

scale are 64. "N-I" stands for non-Indian. To determine degree of blood of
at in left hand column and of the other parent in top row. Read horizontally
find the proper degree. Example: Child of parents, one 11/16 and the other 5/8

area is less than 1/4.

RENÉ DIETRICH AND KERSTIN KNOPF, EDITORS

Biopolitics, Geopolitics, Life

Settler States and Indigenous Presence

Chart for calculating Quantum of Indian Blood

	1/4	5/16	3/8	7/16	1/2	9/16	5/8	11/16	3/4	13/16	7/8	15/16
1/4	1/16	5/64	3/32	7/256	1/8	9/256	5/128	11/256	3/64	13/256	7/128	15/256
5/16	5/64	25/256	15/512	35/4096	5/128	25/2048	15/1024	35/2621	5/256	25/1024	15/512	35/128
3/8	3/32	15/512	9/256	21/2048	3/8	15/1024	9/512	21/2621	3/64	15/256	9/128	21/64
7/16	7/256	35/4096	21/2048	49/65536	7/128	35/65536	21/32768	49/8192	7/64	35/2621	21/1024	49/256
1/2	1/8	5/128	3/64	7/1024	1/2	5/256	3/128	7/32768	1/4	5/1024	3/512	7/128
9/16	9/256	45/65536	27/32768	63/4194304	9/128	45/262144	27/131072	63/33554432	9/64	45/262144	27/131072	63/32768
5/8	5/128	25/1024	15/512	35/131072	5/64	25/32768	15/16384	35/4194304	5/256	25/65536	15/32768	35/8192
11/16	11/256	55/65536	33/32768	77/4194304	11/128	55/262144	33/131072	77/33554432	11/64	55/262144	33/131072	77/32768
3/4	3/64	15/262144	9/131072	21/16777216	3/32	15/65536	9/32768	21/8192	3/16	15/4096	9/2048	21/512
13/16	13/256	65/65536	39/32768	91/4194304	13/128	65/262144	39/131072	91/33554432	13/64	65/262144	39/131072	91/32768
7/8	7/128	35/512	21/256	49/16384	7/64	35/131072	21/65536	49/16777216	7/32	35/4096	21/2048	49/512
15/16	15/256	75/65536	45/32768	105/4194304	15/128	75/262144	45/131072	105/33554432	15/64	75/262144	45/131072	105/32768

1/4	5/16	3/8	7/16	1/2	9/16	5/8	11/16	3/4	13/16	7/8	15/16
1/16	5/64	3/32	7/256	1/8	9/256	5/128	11/256	3/64	13/256	7/128	15/256
5/64	25/256	15/512	35/4096	5/128	25/2048	15/1024	35/2621	5/256	25/1024	15/512	35/128
3/32	15/512	9/256	21/2048	3/8	15/1024	9/512	21/2621	3/64	15/256	9/128	21/64
7/256	35/4096	21/2048	49/65536	7/128	35/65536	21/32768	49/8192	7/64	35/2621	21/1024	49/256
1/8	5/128	3/64	7/1024	1/2	5/256	3/128	7/32768	1/4	5/1024	3/512	7/128
9/256	45/65536	27/32768	63/4194304	9/128	45/262144	27/131072	63/33554432	9/64	45/262144	27/131072	63/32768
5/128	25/1024	15/512	35/131072	5/64	25/32768	15/16384	35/4194304	5/256	25/65536	15/32768	35/8192
11/256	55/65536	33/32768	77/4194304	11/128	55/262144	33/131072	77/33554432	11/64	55/262144	33/131072	77/32768
3/64	15/262144	9/131072	21/16777216	3/32	15/65536	9/32768	21/8192	3/16	15/4096	9/2048	21/512
13/256	65/65536	39/32768	91/4194304	13/128	65/262144	39/131072	91/33554432	13/64	65/262144	39/131072	91/32768
7/128	35/512	21/256	49/16384	7/64	35/131072	21/65536	49/16777216	7/32	35/4096	21/2048	49/512
15/256	75/65536	45/32768	105/4194304	15/128	75/262144	45/131072	105/33554432	15/64	75/262144	45/131072	105/32768

**BIOPOLITICS,
GEOPOLITICS,
LIFE**

BUY

BIOPOLITICS, GEOPOLITICS, LIFE

Settler States and Indigenous Presence

RENÉ DIETRICH AND KERSTIN KNOPF, EDITORS

DUKE

Duke University Press *Durham and London* 2023

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

© 2023 Duke University Press

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper ∞

Designed by Courtney Leigh Richardson

Project Editor: Ihsan Taylor

Typeset in Portrait Text and IBM Plex Mono

by Westchester Publishing Services

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Dietrich, René, [date] editor. | Knopf, Kerstin, editor.

Title: Biopolitics, geopolitics, life : settler states and indigenous presence /
René Dietrich and Kerstin Knopf, editors.

Description: Durham : Duke University Press, 2023. | Includes index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022043243 (print)

LCCN 2022043244 (ebook)

ISBN 9781478019763 (paperback)

ISBN 9781478017080 (hardcover)

ISBN 9781478024347 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Indigenous peoples—Colonization. | Settler colonialism. |

Decolonization. | Biopolitics. | Geopolitics. | BISAC: SOCIAL SCIENCE /

Indigenous Studies | SOCIAL SCIENCE / Ethnic Studies / General

Classification: LCC JV305 .B56 2023 (print) | LCC JV305 (ebook) |

DDC 320.1/2089—dc23/eng/20221205

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022043243>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022043244>

Cover art courtesy of Deborah A. Miranda.

Duke University Press gratefully acknowledges the German Research Foundation through the Universität Bremen, which provided funds toward the publication of this book.

DUKE
UNIVERSITY
PRESS

CONTENTS

Foreword · vii

ALYOSHA GOLDSTEIN

Acknowledgments · xiii

Introduction:

The Bio/Geopolitics of Settler States
and Indigenous Normativities · i

RENÉ DIETRICH

- 1 “You Tell Me Your Stories, and I Will Tell You Mine”:
Witnessing and Combating Native Women’s
Extirpation in American Indian Literature · 45

MISHUANA GOEMAN

- 2 The Biopolitics of Aging:
Indigenous Elders as Elsewhere · 67

SANDY GRANDE

- 3 The Colonialism of Incarceration · 85

ROBERT NICHOLS

- 4 Are Hawaiians Indians? · 107

DAVID UAHIKEAIKALEI‘OHU MAILE

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

- 5 Postcolonial Biopolitics and the Hieroglyphs of Democracy · 131
SHONA N. JACKSON
- 6 Fictions of Land and Flesh:
Blackness, Indigeneity, Speculation · 159
MARK RIFKIN
- 7 “I Was Nothing but a Bare Skeleton Walking the Path”:
Biopolitics, Geopolitics, and Life in Diane Glancy’s
Pushing the Bear · 177
SABINE N. MEYER
- 8 Unseen Wonder:
Decolonizing Magical Realism in Kim Scott’s *Benang*
and Witi Ihimaera’s “Maata” · 197
MICHAEL R. GRIFFITHS
- 9 Agency and Art: Survivance with Camera and Crayon · 219
JACQUELINE FEAR-SEGAL
- 10 Land through the Camera:
Post/Colonial Space and Indigenous Struggles
in *Birdwatchers (Terra Vermelha)* · 245
KERSTIN KNOFF
- Contributors · 273
- Index · 277

DUKE

VI · CONTENTS

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

FOREWORD

ALYOSHA GOLDSTEIN

Dead salmon are coming back to life, and the “Red Crow” Mi’kmaq reserve in so-called Québec is under siege by insatiable white settler zombies. Although immune from being turned into the living dead, Native peoples are nonetheless exposed to the relentless violence of the zombie onslaught and at risk of being disemboweled and devoured. The Mi’kmaq filmmaker Jeff Barnaby’s feature *Blood Quantum* (2019) is a present past set in 1981, the explosive year when the Québec police invaded the Listuguj Mi’gmaq First Nation to impose new controls over Native fishing and when the proposed patriation of the Canadian constitution sought to eliminate Aboriginal treaty rights.¹ Barnaby’s film evocatively stages elements of the biopolitical and geopolitical entanglement of Indigenous presence and settler-colonial occupation that are the focus and vital contribution of this volume. Envisioning an Indigenous futurity beyond the viral plague of the settler undead, the film tells a story of Native peoples defining their own relations with the human and more-than-human world beyond the terrors of colonization and its genocidal calculus of blood quantum deployed in the service of Indigenous displacement and dispossession.

While colonialism renders land an alienable thing to be possessed, passively available for capitalist market exchange, Barnaby’s film, like many of the essays in this book, knows the Earth to be both animate and agential. According to Barnaby, “If you start looking at things like viral outbreaks as the planet’s immune system, what would be better for our planet than just turning all these parasites into fertilizer? It’s like it’s turning the stupid fucking white man into something it could use.”² In a soliloquy midway through the film, during a moment of reprieve from the carnage and struggle for survival, the Mi’kmaq character Moon (played by the iconic Cayuga actor Gary Farmer) declares, “The earth is an animal, living and breathing.” Shifting from English to Mi’kmaq,

he asserts, “White men don’t understand this”; then, in English, “That’s why the dead keep coming back to life.” “Who says we’re immune?” he asks rhetorically, switching to Mi’kmaq to muse that “maybe the earth just forgot about us.” Alternating between Mi’kmaq and English throughout, the film underscores its address to a Mi’kmaq audience and, by inference, a Native viewership more broadly. *Blood Quantum*’s title itself explicitly attributes the colonial necropolitics of Indigenous generational attrition to the genre of horror. Yet its narrative, which ends with a child immune to zombification born of a Mi’kmaq father and white mother, insists on Indigenous futurity, emplacement, and kinship beyond the artifice of blood. Indigenous relations grounded in being claimed as kin ultimately prevail over and against the fabulation of blood quantum as the measure of biopolitical membership and a livable life.

In settler-colonial nation-states such as the United States and Canada, the doctrine of tribal sovereign immunity is a central if nonetheless beleaguered tenet of Indigenous sovereignty.³ Although technically a juridical clause indemnifying legislative bodies, government agencies, and tribal commercial enterprises from being sued, sovereign immunity is in fact a matter of the very substance of sovereignty itself, reaffirming sovereign power as source of juridical authority and reserving the privilege to remain above the law for the sovereign. Sovereign immunity is a preemptive jurisdictional capacity that by extension can inoculate populations and territories. Tribal sovereign immunity is articulated and contested at the biopolitical and geopolitical limit of colonial authority while ultimately inscribed as a category of colonial law rather than originating in the jurisprudence of specific Indigenous nations and, in the United States, remaining nonetheless subordinate to congressional plenary power. For instance, among the most recent flashpoints of contestation over tribal sovereign immunity, the Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe patent deal with the pharmaceutical corporation Allergan in 2017 prompted strident non-Native condemnation of the tribe’s ostensible abuse of immunity for profit. In 2019, the US Supreme Court upheld a lower court’s decision that rejected the application of tribal sovereign immunity in the case, despite the tribe’s contention that the proposed partnership with Allergan would generate revenue necessary to “address the chronically unmet needs of the Tribal community, such as housing, employment, education, healthcare, cultural and language preservation.”⁴ Colonial sovereign power, in this instance, reasserted its prerogative over the dispensation of immunity as superseding the Indigenous administration of life, death, and jurisdiction.

What Roberto Esposito calls the immunological paradigm casts the immune system as a military apparatus. This biomedical model, argues Esposito,

imagines immunity as a means of “violent defense in the face of anything judged to be foreign.”⁵ At the same time, immunization as a mechanism of biopolitical governance entails introducing the virus in attenuated form to preempt a more virulent manifestation of the same contagion and thus “reproduces in a controlled form exactly what it is meant to protect us from.”⁶ With the biomedical model as a basis for juridical-political form, the body politic is imagined as a bounded space under siege and most effectively defended by this form of exclusion by inclusion. Such relations of inclusive exclusion take on starkly divergent valences depending on whether they are mobilized on behalf of the settler nation-state or negotiated by Indigenous peoples as an imposed condition that might possibly facilitate survivance.

Made just before the devastating emergence of COVID-19, *Blood Quantum* now seems eerily amenable to the lens of the pandemic, not least because of the long history of colonial biological warfare waged against Indigenous peoples, perhaps most notoriously through the weaponization of blankets infected with smallpox by the US military.⁷ The proliferation of maps that chart the vectors and epicenters of contagion during the COVID-19 pandemic exemplifies the spatial calculus at work in the biopolitical coproduction of territory and population. Settler epidemiology and news coverage rendered Indigenous nations simultaneously within and beyond the pale of the settler nation-state. Settler news platforms reported the gruesome statistics of Indigenous infection and death as at once symptomatic of the most impoverished and vulnerable populations of the body politic and altogether foreign to the medical modernity and public health governance of the settler state. After suffering the highest rate of COVID-19 infections per capita in the United States during May 2020, the Navajo Nation instituted curfews for its citizens and established checkpoints at its borders to keep out visitors. These measures contributed to substantially reducing viral spread, hospitalization, and death.⁸ For much of the pandemic, Pueblo Indian nations in so-called New Mexico also closed their borders. Surrounded by the settler state of South Dakota, the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe likewise set up highway checkpoints in August 2020 in an effort to turn away the massive influx of people traveling to the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally. Yet more than 250,000 bikers ignored the tribe’s blockade, gathering again in 2021, despite evidence that the previous year’s rally had produced lethal outbreaks in neighboring states and Native reservations.⁹ This volume supplies indispensable tools not only for contending with the politics of the immunological paradigm through which Indigenous life persists but for more broadly engaging the politics of life itself under and beyond settler-colonial occupation.

Biopolitics, Geopolitics, Life: Settler States and Indigenous Presence is a decisive contribution to contemporary debates on the politics of Indigenous life and colonial regimes of land, labor, and racialization. Refusing the separation of land and bodies through which settler colonization seeks to displace and replace, contributors to this volume ground their inquiry in the radical relationalities and interdependences of Indigenous world making. This is a crucial rebuke to the processes that Lisa Lowe critically analyzes as the “colonial divisions of humanity” in which, as Frantz Fanon observed, “the colonial world is a compartmentalized world.”¹⁰ Challenging the colonial capitalist division between land and bodies has substantial consequences. Rigid categorical distinctions between land as the principal target of settler colonization and coerced racialized labor as exclusively associated with chattel slavery obscure questions such as those having to do with Indigeneity in African and African diasporic contexts, Indigenous displacement and migration, and colonial regimes of confinement and carcerality. In the pages that follow, the authors trouble the normative “colonial divisions of humanity” in ways that demonstrate the potential for further developing analytic connections with how particular colonial uses of racialization not only are a means of undermining Indigenous sovereignty but also are sites of struggle over relations of reciprocity, social reproduction, and reproductive justice.¹¹ The volume’s imperative to critically rethink the colonial logics of life, land, human, and more than human together likewise centers the necessarily inextricable realities of movement, multiplicity, and interrelation.

The ten incisive chapters assembled here, along with René Dietrich’s astute introduction, generatively invite further inquiry and elaboration. Just as *Blood Quantum* vividly narrates colonial apocalypse and Indigenous futurity while potentially alluding to the expansive resonance of the zombie film as a subgenre of the anticolonial imaginary, *Biopolitics, Geopolitics, Life* is both a profound resource for thinking together in its own right and inspires ongoing study and critical projects yet to come.¹² Barnaby’s film might evoke anticolonial and antiracist affinities by prompting viewers to recall the specific historical circumstances in which the figure of the zombie emerges not as embodying the insatiable hunger of colonization or capitalism but as bearing the viciously dehumanizing consequences of enslavement and the plantation economy in the Caribbean and the US South while also manifesting white fears of the Haitian Revolution. Contributors to this volume offer compelling insight into the differential distribution of life and value that are fundamental arenas of contestation under colonial racial capitalism with substantial implications. *Biopolitics, Geopolitics, Life* is invaluable for its sustained commitment to centering

Indigenous presence and persistence in its understanding of the biopolitical and geopolitical as constitutively, if also heterogeneously, enmeshed.

NOTES

- 1 On the Listuguj raids, see Alanis Obomsawin's documentary film *Incident at Restigouche* (1984). For more on the First Nations movement that responded to Canada's proposed constitutional changes, see Emma Feltes and Glen Coulthard, eds., "The Constitution Express: A 40-Year Retrospective," a special issue of *BC Studies: The British Columbian Quarterly* 212 (Winter 2021–2022).
- 2 Quoted in Jordan Crucchiola, "Jeff Barnaby Made an Apocalypse Movie to Watch the System Fall. Then a Pandemic Hit," *Vulture*, May 6, 2020, <https://www.vulture.com/2020/05/jeff-barnaby-is-worried-white-people-wont-get-blood-quantum.html>.
- 3 David E. Wilkins and K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *Uneven Ground: American Indian Sovereignty and Federal Law* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2002), 216–48.
- 4 Saint Regis Mohawk Tribe's Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction Based on Tribal Sovereign Immunity, *Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Allergan Inc.*, proceeding no. IPR2016–01127 (September 22, 2017), 6. For an outstanding analysis of the case and its implications see Theresa Rocha Beardall, "Sovereignty for Sale? Tribal Patent Shelters and the Risky Business of Sovereign Derivatives," *Native American and Indigenous Studies* 9, no. 2 (Fall 2022): 3–37.
- 5 Roberto Esposito, *Immunitas: The Protection and Negation of Life*, translated by Zakiya Hanafi (Cambridge: Polity, 2011), 17.
- 6 Esposito, *Immunitas*, 8.
- 7 For further analysis of this history of biological warfare as rationalized by the colonial state's relentless criminalization of Indigenous peoples, see Joanne Baker, *Red Scare: The State's Indigenous Terrorist* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2021), xii–xiii.
- 8 Simon Romero, "Checkpoints, Curfews, Airlifts: Virus Rips through Navajo Nation," *New York Times*, April 9, 2020, <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/09/us/coronavirus-navajo-nation.html>. More broadly, see Matthew L. M. Fletcher, "Pandemics in Indian Country: The Making of the Tribal State," *University of St. Thomas Law Journal* 18, no. 2 (April 2022): 295–306.
- 9 Stephen Groves, "Sturgis Rally Expecting 250K, Stirring Virus Concerns," *Indian Country Today*, August 9, 2020, <https://indiancountrytoday.com/news/sturgis-rally-expecting-250k-stirring-virus-concerns>; M. J. Firestone, Haley Wienkes, Jacob Garfin, and Xiong Wang et al., "COVID-19 Outbreak Associated with a 10-Day Motorcycle Rally in a Neighboring State," *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, November 27, 2020, <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6947e1>.
- 10 Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 7; Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, translated by Richard Philcox (New York: Grove, [1961] 2004), 3.
- 11 The politics of adoption, foster care, and other forms of custodial supervision are especially significant as contested sites for the social reproduction of biopower.

See, for instance, Christina Firpo and Margaret Jacobs, "Taking Children, Ruling Colonies: Child Removal and Colonial Subjugation in Australia, Canada, French Indochina, and the United States, 1870–1950s," *Journal of World History* 29, no. 4 (December 2018): 529–62; Laura Briggs, *Taking Children: A History of American Terror* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2020); and Matthew L. M. Fletcher and Wenona T. Singel, "Lawyering the Indian Child Welfare Act," *Michigan Law Review* 120, no. 8 (June 2022): 1775–98.

- 12 For more on *Blood Quantum* and anticolonial zombie film and television, see Michael Truscello and Renae Watchman, "Blood Quantum and Fourth Cinema: Post- and Paricolonial Zombies," *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* (2022), <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509208.2022.2026273>.

DUKE

XII · ALYOSHA GOLDSTEIN

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book started as an international conference at the Institute for Transnational American Studies (since renamed the Obama Institute) at the Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz in June 2015. As the organizers, we gratefully acknowledge the German Research Foundation (DFG) for its generous financial support of the conference. We give special thanks to the administrator of the Obama Institute, Anette Vollrath, and our staff members Tanja Ebner and Jan Kwiatkowski for making everything at the event run smoothly.

Moreover, we thank everyone who contributed to the gathering—all of the speakers, with their valuable presentations (unfortunately not all of them could be included in this volume), and all of the attendees who added to the conversation, including the students in the seminar “Settler Colonialism,” who provided outstanding poster presentations. We also make special note of the Chumash and Esselen author Deborah Miranda, who not only allowed us to use her artwork for our flyer, poster, and book cover but also enthusiastically answered students’ questions about her writing in a special class session and gave a reading at the Gutenberg Book Store in downtown Mainz. Thanks, Deborah! We also thank the bookstore’s staff for their support of the reading.

In the years since the conference, many people and conversations helped to make this book come into being. First and foremost, we thank all of the contributors to this volume. They literally make this book what it is through offering in their chapters their important insights into the issues of bio- and geopolitics in settler states and forms of Indigenous presence contesting these means of colonial rule. We thank them for sharing their knowledge with us and the readers of this volume as well as for being diligent in their revisions and patient in this rather long process from conference to publication. We extend a special thanks to Alyosha Goldstein, whose thoughtful foreword opens the

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

door to the volume while adding further perspectives and nuances to it. Alex Trimble Young was an early reader of the introduction, and his insightful attentiveness helped to hone some of its central arguments.

In Mainz, Alana Mazur was invaluable for her editorial assistance with the introduction and the overall volume, and in Bremen, Donia Labidi provided important support toward the end. At Duke University Press, we truly could not have found a better editor for this project than Courtney Berger, as she accompanied us on a path that included not only expected, but also the unexpected, difficulties, such as a global pandemic. That this book reached completion under these circumstances can in many ways be credited to her kind and steady guidance along the way. In addition, we thank everyone at Duke who helped: Sandra Korn, who had an answer to every question and paved the way especially at the finishing stage; Alejandra Mejía, for taking care of the final submission; Susan Deeks (copy editor) and Ihsan Taylor (project editor) for their diligent work up to publication; and Courtney Richardson for her beautiful book cover design. We thank the anonymous readers for their careful attention to the manuscript and their valuable comments and suggestions, which helped to make the volume stronger. Finally, we are thankful to everyone who has played a part in making this book into what we hope is a vital contribution to an important and ongoing conversation.

A note on the book cover: We are very grateful and proud to be able to feature the artwork of Deborah Miranda on the cover. The piece, “Blood Quantum: The Four Sacred Directions,” was originally included in her mixed-genre work *Bad Indians: A Tribal Memoir* as part of the series “Things You Can Do with Your Chart for Calculating Quantum of Indian Blood.” Referring to a US-specific context, it illustrates widespread settler colonial biopolitical techniques of racialization while creatively overwriting these with an assertion of Indigenous presence. As an indicator of Indigenous placemaking in spiritual, cultural, social, and political terms, the “Four Sacred Directions” of the piece manifest an understanding of geopolitics and relationality based in Indigenous ways of seeing and being in the world that refuse to be defined and contained by settler colonial restrictions.

DUKE

XIV • ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

INTRODUCTION

THE BIO/GEOPOLITICS OF SETTLER STATES AND INDIGENOUS NORMATIVITIES

RENÉ DIETRICH

Twenty-First-Century Reports from Settler States

On November 21, 2016, water protectors at Standing Rock are attacked with water cannons, mace, tear gas, and rubber bullets by armed forces composed of several law enforcement agencies and private security firms. Earlier the same year, the Lenca Honduran environmental rights activist Berta Cáceres is assassinated. In November 2017, Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull rejects the Uluru Statement from the Heart, which calls for a “First Nations voice” in Australia’s Constitution. On the same weekend, the detention centers for refugees on the islands of Nauru and Manus are dismantled, without offering the inhabitants refuge in the settler colony. In 2018, Indigenous people from Central American countries are among the most vulnerable of those

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

seeking refuge in the United States, where they are subjected to the policy of immediate arrest and family separation; in June, a Maya-Mam woman from Guatemala is killed by a border patrol agent. In Canada, in the spring of 2018, both Gerald Stanley, in the case of his killing of Colton Boushie (Red Pheasant First Nation), and Richard Cormier, in the case of the murder of Tina Fontaine (Sagkeeng First Nation), are acquitted—in Stanley’s case, by an all-white jury—which leads to nationwide demonstrations for reforming the justice system.¹

All of these moments demonstrate the ongoing conditions of settler-state violence across the settler-colonial archipelago in the twenty-first century.² At the same time, they attest to the strength, determination, and resurgence of Indigenous peoples seeking to protect rights, bodies, lands, and waters as part of century-long anticolonial struggles against invasive settler forces. In centering Indigenous principles, politics, and practices of kinship and relationality, these Indigenous activists are living, as the Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar and writer Leanne Betasamosake Simpson describes it, “as we have always done.”³

These are just a few examples of settler-colonial violence that have been deemed “newsworthy” by national and international outlets as well as by social media channels. There are many more moments that do not get registered in the news and social media. But in looking at these moments together, we seek to show what is regularly missed when they are reported as isolated and extraordinary occurrences—namely, how they are in fact related to one another as well as to a settler-colonial status quo of eliminatory dispossession that traverses the national specificities of each reported instance.

In this it is crucial to note what these reports show: militarized police brutality and orchestrated killings of those who oppose capitalist-extractivist interests and protect Indigenous land, waterways, and life; the violent and bureaucratic protection of nativist settler claims while disavowing Indigenous rights; the non-culpability of settlers killing Indigenous bodies; and the increased vulnerability of Indigenous peoples to violence as they move in the contexts of multiple settler regimes. Their newsworthiness might suggest that they are extraordinary, and in being reported as isolated instances, this impression is strengthened. However, looking at them together shows how often violence does not disrupt the status quo but is instead so ordinary an aspect of the settler state that it constitutes the status quo.

Ultimately, the tendency to see such events as isolated incidents rather than as reflective of long-standing structures of dispossession and colonization, or as divorced entirely from questions of settler colonialism and Indigeneity, leads to reports especially by major media outlets that are unable or unwilling to see, know, or name the ongoing condition of settler violence intensified in

these moments. This, in turn, points to the larger patterns of invisibilizing and unknowing of settler colonialism that are endemic to it.⁴ In other words, while the occurrences that appear to have breached the norm can become the object of news reports and analysis for major media outlets, the norm itself remains beyond analysis.⁵

For the purpose of this volume, these individual instances of state violence across multiple sites of settler-colonial formations in the twenty-first century are significant precisely in how they mark momentary intensifications of larger, violent patterns of colonial statist (capitalist, extractivist) non-Native settlement that are otherwise fully routinized, normalized, and unspectacularly habituated. Productive of ongoing dispossessing and unlawfully delegitimizing conditions, these patterns structure the un(re)marked quotidian as much as historically intensified moments in the archipelago of lands colonized via settlement. They signify some of the manifold ways in which, as Aileen Moreton-Robinson (Goenpul, Quandamooka First Nation) has importantly described it: “The relationship between Indigenous sovereignty and state sovereignty [figures] as relations of force located within a matrix of biopower.”⁶ Biopower, for Moreton-Robinson, functions as a normalizing force that “work[s] to produce whiteness as an invisible norm,” making non-Native settlement the unchallenged geopolitical norm through which state sovereignty is constituted and upheld.⁷ The perpetuated settler aggression visited on Indigenous bodies, lands, and lives functions as an enactment of such biopower to “make” the settler state “live” at the expense of Indigenous livelihood.

Constituting globally expansive geographies, these large territories subjected to settler colonialism are then representative, as Scott Morgensen has shown, of the “historical grounds for the globalisation of biopower” and instrumental in “producing biopower in the present that requires denaturalising critique.”⁸ By necessity, such “denaturalising critique” needs to be oriented toward an Indigenous-centered decolonization. In this sense, the instances of settler-state aggression portrayed earlier also figure, in the terms of the Ngāti Awa and Ngāti Porou scholar Linda Tuiwai Smith, as sites in “the struggle for decolonization.”⁹ As one of the “five conditions or dimensions” that frame this struggle, Smith lists “the concept of structure, the underlying code of imperialism, of power relations.”¹⁰ To us, this indicates that a close consideration of the bio- and geopolitical structures underlying the normativities of settler statism is not merely something that precedes forms of “struggle for decolonization” but can be mobilized as being integral to it. Taking this interplay of “structure” and “struggle” into account, this volume seeks to analyze the biopolitics and geopolitics of settler colonialism as they structurally manifest across distinct

yet related international and transnational sites of Indigenous struggle over non-Native settler occupation, including nations across the Americas and the Pacific islands of Hawai'i as well as across Australia and Aotearoa/New Zealand. In doing so, *Biopolitics*, *Geopolitics*, *Life* focusses both on the quotidian aspect of settler state violence and on moments of historical intensification.

At the same time, the volume emphasizes Indigenous work within the interrelated spheres of activism and political and critical thought, along with the literary and visual arts, that can help to map, in Smith's term, "the conceptual terrain of struggle" as well as the everyday sites of struggle on the ground.¹¹ On the one hand, such work makes settler-colonial conditions visible, nameable, and knowable via their denaturalization. On the other hand, this work actively participates in what Smith has described as a further dimension in the "struggle for decolonization"—namely, "a way of reimagining the world" that draws on different epistemologies, thus "unleashing the creative spirit."¹² As our volume draws together different disciplines from the social sciences and humanities, we maintain that "a way of reimagining the world" through Indigenous-centered perspectives provides a shared lens.

The contributions to *Biopolitics*, *Geopolitics*, *Life* illuminate this work toward Indigenous decolonization from their distinct disciplinary standpoints while acknowledging the intersections of thought, practice, and action. We understand this work thus in its political potentiality as one possible path toward the dismantling of settler-colonial bio- and geopolitical conditions. The book thus highlights the Indigenous bodies and lives that continually help to make visible an ever-present and irreducible thinking and practicing that goes beyond and insists on Indigenous epistemologies and practices beyond settler logics.

The Normativities of Settler Settlement

We understand settler-colonial biopolitics and geopolitics as intersecting and coconstitutive paradigms of governance and governmentality. These paradigms ultimately produce settler-defined modes of life and forms of land use that are defined and perpetually reiterated both as a universalized self-evident norm and as normative demand placed on all peoples, including the ones dispossessed and regularized through the very same paradigms. Through this process, certain modes of life—such as the ideal of liberal individuated selfhood produced through the nuclear family or forms of land use, such as home ownership, surplus mass agriculture, or industrialized large-scale construction and extraction—are rendered self-evidently natural, "modern," or "civilized."

This volume sets out to analyze settler nation-states as geopolitical and biopolitical projects that initiate and perpetuate specific forms of land tenure, social practices, and governance, all of which operate in contradistinction to dimensions of embodied and spatialized Indigenous sovereignty. The analytical work of the volume is thus aimed at what David Scott has described as a central concern of colonial projects in “disabling old forms of life” and, in their stead, working to “enable—indeed, . . . to oblige—new forms of life to come into being.”¹³ Even more pointedly, the Yellowknives Dene theorist Glen Coulthard has observed “the ability [of settler colonialism] to produce *forms of life* that make settler-colonialism’s constitutive hierarchies seem natural.”¹⁴

We maintain that laying bare how settler-colonial social structures are normalized and naturalized can be a means of simultaneously denormalizing and denaturalizing them, which ultimately opens a new perspective on Indigenous lived presences and struggles in the settler state. Translating the socially specific into the natural obscures how certain bio- and geopolitical mechanisms derive from and are privileged by a particular non-Native model of governance and social organization. This model is, in turn, based on notions of the social and the political that are historically specific but become universalized. In this way, a specific political model becomes that which, in Mark Rifkin’s words, comes to “to constitute a viable political form(ul)ation as such.”¹⁵ While formed through specific (classed, gendered, racialized, ableist, and heteronormative) power structures, the European-modeled settler state is made to seem as if it promotes the seemingly natural course and order of life—and within the US Constitution the state is even justified with the “right to life.” It is made to appear to promote the *course* of life through its reproduction of nuclear family socialization and its *order* through a hierarchized model of apparently given anthropocentric dominance.¹⁶ This framework calls to mind Michel Foucault’s terminology of biopower. The settler state’s naturalizing “technology of power centered on life itself” enables it to exclusively proclaim unabrogated sovereignty over the territory and all forms of life that inhabit it.¹⁷ All the while, this is made to appear not as an ongoing invasion, but as integral to the normal processes of living. The consolidation of settler-colonial power is then turned into a means through which the state fosters not only its own well-being but that of (settler) life itself.

Following these considerations, the volume seeks to address two central questions: How do biopolitical and geopolitical techniques produce these normativities? And how are these settler-colonial normativities, in turn, upheld and invisibilized through intersecting forces of bio- and geopolitical logics, discourses, and practices? In asking these questions, we are specifically interested

in how they relate to each other, as this indicates to us how intimately settler bio- and geopolitics are related to each other and are used to affirm each other.

This volume seeks to push forth an understanding of the interplay of a biopolitical logic of racialization, regularization, and naturalization with a geopolitical logic of dispossession and removal as a dialectical dynamic within the eliminatory logics of settler colonialism.¹⁸ Instead of advocating the priority of one theoretical framework over another, we ask how a biopolitical perspective can enhance, or complicate, a geopolitical analytic, and vice versa. How can a biopolitical perspective shed light on dispossession, expropriation, extraction, and removal as a set of geopolitical practices that are not only racialized but also targeted particularly in terms of gender, sexuality, age, ability, and so on? And how can a geopolitical perspective productively inform a biopolitical analytic of racialization, subjugation, and regularization by more closely calling attention to how land itself is not merely a place *on* which biopolitical measures take place and manifest? How does the perspective change if land is also viewed as a configuration (of thought, practice, sociality, embodiment) *through* which biopolitical techniques become effective, particularly in their attempt to disable Indigenous peoples' lived relationships to land?¹⁹ Probing these questions is ultimately at the heart of this introduction and guides the contributions to the volume.

How, then, do bio- and geopolitical techniques work together to target Indigenous peoples in specific ways? An important part of answering this question lies in how norms are constructed that relate to both spheres. Many scholars have shown that biopolitical attempts to regulate Indigenous peoples—in the Chickasaw scholar Jodi Byrd's words, via "the technologies of geopolitics that have defined the twentieth and twenty-first centuries," including removal, assimilation, education, administration, genealogical politics, surveillance, and disciplinary regimes—subject those peoples to settler-colonial rule by depoliticizing them into a population subjected to control.²⁰ In refusing to acknowledge Indigenous nations as sovereign polities in their own right, biopolitical practices subsume them under an imaginary racialized population denominated variously, for instance, as "Indians," "*indios*," or "Aborigines." The invented groups under these monikers vary only slightly from one another in their perceived qualities, assumed to be innate, that serve to distinguish them categorically from the (white) settler as the rightful member of the body politic proper.²¹ The intimate links between biopolitics and geopolitics operative in settler states come into full view when one reads Giorgio Agamben's "bare life" together with Mark Rifkin's concept of "bare habitation." In this way, the "state of exception" foundational for Western sovereignty as a practice of "inclusive

exclusion” becomes productively connected to the geopolitical operations of subsuming Indigenous lands within seemingly self-evident settler-state territoriality.²²

Notably, this state of exception is again integral to and productive of the settler-colonial norm. This is not meant to disavow how the principle of “inclusive exclusion,” which the “state of exception” enables, continues to produce actual situations of emergency for Indigenous peoples, predominantly in the starkly unequal manner of how they are exposed to but remain largely unprotected by settler law. The widespread violence against Indigenous women perpetrated by mostly non-Indigenous men, regularly with impunity, sharply conveys this principle for the present moment. At the same time, this can only be fully understood, as Sarah Deer (Muscogee), Joanne Barker (Lenape), Mishuana Goeman (Tonawanda Band of Seneca), and others have shown, within the larger historical continuities of devaluing Indigenous lives and sexualizing Indigenous women.²³ In a self-replicating manner, every present instance of violence is embedded in these histories and helps to entrench them further within the settler-colonial present.²⁴

However, to the dominant white settler society, the very same structures register as the norm. Therefore, any Indigenous challenge to the existing power structures of settler rule registers only as an aberration from said norm. Hence, this challenge needs to be denied or contained in what Elizabeth Povinelli has recently called a “cramped space of maneuver.”²⁵ As the settler state assumes to exhibit the self-evident norm of sociopolitical organization that best enables modes of living and land use that are to reflect a natural order of life, any “Indigenous interruption” of this norm does not appear as political opposition from a positionality of the subaltern.²⁶ Instead, it is read and dismissed as a deviance from the modern-life-affirming norm, a deviance that deserves to be targeted and marked for elimination. Registering as nothing but an aberration, Indigenous life itself in its multiple forms—political and social, collective and individual, embodied and representational, spectacular and quotidian—is what is marked for risk, injury, and elimination through bio- and geopolitical techniques to affirm and reiterate settler-colonial normativities.

With these observations we want to draw attention to how the devaluation and disregard of Native polities and Native lives are interdependent within dominant settler societies—and how this operates simultaneously on a biopolitical and a geopolitical level. As the logics of hierarchization integral to the biopolitical mechanisms of the settler nation-state interlock, they deny on a geopolitical level Indigenous peoples the status of autonomous polities existing on lands that are only imagined as settler territory, because settlers have

imagined Indigenous people as being incapable of properly inhabiting land. These logics quickly and “naturally” extend to denying Indigenous people the right to existence and to life *itself* within the political formation of the settler state. While this formation is constituted from the start as a violation of Indigenous rights, this violation is neutralized by translating it into the naturalized narrative of non-Indigenous progress.

In this regard, Indigenous death, on any scale, does not signal a moment to question the settler order; rather, it functions as a confirmation of its premise and objective—to the point that the Indigenous body becomes legible only as dead, either already dead or always dying.²⁷ What becomes clear when submitting instances—both collective and individual, macro and micro—of settler-colonial violence to a bio- and geopolitical critique is that positioning Indigenous peoples within an Agambenian state of exception to the sovereign rule of settler nation-states is not distinct from exposing Native bodies to settler violence with seeming impunity. Instead, such positioning reproduces, on an individual and bodily level, the logic through which Indigenous peoples are perceived as existing in a state of legal exception. On both levels, Native bodies are rendered as available to settlers’ desires, needs, or force, without this enforcement being registered as a violation of rights of either the individual body or the body politic of Indigenous peoples in their entirety.

By the same token, Indigenous life in its cultural, social, political, and spiritual dimensions represents the antithesis to settler-state rule and exposes the normalized structures of the settler state as designed to uphold an anti-Indigenous status quo. We hope to show, then, through the contributions to this volume, that a focus on Indigenous lived presences—within as well as alongside and, especially, opposed to settler nation-state formations that operate through a set of geo- and biopolitical logics—is not just a means to render visible some of these forms of life and practices that are otherwise invisibilized. Instead, we also want to present it as a way to open avenues for thinking and imagining the denaturalization of settler-colonial rule, something we consider a theoretical tool in service of the decolonial struggle to dismantle the settler-colonial norm.

The volume tackles questions of bio- and geopolitical racialized dispossession by refocusing *life* as a relational and expansive term for the critique of settler-colonial conditions that centers Indigenous perspectives, epistemologies, and ontologies. *Life*, understood as such—intimately related to land, to ways of being in the world that constitute and signal Indigenous peoplehood and sovereignty, to the lived political existence of Indigenous nations in relation to other polities, including settler states—we view as an analytical instrument to capture ways that disrupt or exceed biopolitical management and

geopolitical organization. Beyond that, *life* signals crucial junctures of land and body, the emplaced and the embodied, through which to trouble the clear demarcations of geopolitics and biopolitics. A reconfigured notion of life in these terms works to challenge the premises through which settler-colonial geo- and biopolitics operate and thus suggests alternative normativities that disrupt the logics through which they function.

*Settler-Colonial Analytics, Bio/Geopolitics,
and Multiple Trajectories of Study*

To analyze how biopolitics and geopolitics operate in tandem for the workings of settler-colonial formations, this volume adopts a theoretical perspective on settler colonialism that is relational, flexible, and self-reflexive. Most important, we see analytical approaches to the phenomenon, structures, and logics of settler colonialism as proceeding from multiple points of departure and moving along specific trajectories.

One approach lies in the Australian historian Patrick Wolfe's directing of the anthropological gaze back in the late 1990s at how anthropologists and other non-Native scientists have constructed a racialized and culturalized "Aboriginality"—divorced from Indigenous peoples' understanding of themselves as independent, sovereign polities—in ways that replicate and partake in settler societies' attempts to eliminate and replace Native societies. The dictums through which Wolfe described these structural qualities of settler societies as distinct from other forms of colonialism—"the logic of elimination," "invasion is a structure not an event"—became a main source of citation and adaptation of his work, in some cases too easily standing in for any serious engagement with both a settler-colonial and Indigenous studies framework.²⁸

Preceding Wolfe's work, as Shannon Speed (Chickasaw) and others have recently pointed out, the interrogation of settler societies undertaken by largely female scholars in *Unsettling Settler Societies: Articulations of Gender, Race, Ethnicity, and Class* (1995), edited by Daiva Stasiulis and Nira Yuval-Davis, figures as another point of departure for us that, in turn, sketches a different trajectory for a settler-colonial analytic that we practice in this volume.²⁹ As Stasiulis and Yuval-Davis emphasize their "resistance to drawing an unambiguous line of demarcation between settler and other (colonial, postcolonial, metropolitan) societies" and instead draw attention to how settler societies establish "systems of exclusion and exploitation of both 'indigenous' and 'alien' peoples within," they offer a sense of the entanglements between different colonial regimes as well as between differentiated forms of racialization within a settler state.³⁰

While their work has not circulated as widely as Wolfe's, revisiting it may help us grasp recent debates on the intersections of settler colonialism, empire, and race not only as critiquing a Wolfean approach to settler colonialism that more strongly emphasizes elements of distinction and binary relations but also as reasserting other trajectories of settler-colonial analytics, which we also want to exemplify in this volume.

This volume also engages with the long-standing, robust, and ever expanding work of Indigenous studies that straddles multiple disciplines. (Critical) Indigenous studies are clearly indispensable for a settler-colonial analytic in that they make conditions of ongoing (settler) colonial relations visible by centering Indigeneity as a sociopolitical category and a lived experientiality that contests heteropatriarchal, capitalist, extractivist structures endemic to settler-colonial realities. Indigenous studies thus bring to the fore a continuously emerging and evolving understanding of Indigenous-centered sovereignty and self-determination, including the prospect and potential of decolonization.³¹

A bio/geopolitical analysis of settler colonialism necessarily engages related forms of oppression. For example, Black and anti-imperial scholars have demonstrated the insufficiency of a rigid settler-Native binary to account for slavery and forms of forced migration and thereby worked strongly in revising and expanding a settler-colonial analytic. Offering insights that resonate with Stasiulis and Yuval-Davis's approach in *Unsettling Settler Societies*, these theorizations by Iyko Day, Manu Karuka (Vimalassery), Tiffany Lethabo King, and others pursue a better understanding of how settler states operate through their own, specific racialized regimes and are embedded within imperial assemblages that extend beyond the territory marked, and masked, as domestic.³² In this sense, we see this volume's focus on the interconnectedness of bio- and geopolitics as offering one path to pursue what Alyosha Goldstein, Manu Karuka (Vimalassery), and Juliana Hu Pegues have recently termed "relations of study."³³

Conceiving of Indigeneity within the biopolitically racialized, gendered, and sexualized regimes of settler states, this volume also seeks to open modes of inquiry toward other regimes of racialization and differently defined modes of subjection orchestrated through the same state. While Black, Indigenous, and other bodies that are excluded from the white settler biopolitical body may be subjected to what Wolfe has called "different regimes of race," these regimes clearly are not unrelated.³⁴ We maintain that if, in North American contexts, the Indigenous body is pathologized, abnormalized, and criminalized differently from the Black body, these techniques still share the same premise and aim. They seek to define an unmarked body as the universalized representative of a population that deserves to be nourished, fostered, and protected for the health of the

nation while at the same time denying that this body's whiteness (and hetero-cis-maleness) is the determining factor for its privileged position within the racialized state as the unmarked, universalized qualifier of "the people" as such.

These forms of settler-colonial racialization can be observed in other contexts, as well. Indigenous bodies in Australia codified as "Black" are confronted even more directly with what Moreton-Robinson has recently described as the "white possessive" of the settler state. And in Latin America, Indigenous bodies are to blend into the biopolitical regime of *mestizaje* as another form of Indigenous disappearance. In both cases, whiteness—even if only imagined or projected as a common Europeanness in origin or as a marker specifying degrees of national belonging—still remains a central reference point for what counts as the rightful population of the settler state and can be universalized as the qualifier of the fully human.³⁵ In this sense, Sylvia Wynter's theorization of "Man-as-Human" remains an important touchstone for us as it captures the main biopolitical current that traverses globally connected yet differentiated settler-state regimes.³⁶

Wynter's notion of "Man-as-Human" brings to the fore how regimes of particularized subjection biopolitically produce the seemingly unmarked hetero-masculine white body as the definition of the universalized human. King then draws on Wynter, as well as on Hortense Spillers and Alexander Weheliye, to point out that dehumanizing the Native body by targeting it for extermination and the Black body by turning it into property, unmaking it through "parasitic and genocidal violence," is primarily done "in order for the white human to self-actualize."³⁷ In similar terms, Sherene Razack argues: "Viewed as abject bodies always on the brink of death, Indigenous people can be imagined as less than human, a dehumanization that gives birth to the settler as fully human."³⁸ Widening the geographical focus, Lisa Lowe, in her analysis of "the intimacies of four continents," also identifies how "the placement of peoples at various distances from liberal humanity" leads to "colonial divisions of humanity," which are not aberrations to but "integral parts of the genealogy of modern liberalism."³⁹

For our volume, we seek to investigate these "colonial divisions of humanity" not as an addition to but as the defining starting point of a biopolitical inquiry. Arguably, the "genealogy of modern liberalism" Lowe describes is at the heart of a critical Foucauldian tradition of biopolitical thought, yet the sites from which to appraise the "colonial divisions of humanity" appear only as an afterthought in Foucault's analysis. Thus, a biopolitical approach that centers the varying and intersecting colonial contexts in which differently racialized peoples are not assigned a fully human status requires a critique of the

orthodox biopolitical framework itself. What are the analytical consequences when foregrounding the otherwise marginalized or simply “added” sites as the decisive moments of modern biopolitical formation instead, and what new analytical vocabularies might need to be developed? To engage these questions and their significance for the work this volume sets out to do, we turn to Weheliye, who observes that Wynter’s and Spillers’s theorization of the “violently tiered categorization of the human species in western modernity” opens new insight as it proceeds “without denoting race and gender to the rank of the ethnographically particular, instead exposing how these categories carve from the swamps of slavery and colonialism the very flesh and bones of modern Man.”⁴⁰

In the first instance, Weheliye’s project in *Habeas Viscus* focuses on the significance of Black studies for the figuration of humanity. Still, just as he points to the link between “slavery and colonialism,” his vision of a liberation points to, following Wynter, the understanding of the “figure of Man as a racializing assemblage” and, beyond that, to “the terrain of humanity as a relational assemblage.”⁴¹ Weheliye displaces Man’s universalization as human and indicates the relational itself as integral to the figure of the human. In this way, his project of Black liberation gestures beyond the notion of a liberal humanism, in which everyone is equally human and in which rights can be easily ascertained with reference to a human rights framework that functions by insisting on the same statist framework.⁴² Instead, his project ultimately points more broadly toward the biopolitical mechanisms of the racialized settler state and the possibility of dismantling it. It holds a potential of liberation for differentially racialized peoples in the settler state, and thus for Black freedom and decolonial struggles alike. Arguably, the potential for the latter remains largely implicit, just as the link between slavery and colonialism is not fully argumentatively realized. However, we want to emphasize for the purposes of this volume that his work opens the space to activate this potential for the biopolitical rethinking of the human in and beyond geopolitical white settler contexts. The “violent conflation” of white heteromascularity (“Man”) with humanity—producing a status quo of Man as human inscribed in the legal framework of the racial settler state itself—has targeted African-descended and Indigenous peoples differently, yet relatedly, as marked for enslavement and elimination.⁴³

From this vantage point, Weheliye’s work opens a possibility to refuse the “colonial divisions of humanity” with the insistence “that Man’s juridical machine can never exhaust the plentitude of the world.”⁴⁴ If we thus read the critique of the colonial state within Weheliye’s indictment of the racializing regime, it shows how the “plentitude of the world” can be made to bear on the project of liberation itself. *Habeas Viscus*’s emphasis on the necessity to unmake

and radically reconfigure the racial regimes and colonial divisions of humanness speaks to the shared space in which the varied struggles against the differentially racialized regimes of settler states—which includes but should not conflate Indigenous-centered decolonial struggles and Black freedom struggles—take place. Crucially, they need to take place together for possibilities of (political) sustained life resistant to white settler regimes to emerge.

With the idea of a shared space in mind, this volume seeks to understand differently inflected biopolitical regimes together with geopolitical imaginaries to address how Indigenous dispossessed lands are connected to other subaltern geographies. What Katherine McKittrick has called “black geographies”—particularly the geographies of Black women, on lands already marked by Indigenous dispossession—we see as an opportunity for thinking “Black resistance” through land that is in alliance with and in support of Indigenous anticolonial struggles rather than deferring or subsuming them.⁴⁵ McKittrick’s objective to “make visible social lives which are often displaced, rendered ungeographic” speaks to how invaded spaces, defined by settler norms, are continuously whitened.⁴⁶ In addition, her work calls attention to how the processes that render some geographies legible and legally binding, and that render some lives “geographic” via their privileged position within these imaginaries, legitimizes exclusive white settler belonging on these lands in the first place. Her analysis offers a path, then, which we seek to further lay out in this volume, of thinking through the possibility of multiple geographies that struggle against the monolithic geopolitics of the white settler state—in her case, the United States—while countering the erasure of Indigenous forms of belonging to the land. Conversely, as Simpson outlines in *As We Have Always Done*, thinking McKittrick’s theorization of “black geographies” together with struggles for Indigenous sovereignty can pave ways to address her question: “How am I accountable to the struggle of Black peoples . . . within the context of Nishnaabeg political and ethical systems?”⁴⁷ For Simpson, this accountability might manifest in an understanding of land-based governance that does not demand exclusive control over territory but, rather, allows for the possibility that access to it, as well as meeting obligations and responsibilities toward it, can be defined through relationships of sharing: “Within Nishnaabeg political thought, we have practices of sharing space with other nations and communities of peoples and respecting their autonomy to govern themselves over those lands.”⁴⁸

McKittrick and Simpson thus formulate potential ways of thinking beyond settler geopolitical regimes through figures of multiple political geographies in which land becomes a site of relation for coexistent forms of governance.

While this outlines the conditions for a thriving Indigenous (political) life, our volume also bears in mind the work of María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, which sheds light on how the very geopolitical construction of specific settler states' borders, by contrast, relies on and reinforces differently imagined biopolitical "racial geographies," artificially separating Indigenous people of the same region.⁴⁹ More specifically, the construction of Indigenous people into the distinct racialized categories of "Indians" and "*indios*" serves to reinforce and naturalize the artificial border between the two settler states of the United States and Mexico.⁵⁰ Caught in racial imaginaries, the border both constitutes and divides the geopolitical entities of North America and Latin America as well as, arguably, the economic constructs known as the Global North and Global South. The border of the settler imaginary thus becomes a site through which the North seeks to protect its privilege, strongly configured through whiteness, and disavow its responsibilities in producing globally unjust structures. This, in turn, exposes Indigenous people on both sides of the settler-imposed border to increased vulnerability, as racialized Indigenous minority or racialized migrant population, or both. The ways in which the different imaginaries of race affect Indigenous peoples in bio- and geopolitical terms can be seen, for example, in how Mexican Indigenous communities are absorbed into a *mestizaje* nationalism while their counterparts in the United States are racialized as minorities, underlining a settler norm that is directly defined through whiteness.⁵¹ Shona Jackson's *Creole Indigeneity* further illuminates how geopolitical internationalist relations are tied to the biopolitical production of Indigenous peoples within the racial imaginaries of settler states. Jackson's important theorization of how a subaltern nation-state such as Guyana appropriates Indigeneity as a means of national emancipation for the creolized population is work that she continues in this volume.⁵²

Neoliberalism, Extractivism, and Defending Indigenous Life

To think beyond the biopolitics and geopolitics of race within settler states, we need a linked theorization of biopolitics and geopolitics that considers how life itself is valued (or discounted) within the exploitative and extractivist settler structures toward people and the land. What, then, would it mean to think about the late Lauren Berlant's notion of "slow death" and Rob Nixon's concept of "slow violence" alongside and in dialogue with each other when viewed as conditions of life under settler colonialism?⁵³ While the work of both does not engage directly with questions of Indigeneity, it does speak to the simultaneous pervasiveness and invisibility of settler colonialism as well as to the routine

practices of Native erasure. The question that drives this critical dialogue is, then, not how these concepts outside of Indigenous studies can add to the field but, rather, how this scholarship is itself changed when viewed from the perspective of Indigenous studies.

Both Berlant's and Nixon's decelerated vocabulary of the gradual, incremental, and accretive speaks to how settler social structures are configured as stretched across time in a way that makes the condition of attrition and erosion for Indigenous peoples, directly affecting lands and bodies, appear to be woven into the temporal fabric itself, effectively closing off any alternative future possibility. "Slowness," then, offers a way to consider the simultaneous deprivation of Indigenous lands and bodies as a self-perpetuating structure that not only aims for the elimination of the Native (in Wolfe's terminology) but also employs bio- and geopolitical techniques for "settler time" to function as the erasure of futurities thought otherwise.⁵⁴

Berlant states: "The phrase slow death refers to the physical wearing out of a population in a way that points to its deterioration as a defining condition of its experience and historical existence."⁵⁵ While Berlant's primary target is a neoliberal paradigm of self-optimization, we want to ask what new insights can be gained by considering through their writing intersecting (neo)liberal and settler-colonial logics. Under which conditions and to which end does this "deterioration" occur? And how is value-determining capital linked to the on-going settler capitalization of Indigenous lands, bodies, and lives?

Asking these questions invites us to consider "deterioration" not so much as a "defining condition" for Indigenous peoples. Instead, it appears as a condition through which they become defined from the outside to provide and constantly secure the condition of possibility for the liberal settler state. The state may no longer actively or publicly encourage the killing of Indigenous peoples so as not to trouble its own democratic rights-based order. Yet providing evidence of the "deterioration" of Indigenous peoples as their "defining condition" clearly serves as a means to secure and foster what the Kahnawà:ke Mohawk theorist Audra Simpson has termed "the life of the state," a life imagined as everlasting and ever in the need of resources grabbed from Indigenous lands and lives.⁵⁶

An investment in the belief of Indigenous "deterioration" fosters a pervasive sense of settler indifference to them, even in contexts couched in the benevolent terms of (neo)liberal care. For example, in investigating state responses to health-care emergencies among the Inuit in Canada, Lisa Stevenson has observed how "forms of care" administered by the settler welfare state remain indifferent to the specific Indigenous peoples cared for, an indifference

that is accompanied by a sense of expectancy of their death. In response to the high rates of suicide among the Inuit, Stevenson contends that, within “the forms of anonymous care in the colonial/postcolonial context . . . , caregivers exhort Inuit to live while simultaneously expecting them to die.”⁵⁷ She goes on: “Such forms of bureaucratic care, while working to maintain the physical life of Inuit *qua* Canadian citizens, may also manifest a form of indifference on part of the state—an indifference that is sometimes perceived by Inuit as murderous.”⁵⁸ Inuit may perceive that indifference as murderous because it surfaces also in contexts that are less benevolent. In this case, that indifference manifests in the settler administration of care: caring for the continuity of Inuit life as such while not caring exactly *who* lives and *how* one continues to live under situations of colonialism, and not necessarily expecting Inuit to keep on living. Yet the same indifference and expectancy of Indigenous death through their “deterioration” takes on the form of neglect and aggression in different instances, maybe most notably in the long-lasting neglect by the Canadian state (and by the United States) of the large number of missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls.⁵⁹ While this neglect is once more bureaucratically regulated under the current Canadian government through the conduct of an official inquiry leading to Indigenous charges of race-based genocide, the same indifferent neglect, coupled with an aggressive attitude toward the victims of such violence, continues to manifest itself in the rulings of the court cases on the killings of Colten Boushie and Tina Fontaine in the spring of 2018.

In the cases of both Boushie and Fontaine, one might say that the slow death through settler colonialism—the conditions that make Indigenous bodies vulnerable to settler violence—accelerated rapidly to produce their sudden and violent deaths at the hands of settlers. However, in the widespread settler-colonial perception, the deeper causes lie not in a continuing historical system of social injustice, but in the “deterioration” as the defining condition of the teenagers’ lives that make their violent deaths appear inevitable and as happening unavoidably. In this view, they merely occur, either by accident (in the defense of Gerald Stanley) or at the hands of any other man Tina Fontaine could have encountered (in the defense of Raymond Cormier). Both rationalizations make it possible to absolve the perpetrators of responsibility for Boushie’s and Fontaine’s deaths. With both cases resulting in acquittals, the deaths of Indigenous youth—purportedly brought about by a life inviting danger (Fontaine) or by posing an assumed danger to settler life (Boushie)—are both expected and indifferently accepted. Regarded as non-resourceful lives without benefits to the liberal settler state, neither Boushie nor Fontaine is assigned enough value for their families to receive justice for their violent deaths in settler courts. In this

case, Berlant's idea of "cruel optimism" might mean to still expect "reconciliation" to move forward when being confronted with a situation in which justice and the value of Indigenous life is continually and habitually being denied.

When we move from the biopolitical administration of Indigenous life and death to the geopolitical use of land, rethinking Berlant's notion of "deterioration" as the defining settler perception of Indigenous life also shows how settler accumulation through excavating and exploiting Indigenous resources of life, most often tied to the land itself, can be justified. What is deteriorating can be improved only by settler intervention, whether Indigenous life through the administration of care or other state interventions or Indigenous land through construction or extraction.⁶⁰ In this way, monetary value is generated from the land, regularly with life-diminishing results for Indigenous peoples and lands, causing what Razack has called "dying from improvement."⁶¹

The "attrition of subjects" in Berlant's thought, then, connects to "attritional violence," which for Nixon is a decisive aspect of slow violence.⁶² His concept of slow violence is clearly geopolitically oriented in the way it seeks to account for "slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes" that are characterized by "a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space."⁶³ We want to highlight his thought, as we find it helpful for thinking of land-oriented settler temporalities alongside bodily slow death. This is specifically the case since settler colonialism clearly offers itself for analysis as an ongoing history structured through "slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes," along with moments that intensify these particular forms of violence (toward the land as well as toward the human and other-than-human forms of being that inhabit it).

The centrality of environmental catastrophe to the Indigenous experience of settler colonization also makes environmental justice a key Indigenous issue. At the same time, as Dana Gilio-Whitaker (Colville Confederated Tribes) points out, environmental justice needs to be rethought for the situation of Indigenous peoples so that it takes into account issues of sovereignty, acknowledges the "colonial condition," and frames "decolonization as a potential framework within which environmental justice can be made available."⁶⁴

The "colonial condition" assumes the irreversibility of these catastrophes, thereby creating the conditions for slow death that structure Indigenous life under settler rule, a condition that functions precisely by foreclosing all futures imagined otherwise. Kristen Simmons has written of "settler atmospherics" that stifle the very breath of Indigenous people struggling under these conditions—conditions that are ubiquitous and in which the air itself can be weaponized against Indigenous peoples in moments of intensified state

violence. Simmons's notion that "breathing in a settler atmosphere is taxing," commenting on the violent militarized response with tear gas and pepper spray to the water protection at Standing Rock, also helps us to make sense of the large number of Inuit suicides dealt with only through a care of indifference and the poisonous effects of air pollution through extraction industries, such as the toxic clouds emitted by oil sand production to which Indigenous communities are disproportionately exposed.⁶⁵

How slow violence is an indicator of and contributor to the quotidian attrition of subjects being exposed to slow death becomes visible in the varied forms of extractive capitalism that operate on Indigenous lands. These include mineral mining, oil drilling, and as Macarena Gómez-Barris states, other "technologies that mark out regions of 'high biodiversity' in order to reduce life to capitalist resource conversion."⁶⁶ Indigenous lands are recoded as part of what Gómez-Barris terms the "extractive zone," in which the forms of life it harbors are targeted for profit. While "Indigenous peoples often multiply rather than reduce life possibilities" in these regions, they are still marked not only by deterioration but also by expendability.⁶⁷ Disposability comes to define settler conceptions of Indigeneity. Overall, this places the "destructive path that is extractive capitalism" close to the possible destination of "wastelanding," which Traci Brynne Voyles analyzes with reference to the history of uranium mining in Navajo country.⁶⁸

It is only when settler-colonial attacks on Indigenous lands and bodies are intensified that non-Indigenous publics pay attention to them and to the direct Indigenous response and resistance. Oftentimes, though, such settler-colonial attacks and forms of Indigenous resistance are read merely through environmentalism, ignoring how they are embedded in wider and long-lasting forms of violence. Beyond that, highly visible movements to protect Indigenous life and defend Indigenous lands and waters should not detract from a long history of geographically widespread, diversified, and often less publicized struggles. Gómez-Barris reminds us: "The Sioux and trans-confederation struggle contesting the Dakota pipeline is only one example of continual Indigenous land defense in the Américas," which always entails a defense of the Indigenous rights to this land.⁶⁹ In this sense, it is not sufficient to think of these as environmental causes that are distinct from Native struggles for decolonization. Instead, we want to emphasize for the work of this volume how Indigenous dispossession functions as the condition of possibility for practices and discourses that exploit and violate the land. Understood in bio- and geopolitical terms, the extractive zone continues to be vital to settler-colonial structures that capitalize on Indigenous bodies, lands, and lives.

What the struggles against these structures hold in common is how they counter the seeping of slow violence and slow death into the lands and bodies of Indigenous peoples. In doing so, they center a different temporality of continuities; emphasize enduring relationships to the land reactivated through collective practices, activism, and ceremony; and rearticulate a sense of continual resurgence. Disrupting any conventional self-perpetuating and self-complacent settler fantasy of changelessness as a given in its habituated perpetration of slow violence, such a sense of resurgence calls back to earlier moments of anticolonial struggles and looks toward different possible futurities. Specifically, it highlights the potential of an Indigenous and decolonized futurity rooted in “the invisible, the inanimate, and the non-human forms that creatively reside as afterlives of the colonial encounter,” as Gómez-Barris puts it, all the while pointing to the political significance of Indigenous-centered epistemologies that conceives of all forms of life and being in relationality.⁷⁰

Land, Water, and Indigenous Normativities of Political Life

“Land is life,” posits Patrick Wolfe in his essay “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native” (2006). Notably, he modifies his own statement immediately by adding, “at least, land is necessary for life,” from which follows that “contests for land can be—indeed, often are—contests for life.”⁷¹ From his initial statement, Wolfe develops the premise that settler colonialism’s focus on “territoriality” as its “irreducible element” is inevitably genocidal, as well.⁷² The theft of land equals, and is regularly accompanied by, the taking of lives. In his formulation, then, “land is life” or is “necessary for life” functions through how he defines its negation. Having no land, or being dispossessed of land equals death, and orchestrated acts of dispossession constitute genocidal practices.⁷³

If we approach the statement from a perspective that centers Indigenous epistemologies, however, it resonates in quite a different manner in addition to indexing the genocidal impetus of dispossession. This becomes clear when we read it alongside *mni wiconi*, Lakota for “water is life,” the central call of the water protectors at Standing Rock. This call was taken up on many different occasions and at many different locations to show solidarity. Yet the levels of meaning that were more readily evoked, especially connected to a non-Indigenous environmentalism, could be quite comfortably translated to, or integrated within, a liberal-humanist framework, possibly more so than the parallel statement “land is life.” *Mni wiconi* tended to be read, then, as “water is the source of life” or “without water there is (literally) no life.”

Within these accounts, however, the “life” of “land” and “water” appears immediately and solely in service of human and nonhuman populations. It seems, then, that the “life” that land and water embody is meaningful only to the degree that both are a source of life and a necessity for life for other beings—humans, other-than-human animals, plants—who are in need of their life-giving qualities. In that sense, the “life” of land and water always registers as secondary to the forms of life that need to be nourished by it.

Indigenous scholars discussing the movement at Standing Rock and what Melanie K. Yazzie (Diné) and Cutcha Rising Baldy (Hupa, Yurok, Karuk) call “the politics of water,” though, make clear that *mni wiconi* is not that easily reducible.⁷⁴ They assert instead an expansive view of nonhuman life and relations that has epistemological and political dimensions. Nick Estes (Lower Brule Sioux) states that *mni wiconi* “is also an affirmation that water is alive” and that Mnisose—the Missouri River, which the resistance to the Dakota Access Pipeline sought to protect—is best understood as a “nonhuman relative, who is alive, and who is also of the Mni Oyate, the Water Nation.”⁷⁵ Relatedly, Craig Howe (Oglala Sioux) describes Mnisose as a “living being” and frames the resistance at Standing Rock in terms of relationality: “Standing Rock is where the people are gathered to protect their relative right now.”⁷⁶ Extending this thought, but also emphasizing water’s own autonomy, Edward Valandra (Oceti Sakowin Oyate/Sicangu Titunwan) writes: “We . . . recognize water as having personhood, independent of humans ‘giving’ that standing or status.”⁷⁷ For Yazzie and Baldy, this notion of water’s autonomy is coupled with a focus on “water view,” the perspective that water itself has on the world, which ultimately not only highlights water’s agency but also puts a demand on human action in relation to water: “Our theoretical standpoint is one that foregrounds *water view*, (re)claiming knowledges not just for the people, but also for the water; not just looking at our relationship to water, but our accountability to water view.”⁷⁸

When taking these water views from Indigenous scholars into account, it appears that *mni wiconi* (water is life) and “land is life” do not so much assert that life is equal to water and land or that land and water are important for the continuation of life. Instead, they articulate the dynamic forms of existence, the ways of being in the world that inhere to land and water in themselves as being meaningful in their own right, not solely because they nourish other forms of life. This shift entails viewing how water extends beyond itself toward nonhuman and human bodies without reducing this to a resource that functions in support of a body’s life. Instead, it can be appreciated as a form of communal interaction between humans and what Zoe Todd (Métis/otipemisiw) has called their “watery kin.”⁷⁹ Furthermore, it points to a means of establishing,

manifesting, and affirming relations among all forms of being that makes present a structure of kinship crucial to the social and political life of Indigenous communities.

In these readings of *nni wiconi*, what is at stake is more than the ascription of life and agency to an entity that is, in non-Native epistemologies, largely regarded as inanimate. For merely expanding the definitions of what is alive beyond the more conventional parameters always allows the possibility of redrawing the border between life and nonlife at another moment, thus simply reproducing the system that *nni wiconi* challenges. In that sense, the force of *nni wiconi* might not come so much from an expanded definition of life as from a refusal to accept the rules of a system of governance that operates by insisting on the division of what it regards as life and nonlife. The Australian scholar Elizabeth Povinelli has recently analyzed this system—in analogy to biopower—as “geontopower,” which she specifies as “the management of existents through the separation of that which has and is imbued with the dynamics of life (birth, growth, finitude, agency, intentionality, self-authored, or at least change) and that which settler liberalism treats as absolutely not.”⁸⁰

In *Geontologies: A Requiem to Late Liberalism*, Povinelli investigates six “forms of existence often referred to as Dreaming or totemic formations” for whose maintenance her “Indigenous friends and colleagues” of the social collective Karrabing in the Northern Territory of Australia struggle “within a cramped space of maneuver.”⁸¹ In accordance with her definition of *geontopower*, she asks how these forms of existence could “have standing before the public, law, and market as a political subject.”⁸² Ultimately, this question does not depend so much on extending the parameters of life to include, as Povinelli puts it, these “existents” within it. For her, such a move would confine the existents and Indigenous people engaged with them “to the imaginary of the Animist, a form that has been made compatible with liberal states and markets.”⁸³

According to Povinelli, the figuration of the “Animist” is one of liberal recognition in which “Indigenous people agree to participate as an Animist voice in the governmental order of the people.”⁸⁴ Instead of challenging the order of “late liberal approaches to geontology,” such a measure allows settlers to remain comfortable in that order by affirming their assumption that Indigenous people have “a cultural belief about things rather than a probing analytics of their existence.”⁸⁵ Accordingly, opening the political discourses and spaces for nonlife forms of existence does not mean to assert their liveliness and include them within a “biontology.”⁸⁶ Instead, it means to register them as “geontological, meteorontological, econtological statements [that] refuse to abide by any fundamental difference between Life and Nonlife.”⁸⁷ Through this mode of

refusal Povinelli unmasks how “the division of Life and Nonlife as a division of givenness” is itself the crucial sovereign act of late liberal settler governance.⁸⁸ This act seeks to confine Indigenous people to the “social tense” of the “primitive” in that their “cultural belief” appears as an anachronistic aberration to this norm of “givenness.” By presenting a state of “givenness” that manifests in the “division of Life and Nonlife” as something that is installed through a sovereign act instead of being merely described in a neutral assessment of what self-evidently *is*, though, Povinelli raises another issue—namely, she poses the question of what it means not to make transparent the political reasoning of establishing such a division, especially by acting as if there was no such political reasoning in the first place.⁸⁹ Asking this question becomes particularly salient in the current moment when “the self-evident distinction of Life and Nonlife” is “crumbling” under the “conceptual impact” of the Anthropocene.⁹⁰

The call *mni wiconi* (and Wolfe’s offering that land is life) draws our attention to how settler governance over bodies of water as nonlife, objects for use, and resources to be exploited is already premised on and constructs a seemingly “self-evident distinction” into *bios* and *geos* as relevant separate categories of governing difference. As a form of colonial violence in and of itself, this distinction produces a “cramped space of maneuver” as the defining condition for all ensuing struggles of Indigenous people and the existents they care for and maintain to “*manifest and endure* in contemporary settler late liberalism.”⁹¹

What does it mean, then, to assess the colonial violence of this division as the point of departure for any settler geo- and biopolitical analytics going forward? In “Indigenizing Agamben,” Rifkin influentially and importantly argues that “the biopolitical project of defining the proper ‘body’ of the people is subtended by the geopolitical project of defining the territoriality of the nation,” emphasizing the geopolitical quality of the state of exception to which Indigenous peoples are exposed.⁹² Yet by analytically connecting settler biopolitical to geopolitical rule and ultimately stating that the latter has primacy over the former, he still suggests that the distinction between geo- and biopolitical rule can be meaningfully construed, even if only for analytical purposes. His argument implies that the means through which these specific forms of governance, bio- and geopolitical, are employed are decisive for indicating particular forms of settler-colonial governance, not that their operation is premised on having produced this distinction itself.

The question, then, is whether an analysis of settler-colonial bio- and geopolitics as distinct, yet related, modes of settler governance reproduces, necessarily and inevitably, on an analytic level “the division of Life [bios, zoe]

and Nonlife [geos] as the division of givenness” that Povinelli critiques as a sovereign act of settler governance itself. In this sense, the division of bios and geos becomes a lens through which to interrogate settler-colonial operations (particularly in the way they exceed an Agambenian biopolitical framework) instead of being viewed as a settler-colonial operation in itself. This division itself is thus not viewed as a fundamental sovereign act that discounts Indigenous analytics of (political) existence and casts settler-colonial impositions on this analytic as an assertion of what is always already a condition of “givenness.” If that is the case, however, what would an analytic look like that refuses this violent reproduction of division between life and nonlife while not, at the same time, reproducing the liberal recognition of animism as “cultural belief”? And what role could the call *mni wiconi* play, if not necessarily in formulating that analytic, yet still in orienting the theoretical parameters toward it?

When one reconsiders Povinelli’s analysis of geontopower in this respect, her work does not so much suggest new ways to connect a bio- and geopolitical analytics through a focus on late liberal settler governance as offer a shift in the parameters of inclusion and exclusion central to all biopolitical inquiries from life and death to life and nonlife. She thereby draws attention to how a definition of population and of territory as distinct entities to be governed—without accounting for all forms of existence that inhabit and make up the land that contribute to Indigenous forms of place-based sociality—shows this form of governance to be fundamentally premised on disregarding Indigenous people’s “analytics of their existence.”⁹³ This disregard includes willingly ignoring the impact these analytics exercise on what constitutes societies and polities for Indigenous peoples. So settler forms of governance violently impose, affirm, and institutionalize this disregard while simultaneously insisting on its self-evident quality.

Instead of asking how we might define such Indigenous analytics of being across the constructed divisions of life and nonlife, it might be more useful to consider the forms of being settler-colonial impositions target when they seek to establish and perpetuate their own “givenness.” Goeman’s analysis of settler colonialism as a gendered spatial violence is helpful in this regard, as she writes: “Colonialism is not just about conquering Native lands through mapping new ownerships, but it is also about the conquest of bodies,” so that “the making of Indian land into territory required a colonial restructuring of spaces at a variety of scales,” including “Native bodies” themselves.⁹⁴ What emerges from this scalar analysis is, then, not so much a division of bios and geos as a

continuum of spatial relationships that extends across Native lands and bodies in interaction. Through measures of “colonial restructuring of spaces,” which include “abstracting lands and bodies into territories and citizens,” this continuum of relationships is also targeted as such.⁹⁵ Moving from relationships to abstractions thereby instantiates the division that is to enable clear-cut geo- and biopolitical techniques to be known as the norm of governance.

Importantly, Indigenous political theory and practice contest just such a norm. What Povinelli terms an “antinormative normativity” that could emerge from an engagement with formations “refusing to abide by any fundamental difference between Life and Nonlife” resonates with Coulthard’s concept of “grounded normativity.”⁹⁶ He characterizes grounded normativity as “living our lives in relation to one another and our surroundings in a respectful, nondominating, and nonexploitative way.”⁹⁷ He elaborates: “Within this system of relations human beings are not the only constituent believed to embody spirit or agency. Ethically, this means that humans held certain obligations to the land, animals, plants, and lakes in much the same way that we hold obligations to other people.”⁹⁸ Likewise, Jeannette Armstrong (Syilx Okanagan) and Richard Atleo (Nuu-chah-nulth) show that North West Coast land ethics are based on the notion that humans, animals, plants, and land coequally and interdependently form a life force together; that resources are “shared” according to certain “contracts” and protocols; and that such knowledge is contained in seminal oral accounts.⁹⁹

What marks land as life and water as life, then, might not be so much an ascription of biologically defined lifelike qualities to entities that follow different patterns of being and becoming. In this case, it would reaffirm the premise of a division of bio and geos on which settler-colonial bio- and geopolitics ultimately rest rather than tracing ways, as this volume is interested in, of disrupting or running counter to such a premise. Instead, calling water and land life might be best captured as a naming of the obligations, commitments, reciprocal arrangements, and mutual attachments or affections that constitute lived relationships and relational modes of living between certain forms of human life and other-than-human lives as well as between specific bodies of land and water and other formations of nonlife that are constitutive of, integral to, and interwoven in the social fabric and political life of community and peoplehood.

While Coulthard talks about “grounded normativity” in general terms, he speaks clearly from a Yellowknives Dene perspective; the “land, animals, plants, and lakes” also need to be reflected in their specificity and specific relevance for Yellowknives Dene communities. In that sense, *mni wiconi* as a statement in Lakota (rather than in English) has significance that exceeds

the more general connotation of water being life. Resisting the “power of abstracting land and bodies,” as Goeman puts it, into neatly divided categories means to attend to the specific relationships Indigenous people engage with particular bodies of land and water in the mutual and shared making of social and political life in a specific place. The particular instances of commitment, maintaining, and caring that define the relationships—as between the Byulen and their Dreaming, which move through Povinelli’s *Geontologies*—might then form the ground from which a specific kind of normativity can be articulated. Fundamentally, the very act of biopolitically defining and regulating a people as a solely human population, simply happening to exist on a specific piece of land with given environmental characteristics, already attacks the principle of Indigenous place-based relational peoplehood in that it silently excludes, as Todd states, “land, water, plants, animals and other more-than-human beings as *political agents* in their own right.”¹⁰⁰

Mni wiconi, read in this way, is not a means to communicate Indigenous causes to a broader non-Native public. More to the point, it articulates Indigenous resistance, resurgence, and refusal that is grounded within the normativities of distinct Indigenous conceptions of political formations defined by a specifically place-based relationality. It is not so much an act of resistance that falls into any of the categories—such as environmental protection or cultural preservation—through which Indigenous struggles are largely made legible and relatable to non-Native contexts as an act of refusal that is oriented toward the decolonial imperative of a relational politics. Such a politics seeks to exceed the confines set by each parameter of knowing and governing Indigenous difference by foregrounding the principle of relationality as a mode of refusal. As Simpson argues, “‘Refusal’ rather than recognition is an option for producing and maintaining alternative structures of thought, politics and traditions away from and in critical relationship to states.”¹⁰¹ She goes on: “‘Refusal’ holds on to a truth, structures this truth as stance.”¹⁰² Reading the relational politics of Indigenous sociality as a mode of refusal points to the “alternative structures of thought, politics, and traditions” and the “truth as stance” brought forth as a denaturalizing force to the settler politics of division (into bios and geos) and the resultant governing of difference. Insisting on the “truth” of Indigenous political life structured through all forms of existence—including what is categorized as human and nonhuman, life and nonlife—as dynamic positions of kinship unearths or activates anew alternative structures of the polity that remain irreducible to settler terms of liberal recognition.¹⁰³ They turn Leanne Betasamosake Simpson’s descriptions of precolonial treaty relationships between human and nonhuman nations into a challenge to the state by tracing

the political orders beyond it: “Animal clans were highly respected and were seen as self-determining, political ‘nations’ (at least in an Indigenous sense) with whom the Nishnaabegs had negotiated ritualized, formal relationships that required maintenance through an ongoing relationship.”¹⁰⁴

With this, the claim, assertion, act of refusal, and call to resurgence of *mni wiconi* cuts through settler-colonial techniques of bio- and geopolitical rule by exposing their fictitious divisions as part of the work of dividing Indigenous claims to political life, claims that remain irreducible to the imaginaries inscribed within the legal frameworks of settler states. *Mni wiconi* disrupts these modes of colonial division in that it insists on a political epistemology of relationalities that contains a decolonial imperative. In this understanding, Mnisose, the Missouri River, does not just constitute an object or part of a national geography (Indigenous or non-Indigenous) or a point of reference for the resistance to state power. Instead, it marks a form of political life that exists not merely within the settler state but also alongside it, beyond it, and in opposition to it. Engaged, in Audra Simpson’s words, in a “critical relationship to the state” in which it refuses to be absorbed by modes of settler rule, such life is embodied and emplaced within a position that holds on to “a truth” and is “a stance” opening up new political possibilities.

Attending to Indigenous Lands, Lives, and Bodies across Settler States

Within this volume, the analysis of settler-colonial formations extends across the hemisphere of the Americas and via the Pacific to noncontinental territories claimed by the United States, exemplified by Hawai‘i, as well as to Australia and Aotearoa/New Zealand. In offering such an expansive perspective on the geographies of settler colonialism, we seek to comprehend it as it appears in its various forms, not just as a singularly defined project. We do not want to normalize rhetoric that sees some settler states as more prototypical than others. Instead, we want to foster an approach that more fully engages the complexities and relationalities of colonial statist settlements. Moving across (trans)nationally constituted sites of settlement that proceed on historically differentiated trajectories, this volume seeks to draw out points of mutual recognizability across geographical ranges in their parallelized techniques of instituting ongoing Indigenous dispossession and delegitimization as the status quo of statist formation.

The essays in this volume approach these issues from a variety of disciplinary perspectives, including literary and cultural studies, political theory, age

studies, and visual culture as well as film studies. This variety underscores how the questions and concepts of biopolitics, geopolitics, and life cut across disciplinary and methodological borders. It further illustrates the inter- and transdisciplinarity of Indigenous studies as a field that intersects multiple areas of scholarship—from social sciences, natural sciences and legal sciences to the humanities—to address the diversity of Indigenous peoples as well as to interrogate how settler conditions pervade all areas of life and inquiry.

Within this interdisciplinary framework, the contributions from within literary, cultural, and film and media studies take on a specific significance. Within the realm of the speculative and imaginary, they foreground the bio- and necropolitical conditions of living under settler colonialism that are rendered invisible in dominant discourse and unsettle the limits of the thinkable within settler society by broadening the range of the possible within the imaginative, thus opening a path toward a decolonial imaginary. The volume demonstrates that Indigenous and settler-colonial studies not only inhabit a vital place within the humanities. Beyond that, they also significantly add to humanities' discourses and focuses by making a necessary claim to think decolonization and the liberation of settler bio- and geopolitical rule as a possibility and imperative within our cultural, social, and political imaginary.

The volume opens with an essay by Mishuana Goeman on the violence against Native women as a form of extirpation and the role of Indigenous literatures as paving new paths toward justice. Doing so, her essay already displays the particular social and political function of literature by arguing for its capacity as a form of testimony for the otherwise unsaid and underreported. Goeman denounces the use of the term *epidemic* to describe the widespread violence against Native women in the United States and Canada because it makes assault appear to be linked to innate biological traits, veils culpability of (white) male subjects, and deflects responsibility from the historical and systemic causes of such violence. Moving away from the resulting inadequacies of the settler-colonial justice system, she analyzes Native women's writing as a form of witnessing to violence in two senses: a victim's witnessing of the crime that is also a form of violence affecting Indigenous communities and witnessing as storytelling, giving testimony to occurred (and ongoing) crimes that can provide new paths for justice in combating violence against Native women beyond settler law.

The two essays that follow continue this conversation on normalized violence against Indigenous bodies while extending it to different contexts of institutionalization and exploring its critique as a possibility to emphasize Indigenous-centered normativities. To this extent, Sandy Grande (Quechua)

addresses “age” as a phenomenon and category of life that, particularly in how its management affects Indigenous communities and contradicts as well as alters understandings of age widespread in Indigenous societies, makes visible the mechanisms of a settler-capitalist biopolitics of disposing (as well as physically removing from sight) those modes of life that are not productive to upholding the colonial capitalist status quo. She shows how such mechanisms are countered by the gesturing toward an “Indigenous elsewhere.” She outlines it as a space of being that transcends the mode of productive functionality as well as opposes the narrative of physical and mental decline that accompanies European/settler accounts of aging with accounts of accessing ways of being and inhabiting (mental) space that exceed the commonly shared surfaces of everyday twenty-first-century life in settler states.

Addressing another form of institutionalized containment in distinct yet related ways, Robert Nichols asks how the analysis of the Canadian prison system can be productively rethought by considering its racism in not only the disproportionate numbers of various racialized populations being imprisoned but also the “colonialism of incarceration” itself. The prison system operating from claims of territorialized sovereignty of the nation-state forms the point of departure for its fundamental critique from an Indigenous perspective in Nichols’s argument. The essay thus intersects bio- and geopolitical critique by asserting Indigenous normativities as it examines how a biopolitical form of regulating populations’ lives according to certain norms and nation-state laws can be unsettled through a geopolitical critique of the state’s legitimacy to exert these laws. Doing so, it opens a pathway for activating the decolonial potential in critical prison studies.

As Nichols’s chapter demonstrates, settler state violence is inscribed within the institutions that govern regimes of the everyday—whether they constitute daily processes of law enforcement, legal systems, or age administration. This focus on the institution links Nichols’s chapter to the next two contributions, which investigate techniques that assert the legal framework of the settler state while advocating a rhetoric of recognition and emancipation. Moving beyond the continental possessions of what is today the United States, the Kanaka Maoli scholar David Uahikeaikalei’ohu Maile provocatively asks, “Are Hawaiians Indians?” (thereby repurposing an attack on the Indigeneity of Native Hawaiians by the then attorney Brett Kavanaugh) to connect an analysis of racializing settler-colonial biopolitics to a critique of liberal state recognition. Drawing on the strategy of the US Department of the Interior outlined in the 2014 Notices for Proposed Rule Making to consider the possibility and terms of the federal

recognition of a Kanaka Maoli governing entity (and thereby reestablishing a government-to-government relationship between it and the United States), Maile elucidates how these notices constitute “notices of settlement” that seek to perpetuate US settlement in Hawai‘i by eclipsing Kanaka Maoli sovereignty through recognition. In response, the rejection of these notices by Kanaka Maoli representatives documents for Maile an “archive of refusal” to ongoing settler-state imposition.

As the volume’s geopolitical scope further widens, the repurposing of another Indigenous archive becomes the point of departure for Shona Jackson’s important exploration of postcolonial biopolitics in Guyana: the Guyanese airport, located and temporarily named for the town Timehri, which is known for Indigenous petroglyphs (pictographic rock carving), represents these as hieroglyphs (prelinguistic signs). In Jackson’s reading, this shows how the signs of a sovereignty prior to and independent of the colonial as well as the postcolonial state (petroglyphs) are reproduced as simulacra of an Indigeneity that anticipates and prefigures the emancipation of the postcolonial state as being itself always already protonational (hieroglyphs). As her essay argues for the difference between the postcolonial, nonwhite, involuntary settler state and the dominant white settler state, Jackson expands her discussion to the Amerindian Act in the iterations of 1977 and 2006 to show how the Guyanese state continues to produce Indigenous peoples as a body to be governed in service of the postcolonial state while denying them any rights they could claim as sovereign peoples not restricted to the state’s juridical space.

While the Creolized Black peoples of Guyana constitute the privileged biopolitical body in contrast to Indigenous peoples, Jackson’s contribution crucially attests that the Amerindian Act also signifies a struggle of Black peoples against ongoing histories of being reduced to bare life, which the Guyanese state wards off by relegating Indigenous peoples to this status instead. This strategy does not, however, change Guyana’s own subaltern position as a non-white postcolonial state. The exploration of complex Black-Indigenous relations continues in Mark Rifkin’s chapter, which addresses for the US context the possible incommensurability between Black freedom and Indigenous sovereignty struggles, with the former being largely cast in terms of fungibility of the flesh and the latter in terms of dispossession of land. Attending to this possible impasse, Rifkin considers the role that speculative genres, explicitly creating what-if scenarios, can play in thinking “imaginaries of the flesh and the land” in relation to each other. While Afro-pessimistic thought on Indigenous sovereignty as a reactionary investment in “propertied selfhood,” for Rifkin,

shows the difficulties of overcoming this impasse, his reading of the Afrofuturist author Octavia Butler offers new possibilities to think through it, including the tensions that arise when attempting to subsume a territorial geopolitics of Indigeneity under a biopolitical imaginary of the racialized body.

Rifkin's essay not only accompanies Jackson's in exploring the complexities of Indigeneity and Blackness but is also the first of a cluster focusing on the position and potential of literary writing to negotiate and challenge settler bio- and geopolitical frameworks. After Rifkin's exploration of Afrofuturist writing, Sabine Meyer focuses on Native fiction, taking Diane Glancy's novel *Pushing the Bear* as an example of Native Removal literature that renders the Cherokee expulsion of the 1830s, known as the Trail of Tears, as a biopolitical experience that seeks to reduce the Cherokee to the Agambenian status of "bare life." (We follow Meyer's practice of capitalizing *Removal* to denaturalize it.) At the same time, in her reading the novel brings to the fore the close intertwining of biopolitics and geopolitics manifest in Removal, with the settler-colonial production of the Cherokee as nomadic people facilitating their dispossession and Cherokee slaveholding practices doubly depriving Black enslaved people of the right to life and reducing them to the status of property to be removed. Ultimately, though, Meyer suggests that the novel brings to the fore the category of "Indigenous lives" that counters biopolitical reduction by rehumanizing and repoliticizing the Cherokee through the powers of storytelling and language, oral and written. Within this cluster on literary writing as a contestation of settler bio- and geopolitics, this chapter thus highlights the potential of Native literatures to formulate the dimensions of political and transnational lives for Indigenous peoples beyond reductive settler definitions.

If Rifkin points out how speculative genres can open "political possibilities," the normalized reception of other genres appears to foreclose such possibilities, such as when magical realism is connected to a Third World postcolonial context and the magic it employs appears to originate solely from non-Western cultures. Precisely at this juncture, Michael R. Griffiths's contribution makes an important intervention as he proposes through Daniel Heath Justice's concept of "wonderwork" a decolonization of what is read as magical realism in the works of the Noongar author Kim Scott and the Māori author Witi Ihimaera. Through a reading strategy that puts magical realism under erasure, what is viewed as "magic" no longer appears simply as an othering device for Indigenous cultures but is reappraised by Griffiths as an effect that is produced at the intersection of two competing forms of empiricism in a situation of ongoing colonization. In detailed readings of both writers, Griffiths draws out how such a decolonial reassessment of magical realism through a trans-Indigenous

reading is able to make visible the colonial archive as an investment in the invasive magic of biopower that seeks to erase Indigenous peoples through their ordering into hierarchized colonial systems of belief. At the same time, such a perspective ultimately works to re-presence Indigenous knowledges as both autonomous and necessarily interacting with colonial modes of power in their own dynamic of Indigenous modernity and relationality.

For Griffiths, the colonial archive is the product and the means of settler desire to index and target Indigenous difference, but he also notes that the archive can be turned into a space of resistance (which for Maile, as noted earlier, even extends into an “archive of refusal” of Native people defying colonial power). At this intersection of the archive as colonial instrument and possible site of subversion, Jacqueline Fear-Segal’s contribution is positioned to investigate the visual archive of one of the most (in)famous biopolitical institutions of the United States: the Carlisle Indian Industrial School. The first government-run boarding school complementing the assimilationist efforts of allotment, Carlisle produced a visual archive that documents its erasure of Indigeneity, as Fear-Segal outlines. At the same time, however, Fear-Segal traces in the archive manifestations of visual sovereignty straining against the official narrative of erasing any sense of Indigenous autonomy. Using photography and painting to their own end, students exerted sovereign forms of self-expression that point to visual art as a means of signifying Native belonging and survivance. At the same time, Fear-Segal’s analysis indicates the close link between a defiant mode of self-representation and the political activism some pursued after Carlisle, as exemplified by the portraits of Luther Standing Bear.

Fear-Segal’s chapter is the first of two essays toward the end of this book that focus on visual representation as a means of engaging settler geo- and biopolitics. Following it, the final contribution to this volume, by Kerstin Knopf, focuses on how filmic representations can capture Indigenous struggles over space and its signification by visually rendering how space can be differently produced, possibly simultaneously across multiple layers, as either colonial space or sites of ongoing Indigenous belonging. In an analysis of the Brazilian Italian coproduction *Birdwatchers (Terra Vermelha)*, which depicts the land-reclamation struggles by the Guaraní-Kaiowá, Knopf modifies the Deleuzian-Guattarian framework of “deterritorialization” and “reterritorialization.” Specifically, she adapts it to an Indigenous framework to describe the ongoing dispossessive and acquisitive processes and structures through which Indigenous people and settler culture become simultaneously de- and reterritorialized and Indigenous homelands thus are redefined as post/colonial space. While the film illustrates these processes by showing that the Guaraní-Kaiowá community struggles on places

marginal to its original homelands (reserves, roadways), it also indicates how a production of post/colonial space is never complete and how, through cultural practices and displays of resistance, the continuing sense of Indigenous belonging to the land can be reactivated and asserted.

Clearly pointing beyond the level of representation to the actual struggles portrayed, this final chapter to the volume also shows how these efforts at reclaiming land expose the necropolitics of settler geopolitics. The main character leading the reclamation movement is closely modeled on the actor portraying him, and just like the main character in the film, the actor himself is killed shortly after the film is completed in an effort to quell this moment of anticolonial struggle. As one Indigenous activist's death among many, it adds one more instance to the settler-state violence listed at the outset of this introduction, violence committed to preserve the colonial status quo. At the same time, the Guaraní-Kaiowá keep resisting this violence as they and other Guaraní communities struggle for land demarcation in the south of Brazil.

One point of departure for the analyses performed by the essays in this volume is the settler states' invariable production of Indigenous lives as vulnerable, exposed to violation, or endangered. Inevitably, though, this notion is traced back to some defect within Indigenous peoples themselves, not viewed as a call to analyze the violence inherent to any settler-colonial project. Conversely, this volume is equally interested in how Indigenous life always has been and remains irreducible to the logics of bio- and geopolitical settlement. Acting in the sense of a "being with" that does not engage the oppositional and binary logics of settler bio- and geopolitics, Indigenous people's lived experiences, epistemologies, ontologies, embodiments, and relationalities continually help to make present spaces whose ordering principles are indifferent to any assumed settler parameter of definitional containment.¹⁰⁵ If they seem irresponsible, excessive, or improper to the liberal settler mind, then because they do not exist to respond to colonial imposition, they are always excessive to the colonial order, and they do not adhere to the propertied claims by settler states.

As the Laguna Pueblo author Leslie Marmon Silko puts it in her memoir, *The Turquoise Ledge*, the Laguna Pueblo never corrected the Spanish for falsely dating their establishment to 1698 because this colonial perception "made no difference to their reckoning of the world."¹⁰⁶ Together with Coulthard's grounded normativity, diminishing such colonial falsehoods as inconsequential links to what Shiri Pasternak has called "grounded authority."¹⁰⁷ This authority always exists within and against a situation of colonization and, at the same time, is oriented toward parameters that continually exceed all that seeks

to limit, contain, or otherwise “fix” it. In contrast to a desire to “fix” Indigenous life according to one specifically defined norm or within one register of significance, this volume seeks to trace Indigenous life across multiple sites as an evolving, emergent, ever present, and ever changing practice, constellation, and relation that moves forward while continually constituting manifold ways of being in the world. These ways of being present an otherwise to what is fixable and to what allows fixture in the limited terms of set(tled) theoretical bodies or colonial logics. Out of this tension, the following conversations on settler bio- and geopolitics and Indigenous lived presence gain their dynamic.

NOTES

- 1 For news outlets reporting of these incidents, see, on Standing Rock, Julia Carrie Wong, “Dakota Access Pipeline: 300 Protesters Injured after Police Use Water Cannons,” *Guardian*, November 21, 2016, <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/nov/21/dakota-access-pipeline-water-cannon-police-standing-rock-protest>; and Jonah Engel Bromwich, “Sixteen Arrested at North Dakota Pipeline Protest,” *New York Times*, January 20, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/21/us/dakota-access-pipeline-protesters-police.html>. On the assassination of Berta Cáceres, Elisabeth Malkin, “Who Ordered Killing of Honduran Activist? Evidence of Broad Plot Is Found,” *New York Times*, March 3, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/28/world/americas/honduras-bertha-caceres-desa.html>; on the Stanley verdict, Guy Quenneville and Jason Warick, “Gerald Stanley Found Not Guilty in Colten Boushie’s Death,” *CBC News*, February 10, 2018, <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/saskatoon/gerald-stanley-colten-boushie-verdict-1.4526313>; on the Cormier verdict, Lyle Stafford, “Missing, Mourned, Unresolved: Cormier’s Acquittal Leaves Tina Fontaine’s Family Searching for Answers,” *Globe and Mail*, February 22, 2018, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/tina-fontaine-raymond-cormier-verdict/article38062879>; on the killing of Claudia Patricia Gómez Gonzáles, Nina Lakhani, “‘Immigration Killed Her’: Guatemalan Woman Shot Dead by US Border Patrol,” *Guardian*, May 25, 2018, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/may/25/woman-shot-dead-border-patrol-rio-bravo-texas-identified>; on Indigenous families migrating to the United States from Central America, Tristan Ahtone, “Indigenous Immigrants Face Unique Challenges at the Border,” *High Country News*, June 24, 2018, <http://nmpolitics.net/index/2018/06/indigenous-immigrants-face-unique-challenges-at-the-border>.
- 2 This introduction was written before the COVID-19 pandemic and its disproportionate impact on Indigenous communities. Like many crises around the world, COVID-19 exposes how the violence of settler-colonial biopolitics is indelibly woven into the social fabric of Indigenous life. This stresses the fact that Indigenous peoples are exposed to the pandemic more seriously than any other group in, for instance, North America, unveiling the crisis in its entanglement with settler colonialism as such.

- 3 Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*, Indigenous Americas (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).
- 4 On the notion of “unknowing” as integral to colonial conditions, see Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein, “Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing,” *Theory and Event* 19, no. 4 (2016), <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/633283>. They write, “This ignorance—this act of ignoring—is aggressively made and reproduced, affectively invested and effectively distributed in ways that conform the social relations and economies of the here and now.”
- 5 As a case in point, a major treatise in the *New York Times Magazine* on the Indigenous youth who launched the water protection at Standing Rock analyzes the black snake from Lakota mythology not only as standing in for the pipeline but also as symbolizing, as Dallas Goldtooth put it, “a darkness, a sickness, whose only intention is to sow dysfunction and loss of life in our community.” However, subsequently the article ties this larger reference solely to social problems on the reservation—“alcoholism, suicide, and abuse”—instead of to the larger social condition of ongoing settler colonialism as causing “dysfunction and loss of life”: Saul Elbein, “The Youth Group That Launched a Movement at Standing Rock,” *New York Times Magazine*, January 31, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/01/31/magazine/the-youth-group-that-launched-a-movement-at-standing-rock.html>.
- 6 Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016), 131.
- 7 Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive*, 130.
- 8 Scott Lauria Morgensen, “The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 1, no. 1 (2011): 73.
- 9 Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2d ed. (London: Zed, 2012), 201.
- 10 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 201.
- 11 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 201.
- 12 Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 201.
- 13 David Scott, “Colonial Governmentality,” *Social Text* 43 (Autumn 1995): 193.
- 14 Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 152.
- 15 Mark Rifkin, “Indigenizing Agamben: Rethinking Sovereignty in Light of the ‘Peculiar’ Status of Native Peoples,” *Cultural Critique* 73, no. 1 (2009): 91.
- 16 For the former, see, among others, Beth H. Piatote, *Domestic Subjects: Gender, Citizenship, and Law in Native American Literature*, Henry Roe Cloud Series on American Indians and Modernity (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013). For the latter, see Billy-Ray Belcourt, “Animal Bodies, Colonial Subjects: (Re)Locating Animality in Decolonial Thought,” *Societies* 5, no. 1 (2014): 1–11. I elaborate on the function of settler colonialism to normalize and hierarchize in René Dietrich, “The Biopolitical Logics of Settler Colonialism and Disruptive Relationality,” *Cultural Studies—Critical Methodologies* 17, no. 1 (2017): 67–77.

- 17 Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, vol. 1: *An Introduction*, translated by Robert Hurley (New York: Pantheon, 1978), 144.
- 18 For the logic of elimination, see Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (London: Cassell, 1999), 27: “Settler-colonialism consists in a negative articulation between invaders and the land. The cultural logic which is organic to a negative articulation is one of elimination.”
- 19 For discussions of geopolitics in settler-colonial contexts, see, among others, Ikuko Asaka, *Tropical Freedom: Climate, Settler Colonialism, and Black Exclusion in the Age of Emancipation* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017); Joanne Barker, ed., *Sovereignty Matters: Locations of Contestation and Possibility in Indigenous Struggles for Self-Determination* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2005); Brenna Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018); Lisa Tanya Brooks, *The Common Por: The Recovery of Native Space in the Northeast*, Indigenous Americas Series (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008); David A. Chang, *The World and All the Things upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016); Mishuana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*, First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013); Elizabeth Hoover, *The River Is in Us: Fighting Toxics in a Mohawk Community* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017); Carole McGranahan and John F. Collins, eds., *Ethnographies of U.S. Empire* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018); Dana E. Powell, *Landscapes of Power: Politics of Energy in the Navajo Nation*, New Ecologies for the Twenty-First Century (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018); Alice Te Punga Somerville, *Once Were Pacific: Māori Connections to Oceania* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012).
- 20 Jodi A. Byrd, “Introduction to the Indigeneity’s Difference: Methodology and Structures of Sovereignty Forum,” *J19* 2, no. 1 (2014): 131–36. For discussions of settler-colonial biopolitics from a variety of perspectives, see Joanne Barker, *Native Acts: Law, Recognition, and Cultural Authenticity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011); Jodi A. Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*, First Peoples: New Directions Indigenous (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Sarah Deer, *The Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015); Michael R. Griffiths, ed., *Biopolitics and Memory in Postcolonial Literature and Culture* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate, 2016); J. J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity*, Narrating Native Histories (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008); Dian Million, *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*, Critical Issues in Indigenous Studies (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013); Aileen Moreton-Robinson, “Towards a New Research Agenda?: Foucault, Whiteness and Indigenous Sovereignty,” *Journal of Sociology* 42, no. 4 (2006): 383–95; Scott Lauria Morgensen, *Spaces between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization*, First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Sherene Razack, *Dying from Improvement: Inquests and Inquiries into Indigenous Deaths in Custody*

(Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2015); Rifkin, "Indigenizing Agamben"; Mark Rifkin, *When Did Indians Become Straight? Kinship, the History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014); Kimberly TallBear, *Native American DNA: Tribal Belonging and the False Promise of Genetic Science* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).

- 21 For constructions of the Indian, *indio*, and Aboriginal, see, respectively, Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*; María Josefina Saldaña-Portillo, *Indian Given: Racial Geographies across Mexico and the United States*, Latin America Otherwise (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016); Elizabeth A. Povinelli, *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism*, Politics, History, and Culture (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2002).
- 22 As Giorgio Agamben argues at length in *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), bare life is the status produced for populations that are exposed to the force of sovereign power but not protected from it through law. The status of "inclusive exclusion" and the "state of exception" assigned to the production of bare life is simultaneously the legal space in which sovereign power constitutes itself. "Not simple natural life, but life exposed to death (bare life or sacred life) is the originary political element": Agamben, *Homo Sacer*, 88. Drawing on and revising Agamben through an Indigenous studies perspective, Rifkin coins *bare habitance* as the legal "status of the reservation, a space that while governed under 'peculiar' rules categorically is denied status as 'external,' or 'foreign.'" Similar to the status of bare life, the production of "bare habitance" is constitutive for the exercising of geopolitical sovereignty "in the (re)production and naturalization of national space": Rifkin, "Indigenizing Agamben," 94. Agamben himself draws strongly on Carl Schmitt for his theorization of inclusive exclusion, state of exception, and "nomos." For a critical reappraisal of Schmitt in the context of contemporary anticolonial and anticapitalist insurgent politics, see Federico Luisetti, John Pickles, and Wilson Kaiser, eds., *The Anomie of the Earth: Philosophy, Politics, and Autonomy in Europe and the Americas* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015).
- 23 See, among others, Joanne Barker, ed., *Critically Sovereign: Indigenous Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017); Deer, *The Beginning and End of Rape*; Mishuana Goeman, "Ongoing Storms and Struggles: Gendered Violence and Resource Exploitation," in *Critically Sovereign: Indigenous Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies*, edited by Joanne Barker (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017), 99–126; Sherene H. Razack, "Gendering Disposability," *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 28, no. 2 (August 2016): 285–307. See also Mishuana Goeman's essay in this volume.
- 24 Lorenzo Veracini, *The Settler Colonial Present* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).
- 25 Elizabeth A. Povinelli, *Geontologies: A Requiem to Late Liberalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016), 26.
- 26 The term is from Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*.

- 27 Razack, *Dying from Improvement*. See also Audra Simpson, "The State Is a Man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the Gender of Settler Sovereignty," *Theory and Event* 19, no. 4 (2016): <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/633280>: "Canada requires the death and so called 'disappearance' of Indigenous women in order to secure its sovereignty."
- 28 For some of the most influential work by Wolfe, see *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*; Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December 2006): 387–409; Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race* (London: Verso, 2016). For scholarship on settler colonialism that engages Wolfe's premises and advances the field, especially with a comparative and transnational perspective, see Fiona Bateman and Lionel Pilkington, *Studies in Settler Colonialism: Politics, Identity and Culture* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Bruno Cornellier and Michael R. Griffiths, "Globalizing Unsettling: An Introduction," *Settler Colonial Studies* 6, no. 4 (October 2016): 305–16; Lisa Ford, *Settler Sovereignty: Jurisdiction and Indigenous People in America and Australia, 1788–1836* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010); Margaret D. Jacobs, *White Mother to a Dark Race: Settler Colonialism, Maternalism, and the Removal of Indigenous Children in the American West and Australia, 1880–1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Veracini, *The Settler Colonial Present*. For a critical discussion of Wolfe's work, an approach to settler colonialism in the line of Wolfe's analysis, or the simplified reception of Wolfe's analysis (that runs the danger of occluding other approaches and perspectives), see Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein, "Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing," and contributions to *Theory and Event* 19, no. 4 (2016), <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/633283>; Alex Young, "A Response to 'On Colonial Unknowing,'" *Theory and Event* 20, no. 4 (2017): 1035–41, <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/675630>; Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein, "Colonial Unknowing and Relations of Study," *Theory and Event* 20, no. 4 (2017): 1042–54, <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/675631>. See also Cynthia G. Franklin, Njoroge, and Suzanna Reiss, eds., "Tracing the Settler's Tools: A Forum on Patrick Wolfe's Life and Legacy," *American Quarterly* 69, no. 2 (2017): 235–47. And in response to each other, see J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, "A Structure, Not an Event": Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity," *Lateral* 5, no. 1 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.25158/L5.1.7>; and Beenash Jafri, "Ongoing Colonial Violence in Settler States," *Lateral* 6 no. 1 (2017), <https://doi.org/10.25158/L6.1.7>.
- 29 Shannon Speed, "Structures of Settler Capitalism in Abya Yala," *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017): 783–90.
- 30 Daiva K. Stasiulis and Nira Yuval-Davis, eds., *Unsettling Settler Societies: Articulations of Gender, Race, Ethnicity and Class*, Sage Series on Race and Ethnic Relations, vol. 11 (London: Sage, 1995), 3–4.
- 31 For the purposes of this volume, the development of Native and Indigenous studies termed critical Indigenous studies is most relevant. For an overview of theoretically, critically, and politically oriented Native studies, see Audra Simpson and

Andrea Smith, eds., *Theorizing Native Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014). For a definition and genealogy of critical Indigenous studies (cis) in the United States and Canada, see Barker, *Critically Sovereign*, 9 (“Cis distinguished itself through questions about Indigenous sovereignty, self-determination, and citizenship. Indigenous peoples’ efforts to secure collective rights to sovereignty and self-determination as provided for within international and constitutional law was differentiated from the efforts of ‘minority’ people—including immigrant and diaspora communities and their descendants—to claim citizenship and civil rights within their nation-states”). See also Chris Andersen, “Critical Indigenous Studies: From Difference to Density,” *Cultural Studies Review* 15, no. 2 (2011): 80–100; Danika Medak-Saltzman, “Empire’s Haunted Logics: Comparative Colonialisms and the Challenges of Incorporating Indigeneity,” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 2 (2015): 11–32; Aileen Moreton-Robinson, ed., *Critical Indigenous Studies: Engagements in First World Locations*, Critical Issues in Indigenous Studies (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2016).

- 32 Iyko Day, *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016); Iyko Day, “Being or Nothingness: Indigeneity, Antiracism, and Settler Colonial Critique,” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 1, no. 2 (2015): 102–21; Manu Karuka, “Black and Native Visions of Self-Determination,” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3, no. 2 (2017): 77; Tiffany Lethabo King, “In the Clearing: Black Female Bodies, Space and Settler Colonial Landscapes” (PhD diss., University of Maryland, 2013); Justin Leroy, “Empire and the Afterlife of Slavery: Black Anti-imperialisms of the Long Nineteenth Century” (PhD diss., New York University, 2014). For an investigation of settler colonialism and racial capitalism, see Jodi A. Byrd, Alyosha Goldstein, Jodi Melamed, and Chandan Reddy, eds., “Economies of Dispossession: Indigeneity, Race, Capitalism,” a special issue of *Social Text* 36, no. 2 (June 2018). Much of this work challenges the settler/native binary implicit in some of settler-colonial scholarship and explicitly affirmed in Patrick Wolfe, “Recuperating Binarism: A Heretical Introduction,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, nos. 3–4 (2013): 257–79. Byrd’s employment, borrowed from the Barbadian poet Kamau Brathwaite, of *arrivant*, or a variation thereof, has proved helpful in theorizing processes and the violence of diaspora in connection to settler-colonial modes of dispossession. See also Cornellier and Griffiths, “Globalizing Unsettling,” in which they ask, “Might the relation between diaspora and indigeneity, native and *arrivant* be thought through intersectional solidarities beyond the binarism of the settler/native paradigm, while nonetheless continuing to insist on the sovereignty of indigenous rights to their traditional territories? . . . [O]ur point is to challenge Wolfe’s binarism while acknowledging that to do so is to nonetheless accept that insurmountable salience of Wolfe’s central notion of elimination as the founding premise of settler colonialism.”

- 33 Vimalassery et al., “Colonial Unknowing and Relations of Study,” 1042.

- 34 Wolfe, *Traces of History*, 2.

- 35 Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive*. See also, among others, Speed, “Structures of Settler Capitalism in Abya Yala.” For the “racial dynamics” within settler colo-

nialism and whiteness as central for the position of the settler, see Day, “Being or Nothingness,” 107.

- 36 Katherine McKittrick, *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 3. Sylvia Wynter herself talks of the present ethnoclass (i.e., Western bourgeois) conception of the human that overrepresents itself as if it were “the human itself”: Sylvia Wynter, “Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, after Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument,” *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3, no. 3 (2003): 257–337. How racialization affects settler belonging beyond the settler-Indigenous relation shows also in Australia’s casting the refugees from largely Muslim countries as a threat to be violently detained while inviting non-persecuted fellow-settler white South African farmers as an easily fitting and enriching group with values similar to Australia—or, more specifically, white settler Australia.
- 37 Tiffany Lethabo King, “New World Grammars: The ‘Unthought’ Black Discourses of Conquest,” *Theory and Event* 19, no. 4 (2016), <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/633275>. See Hortense J. Spillers, “Mama’s Baby, Papa’s Maybe: An American Grammar Book,” *Diacritics* 17, no. 2 (1987): 65–81. For additional research in Black studies focusing on the biopolitics of race and racialization, see, among others, Denise Ferreira da Silva, *Toward a Global Idea of Race*, Borderlines 27 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007); Saidiya V. Hartman, *Lose Your Mother: A Journey along the Atlantic Slave Route* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007); Saidiya V. Hartman, *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America*, Race and American Culture (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997); Sharon Patricia Holland, *Raising the Dead: Readings of Death and (Black) Subjectivity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000); Christina Sharpe, *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016); Michelle M. Wright, *Physics of Blackness: Beyond the Middle Passage Epistemology* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015).
- 38 Razack, *Dying from Improvement*, 59.
- 39 Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015), 7–8.
- 40 Alexander G. Weheliye, *Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2014), 30.
- 41 Weheliye, *Habeas Viscus*, 136.
- 42 For a critique of the human rights framework from an Indigenous perspective, see Peter Kulchyski, *Aboriginal Rights Are Not Human Rights: In Defence of Indigenous Struggles* (Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2013); Shannon Speed and Jane F. Collier, “Limiting Indigenous Autonomy in Chiapas, Mexico: The State Government’s Use of Human Rights,” *Human Rights Quarterly* 22 (2000): 877–905.
- 43 Weheliye, *Habeas Viscus*, 136.
- 44 Weheliye, *Habeas Viscus*, 131.
- 45 Katherine McKittrick, *Demonic Grounds: Black Women and the Cartographies of Struggle* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006), xi.
- 46 McKittrick, *Demonic Grounds*, x.

- 47 Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, 230.
- 48 Simpson, *As We Have Always Done*, 230.
- 49 Saldaña-Portillo, *Indian Given*, 7.
- 50 For these questions, see also Maylei Blackwell, Floridalma Boj Lope, and Luis Urrieta Jr., eds., “Critical Latinx Indigenities,” a special issue of *Latino Studies* 15, no. 2 (July 2017): 126–37; as well as M. Bianet Castellanos, ed., “Settler Colonialism in Latin America,” *American Quarterly* 69, no. 4 (2017).
- 51 Saldaña-Portillo, *Indian Given*, 26–27.
- 52 Shona N. Jackson, *Creole Indigeneity: Between Myth and Nation in the Caribbean*, First Peoples: New Directions in Indigenous Studies (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012).
- 53 Lauren Berlant notably does not reference conditions of settler colonialism directly in *Cruel Optimism*; instead, settler colonialism and Indigeneity remain a lacunae and silence in their thought. See Lauren G. Berlant, *Cruel Optimism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011); Byrd, *The Transit of Empire*, 34–38. Rob Nixon speaks more directly to Third World postcolonial conditions, but also creates a link to US expansion and dispossession of Native peoples when he mentions how the ongoing movement of settler colonialism has produced “scars of displacement in American history” that have further inflicted “ecological, spiritual, and communal damage”: Rob Nixon, *Slow Violence: The Environmentalism of the Poor* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013), 243. While neither work thoroughly engages questions of settler-colonial bio- and geopolitics and Indigeneity, we want to consider the implications of their analysis of the contemporary moment for life under settler colonialism and think across both terms to represent the settler structures that they forgo in their own analysis.
- 54 Mark Rifkin, *Beyond Settler Time: Temporal Sovereignty and Indigenous Self-determination* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017).
- 55 Berlant, *Cruel Optimism*, 95.
- 56 Simpson, “The State Is a Man.”
- 57 Cf. Marie-Hélène Cousineau and Susan Avingaq, dirs., *Sol* (documentary film, Arnait Video Productions, 2014). Lisa Stevenson, *Life beside Itself: Imagining Care in the Canadian Arctic* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2014), 7.
- 58 Stevenson, *Life beside Itself*, 73.
- 59 Cf. Audrey Huntley, dir., *Go Home, Baby Girl* (documentary film, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 2005); Christine Welsh, dir., *Finding Dawn* (documentary film, National Film Board of Canada, 2006); Matthew Smiley, dir., *Highway of Tears* (Finesse Films, 2015).
- 60 See also Jaskiran K. Dhillon, *Prairie Rising: Indigenous Youth, Decolonization, and the Politics of Intervention* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017).
- 61 Razack, *Dying from Improvement*.
- 62 Nixon, *Slow Violence*, 2.
- 63 Nixon, *Slow Violence*, 2.
- 64 Dino Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows: The Indigenous Fight for Environmental Justice, from Colonization to Standing Rock* (Boston: Beacon, 2019), 25.

- 65 Kristen Simmons, "Settler Atmospheric," *Society for Cultural Anthropology*, Dispatches, November 20, 2017, <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/1221-settler-atmospherics>. The oil sand extraction completely destroys the targeted boreal forest and bog land in northern Alberta and continually leaks toxins into the environment through tailing ponds; draws immense amounts of water from local rivers; pollutes local water systems; and continuously emits a cloud of small-particles pollutants, secondary organic aerosols, into the atmosphere comparable to that emitted in the larger Toronto area. See Tzaporah Berman, "Canada's Most Shameful Environmental Secret Must Not Remain Hidden," *Guardian*, November 14, 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/nov/14/canadas-shameful-environmental-secret-tar-sands-tailings-ponds>; Ivan Semeniuk, "Oil Sands Found to Be a Leading Source of Air Pollution in North America," *Globe and Mail*, May 25, 2016, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/oil-sands-found-to-be-a-leading-source-of-air-pollution-in-north-america/article30151841>. This industry provides jobs for local Indigenous people, but it also destroys livelihoods and life itself with polluted food sources. Cf. Warren Cariou and Neil McArthur, dirs., *Land of Oil and Water* (documentary film, 2009).
- 66 Macarena Gómez-Barris, *The Extractive Zone: Social Ecologies and Decolonial Perspectives* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017), xvi.
- 67 Gómez-Barris, *The Extractive Zone*, xix.
- 68 Gómez-Barris, *The Extractive Zone*, 2. See also Traci Brynne Voyles, *Wastelanding: Legacies of Uranium Mining in Navajo Country* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015).
- 69 Gómez-Barris, *The Extractive Zone*, xvii.
- 70 Gómez-Barris, *The Extractive Zone*, xx.
- 71 Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," 387.
- 72 Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," 388.
- 73 When Wolfe's statement is cited, the equation of land with life through its negation is usually adapted, as well. A case in point for an argument that defines Wolfe's "land is life" through its negative is in Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz's *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*, in which the quote from Wolfe's essay precedes a statement outlining the intersection of US settler colonialism, white supremacy, and genocide. Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States* (Boston: Beacon, 2014), 2.
- 74 Melanie K. Yazzie and Cutcha Risling Baldy, "Introduction: Indigenous Peoples and the Politics of Water," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 7, no. 1 (2018), 1.
- 75 Nick Estes, *Our History Is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance* (London: Verso, 2019), 15.
- 76 Craig Howe and Tyler Young, "Mnisose," *Society for Cultural Anthropology*, Field-sights: Hotspots, December 22, 2016, <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/mnisose>.
- 77 Edward Valandra, "Mni Wiconi: Water Is [More than] Life," in *Standing with Standing Rock: Voices from the #NoDAPL Movement*, edited by Nick Estes and Jaskiran Dhillon (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019), 81.
- 78 Yazzie and Baldy, "Introduction," 2.

- 79 Zoe Todd, "Protecting Life below Water: Tending to Relationality and Expanding Oceanic Consciousness Beyond Coastal Zones," *American Anthropologist*, October 17, 2017, <http://www.americananthropologist.org/2017/10/17/protecting-life-below-water-by-zoe-todd-de-provincializing-development-series>.
- 80 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 20.
- 81 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 26.
- 82 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 35.
- 83 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 28.
- 84 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 35.
- 85 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 46.
- 86 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 52.
- 87 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 102.
- 88 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 75.
- 89 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 75.
- 90 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 14.
- 91 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 26, 28.
- 92 Rifkin, "Indigenizing Agamben," 94.
- 93 Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 46.
- 94 Goeman, *Mark My Words*, 33.
- 95 Goeman, *Mark My Words*, 32.
- 96 Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*, 60; Povinelli, *Geontologies*, 102, 148.
- 97 Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*, 60.
- 98 Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks*, 61.
- 99 Jeannette C. Armstrong, "Constructing Indigeneity: Syilx Okanagan Oraliture and tmix"centrism" (PhD diss., Universität Greifswald, Germany, 2009), <http://ub-ed.ub.uni-greifswald.de/opus/volltexte/2012/1322>; Richard E. Atleo, *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth Worldview* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2004); Richard E. Atleo, *Principles of Tsawalk: An Indigenous Approach to Global Crisis* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2011).
- 100 Zoe Todd, "Commentary: The Environmental Anthropology of Settler Colonialism, Part I," *Engagement* (blog), April 11, 2017, <https://aesengagement.wordpress.com/thematic-series/life-on-the-frontier-the-environmental-anthropology-of-settler-colonialism>.
- 101 Audra Simpson, "The Ruse of Consent and the Anatomy of 'Refusal': Cases from Indigenous North America and Australia," *Postcolonial Studies* 20, no. 1 (2017): 2.
- 102 Audra Simpson, "The Ruse of Consent and the Anatomy of 'Refusal,'" 9.
- 103 Kyle Whyte addresses many of these issues. He writes, for instance, "The water protector's morality flows, then, from Indigenous governance systems that support cultural integrity, economic vitality, and political self-determination and the capacity to shift and adjust to the dynamics of eco-systems": Kyle Whyte, "The Dakota Access Pipeline, Environmental Injustice, and U.S. Settler Colonialism," *Red Ink* 19, no. 1 (2017): 154–69. We want to propose that the governance systems do more than "adjust to the dynamics of eco-systems"; they are also formed by

structuring these ecosystems as part of the polity themselves for which Indigenous governance systems are responsible.

- 104 Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, "Looking after Gdoo-Naaganinaa: Precolonial Nishnaabeg Diplomatic and Treaty Relationships," *Wicazo Sa Review* 23, no. 2 (2008): 29–42.
- 105 Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study* (Wivenhoe, UK: Minor Compositions, 2013).
- 106 Leslie Marmon Silko, *The Turquoise Ledge* (New York: Penguin, 2011), 21.
- 107 Shiri Pasternak, *Grounded Authority: The Algonquins of Barriere Lake against the State* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS