its definition or else as a kind of bad faith on settlers' part, potentially implying that a guilty conscience somehow seeks to ward off complicity with conquest. I think that Edelman's understanding of futurism, however, helps explicate just how and why this anxious, reiterative, and reactionary veiling impulse is definitive of bio-political sovereignty. Hobbes' narratization of the drive of the state of nature is, like any other narratization of the drive, an imposition and thus an explicitly ideological move that serves a particular political agenda. It is the specifically futurist character of this imposition that destines it for failure and thus explains its anxious and recursive structure. Edelman regards this narrative movement toward a viable political future as fundamentally fantasmatic, not to mention conservative and ideological. Futurism, in other words – and these are his words — "perpetuates the fantasy of meaning's eventual realization," a realization that is by definition impossible, in so far as it is always only ever to come. Right? That's what the future is: It's beyond our grasp, it's always just out of reach. Built into Hobbes' understanding of desire, in other words, is the failed tautology of futurism, which as Edelman instructs, is fundamentally and futilely political. My contention is that this constitutive failure of futurism can be understood as the dynamic content of conquest in settler societies, as the original civilizationist imposition of temporality, an act that explains their subsequent transmogrification into expansionist security states. So, rather than face the violence that brought peace and life itself into being, Hobbes instead naturalizes this founding act by declaring it to be a "general inclination of all mankind" to engage in what he calls a "perpetual and restless desire of power after power that ceases only in death." In other words, he both institutes life and pushes it forward via a futurist narrativization of the drive into an insatiable, cumulative desire. Yet while desire may push us ever forward, ever beyond the initial moment of settlement, it cannot erase that settlement or relieve settlers' sovereignty of conquest. This is neither because of settler colonialist theoretical definition nor because settlers secretly feel guilty, but rather because the impossibility of fulfilling futurism's fantastical promises requires some other way of meeting the needs it manufactures if settler sovereignty is to maintain itself and it polity in tact. **Settler societies resort to any number of destructive forms of managing futurism's failing, from transfer and removal to outright extermination through war, massacre, starvation, and disease**. Yet this anxious reiterative activity is wholly predicable from an Edelmanian perspective and ineliminable from the structure of settler sovereignty because the futurist narrativization of the drive has rendered settlers beholden to an unsustainable temporality that must produce queerness or death in order to continue to produce meaning, survival, and civilization for itself. Settler sovereignty, thus, cannot do without the death native it brings into being. **The native as death must exist in order to purchase life and survival for the settler.** And yet, as Veracini and Wolf argue, the native cannot exist if the settler is to indigenize herself as native to the land she has expropriated, hence the production of new enemies, new queers, new deathly threats to settlement and its civilization and its way of life. The settler colonial foundation of bio-political sovereignty gives way to an expansionist imperial security state that finds new enemies abroad and new obstacles to its endless expansion, thereby solving, albeit only ever partially and temporarily, the problem of futurist failure that constituted settlement to begin with. **purchase life and survival for the settler.** And yet, as Veracini and Wolf argue, the native cannot exist if the settler is to indigenize herself as native to the land she has expropriated, hence the production of new enemies, new queers, new deathly threats to settlement and its civilization and its way of life. The settler colonial foundation of bio-political sovereignty gives way to an expansionist imperial security state that finds new enemies abroad and new obstacles to its endless expansion, thereby solving, albeit only ever partially and temporarily, the problem of futurist failure that constituted settlement to begin with.

#### The AC’s terra nullius conceptions of land ownership are uniquely violent in space – entrenches settler colonialism – affirming indigenous engagement in space is GOOD and key to thwarting settlerism

**Smiles 20** ​​(Deondre Smiles, Ph.D. is a postdoctoral scholar at The Ohio State University. A citizen of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, his ongoing research agenda is situated at the intersection of critical Indigenous geographies and political ecology, centered in the argument that tribal protection of remains, burial grounds, and more-than-human environments represents an effective form of ‘quotidian’ resistance against the settler colonial state/ “THE SETTLER LOGICS OF OUTERSPACE” / October 26 2020 / SOCIETY AND SPACE / ACCESSED 1-13-21) (<https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space>) (SPHS, AL)

In this essay, I position the logics of settler colonialism and the logics of space exploration dominion over both space on earth, and interplanetary space at the expense of Indigenous peoples. I then look to Indigenous conceptions of space as a potential foil to these colonial logics.*“In reaffirming our heritage as a free nation, we must always remember that America has always been a frontier nation. Now we must embrace the next frontier. America’s Manifest Destiny in the stars…The American nation was carved out of the vast frontier by the toughest, strongest, fiercest and most determined men and women ever to walk on the face of the Earth… Our ancestors braved the unknown, tamed the wilderness, settled the Wild West…This is our glorious and magnificent inheritance. We are Americans. We are pioneers. We are the pathfinders. We settled the New World. We built the modern world.” -President Donald J. Trump, 2020 State of the Union address.* To most scholars, and certainly to the virtual majority of Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island, it is no secret that the country we call the United States of America was built upon the brutal subjugation of Indigenous people and Indigenous lands. Fueled by the American settler myths of *terra nullius* (no man’s land) and Manifest Destiny, the American settler state proceeded upon a project of cultural and physical genocide, with lasting effects that endure to the present day. The ‘settler myth’ permeates American culture. Words such as ‘pioneer’, the ‘West’, ‘Manifest Destiny’ grab the imagination as connected to the growth of the country in its early history. America sprang forth from a vast open ‘wilderness’. Of course, for Indigenous people, we know differently—these lands had complex cultural frameworks and political entities long before colonization. Words like ‘pioneer’ and ‘Manifest Destiny’, have deep meanings for us too, as they are indicative of the very real damage dealt against our cultures and nations, damage that we have had to work very hard to undo. Trump’s address raises key insights into the continuing logics of settler colonialism, as well as questions of its future trajectories. Trump’s invocation of ideas such as the ‘frontier’ and ‘taming the wilderness’ draws attention to the brutal violence that accompanied the building of the American state. Scholars such as Greg Grandin (2019) make the case that the frontier is part of what America is—whether it is the ‘Wild West’, or the U.S.-Mexican border, America is always contending with a frontier that must be defined. Language surrounding ‘frontier’ is troubling because it perpetuates the rationale of why the American settler state even exists—it could make better use of the land than Native people would, after all, they lived in wilderness. This myth tells us that what we know as the modern world was built through the hard work of European settlers; Indigenous people had nothing to offer or contribute. For someone like Mr. Trump, whose misgivings and hostility towards Native people have been historically documented, this myth fits well with his narrative as President—he is building a ‘new’ America, one that will return to its place of power and influence. The fact that similar language is being used around the potential of American power being extended to space could reasonably be expected, given the economic and military potential that comes from such a move. Space represents yet another ‘unknown’ to be conquered and bent to America’s will. However, such interplanetary conquest does not exist solely in outer space. I wish to situate the very real colonial legacies and violence associated with the desire to explore space, tracing the ways that they are perpetuated and reified through their destructive engagements with Indigenous peoples. I argue that a scientific venture such as space exploration does not exist in a vacuum, but instead draws from settler colonialism and feeds back into it through the prioritization of ‘science’ over Indigenous epistemologies. I begin by exploring the ways that space exploration by the American settler state is situated within questions of hegemony, imperialism, and terra nullius, including a brief synopsis of the controversy surrounding the planned construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea. I conclude by exploring Indigenous engagement with ‘space’ in both its Earthbound and beyond-earth forms as it relates to outer space, and what implications this might have for the ways we think about our engagement with space as the American settler state begins to turn its gaze skyward once again. I position this essay alongside a growing body of academic work, as well as journalistic endeavors (Haskins, 2020; Koren, 2020) that demands that the American settler colonial state exercise self-reflexivity as to why it engages with outer space, and who is advantaged and disadvantaged here on Earth as a result of this engagement. Settler Colonialism and ‘Space’ A brief exploration of what settler colonialism is, and its engagement with ‘space’ here on Earth is necessary to start. Settler colonialism is commonly understood to be a form of colonialism that is based upon the permanent presence of colonists upon land. This is a distinction from forms of colonialism based upon resource extraction (Wolfe, 2006; Veracini, 2013). What this means is that the settler colony is intimately tied with the space within which it exists—it cannot exist or sustain itself without settler control over land and space. This permanent presence upon land by ‘settlers’ is usually at the expense of the Indigenous, or original people, in a given space or territory. To reiterate: control over space is paramount. As Wolfe states, “Land is life—or at least, land is necessary for life. Thus, contests for land can be—indeed, often are—contests for life” (2006: 387). Without land, the settler state ‘dies’; conversely, deprivation of land from the indigenous population means that in settler logic, indigeneity dies (Povinelli, 2002; Wolfe, 2006.) The ultimate aims of settler colonialism is therefore the occupation and remaking of space. As Wolfe (2006) describes, the settler state seeks to make use of land and resources in order to continue on; whether that is through homesteading/residence, farming and agriculture, mining, or any number of activities that settler colonial logic deems necessary to its own survival. These activities are tied to a racist and hubristic logic that only settler society itself possesses the ability to make proper use of land and space (Wolfe, 2006). This is mated with a viewpoint of landscapes prior to European arrival as *terra nullius*, or empty land that was owned by no one, via European/Western conceptions of land ownership and tenure (Wolfe, 1994). Because of this overarching goal of space, there is an inherent anxiety in settler colonies about space, and how it can be occupied and subsequently rewritten to remove Indigenous presence. In Anglo settler colonies, this often takes place within a lens of conservation. Scholars such as Banivanua Mar (2010), Lannoy (2012), Wright (2014) and Tristan Ahtone (2019) have written extensively on the ways that settler reinscription of space can be extremely damaging to Indigenous people from a lens of ‘conservation’. However, dispossession of Indigenous space in favor of settler uses can also be tied to some of the most destructive forces of our time. For example, Aboriginal land in the Australian Outback was viewed as ‘empty’ land that was turned into weapons ranges where the British military tested nuclear weapons in the 1950s, which directly led to negative health effects upon Aboriginal communities downwind from the testing sites (Vincent, 2010). Indigenous nations in the United States have struggled with environmental damage related to military-industrial exploitation as well. But, what does this all look like in regard to outer space? In order to really understand the potential (settler) colonial logics of space exploration, we must go back and explore the ways in which space exploration became inextricably tied with questions of state hegemony and geopolitics during the Cold War. US and Soviet space programs were born partially out of military utility, and propaganda value—the ability to send a nuclear warhead across a great distance to strike the enemy via a ICBM and the accompanying geopolitical respect that came with such a capability was something that greatly appealed to the superpowers, and when the Soviets took an early lead in the ‘Space Race’ with *Sputnik* and their *Luna* probes, the United States poured money and resources into making up ground (Werth, 2004). The fear of not only falling behind the Soviets militarily as well as a perceived loss of prestige in the court of world opinion spurred the US onto a course of space exploration that led to the *Apollo* moon landings in the late 1960s and the early 70s (Werth, 2004; Cornish, 2019). I argue that this fits neatly into the American settler creation myth referenced by Trump—after ‘conquering’ a continent and bringing it under American dominion, why would the United States stop solely at ‘space’ on Earth? To return to Grandin (2019), space represented yet another frontier to be conquered and known by the settler colonial state; if not explicitly for the possibility of further settlement, then for the preservation of its existing spatial extent on Earth. However, scholars such as Alan Marshall (1995) have cautioned that newer logics of space exploration such as potential resource extraction tie in with existing military logics in a way that creates a new way of thinking about the ‘openness’ of outer space to the logics of empire, in what Marshall calls *res nullius* (1995: 51)[i]. But we cannot forget the concept of *terra nullius* and how our exploration of the stars has real effects on Indigenous landscapes here on Earth. We also cannot forget about forms of space exploration that may not be explicitly tied to military means. Doing so deprives us of another lens through which to view the tensions between settler and Indigenous views of space and to which end is useful. Indeed, even reinscribing of Indigenous space towards ‘peaceful’ settler space exploration have very real consequences for Indigenous sovereignty and Indigenous spaces. Perhaps the most prominent example of the fractures between settler space exploration and Indigenous peoples is the on-going controversy surrounding the construction of the Thirty Meter Telescope on Mauna Kea, on the island of Hawaii. While an extremely detailed description of the processes of construction on the TMT and the opposition presented to it by Native Hawai’ians and their allies is beyond the scope of this essay, and in fact is already expertly done by a number of scholars[ii], the controversy surrounding TMT is a prime example of the logics presented towards ‘space’ in both Earth-bound and beyond-Earth contexts by the settler colonial state as well as the violence that these logics place upon Indigenous spaces, such as Mauna Kea, which in particular already plays host to a number of telescopes and observatories (Witze, 2020). In particular, astronomers such as Chanda Prescod-Weinstein, Lucianne Walkowicz, and others have taken decisive action to push back against the idea that settler scientific advancement via space exploration should take precedence over Indigenous sovereignty in Earth-space. Prescod-Weinstein and Walkowicz, alongside Sarah Tuttle, Brian Nord and Hilding Neilson (2020) make clear that settler scientific pursuits such as building the TMT are simply new footnotes in a long history of colonial disrespect of Indigenous people and Indigenous spaces in the name of science, and that astronomy is not innocent of this disrespect. In fact, Native Hawai’ian scholars such as Iokepa Casumbal-Salazar strike at the heart of the professed neutrality of sciences like astronomy: One scientist told me that astronomy is a “benign science” because it is based on observation, and that it is universally beneficial because it offers “basic human knowledge” that everyone should know “like human anatomy.” Such a statement underscores the cultural bias within conventional notions of what constitutes the “human” and “knowledge.” In the absence of a critical self-reflection on this inherent ethnocentrism, the tacit claim to universal truth reproduces the cultural supremacy of Western science as self-evident. Here, the needs of astronomers for tall peaks in remote locations supplant the needs of Indigenous communities on whose ancestral territories these observatories are built (2017: 8). As Casumbal-Salazar and other scholars who have written about the TMT and the violence that has been done to Native Hawai’ians (such as police actions designed to dislodge blockades that prevented construction) as well as the potential violence to come such as the construction of the telescope have skillfully said, when it comes to the infringement upon Indigenous space by settler scientific endeavors tied to space exploration, there is no neutrality to be had—dispossession and violence are dispossession and violence, no matter the potential ‘good for humanity’ that might come about through these things. Such contestations over outer space and ethical engagement with previously unknown spaces will continue to happen. Outer space is not the first ‘final frontier’ (apologies to Gene Roddenberry) that has been discussed in settler logics and academic spaces. In terms of settler colonialism, scholars have written about how Antarctica was initially thought of as the ‘perfect’ settler colony—land that could be had without the messy business of pushing Indigenous people off of it (see Howkins 2010). Of course, we know now that engagement with Antarctica should be constrained by ecological concern—who is to say that these concerns will be heeded in ‘unpopulated’ space? What can be done to push back against these settler logics? Indigenous Engagement with ‘Space’ I want to now turn our attention towards the possibilities that exist regarding Indigenous engagement with outer space. After all, the timing could not be more urgent to do so—we are now at a point where after generations and generations of building the myth that America was built out of nothing, we are now ready to resume the project of extending the reach of American military and economic might in space. To be fair, there are plenty of advances that can be made scientifically with a renewed focus on space exploration. However, history shows us that space exploration has been historically tied to military hegemony, and there is nothing in Mr. Trump’s temperament or attitude towards a re-engagement with space that suggest that his push toward the stars will be anything different. A sustained conversation needs to be had—will this exploration be ethical and beneficial to all Americans? One potential avenue of Indigenous involvement comes through the active involvement of Indigenous peoples and Indigenous perspectives in space exploration, of course. This involvement can be possible through viewing outer space through a ‘decolonial’ lens, for instance. Astronomers such as Prescod-Weinstein and Walkowicz have spoken about the need to avoid replicating colonial frameworks of occupation and use of space when exploring places such as Mars, for example (Mandelbaum, 2018). The rise of logics of resource extraction in outer-space bodies have led to engagements by other academics such as Alice Gorman on the agency and personhood of the Moon. Collaborations between Indigenous people and space agencies such as NASA help provide the Indigenous perspective inside space exploration and the information that is gleaned from it, with implications both in space and on a Earth that is dealing with climate crisis (Bean, 2018; Bartels, 2019). Another potential avenue of engagement with Indigenous methodologies and epistemologies related to space comes with engaging with Indigenous thinkers who are already deeply immersed into explorations of Indigenous ‘space’ here on Earth—the recent works of Indigenous thinkers such as Waziyatawin (2008) Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (2017), Natchee Blu Barnd (2018) and others provide a unique viewpoint into the ways that Indigenous peoples make and remake space—perhaps this can provide another blueprint for how we might engage with space beyond Earth. And that is just the work that exists within the academic canon. Indigenous people have always been engaged with the worlds beyond the Earth, in ways that often stood counter to accepted ‘settler’ conventions of space exploration (Young, 1987). In one example, when asked about the Moon landings, several Inuit said, "We didn't know this was the first time you white people had been to the moon. Our shamans have been going for years. They go all the time...We do go to visit the moon and moon people all the time. The issue is not whether we go to visit our relatives, but how we treat them and their homeland when we go (Young, 1987: 272).” In another example, turning to my own people, the Ojibwe, we have long standing cultural connections to the stars that influence storytelling, governance, and religious tenets (CHIN, 2003). This engagement continues through to the present day, and points to a promising future. A new generation of Indigenous artists, filmmakers, and writers are beginning to create works that place the Indigenous individual themselves into narratives of space travel and futurity, unsettling existing settler notions of what our future in space might look like. As Leo Cornum (2015) writes, “Outer space, perhaps because of its appeal to our sense of endless possibility, has become the imaginative site for re-envisioning how black, indigenous and other oppressed people can relate to each other outside of and despite the colonial gaze.” These previous examples should serve as a reminder that the historical underpinnings of our great national myth are built upon shaky intellectual ground—we need to be honest about this. America did not just spring forth out of nothing; it came from the brutal occupation and control of Native lands. Despite the best efforts of the settler state, Native people are still here, we still exist and make vital contributions to both our tribal communities and science. We cannot expect Donald Trump to turn his back on the national myth of what made the United States the United States—in his mind, this is the glorious history of what made America great in the past. And it should serve as no surprise that Trump and others wish to extend this history into outer space. Even when Trump’s days in the White House are over, the settler colonial logics that underpin our engagement with land on Earth will still loom large over the ways that we may potentially engage with outer space. But for those of us who do work in Indigenous geographies and Indigenous studies, it becomes even more vital that we heed the calls of Indigenous thinkers inside and outside formal academic structures, validate Indigenous histories, and push to deconstruct the American settler myth and to provide a new way of looking at the stars, especially at a crucial moment where the settler state turns its gaze towards the same.

#### Native understandings of space offer different perspectives — Indigenous space exploration resists common space appropriation narratives informed by colonialism – solves back

**Young 87** ("Pity the Indians of Outer Space": Native American Views of the Space Program Author(s): M. Jane Young - american studies and folklore educator at U of A. Source: Western Folklore , Oct., 1987, Vol. 46, No. 4 (Oct., 1987), pp. 269-279 Published by: Western States Folklore Society) (<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1499889>) (SPHS, AL)

In the 1960s, because of crises in their social and cultural life, many "mainstream" Americans' began to re-examine their goals, calling into question values that they had hitherto taken for granted. Some accompanied this raising of consciousness with a search for their tra ditional "roots" and a renewed interest in recovering the fundamen tals of human life, turning to non-Western religions and philosophies. Many of these people who were searching for an alternative to the mainstream ethos came to regard Native Americans, whose religion and worldview stress respect for nature and harmony with the cosmos, as the proper guides to this "rediscovery." Dissatisfied with social val ues that were shaped by excessive materialism and individualism, non-Native Americans began to become aware of the significant con tribution Native Americans could make to the attempt to restore humanity's ties with the universe and re-establish a sense of identity. Al though the moon walks of the 1970s took place against this background-the search for an alternative reality-the regressive, conservative view of the 1980s is a backlash against the liberalism and questioning mode of the 1960s and 1970s. Still, some Americans today are actively "considering" the Native American alternative-an alter native that, I suggest, would add depth and scope to the narrow vision of the current "me-centered" generation. Because Native Americans have a different perspective of the world, they can offer us alternative ways of seeing ourselves in relationship to the natural world and help us answer the question of what constitutes appropriate behavior-in outer space, as well as on earth. Furthermore, some non-Native Americans realize that, as they look to the traditions of the Native Americans, they see their own heritage with increased clarity. Although this appreciation of Native Ameri cans comes too late in America's history and could be construed as ap propriating their ideas as we did their land, a significant number of Native Americans are receptive to the potential that now exists for a dialogue between traditions, both non-Native and Native American, perhaps because they are experiencing a parallel concern, a need to come to terms with their own emerging identity. Both groups have begun to realize that it is only through such a dialogue that the mistakes of the past can be avoided in the future. For non-Native Ameri cans the justification for this inquiry is that through an analysis of the difference between the two understandings of space-Anglo and Na tive American-we can better "see" the ideological dimensions of our own, taken-for-granted mythology that legitimizes space exploration. Native American attitudes towards "outer space" often conflict with the attitudes of the proponents of the U.S. space program. Rather than applying the metaphor of the "new frontier" or even the term "outer" to this aspect of the cosmos, many Native Americans regard it as encompassed in "Father Sky," part of their network of symbolic associations that integrates all elements of the cosmos. A recent com mercial called "Earth Pictures," produced by TRW, a firm that special izes in "aerial views" of portions of the earth's globe from outer space, aptly illustrates these differing attitudes. In this commercial, TRW representatives give members of the Navajo tribe a guided tour of the TRW laboratories and conclude by showing them a satellite picture (Landsat) of the Navajo reservation from outer space. With evident humor, the Navajos respond by holding up a picture of outer space from their reservation-a dry painting of Father Sky who contains within his body the sun, moon, and constellations. The commercial thus serves to illustrate Navajo beliefs about "outer space." According to Navajo worldview, which emphasizes harmonious relations with all elements of the cosmos-a sacred kinship among all aspects of experience, natural and supernatural-Father Sky is a living being, intimately related to humans who should, therefore, treat him with appreciation and respect. This example from the Navajo is representative of the cosmology of most Native American groups, a cosmology that is shaped by a belief in the unity and sacred nature of all life, the above and the below. As Joseph Epes Brown suggests, the Native American quality of seeing is based on "a polysynthetic me taphysic of nature, immediately experienced rather than dangerously abstracted." He describes this vision as a "message of the sacred nat ure of the land, of place."5 Place in this sense extends, of course, to outer space, or Father Sky, as well as to Mother Earth. This perspec tive contrasts sharply with that of enthusiasts of space exploration who regard space as something "out there," beyond everyday experience, through which we should travel to reach planets and other objects that we will investigate, and, if possible, use to meet our own needs. I have taken the title of this essay from the transcript of a convoca tion of Native American scholars that took place in 1970. The state ment, "pity the Indians and the buffalo of outer space," refers to the Euro-American concept of the American frontier, based on the erroneous notion that the "New World" was unoccupied, hence available for exploration and exploitation. Consequently, many indigenous Americans view the use of the metaphor of the frontier in the argu ment for the expanded exploration and settlement of outer space as parallel to the historic "settlement" of America in which homesteaders extended the notion of "unoccupied" land through time as they pushed the "frontier" steadily westward. The Native Americans had no encouraging vision of the frontier for, as a conquered people, they found their traditional domain constricted by the expansion of Euro pean cultures into the New World. They have no hopeful vision of the so-called "new frontier" of outer space, either: "pity the Indians of outer space" whose territory is regarded as unoccupied land to which powerful governments can lay claim. Native Americans fear that the motives of expansion and exploitation that, in part, drive the space program will bring disorder into the cosmos. In contrast, according to the Native American view, one should strive to bring oneself into harmony with the order perceived in the heavens, rather than to challenge that order. Thus, many elements of Native American folklore and worldview outline principles of behavior that stand in opposition to those of the proponents of the U.S. space program. Behavior is a key word here, for the opposition is directed not so much to the simple goals of the space program as to the attitudes those who are actively involved in the space program have about the beings who reside in this part of the cosmos, and the disastrous actions that will ensue from these mis guided notions. The following anecdotes from recent Native Ameri can oral tradition exemplify this different perspective." An anthropologist working with Inuit peoples in Alaska told them of the first moon shot, and of astronauts walking on the moon. The Inuits began laughing, and when the anthropologist inquired why, they replied: "We didn't know this was the first time you white people had been to the moon. Our shamans have been going for years. They go all the time." The woman who told this story added, "We do go to visit the moon and moon people all the time. The issue is not whether we go to visit our relatives, but how we treat them and their homeland when we go." An example from the Navajo illustrates their concern that the "moon people" will receive the same treatment from "Western" soci ety as the American Indians did. During the first years of outer space exploration, NASA leased some Navajo land for test sites. One site in particular was to be used to test the mechanized moon walker. At one point during the testing, NASA invited the Navajo tribal chairman, Peter MacDonald, out to the site as an observer. MacDonald brought a Navajo singer, or medicine man, with him. When told that these men he saw in strange suits would be going to the moon, the singer asked if he could send a message to the moon people. So a tape recorder was brought to him and he recorded a message in the Navajo language. When he finished speaking, the NASA people asked MacDonald to translate the message. "Okay," MacDonald said, "he's telling the moon people to watch you guys carefully, because you might screw things up on the moon the way you have on Earth." Some of the Navajo regard explorations in outer space, specifically moon landings, as responsible for disasters here on earth. When a particularly dry spell of weather hit the eastern area of the Navajo res ervation and many sheep and goats died, tribal members there attrib uted the drought to witchcraft. This was the same drought period that Navajos in the Chuska Valley interpreted as having been caused by the United States moon landings." In this particular case, the Navajo view space exploration and witchcraft as similarly destructive of the har monious existence that they strive for through the vehicle of ceremo nial activity. Exploring the relationship between what has been called "main stream experiences" and Native American stories, Simon Ortiz, an Acoma poet and short story writer, describes the reactions of a tradi tional Acoma man to modern technology in the story "Men on the Moon." As various relatives point out the benefits of modern technol ogy, the old man's perplexed responses indicate that his traditional view of the world is incompatible with these so-called benefits and the system of values that they imply. His daughter brings him a television set which, in itself, is somewhat incomprehensible to him, and the family watches the Apollo moon landing. When his son-in-law tells him that scientists want to find out what is on the moon because they are looking for knowledge, the old man wonders if men "have run out of places to look for knowledge on the earth." When he is told that the scientists believe this knowledge from the moon will help them learn more about the universe, find out "where everything began and how everything was made," the old man suggests, first, that his son-in-law is teasing him. When assured that this is not the case, he asks, "Do they say why they need to know where everything began? Hasn't anyone ever told them?" The old man's questions here reveal his understand ing that the sacred calls for a different sort of knowledge than that de manded by science and its products. His comments throughout the story suggest, in fact, that research done in the name of science alone cannot provide a holistic understanding of experience. Similarly, some non-Native Americans have begun to question whether scien tists can carry out purely objective research; whether they are capable of, or even ought to attempt, the de-mystification of the moon. 10 The story continues and that night the old man dreams that Flintwing Boy and Coyote are watching a monster with metal legs that crushes trees, grass and flowers; as they watch they realize that, alone, they are powerless to stop the monster. So they face East, pray, his ar breathe on some sacred pollen, take in the breath of all the directions and give cornfood to the earth. Flintwing Boy then prepares rows and sends Coyote to the village to warn the people and to tell them "to talk among themselves and decide what it is about and what they will do." Ortiz illustrates here the relevance and immediacy of traditional narrative for this old man; it becomes for him a way of tak ing the dream-vision to heart in order to begin to take the appropriate action; it is a means by which he comes to terms with such potential dangers as a metal monster that lands on the moon and crushes the life out of things in nature. In contrast to the view of outer space as consisting of inanimate ob jects in motion, many Native American groups see themselves as intimately related, in a literal as well as a ceremonial manner, to the sun, moon, and stars. The Skidi Pawnee, for instance, believe that the people on earth were conceived by the stars; thus, for them, the sky is populated with beings who have a kinship relationship to those on earth.¹¹ The sun, moon, and stars are the fathers, mothers, aunts, and uncles of the people on earth and ought to be treated with respect. Similarly, Zuni cosmology is shaped by a belief in the essential connectedness of all life, the sky and the earth, and all else that exists. The Zunis speak of the Sun Father, Earth Mother, and others who reside in these realms as living beings; furthermore, the zenith (above) and nadir (below) are integral to their conceptual model of directionality, extending the two-dimensional scheme (based on the four semi-cardinal directions) into three-dimensional space. The Zunis, like the Pawnee, see themselves as intimately related to the sun, moon, and stars. It is not surprising, then, that they perceive the actions of non-Native Americans towards these cosmological beings as not only disrespectful, but highly dangerous. The Zuni attitude toward the "persons" who inhabit the sky world, as well as their perceptions of space and time more generally, are aptly illustrated by stories several Zunis told me about certain clown per formances that occurred at the time of the first U.S. moon shots. One man described a memorable summer rain dance during which the clowns mimicked the behavior of the first astronauts to walk on the moon.12 According to this account, the clowns in the plaza gave a good rendition of the particular walk that the astronauts in their cumber some space suits exhibited. Then the clowits climbed to the rooftops and walked on top of one of the sacred kivas. The purpose of these actions, my Zuni consultant said, was to object to the behavior of the astronauts who heedlessly walked on the body of the Moon Mother and pierced her with metal instruments in order to bring back samples. for study. 13 This performance was not only a critique of the moon shots, however, but an enactment of Zuni cosmological principles that the clowns equated the moon with sacred space in this instance was not arbitrary. This coupling suggests a merging of space and time in a ritual context such that the kiva, a ceremonial chamber, some times located underground and symbolically associated with the emergence from the underworld, becomes equivalent to the moon, one of the Zuni deities who travels across the sky. 14 Outer and inner space thus occupy the same place at the same time. Zuni "clowns" who portrayed the astronauts not only provide comic relief, easing tension through laughter, but also embody disorder through ritual reversals. In addition, their performances often be come vehicles for criticizing the actions of both Zunis and non-Zunis alike. The Zunis regard these clowns as extremely powerful, poten tially dangerous beings who play a central role in their ceremonies. Between "sets" of the sacred rain dances, they mimic the stately ka chinas, make sexual overtures to the highly respected matrons of the tribe, and even walk on the moon; yet none of these activities consti tutes appropriate behavior in day-to-day life. The disorderly behavior of the clowns, enacted in a ceremonial context, contrasts with and, therefore, emphasizes the order by which people should govern their lives. Significantly, Zuni and Hopi clowns include impersonations of anthropologists and government bureaucrats, as well as astronauts, in their repertoire-perhaps an indication that these roles are character ized by the exploitative nature of the Anglo-American. 15 Similarly, the Cherokee carry out a special ritual dance, called the Booger Dance, that portrays "the European invader as awkward, ridiculous, lewd, and menacing, a dramatic perpetuation of the tradition of hostility and disdain."16 This dance functions to lessen the harmful powers of the aliens who, in the form of living beings or ghosts, are responsible for sickness and misfortune. The Booger Dance is frequently recom mended by a medicine man to form part of a cure for a sick person. Interestingly, one Zuni man who described the clowns' perform ance of the first moon walk mentioned it within the context of a discus sion about the ability of the clowns to predict, and hence, control, fu ture events. His description of the event tallied with the others I had heard, with one striking difference: he said the event took place a year before astronauts first walked on the moon. Certainly, this example un derscores the perceived power of the clowns, but it also serves to link this event with other ominous events foreseen in the future. This man associated the story of the moon walk with one the grandfathers used to tell long ago, predicting that a time would come when their children would begin to drink dark liquid and quarrel and eventually the world would end in a shower of hot rain. 17 Finally, just as the clowns' equa tion of the moon and the kiva constituted a collapsing of inner and outer space in ritual activity, so does this particular instance of ability to predict the future reveal a similar collapsing of time: present and fu ture coalesce as the clowns ritually enact an event that has not yet oc curred. These examples illustrate a traditional Native American ethos in which time as well as space can be described as "inner-" rather than "outer-" directed. According to Western Puebloan mythology, which the Puebloans themselves regard as history, the people back in the time of the beginning lived in the fourth underworld, below the sur face of the earth. 18 This "time of the beginning" had no beginning; simply was, before the time of the emergence. Similarly, Puebloans be lieve that existence after death is not situated in the sky, but rather, inside mother earth, back in the time of the beginning. In the Zuni origin myth, as the people search for the Center after they have em erged from the underworld, they undertake geographical travels that steadily spiral inward until they reach their destination. Their search for knowledge is, in a sense, synonymous with their search for the Center. The Center represents the physical existence of Zuni, the middle of any place, the time of the winter solstice, a person's heart, and that person's essence as the Center when ritually observing the six directions or offering sacred prayer meal. 19 The vehicle for attaining this knowledge, for finding the Center, for reaching the moon, is ceremonial activity, not travel in a space ship. Also apparent in these examples is the Native American emphasis on process rather than product; on the unity of all beings in the act of harmonious existence. For the Puebloans, the moon, like the sun, is not an object to be walked on or traveled to, but a living being whose light is drawn through the kiva hatchway during certain rituals. 20 They draw the sun, too, into the kiva at certain times and often con struct buildings so that rays of sunlight will enter a window or porthole and strike a specific niche at ceremonially and calendrically important times of the year.21 The interplay of light and shadow at such sites seems to be a celebration of the event-an "inviting in" of the sun or the shadows it casts-an incorporation of the sacred into the structure itself. 22 This perception of the sun and moon as living beings who en ter the sacred space of the kiva at ritually significant times of the year is a phenomenon similar to that described earlier: the behavior of the clowns during a Zuni rain dance that served to equate the kiva with the moon for a circumscribed period of time. Both instances are part of a sequence of ritual activities in which a condensation and intensifica tion of experience occur-a collapsing of "inner" and "outer" into one entity. Thus, the Puebloans in particular, and Native Americans in general, do not view space and the beings who reside there as external to ceremonial life, nor do they regard them as material objects that they can own, control, or overcome. According to this perspective, there are no rigid boundaries between the spiritual and physical; or, if such boundaries exist at all, they are fluid and permeable. The cosmos is one entity; the beings within it operate according to the principles of continuity and similarity-principles evident in the unification of inner and outer space in the context of ritual activity. For most Native American groups, this continuity applies to time as well as to space. Although they may introduce a myth as having occurred "a long time ago" or "in the beginning," they do not envision the events of the myth as over and done with, situated at a single point in a linear flow of time; instead, they perceive them as ever-present, informing the here and now.25
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Dont win aff on a singular layer – it’s a bad model because if you win framing but have no unique offense to why the resolution is true you dont meet your burden AND it makes being neg impossible since its inevitable to concede a minor layer of the aff if the majority of our offense is on a certain part

Egoism is also a bad model to vote on – oif morality is subjective you dont have any criteria as to how to judge the debate thus you cant evaluate the aff