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**Part One is the Space Ship**

**Outer Space and Debate are both a settler project that conceptualizes land as capital to be invested into settler subject formation – the University is complicit with logics of assimilation that drive indigeneity to the outside while fueling militaristic expansion of the settler project.**

**paperson 17** (la, “A Third University Is Possible,” *University of Minnesota Press,* 2017, ‘Land. And the University is Settler Colonial,’ <https://manifold.umn.edu/read/a-third-university-is-possible/section/561c45d2-9442-42d5-9938-f8c9e2aafcfc#ch02>, an alternate avatar used by K. Wayne Yang, Yang’s work transgresses the line between scholarship and community, as evidenced by his involvement in urban education and community organizing. He was the co-founder of the Avenues Project, a non-profit youth development organization, and also the co-founder of East Oakland Community High School. He also worked in school system reform as part of Oakland Unified School District’s Office of School Reform. An accomplished educator, Dr. Yang has taught high school in Oakland, California for over 15 years and received the Academic Senate Distinguished Teaching Award in 2010. His research focuses on the role of youth popular culture and pedagogy in the emergence of social movements. He is currently writing a book, *Organizing the Common Sense: Popular Culture and Urban School Reform*, which examines strategies for organizing in education across three landscapes: youth, community, and bureaucracy. \*Sometimes he writes as la paperson, an avatar that irregularly calls, as in the article, “The postcolonial ghetto: Seeing her shape and his hand” Note – there’s a lot of stuff about the settler that uses the word “he” – this is intentionally left in, because in this book and some other works Paperson/Yang makes it clear that their conception of the settler isn’t a “man” but a hyper-masculinized subject, whereas indigeneity represents more of both the feminine and the non-gendered. I thought a lot about changing the pronouns in this card but decided against it just to maintain the scholarly views of Paperson/Yang. If you read like the Tickner shit or whatever the g-lang cards popular these days are like just fuck you.) zeph

Chapter 2, “Land. And **the University Is Settler Colonial” Land accumulation as institutional capital is likely the defining trait of a competitive, modern-day research university**. Land is not just an early feature in the establishment of universities. **Land is a motor in the financing of universities, enabling many of them to grow despite economic crises**. In my own university context during the subprime loan bust of 2008, California campuses expanded facilities construction even while classes were closed, staff furloughed, enrollments frozen, and tuition and fees hiked.[1] One common joke is that “UC” means “Under Construction” rather than “University of California”; similar satirical acronyms exist throughout the research university world. The irony of continued property expansion and revenue generation while enrollments are capped and tuitions balloon has characterized the twenty-first-century university. **Land is the keystone of the university,** yet land is least likely to be discussed in any critical treatment of it. **Universities do not exist in some abstract academic place. They are built on land, and especially in the North American context, upon occupied Indigenous lands.** From where I write, the California public university system is a landgrant institution. This means that stolen land was (and is) the literal capital used to buy and build one of the largest university systems in the world; the tripartite of California community colleges, California state universities, and the University of California system constitute the largest such public institution in the world (and, arguably, the largest public institution of any sort). Land-grant institutions were legally born in 1862, when Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act into law. The passage of the Morrill Act is often narrated as a quiet, civilian accomplishment during the U.S. Civil War. Nonetheless, it was truly intimate to war and to the production of a Yankee North American empire. In 1862, seven Southern states seceded from the Union and thus removed from Congress the dissenting votes that had previously blocked the Morrill Act from becoming law. The act gave federal public lands to (Union) states, allotting thirty thousand acres of recently appropriated Indigenous lands for each senator and representative to stake out. States were encouraged to sell these “land grants” to raise money for new public universities that would research and educate American settlers in agriculture, science, and mechanical arts. **Land is turned into capital for constructing universities for the principal goal of growing industry**:[2] That all moneys derived from the sale of the lands aforesaid by the States to which the lands are apportioned . . . the moneys so invested shall constitute a perpetual fund, the capital of which shall remain forever undiminished, . . . and the interest of which shall be inviolably appropriated, by each State which may take and claim the benefit of this act, to the endowment, support, and maintenance of at least one college. (Morrill Act, section 4, para. 7) Land as capital and not as campuses is an innovation of the land-grant university. That is, states are able to trade, develop, and sell land to fund the construction of public universities. Land as capital incentivized land speculation. For example, New York State acquired its Morrill Act lands in 160-acre denominations, or “scrip,” which could be traded privately, even for lands in other states. Most notably, Ezra Cornell, cofounder of Cornell University and of the Western Union Company, traded 532,000 acres of scrip in New York to acquire timber-rich lands in Wisconsin. The “Western Lands,” as they were appropriately dubbed, fueled Cornell University from 1865 until the last scrip was finally liquidated in 1935.[3] Therefore land-grant universities are built not only on land but also from land. **Morrill Act** universities are also charged with the research and development of land, particularly for agribusiness. Thus **the university system, especially in the westward-expanding empire of the United States, is intimately underwritten as a project of settler colonialism—the seizing of Native land, the conversion of land into capital, the further domestication of “wilderness” into productive agricultural estates, and the research mandate to procure profitable plants from around the world to colonize North American soil**. The public university, with its charge to underwrite industry and agribusiness, literally changed the landscape of the Americas: The leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes. (Morrill Act, section 4, para. 1) **The prioritization of settler colonial technologies—agricultural and mechanical engineering, not to mention military tactics—reflects how landgrant universities were commissioned as part of the empire-self-making project of the United States.** The year 1862 also saw the passage of the Homestead Act, which allowed for settlers to apply directly for landownership. Between 1862 and 1934, the federal government granted 1.6 million homesteads, distributing more than 270 million acres—10 percent of all land in the United States—into private (settler) ownership. Homesteading was only officially discontinued in 1976 in the mainland United States and in 1986 in Alaska. The year 1862 also saw the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and one can see **the alchemy of capitalism at work: accumulation of land, conversion of land into capital, conversion of capital into institutions, conversion of land into agribusiness**. In my own University of California context, the state legislature established an Agricultural, Mining, and Mechanical Arts College in 1866,[4] the same year of the Three Knolls Massacre, where settlers killed forty Yahi, including the father of “Ishi, the last Yahi.” Also that year, the College Homestead Association purchased 160 acres of Ohlone land in hopes of selling new homesteads to settlers to fund the private College of California. Those lands, along with the Agricultural, Mining, and Mechanical Arts College, would become present-day UC Berkeley. Ironically, “Ishi” became a well-known spectacle for Berkeley anthropologists. After his death, his body was autopsied at the University of California medical school. His body was cremated at a cemetery in Colma, while his brain was shipped to and stored at the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C.—until his remains were finally repatriated back to the Redding Rancheria and Pit River tribe in 2000. **Such stories of land appropriations built upon Indigenous vanishings directly haunt the histories of all the** UC **campuses, whose birth dates march right through the twentieth century**: UCLA (1927), UC Santa Barbara (1958), UC Davis (1959), UC Riverside (1959), UC San Diego (1960), UC San Francisco (1964), UC Santa Cruz (1965), UC Irvine (1965), and UC Merced (2005). There is nothing ancient about this history. On its 2012 sesquicentennial, the Morrill Act was heavily commemorated throughout the U.S. university system, but perhaps the single organization with the most reason to cheer was the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU), “a research, policy, and advocacy organization representing 219 public research universities, land-grant institutions, state university systems, and related organizations.” On January 4, 2014, the APLU Executive Committee issued a statement to “strongly oppose the boycott of Israeli academic institutions supported by certain U.S. scholarly organizations,” in direct response to the Association for Asian American Studies’s (AAAS) April 2013 and the American Studies Association’s (ASA) December 2013 resolutions to support the call for boycotts, divestments, and sanctions (BDS) by Palestinian civil society—although neither the scholarly organizations nor Palestine nor the exact boycott is mentioned in the statement. [5] BDS is built around three demands, specifically, “1. Ending Israel’s occupation and colonization of all Arab lands and dismantling the Wall [built around the West Bank and Gaza]; 2. Recognizing the fundamental rights of the Arab-Palestinian citizens of Israel to full equality; 3. And respecting . . . the rights of Palestinian refugees to return to their homes and properties as stipulated in UN resolution 194.”[6] According to Palestinian American scholar J. I. Albahri, BDS “is designed to intervene on the specific settler colonial practices of Israel” by exerting international pressure on Israeli institutions.[7] Shirking the actual words in BDS is the APLU’s refusal to engage public debate—the very cornerstone of free speech. The APLU’s statement nonspecifically refers to “this boycott” as detrimental to equally nonspecific “critical projects that advance humanity, develop new technologies, and improve health and well-being across the globe.”[8] Some of the discourses deployed by the APLU and other academic voices quick to condemn BDS were that “boycotts are bad” because “free speech is good.” Ironically, the very ineffability of Palestine reflects a national policy of boycotting open dialogue about Palestine. U.S. foreign policy already looks like a boycott of Palestine. The United States has boycotted the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) assembly since November 2011, when Palestine was allowed membership into UNESCO. The United States was by far the largest funder of UNESCO; by withholding dues of $80 million a year—22 percent of UNESCO’s overall budget—it sent UNESCO into budgetary crisis.[9] Unlike the AAAS and ASA resolutions, this boycott—the boycott of Palestine— literally defunds critical projects that “improve health and well-being across the globe.” This boycott is not submitted for vote or discussion but operates at the level of default policy—a policy that includes refusals even to name Palestine, similar to the APLU statement, which would not even name BDS. Unlike the AAAS and ASA resolutions, the APLU’s “boycott of the boycott” was quickly drafted and signed by six people.[10] It did not solicit votes, feedback, or discussion from its member campuses, which, by the APLU’s own claim, “enroll more than 3.8 million undergraduates and 1.2 million graduate students, award over 1 million degrees, employ nearly 1 million faculty and staff, and conduct more than $37 billion in university-based research.”[11] The APLU’s action perfectly captures how **the settler colonial university’s investments do not just stem from land seizures of a settler past but are active investments in the very future of settler colonialism**. This chapter cannot deconstruct the complex American desires surrounding Israel and Palestine. However, relevant to this discussion are the similar yet divergent trajectories of the APLU and ASA as **university formations**—and thus as technological formations that **can be repurposed toward decolonizing goals.** The APLU was founded in 1887 as a direct consequence of the Morrill Act. The ASA was founded in 1951 as a project of Cold War cultural politics through financial support from the U.S. government—which also endowed multiple professorships in European universities, particularly in Germany and Britain. The dominant origin story of American studies is that it was established as a tool of U.S. jingoism and imperialist apology.[12] From a deterministic view of technology as recapitulating ideology, one might not expect a resolution to support the BDS to emerge from the ASA. That the ASA became a lightning rod for BDS politics was perhaps something never predicted by the Cold War machinery that created it. However, from its inception, American studies arguably has had a decolonial tooth in its gear of empire.[13] **The politics of land-grant institutions directs us to think about the work of school beyond curriculum and pedagogy, beyond knowledge production. Universities are land-grabbing, land-transmogrifying, land-capitalizing machines. Universities are giant machines attached to other machines: war machines, media machines, governmental and nongovernmental policy machines. Therefore the terms of the struggle in the university are also over this machinery—deactivating its colonizing operations and activating its contingent decolonizing possibilities.** A decolonizing university is not just about decolonizing the “representational” work of knowledge production that we associate with universities, nor about “decolonizing” the treatment of currently enrolled students in its courses of study**. It is about the steam and pistons, the waterworks, the groundworks, the investments, the emplacements, the institutional–governmental–capitalistic rhizomatics of the university**. What can we do with this hulking mass of ruins, conduit, fibroids, workhouses, and research facilities built on Indigenous land? What would it take for universities to rematriate land? What would it take for universities to clean water? What would it mean for universities to counteract war making? **What would it mean to hotwire the university for decolonizing work?** To these machines of decolonial desire, the desire for a third university, this book now turns.

**The University is marked by investments in theory as radical but sharing the material investments in land as the first – the project of assimilation masks the violence of settler colonialism and nourishes whiteness.**

**paperson 17** (la, “A Third University Is Possible,” *University of Minnesota Press,* 2017, ‘Land. And the University is Settler Colonial,’ <https://manifold.umn.edu/read/a-third-university-is-possible/section/561c45d2-9442-42d5-9938-f8c9e2aafcfc#ch02>, an alternate avatar used by K. Wayne Yang, Yang’s work transgresses the line between scholarship and community, as evidenced by his involvement in urban education and community organizing. He was the co-founder of the Avenues Project, a non-profit youth development organization, and also the co-founder of East Oakland Community High School. He also worked in school system reform as part of Oakland Unified School District’s Office of School Reform. An accomplished educator, Dr. Yang has taught high school in Oakland, California for over 15 years and received the Academic Senate Distinguished Teaching Award in 2010. His research focuses on the role of youth popular culture and pedagogy in the emergence of social movements. He is currently writing a book, *Organizing the Common Sense: Popular Culture and Urban School Reform*, which examines strategies for organizing in education across three landscapes: youth, community, and bureaucracy. \*Sometimes he writes as la paperson, an avatar that irregularly calls, as in the article, “The postcolonial ghetto: Seeing her shape and his hand” Note – there’s a lot of stuff about the settler that uses the word “he” – this is intentionally left in, because in this book and some other works Paperson/Yang makes it clear that their conception of the settler isn’t a “man” but a hyper-masculinized subject, whereas indigeneity represents more of both the feminine and the non-gendered. I thought a lot about changing the pronouns in this card actually but decided against it just to maintain the scholarly views of Paperson/Yang. If you read like the Tickner shit or whatever the g-lang cards popular these days are like just fuck you.) zeph

The Second University Critiques **The second world university**, like Second Cinema, **is marked by** its **investments in critical theory**, that is, the diverse work of the Frankfurt School **in critiquing media and capitalist systems** in the “West” that emerged out of World War II. Two threads of critical theory run through academia in the arts and humanities, on one hand, and the social sciences, on the other. Literary critical theory focuses on the deconstruction of texts for their underlying meanings, whereas social theory focuses on domination within social systems, usually from a neo-Marxist frame. At least ideologically, the second world university is **committed to the transformation of society** through critique, **through** a **deconstruction** of systems of power, and in this way offers fundamental analyses for any third world university curriculum. **Yet its hidden curriculum reflects the material conditions of higher education—fees, degrees, expertise, and the presumed emancipatory possibilities of the mind—and reinscribes academic accumulation**. Usually, when traditionalists speak with nostalgia for the idealized university of old, the library counter in the sky where Kant and Hegel and Freire study together, this is the second world university. We are familiar with it; in the United States, it often houses the Marxist scholars, the ethnic studies formations, women’s studies, gender studies, and American studies. To borrow some rhetoric from Gayatri Spivak, **it is** the house of the hegemonic radical, **the postcolonial ghetto neighborhood within the university metropolis**. One of **the tautological traps** of the second world university **is mistaking its personalized pedagogy of self-actualization for decolonial transformation**. When people say “another university is possible,” they are more precisely saying that “a second university is possible,” and they are often imagining second world utopias, where the professor ceases to profess, where hierarchies disappear, where all personal knowledges are special, and, in other words, none are. **Their assumption is that** people will “naturally” produce freedom, and **freedom’s doppelganger is critical consciousness. They are rarely talking about a university that rematriates land, that disciplines scholar-warriors rather than “liberating” its students, that repurposes the industrial machinery, that supports insurrectionary nationalisms as problematic antidotes to imperialist nationalism, that acts upon financial systems rather than just critiquing them**, that helps in the accumulation of third world power rather than simply disavowing first world power, that is a school-to-community pipeline, not a community-to-school pipeline. In short, “another university is possible,” so far, hasn’t made possible a third world university. The second world university announces itself through nostalgia. Sara Ahmed describes this as “an academic world [that] can be idealised in being mourned as a lost object; a world where dons get to decide things; a world imagined as democracy, as untroubled by the whims and wishes of generations to come.” This nostalgia can be futuristic, indeed, **the dons** are **imagin**ing themselves **a** permanent future in a **white academic pantheon. This is** similar to **settler futurity**, which is always nostalgic for its own current power, fearful that it may come to pass. The second world university is a pedagogical utopia. Its horizons are still total in that its end goal is a utopia that everyone should and can attend. **This liberal expansion rests materially on the continued accumulation of fees, debt, and land by its big baby turned big baby daddy, the first world university**.

**The settler project is never completely until blackness and indigeneity are eradicated entirely. Outer Space is the newest Manifest Destiny. As the International Space Station Said, “We have a manifest destiny to go into space and to find new worlds to live in” It is just the next step in the path for the white utopia’s completion.**

https://www.facebook.com/ISS/videos/1246350118731250/

**Smiles 20** (Deondre Smiles, bachelor’s degree in Geography (2013) from Saint Cloud State University, my master’s degree in Global Indigenous Studies (2016) from the University of Minnesota-Duluth, and my Ph.D. in Geography (2020) from The Ohio State University. Chair of the Indigenous Peoples Specialty Group of the American Association of Geographers (AAG), member of the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA), and the Canadian Association of Geographers. (CAG). "The Settler Logics of (Outer) Space" October 26th 2020. <https://www.societyandspace.org/articles/the-settler-logics-of-outer-space>.) zeph

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. 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:

**Part Two is Education**

**We advocate for Diplomacy in the Undercommons – this is a space of unintelligibility beyond the settler gaze. The Undercommons is an orientation towards counter-insurgency and fugitivity which is illegible to University itself.**

**Rifkin 19** (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 ‘Fictions of Land and Flesh: Blackness, Indigeneity, Specuation.” Cut straight from the Google Book August 23rd 2019 pages 168-170) zeph

In the past several chapters, I've attended to figurations of fungibility, fugitivity, and marronage in Afrofuturist writing, addressing the ways these prominent tropes of Black political imagination shape readers' apprehension of the contours, trajectories, and potentials of blackness, as well as the continuing force of antiblackness. I've also traced how these framings translate indigeneity: especially in terms of place-based peoplehood. These text’s **critical speculative relations to** dominant **understandings of race and racism**, their **effort to reorient** visions of **justice away from** individual inclusion into **(neo)liberal citizenship, helps prompt** my **analysis of** their experiments in engaging with **Indigenous difference and the impasses that arise** in those efforts. **These narratives** help **highlight how conceptual and perceptual frameworks affect** ways of engaging across **difference**, and in this way, **they** also **point to the importance**, in Marisol de la Cadena's terms, **of** "**probing** the **translation** process **itself to make** its **onto-epistemic terms explicit**" **in order to facilitate sustained relations among Black and Indigenous writings. Bearing such dynamics in mind**, I'd like to return to where I began in the Introduction—the scene of attempted Black-Indigenous alliance—in order **to explore** further the **possibilities opened by** a **subjunctive** kind of **solidarity**. Such relations need not offer structural resolution so much as a more tentative, negotiated, and renewable connection, one conducted in the translational mood of might be. **We could call it diplomacy in the undercommons**. **Planning happens in relation to a horizon**. The effort **to come together** with respect to some joint project, including in enacting forms of solidarity, **involves more than** just the fact of **present interaction; it also entails** having **some** kind of orienting **direction toward** which **shared thought and activity** moves. As Sara Ahmed suggests, “**Depending on which way one turns, different worlds** might even **come into view**. If such turns are repeated over time, the bodies acquire the very shape of such direction.… [I]n moving this way, rather than that, and moving in this way again and again, the surfaces of bodies in turn acquire their shape. Bodies are ‘directed’ and they take the shape of this direction,” and she later notes of collective forms of turning that “**a ‘we’ emerges as an effect of a shared direction toward an object**.” In this vein**, alliance building might be understood as** the process of **turning in the same direction**, of forming a “we” through intentions and acts of movement making toward some mutual (set of) objective(s). **What happens**, though, **when those who** gather to **plan**, to be in sustained relation in ways that might bring into view and help materialize different worlds, themselves **emerge from “we”s that tend toward** different **objects**? In **The Undercommons**, Stefano Harney and Fred Moten **characterize planning as refusing the “compulsion of scarcity**” at play **in** projects of “**management,”** instead **conducting an “ongoing experiment with the informal**, carried out by and on the means of social reproduction”: “**planning in the undercommons is not an activity**, not fishing or dancing or teaching or loving, but the ceaseless “all politics is correctional,” in that **it seeks to engender forms of being** and becoming **conducive to** proper **inhabitance of** existing **institutional structures** (whose aim ostensibly is “to make us better”). **Being beyond politics** also **means** being **beyond** the search for **intelligibility** within its terms. Harney and Moten insist, “**We cannot represent ourselves. We can’t be represented**.” The “we” named here are those who dwell within the “undercommons,” **all those whose** ongoing **racialized “social dispossession” comprises state-backed** imperatives of extraction and **exploitation. To be outside** of **or illegible to representation is to refuse** to be a proper subject of **governance and capital** and to refuse to be judged as failing to be such a subject when not performing personhood correctly. The futurist fiction I’ve engaged theorizes various forms of such unrepresentability, or the force of state representation, as in Walter Mosley’s portrayal of the role of race-neutral modes of racialization within carceral geographies (addressed in chapter 3) or Melissa Tantaquidgeon Zobel’s and Stephen Graham Jones’s depictions of settler processes for officially acknowledging Indigenous land bases (discussed in chapter 4). The kind of **planning** Harney and Moten address, then, **involves less** a set of **shared political projects**—a direction toward a common object(ive) of change in which the “we” collectively gains coherence as a “we” through such communal movement—**than** shape of **matrices of relation outside** of **the** state **imperative to reproduce** officially recognized kinds and modes of **identity**. The notion of **the undercommons**, then, **enables** a thinking of **solidarity as a speculative endeavor**, something like a shared project of experimentation in which the potential for differently imagined futures distends the terms of relation in the present. Existing political and analytical frameworks as well as extant trajectories of collective direction come into disorienting conjuncture in ways that raise questions about what constitutes desirable “forms of life,” for whom, and how to negotiate among such visions and attendant kinds of “we”s without the presumption that there is or must be a shared horizon. **The “we” of the undercommons gestures toward** multiple, ongoing **dynamics of racializing abjection and expropriation** while **turning away from state** recognition or **representation**, and in doing so, Harney and Moten’s speculative vision opens onto exploration of the modes of relation at play in such noncohesive mutuality. In the absence of a singular identity or even a shared objective that provides the basis for collective self-understanding, what principles and processes guide connection, collaboration, and planning? Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang suggest that **among Black and Indigenous movements “the opportunities for solidarity lie in what is incommensurable rather than what is common across these efforts**,” further insisting on the need for a conception of “uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics.” When operating in the key of incommensurability, though, practices of engagement—of “ongoing experiment” with what constitutes ethical relation—become difficult to imagine. political movements entail when they offer varied accounts of the real and turn toward discrepant (visions of desirable) forms of life?

**Embracing the undercommons as praxis allows us to recenter our relationship to the land and education – that disrupts settler mentalities of control.**

**Ballantyne 14** (Erin Freeland Ballantyne, Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Oxford, Master’s degree in Science, Natural Society, and Environmental Policy from the University of Oxford, Bachelors in Development Economics and International Development. Dr. Freeland Ballantyne is a settler political ecologist born and raised on Yellowknives Dene Akaticho Treaty 8 Chief Drygeese Territory. Their research interests include settler decolonization, deschooling, participatory video research, petro-capitalism and land generated theory, pedagogy and practice. they facilitate the disruptions of settler colonial capitalism and space through facilitating intergenerational land-based university programming at Dechinta Bush University. “Mobilizing a Knowledge Economy of Reciprocity, Resurgance, and Decolonization” https://journals.scholarsportal.info/details/19298692/v03i0003/nfp\_dbumakeorrad.xml&sub=all January 2014, Pages 76-78) zeph

As the conversation of Dechinta grew, the ugly politics of education on a broad political scale quickly surfaced. It became clear that **education is** a domain of power and **privilege** that is **fiercely protected. Questions relating to** control over its content, production and **process were**, apparently, **not open for discussion. Curricula were** deeply homogenized, **deterritorialized** and standardized. Post-secondary in the territory was overtly geared toward training people for industry and the endless promise of mining, pipeline and oil and gas booms (and busts). People were either emphatically supportive of the notion of ‘Elders as professors’ being recognized as equals and collaborating with university professors, or incensed by its disruption of typical academic power. The creation of Dechinta was polarizing, and reactions were telling of the deeply embedded sense of entitlement and power that the state, and existing institutions, had over determining what did and did not count as ‘education’. Rather than support spaces where academic and Indigenous knowledge would overlap, **Indigenous knowledge was** viewed as curriculum that should be **relegated to ‘culture camps’**. That processes like hunting and moose-hide tanning could draw parallels, or even inform governance, consensus building and self-determination, continue to elude most mainstream reporters, critics and institutions. Coming back to the land is a battle. **‘Education’ on the land is a direct hit to the exoskeleton of continued colonial power**. By specifically **disrupting education as** a domain of **settler** colonial **control** to be deconstructed and re-imagined, Dechinta has **challenged** the most comprehensive, yet skilfully cloaked machine of settler colonial capitalism - the **prescriptive education** process, **which produces more settler colonial** bodies, **thinkers**, and believers. Building strong relationships of reciprocity with the land results in the crumbling of settler capitalism because it fundamentally shifts the relationships people experience and what they believe about who they are, how they are in relation to and with land, and what they believe to be true. Being together on the land, learning with the land, and having a strong relationship with the land is antithetical to settler capitalism itself. **The power of settler colonization relies on** the total **deterritorialization of** people’s relationship with **land**. Deleuze and Guattari’s (1972) work on deterritorialization, ‘the process whereby colonization leads not just to the loss of territory but also to **the destruction of** the **ontological** conditions of the colonized culture’s **territoriality**,’ is a fitting philosophical conjecture to Dene expressions of how they are dislocated from their relationships with land due to process of nation-building and capitalism, and how this deterritorialization **separates people from** practices with **the land** that keeps them healthy, even if they still live on the land (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 192; Hipwell, 2004, p. 304). As Said (1993) has stated: land, in the final instance, is what empire is about. In this way, our relationships with land are central to the great unsettling. **Reconnection**, and the exchange of skills, knowledge and practice **with land**, thus directly threaten the settler colonial project. It **removes bodies from** the **forces designed to encode the body** as capital. **The foremost space of enclosure**, of encoding, **is the ‘school’**. The ongoing trend in Indigenous and Northern settler education since its earliest colonial intrusion has been to train Indigenous bodies to serve the needs of industry. Education has happened in Denendeh since time immemorial. It has been the settler prerogative to dismantle Indigenous ways of knowing and being, of education. Returning learning to an intergenerational exchange, on the land - which has at its very core the fundamental teachings that, if we take care of the land, the land takes care of us - will shake the foundation of settler colonization by breaking the dependency that has been created on capitalism through deterritorialization. Transformational learning supports intergenerational learners and teachers to think critically and re-imagine what the purpose of learning is. Learning on the land is healing and being in community on the land is challenging, pulling our attention to the hard work of decolonization. The year after our initial gathering, Dechinta launched a pilot semester with three courses nested within an interdisciplinary approach. Student evaluations of the program indicated it was profoundly ‘transformative’, and was for some the first ‘safe space’ of education that they had encountered (Luig et al, 2011). Interdisciplinary and collaborative, the pilot set the stage for the following four years. Dechinta now has 8 original courses, and a two semester-long program growing into a full degree that operates from -50 winters to the steamy height of summer. The challenges have been substantial. Conflict between academics and Indigenous students have made real the tensions of working on decolonization in concert, even with those who identify, or who are identified as allies. Solving conflict and difficulties through shared governance circles, while combating ingrained reactions of lateral violence and other social expressions codified in settler colonization are truly challenging, but deeply rewarding. Through the building of relationships we have a growing cohort of faculty dedicated to not just teaching but sharing in the creation of safe spaces, where the hard mental work of **decolonizing in theory is met with the even harder work of decolonizing as practice. When students** and faculty **create** a community where their **relationships are ordered through** their relationships with **land**, the work of **decolonization move from** a discussion in **theory to** practice of being and becoming **a source of decolonial power**. At Dechinta we debate this, and experiment with its meaning in tangible ways. Here, skills categorized as ‘subsistence’ or ‘arts and crafts’ are fundamental in forming and understanding theory. Such practices are themselves theory in action.

**The Role of the Ballot and Judge is to disrupt settler subjectivity.**

**The only ethical jurisdiction we have is to interrupt our own subjecthood – vote aff to force confrontation with the settler imaginary – only disruption of the psychic attachments within settler colonialism can break down it’s structures. This is an apriori issue – we must forefront the consideration of how the knowledge that we create in round shapes the world.**

**Henderson 15** (Phil Henderson, Bachelor’s in Political Science from University of Western Ontario. Masters in Political Science from University of Victoria. Henderson’s research focuses on the intersections of settler colonialism and neoliberalism; in particular, how these regimes co-constitute and reinforce one another. His ongoing research investigates the growing sense of settler anger in the age of neoliberal restructuring and the ways in which this anger deepens settler investments in processes of colonial (dis)possession. Predominantly, his research focuses on the territories of the Saugeen Anishinaabek, also known as the south-western Ontario riding of Bruce-Grey-Owen Sound where he and his family live as settlers. Imagoed Communities: The Psychosocial Space of Settler Colonialism" October 21st 2015, Pages 12-13) zeph

Goeman writes as an explicit challenge to other indigenous peoples, but this holds true to settler-allies as well, **that decolonization must include an analysis of the dominant ‘self-disciplining colonial subject’**. However, as this discussion of subjective precarity demonstrates, the degree of to which these disciplinary or phenomenological processes are complete should not be overstated. For settler-allies must also examine and cultivate the ways in which settler subjects fail to be totally disciplined. Evidence of this incompletion is apparent in the subject’s arrested state of development. **Discovering the instability at the core of the settler subject,** indeed of all subjects, is the central conceit of psychoanalysis. This exception of at least partial failure to fully subjectivize the settler is also what sets my account apart from Rifkin’s. His phenomenology falls into the trap that Jacqueline Rose observes within many sociological accounts of the subject: that of assuming a successful internalization of norms. From the psychoanalytical perspective, the ‘unconscious constantly reveals the “failure”’ of internalization. As we have seen, **within settler subjects this can be** expressed as an **irrational anxiety** that expresses itself **whenever** **a settler is confronted with** the facts regarding **their colonizing status**. Under conditions of total subjectification, such charges ought to be unintelligible to the settler. Thus, the process of subject formation is always in slippage and never totalized as others might suggest.75 Because of this precarity, the settler subject is prone to violence and lashing out; but **the subject in slippage** also **provides an avenue by which** the process of **settler colonialism can be subverted – creating cracks in a phantasmatic wholeness which can be opened wider**. Breakages of this sort offer an opportunity to pursue what Paulette Regan calls a ‘restorying’ of settler colonial history and culture, to decanter settler mythologies built upon and within the dispossession of indigenous peoples. The **cultivation of** these **cracks is** a necessary **part of decolonizing** work, **as it continues to** **panic and thus to destabilize settler subjects. Resistance to settler colonialism** does not occur only in highly visible moments like the famous conflict at Kanesatake and Kahnawake, it also **occurs in reiterative and disruptive practices**, presences**, and speech acts**. Goeman correctly observes that the ‘**repetitive practices of everyday life’** are what **give settler spaces** their **meaning**, as they provide a degree of naturalness to the settler imago and its psychic investments.78 As such, **to disrupt the ease of these repetitions is at once to striate radically the otherwise smooth spaces of settler colonialism and also to disrupt the easy (re)production of the settler subject**. Goeman calls these subversive acts the ‘micro-politics of resistance’, which historically took the form of ‘moving fences, not cooperating with census enumerators, sometimes disrupting survey parties’ amongst other process.79 These acts panic the subject that is disciplined as a product of settler colonial power, by **forcing encounters with** the sovereign **indigenous peoples** that were **imagined to be gone**. This **reveals to the settler,** if only fleetingly, **the violence that** founds and **sustains the settler colonial relationship**. While such practices may not overthrow the settler colonial system, they do subvert its logics by insistently drawing attention to the ongoing presence of indigenous peoples who refuse erasure. Today, we can draw similar inspiration from the variety of tactics used in movements like Idle No More. From flash mobs in major malls, to round dances that block city streets, and even projects to rename Toronto locations, Idle No More is engaged in a series of micro-political projects across Turtle Island.80 The micro-politics of the movement strengthen indigenous subjects and their spatialities, while leaving an indelible imprint in the settler psyche. Predictably, rage and resentment were provoked in some settlers;81 however, Idle No More also drew thousands of settler-allies into the streets and renewed conversations about the necessity of nation-to-nation relationships. With settler colonial spaces disrupted and a relationship of domination made impossible to ignore, in the tradition of centuries of indigenous resistance, Idle No More put the settler subject into serious flux once more. Settler colonialism has been distinguished from colonialism proper by what Wolfe calls its ‘logic of elimination’, which requires the erasure of indigenous peoples from the colonized territory. This is accomplished through a variety of mechanisms that range from outright violence to policies of gradual elimination. Ultimately, **settler colonialism is perpetuated** through a double move: **to erase indigenous peoples and then to disappear settlers by naturalizing the violence inherent their existence in colonized territory**. This is accomplished through the production of spatialities bereft of indigeneity. Out of this spatial logic, **an imago of settler society** is produced that bi**nds** settlers both psychically and socially to each other and **to** the **colonized spaces. The** continual **(re)production of a settler** colonial **imago is necessary to secure the** psychic horizons of the **settler subject**; it is also inextricably bound up with an insatiable need to constantly renew the erasure of indigenous peoples. Thus, in order to secure its continued survival as a subject, the settler must always strive to maintain the conditions of settler colonialism. **Total erasure of indigeneity is the grotesque desire of the settler that must be constantly disrupted**. Where indigenous peoples have persisted as an insurgent presence in the settler imago, they are always already threatening this disruption of the settler subject at its very core. For **while** the affirmation of **indigeneity can induce** **panic**, and subsequently rage, **in the settler, it** also **opens a crack within** the imago – that is, within **the** settler **subject** itself – **through which** an ethic of **decolonization can emerge**. While it seems that settler colonialism is propelled by a tightly circuitous movement of subject formation, projection, and (re)formation, the presence of indigenous peoples in ongoing and sovereign relationship with the land serves as a powerful blockage of to the smoothness of this process.

**We must adopt an ethic that is willing to risk everything in order to form the ethical subjectivities that are actually oriented towards a world without settler colonialism.**

**Pinkard 13,** Lynice Pinkard, “Revolutionary Suicide: Risking Everything to Transform Society and Live Fully”, Tikkun 2013 Volume 28, Number 4: 31-41, http://tikkun.dukejournals.org/content/28/4/31.full]

I’d like to present an alternative to conventional identity politics, one that requires that we understand the way that capitalism itself has grown out of a very particular kind of identity politics — white supremacy — aimed at securing “special benefits” for one group of people. It is not sufficient to speak only of identities of race, class, and gender. I believe we must also speak of identities in relation to domination. To what extent does any one of us identify with the forces of domination and participate in relations that reinforce that domination and the exploitation that goes with it? In what ways and to what extent are we wedded to our own upward mobility, financial security, good reputation, and ability to “win friends and influence people” in positions of power? Or conversely, do we identify (not wish to identify or pretend to identify but actually identify by putting our lives on the line) **with efforts to reverse patterns of domination, empower people on the margins (even when we are not on the margins ourselves),** and seek healthy, sustainable relations? When we consider our identities in relation to domination, **we realize the manifold ways in which we have structured our lives and desires in support of the very economic and social system that is dominating us**. To shake free of this cycle, **we need to embrace a radical break from business as usual.** We need to commit revolutionary suicide. By this I mean not the killing of our bodies but the destruction of our attachments to security, status, wealth, and power. These attachments **prevent us from becoming spiritually and politically** **alive. They prevent us from changing the violent structure of the society in which we live.** Revolutionary suicide means living out our commitments, **even when that means risking death**. When Huey Percy Newton, the cofounder of the Black Panther Party, called us to “revolutionary suicide,” it appears that he was making the same appeal as Jesus of Nazareth, who admonished, “Those who seek to save their lives will lose them, and those who lose their lives for the sake of [the planet] will save them.” Essentially, both movement founders are saying the same thing. **Salvation is not an individual matter. It entails saving, delivering, rescuing an entire** **civilization**. This cannot be just another day at the bargain counter. The salvation of an entire planet **requires a total risk of everything** — of you, of me, of unyielding people everywhere, for all time. This is what revolutionary suicide is. The cost of revolutionary change is **people’s willingness to pay with their own lives**. This is what Rachel Corrie knew when she, determined to prevent a Palestinian home in Rafah from being demolished**, refused to move and was killed by an Israeli army bulldozer in the Gaza Strip**. This is what Daniel **Ellsberg knew when he made public the Pentagon Papers.** It’s what Oscar Schindler knew when he rescued over 1,100 Jews from Nazi concentration camps, what subversive Hutus knew when they risked their lives to rescue Tutsis in the Rwandan genocide. This call may sound extreme at first, but **an unflinching look at the structure of our society reveals why nothing less is enough**. Before returning to the question of revolutionary suicide and what it might mean in each of our lives, let’s look at what we’re up against.

**Settlers have an obligation to center indigenous people and scholarship within academic settings. Settlers can either take up this role or collude with colonialism.**

**Carlson 16** (Elizabeth Carlson, PhD, is an Aamitigoozhi, Wemistigosi, and Wasicu (settler Canadian and American), whose Swedish, Saami, German, Scots-Irish, and English ancestors have settled on lands of the Anishinaabe and Omaha Nations which were unethically obtained by the US government. Elizabeth lives on Treaty 1 territory, the traditional lands of the Anishinaabe, Nehiyawak, Dakota, Nakota, and Red River Metis peoples currently occupied by the city of Winnipeg, the province of Manitoba, (2016): Anti-colonial methodologies and practices for settler colonial studies, Settler Colonial Studies, DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1241213) zeph

According to Kuokkanen, ‘In the academy, Indigenous epistemes need to be recognized as a gift according to the principles of responsibility and reciprocity [...] the gift of indigenous epistemes must be acknowledged through reciprocation.’56 Settler colonial studies and anti-colonial **settler scholars owe a huge debt to Indigenous oral and academic scholarship and to traditions of activism**. Not only has our scholarship (hopefully) been built on the foundation of Indigenous anti-colonial oral and academic scholarship, the content of our work is also dependent on the historical and contemporary presence of the suffering of Indigenous peoples under settler colonialism. As we research, write, publish, gain academic positions and promotions, we are benefiting from Indigenous dispossession. **How can we show reciprocity in light of this debt**? de Leeuw, Greenwood, and Lindsay note the heavy demands on Indigenous scholars in the academy: ‘many Indigenous faculty experience extraordinary, specific, and unique demands for supervision and support of Indigenous students and related university service (representation on committees, partici- pation in initiatives, consultation, etc.)’.57 These demands interfere with having time to focus on the types of scholarly achievements that would advance their careers. Leanne Simpson notes the rarely recognized ‘real and symbolic normalized violence’ and coercion that has ‘meant individual sacrifice for Indigenous women in order to obtain the creden- tials necessary to make the academy less violent toward the next group of Indigenous people coming through the system’.58 Simpson suggests that restitution is owed by the academy for its colonizing impacts, which would require that it make ‘a conscious decision to become a decolonizing force in the intellectual lives of Indigenous peoples by joining us in dismantling settler colonialism and actively protecting the source of our knowledge–- Indigenous land’.59