

Introduction

“The *guerrero del amor* becomes a warrior lover who understands struggle and battle as expressions of commitment, loyalty, sharing of self—a selflessness that is not sacrifice but fulfillment through collectivity.”

—James & Gordon (2008)

The past ten years have ushered in extraordinary change. When I first wrote *Red Pedagogy*, the field of Native American and Indigenous studies was still emerging, critiques of capitalism were generally relegated to the radical left, and theorizations of the United States as empire were both forestalled and animated by the events of September 11. But as the vicissitudes of settler colonialism, amplified through neoliberalism, increasingly came to condition both life and death, so too has the counter-hegemonic blowback.

According to a recent study, the number of global protests against domination has steadily and significantly increased, moving from fifty-nine in 2006 to 112 protests in the first six months of 2013 alone. The Arab Spring, *Indignados*, Occupy Wall Street, and Idle No More movements, among others, helped to revive faith in direct action as an effective and integral component of resistance, perhaps emboldening more recent collective uprisings around #BlackLivesMatter and #ICantBreathe.

Such on-the-ground struggles have been anticipated and supported by corresponding surges in intellectual critique. Treatises on empire, imperialism, settler, and other colonialisms are no longer relegated to the margins of academic discourse and have become central to a variety of fields and disciplines. As a result, the landscape has shifted significantly since I wrote *Red Pedagogy*, with new and revived synergies between scholarship and activism pushing deeper considerations of the limits of liberal theories and discourses. More specifically, within Native American and Indigenous studies,¹ a new subfield of critical Indigenous studies (CIS) has emerged wherein CIS schol-

ars undertake (Western) critical theory as a means of “unmapping” the structures, processes, and discourses of settler colonialism at the same time they use it to disrupt and redirect the matrix of presuppositions that underlie it (Byrd, 2011).²

Such “unmappings” have compelled examinations of self-formation, governance, and political power; normative conceptions of justice; the articulation of Indigenous structures within the grammar of empire (i.e., sovereignty, nationhood, recognition); the dialectics between governance and economic systems (i.e., capitalism, socialism, nonmonetized systems of reciprocity); and the relationship between settler colonialism, patriarchy, and heteronormativity (Grande & Nichols, 2014).

In education, the relationship between on-the-ground struggles and the broader intellectual life of the field is more tenuous but strengthening. While anti-testing and anti-privatization movements (e.g., Opt Out and Save Our Schools) have proliferated in response to the intensification of neoliberal reform efforts aimed at restructuring schools to be “more conducive” to capital,³ principal academic organizations and editorial outlets hold fast to liberal discourses and modes of educational research.⁴ Such liberal stances of “neutrality” do more to legitimate than disrupt the fundamental assumptions of the reform agenda: that teachers are inadequate and public schools are failing. While the discipline of critical pedagogy remains a perennial site of contestation, it is still marginalized within the broader field of education. Although this could be an indicator of the continued hegemony of dominant educational discourses, it could also mean that what was once considered “radical” analyses from old-school leftists has become more integral to a more general grammar of critique shared among sub-fields and disciplines. In other words, if critical pedagogy has plateaued as a *discrete* field of study, it could be because a broader range of disciplines is undertaking its logics and analytics.

Perhaps the greatest divide between on-the-ground-struggle and research remains in the field of Native American education. The primary reasons for this are essentially the same as they were a decade ago: the relentless pressure to address the more immediate sociopolitical urgencies of communities is given precedence over engagement with theory (Grande, 2004, p. 2). Moreover, significant decreases in state and federal funding have imposed an even greater reliance on corporate funding sources (e.g., Gates, Walton, Teach for America) with neoliberal agendas attached. That being said, undertakings of critical theory are still more present than they were ten years ago, particularly in the articulation of Indigenous (and decolonial) research methodologies.⁵

LOVE'S LABORS LOST

Given recent developments, I am truly grateful to have this opportunity to revisit and (re)vision my work alongside a deeper field of critical Indigenous scholarship as well as in a moment when the violence of the settler state is more widely visible and questioned. That being said, when the idea of publishing a tenth anniversary edition was first presented to me, I was reticent. I wrote *Red Pedagogy* as a young scholar—and by young I don't mean in terms of age or professional rank but rather in terms of experience.⁶ To be clear, my reticence is not about the quality of my words or ideas (I stand by them) but rather about the culture of academia in which they were undertaken—too fast and too soon. Over the past ten years, I have come to an even deeper realization of how academia objectifies knowledge (and authorship) as a pre-condition of its commodification and reification, both of which serve the broader project of corporatization.

More specifically, following the publication of *Red Pedagogy* I was quickly and unexpectedly positioned as an “authority” in the field, inundated by a profusion of invitations to speak in a variety of communities, most of which were not my own. Generally speaking, authority and public voice in Indigenous communities emerge alongside age and experience; the young are expected to cultivate listening skills while elders are ceded both the actual and metaphorical floor.

The basic understanding is that because history, experience, and (institutional) memory matter, “new” and young knowledge is to be met with caution and restraint while important “teachings” are learned from elders and ancestors whose voices serve as important fetters for the intemperance of youth. Thus, as I started to make the rounds of the academic circuit, I became increasingly troubled by the experience of being positioned to assume a voice-too-public-and-bold-for-its-experience. As I gathered my wits about me, I started to begin talks with an acknowledgments section that ended with the statement, “and to any elders present today, I ask your forgiveness for speaking so boldly and out of turn.”

While such a gesture helped to assuage a modicum of discomfort, it did nothing to address the more structural and systematic erasures at play. In particular, as an arm of the settler state, one of the many ways that the academy refracts colonial logics is through the overvaluing of “young” and individual voices and the undervaluing of elder and collective voices.⁷ And, in a system that overvalues “new” knowledge, fast productivity, and solitary thinking, paradigms of connection, mutuality, and collectivity are inevitably undermined.

The distinction between Indigenous and settler protocols around public voice (as well as author and authorship) mark the edges of the binary that colonial logics seek to eliminate: *the difference between subjectivities pro-*

duced in and through relationship to land and those produced under and through significations of property. Thus, in the following sections, I engage in a deeper theorization of the relationship between the academy and settler logics. More specifically, I apply the work of CIS scholars developing analyses of Indigenous-state relations to theorize the relationship between the academy and settler logics. Specifically, theorizations of the politics of *reconciliation*, *recognition*, and *refusal* are employed as frameworks for articulating the academy as a space where capitalist social relations and modes of production (particularly of knowledge) are reconstituted within the academy. Beginning with a short history, I discuss the role of *reconciliation*- and *recognition*-based politics in maintaining the hegemony of the settler academy as well as of *refusal* to help imagine alter-Native modes of participation.

THE PERILS OF ACADEMIC RECOGNITION AND RECONCILIATION

From the beginning, Euro-American cupidities were so enmeshed that every attempt to “civilize” was one to Christianize, and every effort to Christianize, one to capital-ize. At stake were not only the bounty of minds and souls for Christ but also the currency—the property—that the primitive accumulation of Red bodies signified for the state. Education became the nexus between these capitalist and religious missions, manifesting the campaign to “kill the Indian and save the man” under the auspices of schooling and the establishment of universities. It wasn’t long before investment in Indian education became the subtext for the appropriation of Indian land.⁸

Axtell (1985) writes, “underwriting an educational institution with a potentially long corporate life” appealed to the settler class as they “who had never seen an Indian felt comfortable in contributing to schools that promised to solve America’s native problem in a relatively inexpensive and appropriately civilized way” (p. 216). Ironically, despite centuries of state sanctioned programs to “civilize” Indians through schooling, a report issued in 1932 found that only fifty-two American Indian students had earned college degrees and fewer than five institutions offered scholarships to Native students (Szasz, 1974, p. 135).

While, on one level, this could be understood as an effect of Native resistance or refusal, my central concern here is the material cost of this calculus. Specifically, given the number of schools founded on Indian land, with Indian money, or monies earmarked for Indian services, the sheer paucity of Native students and graduates vividly illustrates the historical materialist relationship between the academy and Indigenous dispossession.

It wasn’t until the late twentieth century that the university sought to *reconcile* this history by incrementally shifting its strategies and apparatuses

to “include” Native peoples, extending “opportunity” through liberal and assimilative discourses of respect, mutuality, and tolerance. The appeal of *reconciliationary* discourses is that they occlude the need and forestall demands for structural change through the strategic deployment of performative acts of “healing” and “unity.” For example, an institution can effectively display an ethic of multicultural tolerance by celebrating Native American Heritage month while at the same time resisting more structural changes (i.e., hire more Native faculty or repatriate the Indigenous lands upon which the campus is undoubtedly constructed). Though perhaps preferred to explicit forms of exclusion, models of *reconciliation* are not only insufficient but ultimately serve as “transits” of settler authority and continued domination (Byrd, 2011). That is, they fail because they are “always already conceived through the prior disavowed and misremembered colonization of indigenous lands that cannot be ended by further inclusion or more participation” (Byrd, 2011, p. xxvi).

Similar to models of reconciliation are *recognition*-based models that “seek to overcome the colonial character” of Indigenous-settler (state) relations by “recognizing and affirming the value of Aboriginal cultural identities” and their distinctive forms of governance and political formation (Coulthard, 2003, p. 2). While still undergirded by the liberal discourses of the modernist state, self-determination enacted via the politics of recognition has effected some substantive outcomes, securing various entitlements for Native nations including land claims (e.g., *Joint Tribal Council of the Passamaquoddy Tribe v Morton*, 528 F.2d 370 1st Cir. 1975), reparations (e.g., *Cobell v Salazar*), and Indigenous “rights” (e.g., United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples).

Despite these achievements and the overall aim of *recognition* to fetter the damage of *nonrecognition* (or *misrecognition* as noted by Taylor, 2004), such models ultimately sustain colonial systems of power and undermine Indigenous sovereignty by keeping intact the asymmetric relations of power whereby the dominant agent (settler state) retains the authority to “recognize” the subjugated polity (Indigenous peoples).⁹ Moreover, Wolfe (1999) cautions against the collateral and dilatory effects of “inducements” gained via the politics of recognition. He writes, “from the treaty era onwards Indigenous peoples have been subjected to a recurrent cycle of inducements” (e.g., allotments, citizenship, tribal enrollment) “each of which has sought to present domination as empowerment” and thereby assist Natives’ consent to their own dispossession” (p. 259).

Coulthard (2007) similarly warns against the effects of inducements, particularly as they result in economic gains for individuals. He argues that when recognition is granted through mainstream forms of economic development, it inheres the potential for creating a “new elite of Aboriginal capital-

ists” whose “thirst for profit” comes to “outweigh their ancestral obligations” (p. 452).

As an arm of the settler state, the academy similarly traffics through a “cycle of inducements”—prestigious grants, awards, titles, and endowments—that proffer “domination as empowerment.” The thirst for such forms of (academic) recognition drives a culture of competition and self-promotion that mirrors the broader “inducements” of settler colonialism and “seductions of empire” (Agathangelou, Bassichis, and Spira, 2008). The danger of academic inducement is not just the cultivation of individualism or creation of an “Aboriginal elite” but also the engendering of an academic arms race that misrepresents the (fast) production of knowledge as “progress” or worse as a transit for intellectual imperialism. Thus, as understood within the broader context of the settler project, academic recognition refracts the colonialist logics of “remove to replace” (slow for fast, old for new, aged for young), that ultimately serves to obscure the violence and material effects of epistemicide (Wolfe, 1999).

THE POSSIBILITIES OF ACADEMIC REFUSAL

In working past and through the aporias of reconciliation and recognition, scholars of CIS have advanced theorizations of *refusal*—a politics that Garland (2013) defines as “the negation of that which negates us” (p. 375). The logic of *refusal* is “less oriented around attaining an affirmative form of recognition from the settler-state and society, and more about critically reevaluating, reconstructing and redeploying culture and tradition in ways that seek to refigure . . . a radical alternative to the structural and psycho-affective facets of colonial domination” (Coulthard, 2007, p. 456).

For example, Gómez-Barris (2012) theorizes the hunger strikes staged by the Mapuche peoples for the return of their lands as acts of refusal: “As extreme bodily performance and political instantiation, the Mapuche starving body literally enacts the condition of precariousness, specifying the meanings of social death for indigenous peoples living within a state of permanent war” (p. 120). Coulthard (2007) and Alfred and Cornthassel (2005) similarly take up *refusal* as a pre-condition to (or in dialectical relationship with) the political project of Indigenous resurgence.

Within the field of Indigenous research, Simpson (2011) theorizes *refusal* and sovereignty at the “level of method and representation,” exposing the colonialist underpinnings of the (academic) “demand to know” as an instantiation of settler logic. She posits *ethnographic refusal* as a stance/space wherein Indigenous subjects limit access to be known (p. 73). Mignolo (2011) and Quijano (1992) similarly take up *refusal* in relation to knowledge formation. Specifically, they assert Indigenous knowledge as a space of *epi-*

temic disobedience that is “delinked” from Western, liberal, capitalist understandings of “knowledge as production” or as a search for newness. They write, “Indigenous knowledges take us to a different place” and beginning—not just a “new temporality within the same space” but to an alternative site of “struggle and building” that represents an actual “paradigmatic break” (p. 45).

Understood as a radical assertion of sovereignty, the act of “refusal” is threatening to the settler state and thereby dangerous for the Indigenous subject—Native peoples worldwide continue to be “disappeared” or murdered at disproportionate rates. While the sanctions for “refusal” in the academy are not about life and death, “refusal” to comply with the normative publish-perish, tenure-promotion disciplinary strategies can lead to increased marginalization, exploitation, and job loss as well as decreased funding. And, in a system where Indigenous scholars comprise less than 1 percent of the professorate, such consequences not only bear hardships for individuals but also whole communities.

Nevertheless, the material gains accessed through reconciliatory and recognition agendas have even deeper costs and consequences. As Byrd (2011) reminds us, the colonization of Indigenous lands, bodies, and minds will not be ended by “further inclusion or more participation” (Byrd, 2011, p. xxvi). Indeed, particularly in this moment of a metastasizing settler state, I believe it is incumbent upon each and every one of us to refuse, reimagine, and rearticulate assimilative logics in all of their (low and high intensity) forms.

ACADEMIC SURVIVANCE

The inspirational work of critical scholars and community activists has compelled me to think hard about this anniversary edition, to carefully weigh the options. Undertaken as a form of recognition, it could take the form of a commemorative text, following the usual protocol of updating the core chapters while adding a new introduction and conclusion. Given the tenor of times and urgings of the field, this approach seemed counter-productive if not antithetical to the overall project. Alternatively, in the spirit of refusal, I could have simply turned down the opportunity, letting the text fade into respectable obscurity. While I seriously considered this option, the opportunity presented itself just as my mom (Ona) herself began to fade—and, something about the juxtaposition of these events seemed important—to not let go, to hold tightly, to come to terms.

Within this context, I decided to capture the moment as an opportunity to delink the tenth anniversary of *Red Pedagogy* from the politics of recognition and reimagine it as a project of both refusal and renewal. Specifically, in refusal of the solitary, “expert” voice, this edition presents a collectivity of

students and scholars, each of who are contributing from across a variety of fields and subject positions to the field of critical Indigenous studies. Moreover in refusal of an essentialist identity politics and as a means of refracting the diversity of voices that currently populate the field of critical Indigenous studies, essays were solicited from Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars. Specifically, rather than write an updated and revised text that would capture the shifts in the field and the broader socio-political conditions of settler society and Indigenous communities, I decided to leave the original text intact, an invite scholars doing work in each area (i.e., history, governance, Indigenous feminism etc.) to write response essays that would, “engage, extend, critique, speak back to, and intensify the contents of the chapters and, thus, the book overall.” The text of the original invitation read as follows:

Part of my initial motivation for writing *Red Pedagogy* was to address the lack of interchange between critical theorists and Indigenous scholars, particularly in the field of education. I intended to start a conversation. This Anniversary Edition is an effort to model that conversation, demonstrating that the field is now deep and broad enough to sustain internal critique. In particular, while the text continues to reflect my major intellectual commitments, I wrote it straight out of graduate school and my thoughts have matured since then. Also, ten years ago, the field of critical Indigenous studies had yet to be established and now it is burgeoning and supported by a number of new organizations and journals. *The time is ripe for this work to be revisited*. My hope is that as a collective we can write in refusal of Manichean academic logic that either confuses condemnatory discourse or substitutes sycophantic praise for critique, committing instead to engage, extend, trouble, speak back to, and intensify the text, building a deep, sustained and critical dialogue that engages in the analysis of ideas. Toward this end, I offer up my own words and their understood limitations for your consideration and rigorous engagement.

I am honored that so many agreed to think alongside me. Gathering this particular assemblage has made me think of the potential of constituting a more permanent body, perhaps writing under and through a *nom de guerre* (similar to the Combahee River Collective). That is, if furthering Indigenous resurgence (not individual recognition) is indeed paramount, then the more radical refusal would be to write together as one, enacting a kind of Zapatismo scholarship, a *balacava* politics of concealment, where the work of the collectivity transcends the one; voice, body, life. Until then, I offer this collectivity of Indigenous and non-Indigenous voices working to “unmap” the structures, processes and discourses of settler colonialism.

Responses begin with Muryam Yataco’s preface-as-offering which customarily prepares the ground upon which we write. Prayers and acknowledgements typically precede work in Indigenous communities to ensure that it is undertaken in a blessing way. The first section of the text, the architecture or “bones” as Peter McLaren writes, is reinforced by the work of four estab-

lished scholars. John Tippeconnic opens with a gracious but firm reminder that if the work of critical Indigenous studies is to matter, that scholars will need to make deeper and more sustained connections with those on the front lines of struggle, particularly students and teachers. John’s contribution reflects ongoing conversations in the field that call attention to the need to work with communities, that raise questions about the need for interlocutors, and/or the responsibility of scholars to write for multiple audiences. Next, Alysha Goldstein extends the discourse by re-mapping the “terrain of struggle” through a careful consideration of the more recent and important court cases that continue to frame (which is to say mitigate) Indigenous sovereignty and their subsequent analyses. In so doing, Goldstein reminds of the importance of grounding the undertaking of *settler colonialism* and *decolonization* (in both in theory and practice) in the “specificity, social etymology, and complex genealogies of the terms.” The second chapter, “Competing Moral Visions: At the Crossroads of Democracy and Sovereignty,” is first responded to by Audra Simpson who more deeply contextualizes the antagonisms. Her analysis, as well as her work more generally,¹⁰ carefully maps the contours of the settler state and its logics, reminding us of the ways in which “sovereignty” is a distinctive political project that operates outside the bound of “inequality.” Following this cogent analysis, long time cultural-worker, Peter McLaren speaks back to the text through his reassertion of the enduring significance of the social relations of production (and the political class conflicts taking place within these relations) as the central antagonism. In so doing he foregrounds a reassessment of the possibilities of Marx(ism) in creating a “socialist alternative . . . that might be useful for Indigenous educators.”

Next, Greg Cajete and Donna Houston take up what might be considered the heart of the text: the question of land. In his essay, Cajete focuses the analysis, providing a pedagogical model for rethinking Western science through Indigenous ontologies. He submits that a “participatory” Native science is “desperately needed to balance the imbalance” that has manifested from the misapplication of modernist science. Donna Houston follows with a similar call for a “re-animation” of critical pedagogy through a deeper alignment with Indigenous struggles for land justice. In so doing, she calls attention to the important scholarship that has emerged within the field of critical pedagogy in response to the critiques of its anthropocentrism. Insofar as land is life (and identity) for Indigenous peoples, the next responses by Jodi Byrd and Leigh Patel take up the question of subjectivity; both extend the discourse through a more vigorous engagement with the normative categorizations inherent in settler logics. More specifically, Byrd, extends and reframes the discourse to account for the important interventions in the field of Native studies by queer and feminist scholars, theorizing how “heteronormativity and heteropatriarchy work in tandem with racism and colonialism to further In-

digenous dispossession, loss of identity and culture.” Patel provides insight to the distinctions and commonalities between the social movements of Indigenous peoples and undocumented subjects. She argues that the “blunt tools” of settler colonialism have failed to disrupt the core and deficient logics of the “innocence/guilt/legality/illegality” frameworks, looking instead to critical analyses of coloniality.

Rounding out this section is the work of Eve Tuck and Andrea Smith both of who make important interventions to the original texts’ nascent engagement with feminist discourses and their relevance to the struggles of Native women and communities around issues of gender and (hetero)sexism. Tuck grounds her essay in the real-existing world of settler violence on the bodies of Native women. Her poignant references to the missing and murdered Indigenous women at the center of the #AmINext movement, is a sobering reminder that the bridges of liberal settler discourses continue to be written upon the backs of red and other women of color. Smith, a leading feminist-scholar-activist, writes a sharp essay that cogently addresses the perceived aporias of the first edition.

I would feel remiss if I didn’t mention the current controversy regarding Smith’s claims to Indigenous identity. As someone who is neither a citizen of the Cherokee nation, nor her relation, I don’t see it as my place to comment on her identity but I am compelled to speak to the impact of the controversy on the field of Native studies. First, it should be clear that for this chapter, Eve Tuck was invited as the Indigenous voice and each chapter pairs an Indigenous and non-Indigenous voice. Second, I invited Andy based on the circulation and impact of her work. Her first book, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (2005), made a critical intervention, moving the field toward deeper analyses of the relationship between patriarchy and state sanctioned violence.

Scholars are just beginning to discuss whether and how the reading and analysis of Smith’s work shifts if it was indeed written from the subject position and voice of a white woman. While it’s not possible to speak to the whole of her work, I can comment on her contribution to this volume. Smith always remained a staunch advocate of (Indigenous) feminism, not just in terms of its politics or frames of analysis, but as a subject position. When I wrote *Red Pedagogy*, Native feminism (along with critical Indigenous studies) was not yet a vibrant field of study. Thus, when *Conquest* first emerged (it was published one year after *Red Pedagogy*) it pushed my thinking in productive ways. I continue to appreciate her analysis of sexual violence as a tool of settler colonialism and patriarchy as she rearticulates it in her response essay “The Indigenous Feminist Revolution.” Though my critique in *Red Pedagogy* (2004) turned upon whether feminism grounded in liberal and statist, which, is to say settler logics, was a viable space for theorizing Indig-

enous formations, analyses and politics of gender and sexuality and I’m not sure her essay adequately addresses this assertion.

That being said, I now read Smith’s defense of feminism *quia* feminism differently if indeed it is voiced from the subject position of a white woman. Particularly in this essay, Smith’s support of Native women as feminists draws upon a troubling narrow range of antecedents (e.g., Rayna Green who has also been called into question for her claims to Cherokee identity). It is additionally curious that, writing ten years later, she does not call upon the brilliant works of Joanne Barker, Jodi Byrd, Sarah Deer, Jennifer Denetdale, Mishuana Goeman, Sarah Hunt, Lisa Kahaleole Hall, Dian Million, Dory Nason, Noenoe Silva, Audra Simpson, or Kim TallBear among many other contemporary Indigenous feminist scholars. While I still do not identify as a “feminist” for much the same reasons I don’t identify as “Marxist” (though I find Marx critically important and useful), I continue to learn and be schooled by these amazing women and their commitment to Indigenous feminism. I also continue to support the broader effort to (re)center gender and sexuality in analyses of settler colonialism and Indigenous resurgence.

Next, in response to the original concluding chapter, Malia Villegas and Kevin Bruyneel raise substantive questions that aim to complicate and further the discourse and thereby the field of Native studies. Bruyneel urges a deeper consideration of the relationship between settler colonialism, white supremacy and anti-black racism. Given the recent emergence of the #BlackLivesMatter movement alongside the #AmINext and Idle No More movements, theorizations of these intersection may be the definitive task for the field. Malia Villegas, literally and figuratively, brings us home. Writing from the front lines of policymaking, she aims to bend the arc of Red Pedagogy toward a “stewardship framework” of self-governance, bringing the questions of, “in what way,” and “toward what end” to the forefront.

The final section, “Teaching Red Pedagogy” is new to this edition and includes a mix of new and distinguished scholars as well as students from across a variety of disciplines. The section opens with Robert Stam and Ella Shohat’s essay discussing the relevance of *Red Pedagogy* to their courses on colonial history, media, and discourse. As distinguished professors and authors of the classic text *Unthinking Eurocentrism* (1994), they enter into a “dialogue” with the text, making artful and seamless connections among questions of Indigeneity, coloniality, and Western philosophical thought. Mary Hermes, professor and lead researcher for the Ojibwe Conversational Archives at the University of Minnesota, discusses the implications of the text for language revitalization. She issues a careful reminder that while “grand narratives” may be helpful in framing the broader issues of language loss (i.e., epistemicide), the “real work” of language (re)acquisition requires specificity and community grounding. Sweeny Windchief, Tim San Pedro, and Jeremy Garcia write together as early career scholars who work closely

with Indigenous students and their communities. They raise questions about academic discourse and issues of accessibility, moving to “rehumanize” the road between theory and practice.

Florida Boj Lopez and Lakota Pochedly write insightfully about their graduate student encounters with *Red Pedagogy*. Lopez poses important questions about Indigenous (im)migrants and their relationships to “the original peoples of the places they inhabit.” Such questions are reminiscent of (though arguably more politically charged than) Shona Jackson’s work on Creole Indigeneity (2012) and Dean Saranillo’s on Asian settler colonialism (2013), rethinking the sociopolitical positionality of Indigenous (im)migrants in the United States.

Pochedly writes in reflection of her work with students with multiracial identities in the Oklahoma school system, raising similarly complex questions about teaching *Red Pedagogy* in a “multicultural” context. Together, their work extends the discourse on subjectivity in ways of increasing importance as the Indigenous population continues to shift. Finally, distinguished professor and author of the classic text *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (1992) Mary Louise Pratt maps the central ontological tensions between Indigeneity and (settler) colonialism, refining and sharpening the edges of the “contact zone.”

That such distinguished scholars and students would take up the text is truly humbling. However, for me, the greater significance is that intergenerational voices came together to form a scholarly collective, one that inheres its own possibility. That is, insofar as form suggests function, I have been thinking more about what it means for scholars committed to enacting a “politics on the boundaries” to form a collectivities of sovereignty; to exercise intellectual in support of Indigenous resurgence (Bruyneel, 2007). The aim of such collectives could be to cultivate spaces of thought and action that not only *refuse* forms of knowledge and knowledge-making contingent upon settler imperatives but also to conscientiously enact others grounded in Indigenous specificity and well-being. Together, we could work toward *academic survivance*, operating beyond (i.e., in refusal of) the bounds of mere survival and toward “an active presence” in society and the academy (Vizenor, 1993, p. 15).

In her end of days, Ona demanded never to be alone. She often called out my name, requiring that I not only make my presence known but also that I sit with her “skin to skin.” I have come to understand these moments as radical assertions of connectivity borne through love and rage, the affective economies of both revolution and resurgence. I offer the following chapters in the spirit of Dylan Thomas, who reminds us to refuse to “go gently into that good night,” but rather to collectively burn, “rage, and rage against the dying of the light.”

NOTES

1. Over the passing decade, Native studies has burgeoned from a nascent to a major field of study supported by and through the newly established Native American and Indigenous Studies Association.
2. Scholars from across disciplines, tribes, nations, and subjectivities are coming to define CIS including key thinkers such as Kevin Bruyneel, Jodi Bryd, Glen Coulthard, Mishuana Goeman, Scott Morgensen, Mark Rifkin, Andrea Smith, Dean Saranillo, Aileen Moreton-Robinson, Robert Nichols, Noeone Silva, Audra Simpson, Eve Tuck, Dale Turner, and Patrick Wolfe, to name just a few.
3. Reformists have adopted the Chicago-school Friedmanist logic of “crisis” in order to deploy strategies of school closure, displacement, and removal, to privatize public education (mainly by undermining unions and public participation). Such strategies are deployed universally but more intensively in poor and communities of color—the new palimpsest of manifest destiny.
4. As one indication, despite his spearheading of privatization schemes that undermine teachers, unions, and urban/high need schools, Secretary of Education Arne Duncan was invited by the American Educational Research Association to address the membership at its annual meeting in 2013. While there were some protest efforts, they did not represent the majority of the membership. Also, unlike other national organizations, the American Educational Research Association has not taken a public stand in defense of public education or teachers. In 2014, a new organization, the Network for Public Education, was launched, though it is made up mostly of practitioners, not scholars in the field.
5. Another promising development is the emergence of a new scholarly journal, *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*.
6. To be clear, I wrote *Red Pedagogy* straight out of graduate school. It was the dissertation I *wasn't* allowed to write as a student and kept locked in a file on my desktop labeled, “The Book.” It came to fruition during my year as a Ford Foundation post-doctoral fellow for which the American Indian Leadership Program at Penn State University graciously served as my “host institution” and Dr. John Tippeconnic as my mentor.
7. Indeed, success in the academy is contingent upon the production of single-authored, monographs that ostensibly contribute “original knowledge” to the field—with the greatest pressure to produce exerted *early* in one’s career—instantiating capitalist desire for the young and new.
8. Harvard is a prime example. Founded in 1636 by “the Great and General Court of the Massachusetts Bay Colony,” the college was established in name only. It didn’t have a single building, teacher, or student until 1638 when John Harvard, a young minister of Charlestown, died leaving his library and a significant portion of his estate to the new institution. Even so, nearly two decades later, the fledgling institution was on the brink of bankruptcy. In a last ditch effort, then Harvard President Henry Dunster (re)engineered the College Charter (1650) to include the civilizing mission and thereby gain access to public and private funds available for such efforts (Wright, 1997). Dunster’s scheme paid in dividends. The “trustees of the missionary fund” bestowed Harvard the necessary capital to build an “Indian College.” It wasn’t long, however, before the use of such funds aroused suspicion as the proposed building expanded to four times the estimated cost and not a single Indian student had been admitted (Wright, 1997, p. 74). Despite the absence of Indian students, Harvard officials saw no reason to let the new college stand vacant and filled its halls with expectant white students. Until its dismantlement in the 1690s, the “Indian College” at Harvard graduated only one Native student, Caleb Chee-shataenuck (Wampanoag).
9. A growing number of CIS scholars are engaging in analyses of the role of the politics of recognition in sustaining colonial power. For example, in *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism*, Beth Povinelli (1998) examines the ways in which land title and other forms of Australian recognition of Aboriginal peoples ultimately furthered the reach of the contractual state. Working within a Canadian context, Glen Coulthard (2007) articulates the limits of recognition through the critical purchase of Fanon’s work, arguing that colonial structures of dominance rest on their ability to cull

Indigenous peoples to come to *identify* with the profoundly *asymmetrical* and *non-reciprocal* forms of recognition either imposed or granted by the colonial state (p. 439).

10. See her award winning book, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014).