

Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Cierra Norman

April 10, 2023

Alternative Relationships in the Wake(s): Intersections in Indigenous and Black Theory and
Praxis

by

Cierra Norman

Alix Olson
Adviser

Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Alix Olson
Adviser

Sameena Abdus-Sattar Mulla
Committee Member

Mandy Suhr-Sytsma
Committee Member

2023

Alternative Relationships in the Wake(s): Intersections in Indigenous and Black Theory and
Praxis

By

Cierra Norman

Alix Olson

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

2023

Abstract

Alternative Relationships in the Wake(s): Intersections in Indigenous and Black Theory and Praxis

By Cierra Norman

This thesis observes the unfolding legacy of settler-carceral colonialism that is co-created by the wakes of anti-Black slavery and anti-Indigenous settlement. Contemporary sociopolitical and economic infrastructures are sustained on colonial conditions of Indigenous and Black social death. Within the settler-carceral wake(s), Indigenous and Black communities reject colonial aesthetics of fatalism, victimry, and historic amnesia through wake work that is interrelated and often in dialogue. Indigenous and Black annotation are multimodal forms of wake work that are tools of resistance and counter-abandonment. Annotations interrogate and reject settler-carceral archives to “see more” and prioritize other knowledges of/and histories. Black and Native annotative supplementation (re)claims ancestral knowledge and ways of being that have been violently dislocated and erased through imagining. This imagining functions to fill-in the archive with narratives that are intentionally left out of hegemonic knowledges because they disrupt and threaten to destroy the foundations of contemporary settler-carceral logics and structures of racial capitalism. The first chapter analyzes Deborah Miranda’s (2013) tribal memoir, *Bad Indians*, as a useful site to observe the ways Black and Indigenous modes of knowledge production and resistance to the (anti-Black and anti-Indigenous) wake(s) are always already interrelated. The first chapter focuses on wake work that is oriented towards the past; that (re)claims ancestral knowledges and relationships, and resists historic archives of erasure and misrepresentation. The second chapter is concerned with imagining the future, the construction of alternative worlds, and how we might get there. Modes of Indigenous and Black wake work challenge and expand ways of imagining and creating futures in which the world works differently through creative production at the intersections of science, technology, and the future. The final chapter observes embodiments of Black and Indigenous wake work in the present at Standing Rock and in Detroit and Flint (MI). Environmental Justice in the wake(s) re-imagines ontologic relationships between people and land through divestment from the settler-carceral imperial state. Such wake work fosters and prioritizes alternative modes of relationality that condition and imagine alternative relationships and futures in the wake(s).

Alternative Relationships in the Wake(s): Intersections in Indigenous and Black Theory and
Praxis

By

Cierra Norman

Alix Olson

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

2023

Acknowledgements

My sincere gratitude to Dr. Alix Olson for introducing me to Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, for being such a genuine and supportive mentor, and pushing me through moments of doubt and uncertainty, before we ever met face-to-face.

My deepest thanks to my thesis committee: Dr. Alix Olson, Dr. Sameena Mulla, and Dr. Mandy Suhr-Sytsma. Thank you for your guidance, encouragement, and care thinking with me.

Many thanks to the professors and teachers who have taught, mentored, and supported me. Thank you for connecting me with others.

Deepest love and gratitude for my partner, for your patience, love, and support.

Because it matters.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Debora Miranda's <i>Bad Indians</i> as an Example of Native Wake work and Ancestral Reclaiming In/Against Settler Archives of History.....	18
Chapter 2: Indigenous Futurisms and Afrofuturism: Interrogating and Imagining Futures In and Beyond the Wake(s).....	35
Chapter 3: Enacting Decolonization and Abolition in the Present through Embodied Praxes of Indigenous and Black Environmental Wake Work.....	60
Conclusion: Unknowing the Future.....	72
Notes.....	74
Bibliography.....	82

INTRODUCTION

Resisting In and Against the Wake(s)

Generational Inheritance(s) in the Wake(s)

The origin story of this thesis is complicated. I think my drive to understand the foundational contexts of contemporary experiences and systems of inequity, vulnerability, and power as they are shaped by anti-Blackness and anti-Indigeneity began as an internal inquiry that was rooted in the conditions and experiences of my life. I lived my early years oriented in positivist and humanist frameworks of “righting” individual and social “wrongs” that led me to seek cures what appeared to be illness and epidemics born out the conflict naturally produced in large-scale societies.¹ As I was introduced to radical politics and theory as an emerging scholar within studies of race, gender, and sexuality, I experienced an upending shift – from priorities of policy and social reform to anti-colonial, anti-carceral, and anti-imperial physical, psychic, and sociopolitical revolution. This thesis is indebted to the work of those whose critical theory and praxis have given me, and many others, tools through which to recognize the ways in which personal experiences have been and are shaped by racialized, gendered, classed, ableist, and nationalist symbols of power across cultural and social contexts of time and space. I hope the work I am doing here honors and extends their projects as I attempt to better understand these systems of power and my position and complicity within them.

My mother’s ex-husband, whom I referred to as to as “Dad” until their divorce, has had post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) since his time in the United States Army where he served in Afghanistan and Iraq after September 11th, 2001. It is also likely that he experienced PTSD from experiences of childhood abuse and neglect after watching his own father struggle with PTSD and commit suicide after serving in Vietnam. Throughout my childhood and early adult years, I was taught to attribute his verbal, physical, and sexual abuse as symptoms or side effects

of his PTSD. I dissociated from life at home through academics and prioritized a passion for neuroscience and biology in order to understand and how a biochemical brain disorder caused the abuse I experienced, and how understanding its mechanisms might enable me to find a treatment, a “cure,” for him to make it stop? Embedded within and led by the epistemic promises of scientific reason, I oriented myself within linear and individualistic frameworks of health and behavior such that my stepfather’s brain could be “fixed”, and he would start acting more ethically. I became increasingly frustrated with the repeated neglect and abuse that he experienced by practitioners and institutions within the Military and Veterans Affairs Office which prevented him from accessing therapy, medication, financial and other resources; the violence of state interventions by child protective services, police, and the court system, all of which could not protect my mother, myself, or my siblings, support the family’s needs, or increase my stepfather’s access to treatment and care; and the hyper-glorification and romanticization of the U.S. military despite its historic abuse and neglect of poor soldiers in pursuit of political goals incentivized by the wealthy. These conditions shaped one another as my family encountered homelessness and food and housing insecurity while my mother worked overtime as the sole family provider and legal guardian of my stepfather given his inability to work. My siblings and I were left to care for one another.

Although I recognized that my experiences were situated within many interrelated social and political systems, I continued to rely on universalist frameworks of scientific reason to understand the mechanisms of my condition. I attributed these mechanisms to my stepfather’s bodily, mental, and personal incompetence – his PTSD – and optimistically hoped someday for a cure-call. I gravitated towards reformist frameworks through which I understood social problems to be related but not co-creating and interlocking. As a result, I became increasingly by the ways

in which none of the one-size-fits-all methods of activism addressed these apparently separate issues seemed to create real (or even imagined) conditions of equity. The simplest answer offered by family and society at large is that “life is unfair,” that there will always be inequality, and people would fuck it (equity) up. This answer is situated within settler colonial, neoliberal onto-epistemologies of human subjectivity wherein qualities of human life are understood as rights that are conferred through citizenship to *rational*, or competent, citizens. Within this episteme, the apparent inability of local, national, and global communities to address social issues can be attributed more to the guaranteed failure of some individuals who will never be proper citizens – that is, able to properly exercise and fully enjoy equal and equitable access to rights and resources – than to systems that re/produce inequality. Consider, for instance, the canonical policy report written by Democrat Daniel Moynihan and published by the Office of Planning and Research in the U.S. Department of Labor in 1965, “The Negro Family”, which attributes the sociopolitical disenfranchisement of Black communities in the U.S. partly to the temporary “racist virus in the American blood stream,” and primarily to the inability of poor, uneducated, and unskilled Black people to model conventional social relationships and subjectivities of citizenship. Or, consider both the criticisms and propositions for same-sex marriage, which conceptually argue for the fundamental ability, or lack thereof, of same-sex relationships and families to model the nuclear, monogamous, heterosexual family. Additionally, proponents of reformist activism like legalized (monogamous) same-sex marriage emphasize a trickle-down orientation of policy reform that is embedded within capitalist epistememes of universalism that assume that changes made to legal policy at the federal level will trickle-down to local communities and eradicate social inequities. This can be seen in reproductive rights advocacy that singularly prioritize the federal legalization of abortion – the right to abortion care

– under the assumption that the federal right to abortion will guarantee equitable contraceptive access and care to all communities. These models of activism disregard or fail to recognize the varying conditions through which inequality manifests across communities. As such, a convenient cure-all becomes available to singularly address multi-layered social issues and experiences of inequality can be attributed to the individual failings of a person or community to properly exercise their rights as legal citizens and (neo)liberal subjects.

The reformist models of activism that I knew are those immediately available within popular discourse regarding social needs and change. My own frustrations with bureaucracy and its clear failing were evidenced both in my personal experiences and in the voices of poor, disabled, queer, and immigrant communities and women that seem to echo in the American sociopolitical memory. Despite this, the social, financial, and political frameworks and resources made available to us when we attempt to seek assistance, care, justice, reparations, and/or sovereignty² embed us further within the bureaucratic systems and institutions from which need is unevenly re/produced and distributed. Among even the most radical reformist politics there is an ultimate defeat and return to pre-existing systems and institutions. The climate change movement, which ought to be the most radical among reformist demands, uses positivist scientific reasoning and evidence to call for significant changes in consumption patterns through a framework of sustainability that seeks methods to maintain current lifestyles (United Nations). If we recognize that a lifestyle is a right (or comprised of rights), such reformist approaches take for granted the inherent onto-epistemologic inequities embedded in universalist language wherein the goal of reform does not become equity but inclusion into economic hierarchies of rights. The goal of sustainability, then, does not become global equity but the responsible management of resources to enjoy access to current generational luxuries that are already

distributed unevenly within gendered, classed, and racial hierarchies. (Such as being able to travel and enjoy nature in domestic or international locations or to own a home.) These seemingly universal desires omit the point of view from which they are constructed and the sociopolitical hierarchies necessary to maintain them.

My introduction to neuroscience solidified my disdain for bureaucracy and reformist activism, although I did not yet have the language for my critiques. I increasingly felt the futility of my goal to increase access to effective treatment options against the totality of healthcare and political systems that systematically deny equitable access to necessary resources according to economic hierarchies of rights wherein the wealthiest and abled are the most deserving and first to be prioritized and the poor and disabled are neglected. I also began to realize that my own experiences could not have been singularly addressed through paternalistic biomedicine; my stepfather's PTSD was not his individual mind-body failure but a response to sociopolitical contexts within which he experienced trauma. Similarly, PTSD, like many mental and physical health disorders, cannot be singularly treated with biomedical intervention such as pills but includes social and environmental aspects of treatment that can be oriented for short- and long-term strategies depending on one's needs. For many, PTSD is not a short-term ailment but a lifelong experience that can necessitate lifestyle changes and shift over time. PTSD, like other health and social needs, requires dynamic, responsive, and active learning and listening to recognize the complex underlying causes of physical, social, economic, and political vulnerabilities and how to address them. Yet, hegemonic positivist models of biomedicine and PTSD treatment continue to rely on singular frameworks of health and care such that understandings of PTSD are constrained to symptoms of the body and brain. Consequently, environmental and systemic causes are ignored or deprioritized due to the inability of the

scientific method to quantitatively measure or control their varying effects. As I would soon learn, the inability of positivist biomedicine to attempt to recognize and address deeper underlying sociopolitical issues of health and care, like other hegemonic paradigms, is not an unfortunate tendency but embedded within epistemic infrastructures that necessitate the obfuscation of mechanisms of vulnerability to maintain systemic structures like its own.

It was within this context of growing frustration that I took a course in gender and sexuality studies in my second year of undergraduate studies at the recommendation of a peer with a background in feminist science studies. In that space I was introduced to the work, theory, and activism of scholars and collectives such as Audre Lorde, Gloria Anzaldúa, Kimberlee Crenshaw, the Combahee River Collective (CRC), SisterSong, Loretta Ross, Patricia Hill Collins, Barbara Gurr, Natalie Diaz, Yatasha Womack, Saidiya Hartman, Dean Spade, Immanuel Wallerstein, Adrienne Maree Brown, Sara Ahmed, Sara Deer, bell hooks, Toni Morrison, Joy Harjo, and so many others. These thinkers had long been articulating what I, as a white queer person, was observing and more in deeper analyses rooted in lived personal knowledges. In reading their works, I became passionate about finding the language to describe contemporary conditions as they are co-created and yet made to seem mutually exclusive so as to naturalize (make invisible) the mechanisms through which vulnerability is unevenly distributed and differentially experienced. Perhaps most eye-opening to me were Crenshaw's (1991), Gurr's (2011), and Collins' (2015) frameworks and applications of intersectionality theory, which gave me tools to recognize the ways that my personal experiences have been and continue to be shaped by racialized, gendered, classed, ableist, and nationalist systems of power that configure social inequities across cultural and social contexts of time and space. I hope the work I am doing here honors and extends these projects as I attempt to better understand systems of power,

my own positionality within them, and my complicity with efforts to reproduce or dismantle them.

Disentangling Mechanisms of Vulnerability: Theorizing the Wake(s)

Critical Indigenous Studies (CIS), Black Feminism, and Afropessimism have challenged and expanded upon intersectionality studies by unpacking the historical roots of contemporary hegemonic discourses and systems of power that are obscured within sociopolitical imaginaries and archives. These studies draw on the knowledges and experiences of persons and communities within Indigenous and Black diasporas in the United States (and across the world) to observe and articulate how mechanisms of power are historically embedded and contemporarily reproduced. Black feminists such as Hortense Spillers (1987), Saidiya Hartman (1996), and Denise Ferreira Da Silva (2014) unpack the contradictions and omissions in hegemonic archives of history and contemporary discourses such as Historical Materialism, scientific reason, and neoliberalism. Their analyses reveal the historic infrastructural and onto-epistemologic foundations of contemporary systems and discourses to be rooted in the (settler³) colonial-capitalist production of property through the expropriation of African and Black enslaved labor that began in the 15th century under European colonialism. Specifically, they illustrate the mechanisms through which contemporary (neoliberal) subjectivity is predicated on racialized and gendered ontologies of white supremacy that render the Black body as a non-human subject – property, a slave – through the violent un/re-gendering of the Black female body as rapeable flesh. That is, Black non/subjectivity was made possible through the rapeability of the Black woman as evidence of her uncontrollable and unnatural hypersexuality and inherent Black irrationality. Their work demands acknowledgement that the “total value produced by

slave labor continues to sustain” existing structures of global neoliberal capitalism that necessitate and reproduce Blackness as a Racial Other in the World of Man.⁴

Like Black feminism, CIS challenges popular discourse that naturalizes systems of power that organize social arrangements in uneven distributions of vulnerability through archival re-tracing that prioritizes Indigenous embodied knowledges. Such analyses have critically interrogated the onto-epistemologic foundations of contemporary social arrangements as they are embedded in the infrastructural relationship(s) between transatlantic slavery and the settlement of Indigenous lands. Indigenous scholars have demonstrated the ways in which ongoing racial and gendered onto-epistemologies of power are structured on the ability and authority of neoliberal subjectivity to orient itself through logics of private citizenship (including the right to private property). In centering the experiences of Indigenous peoples as they have been racialized within systems of white supremacy, CIS scholars have articulated the mechanisms through which settler colonial States such as the U.S. built their symbolic, juridic, and economic infrastructures of governance, including slavery, upon claims of sovereignty over Indigenous lands.⁵ These claims to land are predicated on the omission of settler colonial mechanisms of genocidal violence against Indigenous peoples to establish land as *terra nullis* and affirm the Doctrine of Discovery episteme by ontologically positioning Native subjectivities alongside land within Cartesian ontologies.⁶ As scholars like Andrea Smith (2005), Mishuana Goeman (2008), and Sara Deer (2015) articulate, the onto-epistemologic construction of Indigenous land as violable was enacted through gendered violence that shaped racialized knowledges of the Native body as a non-human subject among the flora and fauna by establishing the rapeability of Indigenous women. Placed ontologically in a permanent state of stunted development incapable of proper self-governance over mind, body, and land, Indigenous nations were massacred,

enslaved, raped, forcibly relocated, and stripped of tribal recognition, identity, and language – mechanisms of physical and cultural genocide – to erase Native physical and cultural presence and, thus, claims of sovereignty to land.⁷ In this way, CIS scholars have critically interrogated and destabilized the omissions within settler colonial archives of knowledge and neoliberal discourse that are embedded and reproduced within contemporary structures and meanings that attempt to erase Indigenous people, cultures, and knowledges from the present by placing the Native ontologically in a position of stunted development and disappearance in modernity. Simultaneously, they have highlighted the spatial and onto-epistemologic relationship between settlement, Indigenous dispossession and genocide, and the expansion of transatlantic and plantation slavery.⁸

In recent years, Afropessimism has made instrumental analyses observing the mechanisms of contemporary neoliberal settler subjectivity and white supremacy within the dialogues of CIS and Black Feminism. This body of knowledge production pays special attention to the ontological infrastructures of social arrangements shaped by anti-Blackness, anti-Indigeneity, slavery, and settler colonialism in ways that challenge common (White/Black, Settler/Native) binaries in popular discourse, settler colonial and whiteness studies, and some tendencies within CIS and Black Studies. Frank B. Wilderson III, who is considered to have coined the term “Afropessimism” in its current popular usage, cites Black feminists, including Spillers and Hartman, as predecessors of the framework (although some scholars disagree with the consideration of their work as Afropessimist). Afropessimists, including Wilderson, argue that Blackness is excluded from the category of the Human and ontologically positioned as socially dead, the Slave who is unable to possess modern political subjectivity. The totality of Black non-being is the foundation upon which white, “non-White,” “non-Black,” and “non-

heterosexual” subjectivities are (re)produced and come into conflict with the structures of the Human as settler subjects of exploitation and alienation, including Native subjects who are ontologically marked by genocide and dispossession as the Savage. That is, Wilderson’s framework of Afropessimism holds that Black (non)subjectivity lies singularly outside of humanity as the ontological foundation upon which the Human subject (and the half-socially dead, half-alive Native Savage) is structurally dependent on its relational antagonism to the Slave.⁹ Other Afropessimist scholars, such as Sylvia Wynter (2003) and Da Silva (2014), observe both the Black Slave and Indigenous Savage to be ontologically positioned outside of modern neoliberal humanity. The white subjectivity of Man, endowed with inalienable rights as a rational (neo)liberal subject, is predicated simultaneously on Black and Indigenous social death enacted through genocide, dispossession, conquest, settler colonialism, and the transforming afterlife of slavery. While aspects of Afropessimism are contested within and across disciplines, such as questions regarding the ontological incompatibility of Black and Indigenous subjectivities, Afropessimists have presented alternative relational frameworks through which to observe mechanisms of white supremacy that produce Human neoliberal settler subjectivity through racialized and gendered ontologies of anti-Blackness and anti-Indigeneity.

Afropessimist interrogations of contemporary global systems and infrastructures of social death align with challenges among CIS scholars against assumptions within academia and hegemonic discourse that configure settler colonial imperialism (including slavery) in the past. Scholars such as Arnold Krupat (2000) provide valuable distinctions between the Native condition and that of other racialized subjects in his assertion that “there is not yet a ‘post-‘ to the colonial status of Native Americans” in a sustained condition of “domestic imperialism or internal colonialism”.¹⁰ Similarly, Yarimar Bonilla (2020) observes contemporary infrastructures

and onto-epistemologies to sustain conditions of coloniality defined by temporal logics of deferment which indefinitely postpone access to full citizenship to racialized Others as necessary to maintain infrastructures of symbolic, judicial, and economic white supremacy. Bonilla's application of coloniality is useful in recognizing that imperial infrastructures of expropriation and accumulation established in European settler colonial capitalism have not been dismantled but have transformed to shape contemporary conditions of neocolonialism alongside global histories of imperialism and industrialization.¹¹ This description of contemporary systems of power aligns with Christina Sharpe (2016), who expands on Hartman's analysis of the afterlives of transatlantic slavery to theoretically conceptualize the anti-Black *wake* as the "contemporary conditions of spatial, legal, psychic, material, and other dimensions of Black non/being as well as Black modes of resistance"¹² shaped by the transforming infrastructures of slavery and mechanisms of (neo)colonial accumulation. For Sharpe, the wake is the dysgraphic ontology that conditions Black life and death through abjection and abandonment in ancillary institutions of slavery that structure the subjectivity of the Human citizen upon Black social death. Although Sharpe focuses on the unfolding "legacies of slavery's denial of Black humanity,"¹³ her engagement with Brathwaite's tidalectics provides alternative ways of recognizing the constitution and legacies of slavery within other mechanisms of imperial settler colonialism, including Indigenous genocide and dispossession, and projects of the Human (Man) through ontologic relations of conquest and gratuitous violence. Tiffany Lethabo King (2019) takes tidalectics further to conceptualize the *shoal* as a site of liminality that disrupts singular coherences of Blackness and Indigeneity. Shoals destabilize binary epistemes that omit economic relations between the settler colonial production of property and global capital, the expropriation of enslaved labor, and the dispossession of Indigenous lands. In doing so, King's

conceptualization of the shoal challenges hegemonic “applied intersectional frames” that “separate ocean from land and render Black people and Indigenous people as an antagonisms” to recognize Goeman’s positioning of “land and water as always connected”.¹⁴ Such scholarship emphasizes “the always already intersectional”¹⁵ dialogue between Black/Indigenous experiences, theory, and activism given the intersectional nature of anti-Black and anti-Indigenous violence.

My work is positioned within and expands upon frameworks produced in and across disciplines of Indigenous and Black thought. Specifically, my goal is to unpack projects of white supremacy and humanity in popular discourse by prioritizing, listening to, and learning from Indigenous and Black theory and praxis to recognize the ways in which contemporary systems and institutions of power are shaped by and function to reproduce white settler neoliberal capitalism as it sustains global infrastructures. Such dialogue is not only insightful to “minority” communities and issues but attends to global structures and systems of power as they shape local conditions, experiences, and responses to vulnerability. In this way, my methodology follows challenges “‘applied intersectional frames’ that attempt to discover, connect, or wrangle together experiences and power dynamics that are conceived as emerging independently of one another”¹⁶. Like Smith (2005), Da Silva (2014), King (2013), and Lethabo (2019), I uphold that Indigenous and Black demands and practices of abolition and decolonization are sites of co-constitution upon which the World of Man and Human subjectivity are spatially and temporally destroyed and “the contours of humanness” are expanded in uncontainable ways.¹⁷ Expanding on Sharpe’s conceptualization of the anti-Black wake “to occupy and to be occupied by the continuous and changing present of slavery’s as yet unresolved unfolding,” I conceptualize the anti-Indigenous wake of settlement – colonial genocide, slavery, cultural-political erasure and

marginalization, dispossession and removal – that has continued since 1492 to shape conditions of Indigenous non/being and modes of resistance against structurally based cultural genocide and social death. As Gilio-Whitaker (Colville Confederate Tribes) explains, settler colonialism is a continuing structure of Native physical and political social death to gain access to land that can be seen in “the refusal of the State to fully recognize the nationhood of Native collective existence” to justify the absorption of Indigenous lands within legal systems of private property.¹⁸ While I do not seek to equate, reduce, or misrepresent the unique experiences and modes of violence which since the 15th century have sought to systematically reduce Black and Native bodies to the ontological status of flesh, the Slave and the Savage, this thesis observes Black and Indigenous conquest and social death to be co-constitutive and have throughout temporal and spatial contexts tethered the survival of Black or Indigenous people to the death of the Other within the wake of the Master’s/Settler’s ship.¹⁹ Conquest and genocide enacted through slavery and settlement were justifiable and executed through the creation of Man, which “demands the invention and negation of the Negro and Native to know the self”.²⁰ Judeo-Christian imperialism modeled white, male subjectivity as free citizens and natural masters of the World who were divinely ordained to enact God’s will in preparation for Christ’s imminent return. This necessitated the conversion of non-Christians, “controlling their territorial lands, and exploiting their natural resources, which supposedly would result in establishing God’s kingdom on earth as soon as possible”.²¹ Within this religious hierarchy of humanity, dark-skinned Africans and Indigenous peoples were deemed cursed like and/or idolators of Canaan and, thus, impediments to parousia, and incapable of full redemption due to the permanency of female delinquency according to the curse of Eve. That is, racialized and gendered logics fitted the cursed conditions of Canaan and Eve to Black and Indigenous women such that Black and

Indigenous peoples were permanently excluded from the ontology of Human as slaves and savages handicapped from natural rights and rationality. Between 1492 and 1880, an estimated 2 to 5.5 million Indigenous and 12.5 million Africans were enslaved, and approximately 100 million Indigenous and 60 million Africans died or were killed in conditions sustained under imperial settler colonialism and racial capitalism.²² These logics transformed over time through onto-epistemologic epochs (such as the Enlightenment and Abolition) during which racialized and gendered knowledges of Christian imperialism were reconfigured under positivist secularism and historical materialism across geographic and cultural contexts.²³ Historical Materialism occludes the economic relationship between slavery, dispossession and settlement, and (racial) capitalism by framing descriptions of gratuitous violence enacted under logics of white supremacy in moral frameworks that deem carceral slavery and genocide to be moral atrocities at the level of subjective conflict rather than foundational structural violences. The denial of slavery through moral frameworks places Black subjectivity in the present moment while denying the ways that the institution(s) of slavery are unfolding and mark Blackness for/as social death to sustain white supremacist infrastructures of (neo)liberal subjectivity and global capital. This occlusion maintains the condition of social death that sustains ontologic relations of (the Black body as) property which frames Black suffering as evidence of Black incompetence. Similarly, epistemes of *terra nullis* necessitate the denial of Native sovereignty and place Natives in a permanent state of incompetence that explains Indigenous physical and cultural genocide as evidence of the Native Savage's inability to modernize. Modern Native subjectivity is unintelligible and oxymoronic within the white supremacist infrastructures of (neo)liberal subjectivity; the Native can only exist in modernity as non-Native or post-Native. That is, the cultural and social death of the Savage is necessary for the Native to ascend closer to whiteness

and become the non-Native or post-Native subject devoid of “indianness.”²⁴ In this way, the anti-Black and anti-Indigenous wakes are the perpetuation of colonial conditions of ontologic social death and gratuitous violence through which Black and Indigenous bodies are reduced to flesh to make the contemporary world legible.

Anti-Blackness and anti-Indigeneity are co-constitutive such that Black demands for abolition and Indigenous demands for decolonization (sovereignty) are and must be co-creative. Indigenous and Black communities have survived and resisted against conditions of social death, often in communication with one another (in the shoals; in the wake of the Master’s/Settler’s ship), to demand the deconstruction of infrastructures of white supremacy (slavery, genocide, and dispossession) that sustain the wake(s).²⁵ Black Feminist Poethics imagine and demand *simultaneous* abolition and decolonization through Reconstruction – the restoration of the total value expropriated from slave labor and appropriated from Indigenous lands.²⁶ These calls for the end of the world are enacted through unique modes and knowledges that are rooted in Black and Indigenous experiences to destabilize infrastructures of white supremacy that sustain *both* Black and Native social death. Sharpe (2016) conceptualizes such knowledges and praxes as *wake work*: tools of resistance (interrogation and counter-abandonment) against processes of unknowing as “another effort to try to look. To try to really see” past what is available in the colonial archive and to imagine “new ways to live in the wake, to survive (and more) in the afterlife of property”.²⁷ In her observations and personal enactment of (Black) wake work, Sharpe recognizes Black annotation and Black redaction as tools to locate, prioritize, and resist the erasure and misrepresentation of Blackness (Black voice and subjectivity) within (anti-Black) carceral archives. Sharpe’s praxis of wake work is one of *care* against the gratuitous violence(s) which renders Blackness (Black flesh) anagrammatical to “make Black life visible, if only

momentarily, through the optic door of Black annotation and redaction.”²⁸ The visibility of Blackness (even if temporary) disrupts if the optics of the wake and dismantles infrastructures of the State and white supremacy that continue to expropriate capital from slave labor and Native lands. Similarly, I name and observe Indigenous annotation and Indigenous supplementation as tools of interrogation and survivance. Anishinaabe scholar and sf writer Gerald Vizenor (1998) conceptualizes survivance as “more than survival, more than endurance nor mere response, survivance is an active repudiation of dominance, tragedy, and victimization.”²⁹ In this way, Indigenous wake work simultaneously affirms and makes visible Indigenous life and sovereignties and asserts the illegitimacy of the State towards the deconstruction of infrastructures of white supremacy that perpetuate *both* Indigenous and Black social death. Indigenous and Black praxes of wake work are related in that each destabilizes the infrastructures of social death that condition the Other in the past, present, and future(s).

Overview of Chapters

I begin with an analysis of Ohlone-Costanoan Esselen and Chumash scholar Deborah Miranda’s (2013) tribal memoir by and for California Natives, *Bad Indians*, as a useful site to observe the ways in which Black and Indigenous modes of knowledge production and resistance to the (anti-Black and anti-Indigenous) wake(s) are always already interrelated. The first chapter focuses on wake work that is oriented towards the past; that is, in (re)claiming ancestral knowledges and relationships and resisting historic archives of erasure and misrepresentation. The second chapter is concerned with imagining the future, the construction of alternative worlds, and how we might get there. Specifically, I am interested in learning from modes of Indigenous and Black wake work that challenge and expand ways of imagining and creating futures in which the world works differently through creative production at the intersections of

science, technology, and the future. In the final chapter, I observe embodiments of Indigenous and Black annotation that assert the presence of Black and Indigenous bodies and knowledge within contemporary moments (the present). Specifically, I observe the dialogue between Black and Indigenous environmental wake work at Standing Rock and in Detroit and Flint (MI) that re-imagines ontologic relationships between people and land through the dismantling of the settler imperial State and racial capitalism, which necessarily sustain Black and Native social death. Such practices prioritize and foster alternative ways of relating and caring for one another – people and land – within (and potentially beyond) the totality of the wake(s).

CHAPTER ONE

Deborah Miranda's *Bad Indians* as an Example of Native Wake Work and Ancestral Reclaiming In/Against Settler Archives of History

Introduction

This chapter analyzes the tribal memoir by and for California Natives, *Bad Indians* (2012), assembled by Ohlone-Costanoan Esselen and Chumash scholar Deborah Miranda. On the last page of the memoir's introduction, Miranda reappropriates the words of Mission San Juan Bautista (1812) observing a group of 'primitive' California Native Americans, asserting "fables" as their primary knowledge source: "Yes – and they are, still. May it always be so."¹ In this powerful re-assertion and re-claiming of an imposed/imposing colonial language and stereotype of Natives as 'storytellers', Miranda emphasizes the goal of her project as one to look through and beyond the frameworks of knowing and seeing that are offered by colonial archives to uncover the *voices* of those (California) Natives who have been systematically and violently erased and misrepresented. In this way, Miranda's project is an Indigenous assemblage: as Laura M. Furlan (2021) describes, "assemblage" is a process or action of archival interrogation to make room for the imagining and creation of alternative archives of Native history towards recovering, re-claiming, and reestablishing (ancestral) kinship and knowledge that has been violently disrupted and erased through colonization.

If Miranda's goal is to make space for alternative ways of (Native) knowing and being (in relation) in the wake of the settlement of Indigenous lands through the genocide of Native bodies and cultures through Native intervention in colonial archives, how can *Bad Indians* be recognized as a form of Native *wake work*? Here, I draw on Christina Sharpe's (2016) conceptualization of anti-Blackness as a continuing wake in the legacies of Transatlantic Slavery. For Sharpe, the *wake* is the violent and unfolding afterlives of anti-Black slavery which

shape the “contemporary conditions of spatial, legal, psychic, material, and other dimensions of Black non/being as well as Black modes of resistance.”² She goes on to conceptualize *wake work* as a praxis of imagining that includes *Black annotation and Black redaction* as tools of resistance (interrogation and counter-abandonment), as “another effort to try to look, to try to really see” past what is available to us in the archive.³ In drawing resonances between Sharpe’s framework and Miranda’s production, I do not seek to equate, reduce, or misrepresent the unique experiences and modes of violence which have throughout time sought to systematically reduce the Black body to (the ontological status of) flesh and the Native body to (the ontological status of) half-human (savage). This chapter engages what I conceptualize to be the anti-Indigenous wake of settlement and racial capitalism that continues to shape Native life, the “story of California”, and, more broadly, of the United States, through the physical, political, and symbolic erasure and mis-representation of Native voice. In this way, Miranda’s memoir can be recognized as an assemblage of Native wake work that seeks to interrogate and re-create the archive through *Native annotation and Native supplementation*. Specifically, I argue that Miranda enacts California Native futurity in her performance of Indigenous wake work to enter and interrogate the archive(s) of California by centering an Indigenous lens that legitimizes Native forms of knowledge production, including and especially storytelling. Mvskoke scholar Laura Harjo (2019) describes futurity as the refusal of “the trope of the dying, disappearing Indian – a trope that has been necessary for the settler to take Indigenous lands and lives.”⁴ Miranda’s assemblage of tribal (hi)stories re-connects tribal relationships across contexts of time and space, which Harjo recognizes as “kin-space-time envelopes,” to imagine and enact Native relationality outside of colonial frameworks of linear time such that ancestors and descendants

can interact and engage with one another through Native wake work enacted in and against archives of the past.

Annotative Assemblage: Re-Connecting Tribal Stories and Relations

The mosaic-style of Miranda's memoir enables the use of multimodal forms of Native annotation (including Native supplementation) to challenge and intervene in colonial archives. Miranda structures her tribal memoir as a scrapbook composed of multiple genres and sources of storytelling and personal narrative to patch stories together. This includes oral stories, written narratives, personal experiences, tapes and recordings, ethnographic and anthropology research, government documents, Spanish and U.S. archives of missionization, the Gold Rush, and California expansion, newspaper reports, photographs and art, museum archives and artifacts, wax cylinders, poetry, "genealogical gossip"⁵, and more, carefully sampled, annotated, and compiled into Miranda's written tribal memoir. This methodology enables Miranda to maneuver the conditions of her family and tribal archive as they have been deconstructed, displaced, and erased by the nation-state, colonialism, and Mission Mythology. Miranda describes these archives, and by embodied extension her family, culture, and community, tracing since Contact (with colonial-settlers), as broken, fragmented, shattered, and battered. She recognizes her own work as the piecing together of "shards" left behind by others – ancestors and community members – whose stories comprise tribal history and future.⁶ In observing the brokenness of her tribe's history and culture, Miranda challenges the temporal models of healing, community, and decolonization that imagine recovery as a linear progression towards a previous or "traditional" state of culture isolated in history. Rather than aspiring to an imaginary historicized tribal and cultural identity, attempting to recreate what has been lost, Miranda suggests her tribe thinks of themselves "as a mosaic."⁷ That is, Miranda subverts frameworks of recreation with frameworks

of *reinvention* and *transformation* in which pieces of culture and history (stories, etc.) and bodies themselves form a heterogenous whole made of disparate parts, a “new design” in which “human beings constructed of multiple sources of beauty . . . bring wholeness to the world and ourselves.”⁸ Laura Furlan (2021) and Lisa Tatonetti (2014) recognize this as a methodology of “Indigenous assemblage” that seeks to decolonize and (re)connect the “pieces” of tribal history across time and space through complex and nonlinear (re)layering of source and story. This strategy enables Miranda to enter and read colonial archives through and alongside Indigenous knowledges and archives in nontraditional⁹ ways that allow her to sample, overwrite, edit, bring together, and relocate pieces of her and tribal history as they have been displaced within the Mission Mythology archive. Miranda broadens the archive through the inclusion of non-academic sources and irregular citational formats, enabled by an annotative methodology of assemblage, “to construct a tribal memoir that performs the decolonization” of California’s Mission Mythology.¹⁰ In this way, Miranda demonstrates the flexibility and fluidity of Native annotation as a research praxis to ethically enter and de/re/construct archives to interrogate and decolonize histories and knowledges towards the cultivation of tribal identity (identities) and (re)connection of tribal relationships.

Miranda’s multimodal usage of Native annotation interrogates California’s archives to re-establish and affirm tribal relationships of healing and futurity. She cultivates a tribal memoir that, as a mosaic (annotative assemblage), patches together the archival knowledges and histories of California Native tribes, especially oriented from the tribal experiences and knowledges of her Ohlone/Costanoan-Esselen family. Miranda recognizes her work as a space-making project, “to create a space where voices can speak after long and often violently imposed silence.”¹¹ By searching for and recovering the voices of her ancestors, whose words and experiences

collectively shape the “story-bridge” of all California Natives (including Miranda), Miranda situates herself as “one of the bridges back to them,” re-connecting tribal relationships through archival annotation and assemblage. Miranda recognizes the power of personal story/telling to recover relationships with ancestors, as well as build future (re)connections with descendants, including her own. The tribal story (stories) she assembles in the memoir creates space for descendants and contemporary tribal communities to engage in active, dynamic dialogue with the stories and knowledges of silenced and lost ancestors within contemporary processes of healing, decolonization, and survival. In this way, Miranda recognizes that the unfolding and lived realities of California Natives are directly tied to the stories of ancestors whose lives and experiences “are the bridges over which our descendants cross,” and survive.¹² This relationality extends across time and space in what Harjo (2019) observes as “kin-space-time envelopes” in which community is shaped by the stories and embodied knowledges of ancestors and descendants, human and nonhuman, blood and chosen relatives alike, such that “relatives’ life force has the power to move and invoke us into action and responsibility to community.”¹³ Community history (and future) is unfixed and in flux as the stories of community members unfold in relation to one another in reciprocal exchange; “what I have become is only possible because of what you have become, and the encounter between use had and has the power to transform each of us.”¹⁴ Thus, Miranda’s tribal memoir is not just a revitalization of ancestral relationships, but a “mark” left in the archives for future descendants to find and continue building tribal stories, relations, and identity.¹⁵ By challenging “the official story, Miranda changes the script of settler colonialism in California mission history for future generations.”¹⁶ Her annotative assemblage enacts a California Native project of futurity that resists disappearance and archival erasure by creating a space of knowledge production and dialogue for

ancestors and descendants that pushes towards the reconciliation and healing of contemporary tribal identities through the affirmation of tribal relationships across contexts of time and space.

The interrelatedness of personal experience shapes California Native knowledges such that storytelling becomes a primary mode through which Native knowledge is (re)produced; the collective stories of California Natives shape tribal history. Thus, Miranda roots her method(s) of Native wake work in the practices and embodied knowledges of ancestors who used their available tools to insert Native story and presence into the archive of California. A guiding voice throughout her tribal memoir is Isabel Meadows, Miranda's relative through marriage, a California Native woman who was an informant for Smithsonian ethnologist J.P. Harrington. Although Harrington was motivated by a paternal curiosity that sought to record the "dying" cultures of an extinct people, Meadows uses his ethnographic notes as a space through which to construct a California Native archive within settler-colonial archival infrastructures for future generations. By translating and sharing tribal stories with Harrington, Meadow enacts Native annotation to intervene in contemporary metanarratives "intent on displacing and disappearing Indigenous Californians."¹⁷ Miranda recognizes Meadow's Native annotations on the California archive as a teaching device, "storytelling as education," for contemporary California Natives "who will one day read Harrington's notes," and reconnect them to the other stories of California Native community and survival.¹⁸ In this way, Meadow's written archival intervention "embodies the very act of creating and Indigenous identity"¹⁹ by providing a strategy through which to enter and (re)construct archives through the insertion and affirmation of Native voice. Miranda looks to the guidance of Meadow's annotations "to construct her own narrative intervention in Mission Mythology" through the assemblage of California Native stories.²⁰ Simultaneously, she demonstrates the embodied nature of Indigenous knowledges and practices,

including Indigenous annotation. Miranda's personal, lived experiences as a California Native inform her investments, theory, and methodologies (praxes) within California's (Indigenous) archives. Miranda's work leads her to Meadows, whose archival annotations – enacted through storytelling – retain and transfer intergenerational knowledge that shapes Miranda's (wake) work and an Indigenous history of California. In doing so, Miranda situates Native wake work within (hi)stories of Native survival as an agentive tool of self-assertion and futurity against immediate realities of systematic oppression and erasure. The prioritization of personal and intergenerational knowledges resists colonial aesthetics of Native disappearance, passivity, and victimry within the archives through remembrance and storytelling.

For Miranda, the re-connection of tribal stories and relationships through annotative assemblage seeks to decolonize the archive of California by deconstructing and disentangling the lies of Mission Mythology. In other words, Miranda creates space within the archive for the insertion of Native knowledges towards the cultivation of an alternative history of California that can begin to reconcile the continuing violence imposed on California Natives and non-Natives by settler-colonialism and the nation-state. The re-telling of Native stories, including personal narrative, is an act of Native annotation “to chronical and give Indian testimonio to part of California's past that has been erased or subsumed under that catchall ‘assimilation’.”²¹ Miranda recognizes this practice of annotative storytelling (storytelling as annotation) as both a project of community healing and of decolonizing the archives and geographies of California. She asks, “Indian or not, haven't we lived under the burden of California mission mythology and gold rush fantasy long enough? Isn't it time to pull off the blood-soaked bandages, look at the wound directly, let clean air and healing take hold?”²² Calling for collective action towards change, Miranda urges the reader to “look at the wound directly,” whether by telling one's story (Native

annotation) or listening to the stories of those whose very existence destabilizes the foundations of settler-colonial archives. Tribal stories foster relationships, but also “inspire sustained action by emphasizing the significance of ‘truth telling’ to validate Indigenous experiences, voices, and practices” towards alternative ontologies outside of settler-colonial arrangements of harm and (dis)possession.²³ In this way, Native annotation intervenes in the archive in what Wahpetunwan Dakota scholar Waziyatawin of Pezihutazizi Otunwe (2008) recognizes as truth telling: a decolonizing strategy to resist “the impetus to maintain the status quo” and recognize the need for change.²⁴ The insertion of Native story and voice into California archives destabilizes Mission Mythology and pushes California as a community of peoples embedded in settler-colonialism towards a collaborative project of decolonization through the legitimation and reproduction of Indigenous knowledges and the resistance of Native disappearance in the archives.

Resisting Archival Disappearance: Inverting the Colonial Gaze

Miranda’s annotative assemblage is a performance of Indigenous (California Native) futurity that refuses “the trope of the dying, disappearing Indian.”²⁵ She describes the power of narrative and storytelling as tools of self-determination and assertion to “beat back Disappear” and affirm continued survival amidst the structural and archival realities of settler-colonialism and Mission Mythology in which Native subjectivity is erased or distorted. In her tribal memoir, Miranda enacts Native wake work – annotation and supplementation – to enter, interrogate, and decolonize settler-colonial archives through the assertion of Native subjectivity and knowledge. This refusal to disappear simultaneously destabilizes settler-colonial archives and claims to land and cultivates an alternative archive of California Native history, enacted through annotative assemblage.

“The Diggers”

In Part II of *Bad Indians*, “Bridges: Post-Secularization 1836-1900”, Miranda explores the violent and often erased and/or romanticized era of the mid-18th to late 19th centuries in which the term “Digger” appeared as a racist derogatory term to describe (Northern) California Natives rooted in anti-Black rhetoric, where Native women were affectionately (and ironically) coined “Digger belles”. In this section, Miranda looks deep within California’s archive to trace the violent genealogy of this term and uncover its symbolic, political, and economic origins as a way for settlers and their government to categorize California Natives who experienced the California Gold Rush (1848-55) instead of missionization. These peoples were recognized as an impediment to Westernization and Manifest Destiny and, thus, targets of “one of the bloodiest genocides ever documented” during which the United States Congress “appropriated and paid out over one million dollars in bounties to white men who harvested Indian scalps [including children] from the California goldfields,” slavery, and/or starvation and disease as local cultural resources and ecosystems were consumed and destroyed through the Gold Rush and Missionization. Retaining a similarly disturbing and violent background, the term “Digger Belle”, as Miranda uncovers much to her disgust and sadness, “seems to have been a widespread joke in California – sarcasm, irony, mean-spirited derision,” a tool which fetishizes and profits on the suffering of Indigenous women.²⁶ Miranda’s archival project unearths an ugly, white past that has violently written over the California Native’s voice through genocide and misrepresentation.

Miranda’s goal in uncovering these troubling narratives and images documenting “Digger Indians” is more than to expose the violence of California’s colonial archive, though. As implied in the title of this section, “Bridges”, and in the description of her overall project through *Bad*

Indians, Miranda is seeking to read between the lines to recognize and amplify the Native stories and voices that settler-colonial knowledge attempts to silence through these manipulations of historic narratives and events, ancestral stories and voices whose knowledges and experiences have been withheld even from their own descendants, including Miranda herself. Thus, Miranda is seeking to look beyond what is immediately visible within the violence of the archive; like Sharpe, she continues to look “because that could not be all there is to see or say.”²⁷ As such, in her archival tracing of the history of “Diggers” and “Digger Belles”, Miranda moves beyond analysis to *annotation* “to try to look, to try to really see”²⁸ as a project of California Native futurity that resists disappearance and reclaims ancestral relationships. She inverts the settler-colonial gaze of the archive and inserts a California Native lens (voice and story) that recovers tribal relations and exposes the violence of the lie.

Miranda emphasizes two images unearthed in her search: “A Digger Belle” (1849), a portrait drawn from a photograph by David Leeper in his memoir *The Argonauts of ‘Forty-nine*, and “The Belles of San Luis Rey” (1895), a photograph of three Native elders, “Rosaria, Tomás, Vaselia”, which has been marketed on postcards and in historic pamphlets near San Luis Rey since the early 20th century, with original photographs selling for over a hundred dollars. In resisting the disappearance of these ancestors within the archive, Miranda enacts an annotative project of futurity that remembers and reclaims ancestral kin within Indigenous projects of reconnecting and healing for California Natives towards the decolonization of settler-carceral infrastructures and epistemes of California and the U.S. at large.



"A Digger Belle" From *The Argonauts of 'Forty-nine* (1894)

Starting with “A Digger Belle”, Miranda learns that the image is part of David Leeper’s larger illustrated collection of “Digger Indians” in “tribal garb”, fetishized through and into the archive by the “devastating” colonial (white) gaze. The image, as Miranda observes, depicts a straight-faced Native woman (mouth shut tightly, eyebrows furrowed) facing the photographer sitting half-clothed in a tulle or woven skirt with “spiky” hair and braids. However, with her insight of California Native culture and style, Miranda helps to clarify photo in ways that Leeper could not:

“ . . . this woman had probably cut or burnt her hair close sometime in the recent past, the most likely reason being a traditional act of mourning. Her full breasts indicate she is a young woman in the prime of her life, perhaps even a young mother (if so, where is her baby?) . . . I do not see the classic ‘stoic’ Indian in this face; I see deep grief, and desperation, and the burning of the kind of strength that emerges when all else fails . . . I am stunned by what she has survived, and I wince at her probable fate. Was she paid to sit for the photograph, or simply forced? Paid in money, or food? Released afterwards, or returned to her owner? And if released, what home, what homeland, what community, did she have to return to? Her fierceness – her face a mask of hardness and suspicion – burns through the photographers’ lens and artist’s hands.”²⁹

It is worth quoting Miranda at length here because this passage provides a stunning example of the ways in which Miranda equips *Native annotation* in her exploration and re-claiming of California’s archive(s). In a process similar to Sharpe’s utilization of *Black*

annotation, Miranda enters the archive here to expose the violence done upon this young Native woman by the annotations made by Leeper (and, symbolically and literally, the settler United States), and then she looks for more; she asks the woman in the image, herself, and the reader: *What can we see beyond that first annotation which “threatens to block out everything else [the Native voice]”?*³⁰ In an annotative process of inversion, Miranda takes in what is being fetishized, commoditized, silenced, and appropriated through Leeper’s annotations – the young woman’s ‘eccentric hair’, her nakedness, her ‘exotic’ style – and uses her insight as a historian and California Native to enhance the viewer’s frameworks for seeing the illustration and recognizing what it might have to show us: a young woman (mother?) in the midst of violent, State-sanctioned genocide and enslavement. While Leeper’s colonial gaze and annotative instruments are layered and choking (eclipsing), Miranda guides us to (try to) see, to (try to) find the California Native’s voice, even if that voice is expressed through silence (the silence of a photograph; her lips firmly shut, a “mask” of fierceness, harshness, and suspicion; her story misappropriated into Leeper’s ‘memoir’ of “Digger Indians”). That is, through Native annotation, one might be able to hear and see what else this young Native woman has to say “in the midst of the ways she is made to appear only to be made to disappear.”³¹



"The Belles of San Luis Rey" (Late
19th Century)

Like “A Digger Belle,” Miranda uncovers a violent history of Native misrepresentation and disappearance in her search for and uncovering of the stories of Rosaria, Tomása, and Vaselia, the three Native elders photographed in “The Three Belles of San Luis Rey”. Miranda finds the photograph still profited on by local organizations in the towns surrounding Mission San Luis Rey, often claiming the women to be centuries old beggars (or, at the very best, “tour guides”). As Miranda has already explicated the brutal violence towards Native women during the eras of Missionization and continues to reveal in her annotations here, these women were likely the survivors of Mission San Luis Rey, were left without resources or shelter beyond the physical remains of the mission itself, and so became local ‘legends’ who traded stories and photographs for money or food with tourists, travelers, and traders who came through the Mission. Their presence at the missions “became a marketable tourist product” as an embodiment of Manifest Destiny and Mission Mythology in which the Native is unable to perform proper modern subjecthood, maintaining the legitimacy of settler claims to Native lands as open and unoccupied (*terra nullius*). “They appeared to be fulfilling the promises of manifest destiny as the disappearing last remnants of the mission Indians, not the survivors of social upheaval and genocide.”³²

Miranda again enacts an annotative method of inversion to reverse the archival gaze and insert Native voice and knowledge within settler archives of Native disappearance. Miranda’s insertion of *Native annotation* into the California Mission Mythology archive contradicts and seeks to move beyond the colonial annotations which have “marked [these California Native women] as a commodity, female (thought not human): marketable, a product for brief enjoyment”.³³ Yet, she is restrained by the colonial archive’s erasure and fragmentation of their stories – Miranda notes that their cited names, Rosaria, Tomása, and Vaselia, are not Native but

baptismal – and left with more questions than answers: “What were their last names, were they ever married, what happened to their children, do they have any living descendants?”³⁴ Even so, Miranda provides a strategy for engaging with the violences of the archive. Furlan (2021) describes Miranda’s annotative methodology as one of teaching that “instructs us to think about the women’s stories and their lives, not simply the artifact of the postcard – to think about these women in relationship, *to reclaim them as ancestors*”³⁵. Thus, Miranda’s annotations provide a powerful form of intervention in the colonial archive of “Digger Indians” (the “Digger Belle”, Rosaria, Tomás, and Vaselia) that is able to look beyond the violence and what has seemingly been erased to uncover and read a story of Native women and their creative capacity to survive in the midst of colonization. This is a story of survival of/and the body: “Sometimes all you can do is sell what you’ve got. Your face. Your breasts. Your Otherness. Your frailty. Your story.”³⁶ Although she is only left with photographs, Miranda re-traces and re-connects their stories in such a way that builds a tribal memoir (mosaic) which can re-claim these elders as ancestors whose bodies “are the bridges over which their descendants cross, spanning unimaginable landscapes of loss.”³⁷ Through annotative assemblage, Miranda works to see beyond the colonial gaze towards the assembling of a (California) Native archive that (re)claims the physical and symbolic relationship and role of ancestors whose bodies and voices endured and survived so that their descendants could be. While the racial ontologies of Mission Mythology continue to misrepresent these women “as passive, dumb, and disappeared,”³⁸ Miranda refuses their erasure and applies a Native lens to uncover a story of survival. In resisting the disappearance of these ancestors, Miranda enacts an annotative project of futurity that remembers and reclaims ancestral kin towards reconnecting, healing, and decolonizing contemporary California Native communities.

“Bells”

In Part I of *Bad Indians*, “*The End of the World: Missionization 1770-1836*”, Miranda creates an Indigenous appropriation of California State’s fourth grade Mission Unit Project (6-20), in which students are ‘indoctrinated’ in the practices of imperialism, settler colonialism, and racial capitalism through a curriculum of “Mission Mythology” that “glorifies the era and glosses over both Spanish and Mexican exploitation of Indians, as well as American enslavement of those same Indians during American rule.”³⁸ This glorification occurs in the colonial archive and educational systems as sites of colonial knowledge reproduction where Spanish and American colonialism and missionization is romanticized as “the olden days” and cultural frameworks of knowing and recognizing the Indigenous peoples of California only make room for narratives of disappeared. Thus, Miranda’s goal in undertaking “a very late fourth grade project” is to craft an Indigenous assemblage of Californian Missionization through the supplementation of Native voice and ways of being to interrogate and disrupt colonial modes of knowing and reading the archive so that we might look beyond the colonial frame to expose and/or imagine “what the archives don’t record.”³⁹ In this way, we can understand Miranda’s “fourth grade project” as both an Indigenous Assemblage and a “praxis for imagining”⁴⁰, which I conceptualize as Native supplementation (a form of annotation): a tool which re-claims Native relationship to ancestral knowledges and ways of being that have been violently dislocated and erased through imagining. This imagining functions to fill-in the archive with the types of narratives that are intentionally left out of hegemonic knowledges because they disrupt and threaten to destroy the (symbolic, juridic, and economic) foundations of settler-colonial logics, which assume possession over Native lands and, thus, are founded on Native erasure and misrepresentation.

The site of analysis in Miranda's "fourth grade project" through which I seek to demonstrate her wielding of Native supplementation in and against California's Mission Mythology archive is the assemblage titled "Bells".⁴¹ In this section, a fictional and unnamed California Native speaks from the first person telling the transitional narrative of when bells were brought to Catholic missions in California and used to survey and regulate Native life being expropriated by the Church, describing the bells as a literal and symbolic embodiment and reminder of the environment of total domination by the Church (and the padres assigned to run the missions): "The voice of the bell is the voice of the padres."⁴² Here, though, Miranda is not re-telling or re-solidifying narratives of Native trauma, grief, injury, and "bitter survival,"⁴³ but utilizing *Native supplementation* to de-center the colonial gaze and imagine, from a Native lens, what California Natives did with their bodies, voices, and minds when they were able to temporarily escape from the grasp and gaze of the padre (and colonial violence); that is, when "the bells hung silent".⁴⁴ The image before us is splendid: Natives laughing, eating, singing loudly, sharing, having sex, gossiping, sleeping together, and dreaming with full stomachs on a beach with warm sand, feeling and being "whole and unbroken".⁴⁵ It is a narrative of Native aliveness, joy, fullness, and ease that describes what those moments of Native agency, resistance, and being might have looked like, because there must have been some. It is a narrative that threatens the Mission Mythology which shapes the contemporary political imagination of California Natives as, if not extinct, dying out from self-caused social conflict, disease, and an inability to adapt. Rather than dying and disappeared, these Natives are playful and agentive. Simultaneously, Miranda's exercise of imagination here acts as a site (in her own words, a "bridge") through which Miranda and other California Natives can begin to recover and reestablish a relationship with those ancestors whose name, tribal kinship, body, story, and voice

might never be known to their descendants. In this way, Miranda demonstrates the function of Native supplementation to negotiate the tensions of justice and reconciliation for California Native communities by creating space for Native subjectivities that are otherwise untraceable within the violence of settler-colonial archives.

Conclusion

What are the implications of exploring the intersections between Black and Native Studies in a way that might allow us to conceptualize Native ways of being in/and the wake of colonial and imperial violence (genocide, slavery, removal, and land theft)? Extending Christina Sharpe's framework of the anti-black wake in analyzing *Bad Indians* recognizes the tools of *Native annotation* and *supplementation* that Miranda uses to assemble an alternative archive of California and Indigenous history through interrogations of colonial archives that allow for the recovering and reclaiming of Native voice and presence towards the re-establishment of ancestral relations and, thus, Native relationship (sovereignty) to land. In this way, *Native supplementation* and *annotation* demonstrate the radical potential and creative capacity of (Native) intervention and imagination to create alternative ways of (Native) being in the wakes of slavery and settlement that have the resistive potential to empower and re-connect through the destructive processes of archival decolonization. Such praxes have the potential to not only shift relationships and knowledges of the past but to imagine alternative social arrangements and (Indigenous and Black) futures rooted in the embodied experiences of Black and Indigenous communities in the wake(s).

CHAPTER 2

Indigenous Futurisms and Afrofuturism: Interrogating and Imagining Futures In and Beyond the Wake(s)

Introduction

The second chapter of this thesis is concerned with imagining the future, the construction of alternative worlds, and how we might get there. Specifically, I am interested in learning from modes of Indigenous and Black wake work that challenge and expand ways of imagining and creating futures in which the world works differently through creative production at the intersections of science, technology, and the future. I center Afrofuturism and Indigenous futurism as sites to observe mechanisms of alternative futuring through the prioritization of ancestral and embodied knowledges in the (anti-Black and anti-Indigenous) wake(s). Afrofuturism and Indigenous futurisms can be understood as forms of Black and Native wake work, specifically Black and Native *supplementation*, that use imagination to (re)claim ancestral knowledges and ways of being that have been violently dislocated and erased. This imagining functions to fill-in the archive with subjectivities and narratives that are intentionally made unintelligible within hegemonic knowledges because they disrupt and threaten to destroy the foundations of settler colonial racial capitalism, which center on Indigenous and Black social death and perpetuate conditions of vulnerability. In this way, Afrofuturism and Indigenous futurisms interrogate possibilities for alternative futures not just for Black and Indigenous communities but for “all of us”.¹

Of particular interest in this chapter is the relationship between Indigenous futurism(s), Afrofuturism, and the genre of science fiction (sf). As a genre associated with critical interrogations of possible futures created by contemporary conditions, why has the genre of sf typically not been associated in popular culture with Black and Indigenous expressions of social

critique and alternative futuring at the intersections of science, technology, and imagining? The genre of sf and its proponents often taken for granted the precursors of hegemonic (settler-carceral) culture that epistemologically and ontologically structure (and limit) the aesthetic, philosophical, scientific, and imaginative boundaries of popular sf. Euro-American narratives of Historical Materialism undergird accounts of sf history in the U.S. that unfold within particular sociopolitical and technological timelines that uphold onto-epistemologies of white supremacy by positioning Euro-American scientific achievements in a linear temporality of human development wherein modern (neo)liberal subjectivity is predicated on its antagonism to Black and Indigenous delinquency and savagery (non-subjectivity). The structural incompetence of Black and Indigenous peoples enables the (re)configuration of their bodies into property to propel imperial fantasies and desires for the accumulation of land and capital through the appropriation of carceral labor and Native lands. This structural relationship is omitted in Historical Materialism in ways that maintain moral, economic, and political white supremacy. In this way, contemporary settler sf avoids implications within while sustaining imperial infrastructures of white supremacy by creating narrative spaces within which (white) settlers can partake in emancipatory narratives against social injustice through frameworks of moral superiority and white saviorism. Thus, settler sf often does not – or cannot – imagine alternative futures of social justice without reproducing the foundational infrastructures of (neo)liberal subjectivity that necessitate Black and Indigenous social death in its imaginings of freedom. In contrast, Indigenous futurism and Afrofuturism prioritize embodied experiences and knowledges of and within the wake(s) to imagine possibilities for Native and Black futures that will at once end and re-shape the world.

I begin by analyzing the mechanisms through which American settler sf is predicated upon the misrepresentation of Black and Indigenous ontologic suffering to demonstrate the inability of settler sf to imagine alternative futures of genuine social justice. I then move on to observe the ways in which Afrofuturism and Indigenous futurism intersect in their unique demands for and imagination of abolition and decolonization as praxes of imagining that necessitate the dismantling of global infrastructures of capital dependent on settler-carceral imperialism and Black and Native death. I end with an annotative analysis of Anishinaabe scholar Gerald Vizenor's (1978) fictional short story, "Custer on the Slipstream," as annotation of settler archives against myths of savagery, aesthetic victimry, and disappearance by affirming the continued resurrection of Indigenous praxes of decolonization and survivance rooted in Indigenous temporal epistemologies.

Identifying Indigenous and Black Social Death in Settler SF

To situate a history of settler science fiction contextually is to resist European-American exceptionalism and recognize that sf as a genre transforms across historical, geographic, and cultural modes of production. While the term "science fiction" is often conflated with Euro-American sf, global traditions of science fiction have existed for thousands of years before popularization of the term in the 19th Century, and the origin of the genre remains highly disputed.² As Mark Bould and Sherryl Vint (2008) assert, "there is no such *thing* as SF, but instead multiple and constantly shifting ways of producing, marketing, distributing, consuming, and understanding texts as SF."³ In other words, fans, creators, critics, and scholars collectively contribute to an ongoing process of genre formation as different texts throughout time are, or are not, recognized as sf. It is, thus, crucial to disentangle sf from deeply entrenched settler paradigms to explore the dynamism of the genre and its potential for critical interrogations and

social change. This tracing a particular history of settler sf, then, aims not to maintain patterns of settler dominance and hegemony within the genre. Instead, I wish to reveal the settler colonial origins of anti-Indigeneity and anti-Blackness within mainstream sf to expose the mechanisms through which Indigenous sf and Afrofuturism continue to be obscured and marginalized in American settler culture.

The origins of settler (Euro-American) sf are debated by scholars, creators, and fans alike. William Wilson, Scottish-American poet and publisher, first used the term “science fiction” in his 1851 novel exploring the potential relationship between poetry and science. Wilson believed that sf was an educational tool to spread scientific truth and enlightenment, sugarcoated in fiction, to the American public. However, many (settler) sf fans and scholars attribute American pulp magazines that popularized during the late 19th to mid-20th centuries to the origin of sf.³ Specifically, Hugo Gernsback, an editor and publisher known for publishing the first sf magazine, *Amazing Stories*, in 1926, is named by Moskowitz (1963) as the “real ‘Father of Science Fiction’”.⁴ Gernsback coined the term “scientification” in 1926 to describe sf content in *Amazing Stories*, placing well-known fictional authors like Jules Verne, H.G. Wells, and Edgar Allen Poe within the genre. (Gernsback later used the term “science fiction” to describe the content of future publications following his bankruptcy in 1929).⁵ Like Wilson, Gernsback promoted sf as an educational resource that circulates (Euro-American) scientific knowledge in a “very palatable form” (1926).⁶ For Wilson and Gernsback, sf emerged simultaneously with, or as a product of, the progression of Euro-American scientific and technologic production and discourse. (Gernsback argues that sf stories would not have been possible 200 years prior). This discourse positions white, Western democracies as the pinnacle of human civilization and scientific advancement upon the omission of infrastructures of capital and gratuitous violence

(slavery, settlement, Christian imperialism) that made such advancements possible in the construction of a morally superior neoliberal subject with the rational ability and authority to promote scientific discovery and democracy. The foundations of these claims were (and remain) predicated on ontologies of Indigenous primitivism (un-/non-development) that render Indigeneity disappeared (socially dead) within modernity and, thus, excluded from modern humanity. These historic narratives of European-American exceptionalism in sf parallel the works of scholars such as Brian Aldiss (1975) and Roger Luckhurst (2005), who situate the origins of sf strictly within recent Euro-American sociopolitical and technological history. Others, like Adam Roberts (2005), trace the origins of the genre to older European traditions such as ancient Greek speculative narratives.

For these authors, sf as a genre is singularly attributed to European and American history and cultural production. While settler scholars increasingly recognize that there are many histories and definitions of sf, many still contend that sf is an extension and product of colonial and imperial culture. For instance, while Roberts (2005) and John Rieder (2008) recognize the complicated and multiplicitous history of the genre, each nevertheless configures sf within settler-colonial technological history and cultural experiences as “a direct mapping of Imperialist or political concerns.”⁷ Luckhurst (2005) traces a contextual cultural history of sf, but he maintains that sf is associated with “the different experiences of time associated with modernity” and “orients perceptions towards the future rather than the past or the cyclical sense of time ascribed to traditional societies.”⁸ Here, Luckhurst defines sf in relation to European-American technological and social changes following the 19th Century and inadvertently relegates non-Euro-American frameworks of time outside of modernity and fixed in an ahistorical past, thus incapable of being sf. Similarly, Darko Suvin (1979), whose influential work established a broad

definition of sf that recognizes “science” as an “intrinsic, culturally acquired cognitive logic”⁹ that acknowledges non-Western forms of cognition. However, as Spires (2021) highlights, Suvin’s theory simultaneously denies the legitimacy of alternative cultural frameworks of sf in his assertion that religion is “diametrically opposed” to “a genre that hinges upon the possibility of change.”¹⁰ The definitional emphasis on science and technology, time, and religion by settler authors reveals the Euro-American epistemologies and ontologies within which their understandings of sf are positioned. Such a perspective fails to consider – and in some cases, actively denies the possibility of – alternative cultural frameworks and experiences of science, religion, and sf, including many Indigenous religious epistemologies that are not based in linear assumptions of time but in embodied knowledges and experiences of place.¹¹

Despite the firm distinctions drawn by settler scholars between modern/traditional and science(fiction)/religion, settler definitions of sf are, ironically, rooted “in a very particular understanding of religion, as well as a specific historical and ideological approach.”¹² This approach is shaped by Western European religious beliefs – broadly, Protestantism, Christianity, and Judaism – which fix human history in a linear timeline according to a predetermined divine plan created by God. Philosophers of the European Scientific Revolution recognized the principles of scientific reason (essentialism and efficient causality) as means to discover and manifest the God’s plan of creation in preparation for Jesus Christ’s spatio-temporal return from heaven to earth.¹³ This linear understanding of space-time shaped Enlightenment philosophies and sciences of human history and subjectivity. This link between Euro-American frameworks of time, science, and subjectivity sheds light on the mechanisms through which settler sf maintains the exclusion of Black and Native cultural frameworks from the genre. In the philosophies of Kant, Herder, and Hegel, human subjects and subjectivity are situated in (the Workshop of) Time

in relation to the linear notion of development.¹⁴ Human history is configured in stages of self-development wherein “the World and its Categories thrive in the contingency of Existence shared by the Subject of Whiteness and its Racial Others,” whose subjectivities are un(der)developed.¹⁵ Enlightenment philosophers conceptualized modern (liberal) subjecthood through inalienable natural rights granted by God. John Locke and Thomas Hobbes conceptualized natural rights in extension from a man’s “state of nature” in terms of (self-)development. Hobbes placed Native Americans in the lowest state of human nature, savagery, in juxtaposition to a masculine, white-European state of nature (i.e., the white male subject). He argued that the most innate natural right of man was “to use his own power, as he will himself, for the preservation of his own Nature . . . doing any thing, which in his own Judgement, and Reason, hee shall conceive to be the aptest means thereunto.”¹⁶ These rights, along with the Principles of Reason, bestowed by Nature, were denied to Native Americans, “the Savage people of America,” who were incapable of reason.¹⁷ Similarly, Locke asserted that “Indians” occupy a state of nature without natural or freeborn rights. He observed all men to possess “freeborn rights” to preserve life and property where the life and body (of man) serves as the “great foundation of property” over which man is “master of himself, and *proprietor of his own person*, and the actions or labor of it.”¹⁸ That is, the greatest right (of man) is to use his body to perform labor; labor, then, is the embodied performance of freeborn rights. Once a man labors on something – for example, land – the application of his labor removes it from its natural state and “thereby makes it his property . . . the labour being the unquestionable property of the labourer.” The “wild Indian,” who is, according to Locke, nourished by the natural production of the earth (plants and animals), “is still a tenant in common” and, thus, has no rights (18).¹⁹ Locke and Hobbes, among other contemporary philosophers, use the “state of nature” as an ontological

tool to place Native Americans in comparison and relation to the (hu)man with inalienable rights and Principles of Reason to epistemologically justify the dispossession and settling of Native lands. Within this progressive human history (the Category of) Blackness signifies a failed or non-subjecthood, that establishes a causal relation between the enslavement of Africans and the dispossession of Native lands as a natural reaction of white Europeans to inherent racial difference and inferiority. This logic undergirds Marxist narratives of Historical Materialism that erase the economic relationship between slavery, dispossession, and capitalism by rooting descriptions of slavery and dispossession in moral frameworks in which they are “first and foremost the opposite of freedom.”²⁰ Thus, the mechanisms through which anti-Blackness and anti-Indigeneity are embedded in European(-American) subjectivity become occluded.

Historical Materialism maintains a glaring grip on settler political imagination, including that of settler sf, since the Enlightenment. (Suvin, for example, is a Marxist). The relegation of Black and Native peoples to a failed or primitive state of development and subjecthood included the understanding of Black and Native American languages and literatures as pre-modern and primitive in the form of linguistic determinism. “Their ceremonies and beliefs were often regarded as satanic parodies of Christianity, their languages deficient and defective” (Swann 2). As late as 1894, historian and founder of modern American Anthropology Daniel Brinton asserted that non-descendants of “our Aryan forefathers,” (who were endowed “with a richly inflected speech,”) are “fatally handicapped ... in the struggle for supremacy.”²¹ During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, anthropologists and researchers concerned with recording “dying” cultures and languages (mis)translated Indigenous cultures into settler colonial archives via “the creation of stereotypes” (the misrepresentation of Native subjectivities) that were legally reinforced through the criminalization of Native languages.²² This linguistic determinism

“worked against the possibility of” Native and Black subjectivities in sf, both as sf creators and within sf stories as the genre gained official recognition in the 19th and 20th centuries.

Foundations of settler subjectivity and dialectics of time, science, and religion reinforced the exclusion of Indigenous futurism and Afrofuturist stories in mainstream sf during the early 20th century, including sf pulp magazines such as *Amazing*, by representing Native and Black subjectivities through one-dimensional characterizations and stereotypes of savagery and victimhood. For instance, de Quincey’s *Confessions of an English Opium Eater* (1822) and Ludlow’s *The Hasheesh Eater* (1857), depict drug narratives that engage settler-colonial models of masculinity and race to narrate hallucinogenic experiences as “an imaginative journey to the imperial frontier; one is able to take opium to explore the mysteries of ‘the Orient’ [or, in Ludlow’s case, the American Western Frontier] only so long as the Mystical East is imagined as an idealized dreamland safely insulated from foreign people and disconnected from troubling and complex imperial histories” (Higgins 228; Zieger). These hallucinogenic inner space travels share traits of early settler sf that centered Euro-American imperial desires and racial anxieties of the Western and Oriental frontiers. Baum’s (1900) *The Wizard of Oz* depicts a white, privileged subject, Dorothy, traveling through an unknown frontier where she must navigate among savage and friendly primitive non- and sub-human races while avoiding death or injury to liberate a select group of primitives with potential from psychic and physical oppression and slavery and moral delinquency. Burroughs’ (1912) “A Princess of Mars” tells of a Confederate veteran attacked by an Apache group and transported to Mars during his escape, where he befriends and then betrays a warlike, nomadic Green Martian tribe to rescue a humanoid Red Martian princess, after which he becomes prince and saves the planet’s native inhabitants from mass morality. Weinbaum’s (1934) “A Martian Odyssey” depicts an encounter narrative through which

Martians are humanized in relation to (primarily) white space travelers based on their noted superiority to African knowledge production and classification systems. Native (alien) populations in these early sf stories are primarily depicted as primitive, helpless, and easily manipulated or as superior in relation to under-developed (Black and Indigenous) humans. Such ontological depictions clearly assert the non-presence of Black and Indigenous knowledges and persons in humanity's future as incapable of modern subjectivity. Their courageous and honorable protagonists are privileged, white, and often male, who bravely traverse worlds "shared by Whiteness and its Racial [or Alien] Others".²³ In this way, early explorative frontier narratives of settler sf were embedded within (and functioned to reproduce) linear frameworks of human (and scientific) development that construct white, settler masculinity and subjectivity upon the non- or failed humanity of Black and Indigenous people. Such cultural production naturalizes settler capitalist systems of Black and Native social death as an unfortunate but inevitable consequence of modernity along the natural progression of human development towards whiteness.

Following World War II, settler sf shifted from colonial and imperial adventure stories focused on expansion, conquest, and discovery (Manifest Destiny) to heroic decolonization narratives. As scholars have noted, emerging scientific discoveries and technologies during and after the War shifted global conversations towards the potential futures made possible by technology.²⁴ Equally significant was the growing movement of European decolonization and anti-imperialism following the War, during which "imperialism gained a negative reputation in the western popular imaginary (even as imperial practices continued under newly hegemonic regimes of neoliberal globalization)."²⁵ During this time, American-settler sf narrated emancipatory journeys against oppression and genocide through privileged, white subjectivities.

In these narratives, protagonists are made relatable as oppressed characters through a “masochistic invitation to occupy the position of victims.”²⁶ Consider Luke Skywalker from *Star Wars* (1977), who rose from poverty to liberate the Empire from the tyranny of the Sith. Similarly, Katniss Everdeen from *The Hunger Games* (2008) sacrifices herself to fight instead of her younger sister, Primrose, as the female tribute from District 12, the poorest district in the empire. Jake from *Avatar* (2009) is a disabled Marine veteran whose military virtues of courage and honor enable him to work with Pandora’s native Na’vi warriors and save them from genocide and forced removal. These privileged, settler subjects embark on emancipatory journeys against imperial subjugation at personal expense, including the possibility sacrificing oneself towards the possibility of liberation. Within such narratives, Native and Black subjectivities are reinforced as racial or alien others as either victims or agents of oppression, unable to rescue themselves from internal and external imperial subjugation without the heroic actions of the (settler) protagonist.

We can see the influence of Historical Materialism following WWII in shaping contemporary settler sf narratives which fetishize decolonization struggles through stories in which “class displaces race as the primary axis of imperial subjugation [such that] white figures usurp the positions of colored bodies within oppressive regimes of colonial control” (Higgins 52).²⁷ The heroic victimry characterizing settler sf protagonists justifies and reinforces the exclusion of Native and Black subjectivities as un/der-developed subjects within sf narratives who are unable to recognize and/or liberate themselves from internal or external subjugation, or, conversely, tokenistic inclusion of Black and Native characters divorced from Blackness and Indigeneity. Representations of colonialism – for instance, in Marvel’s *Eternals* (2021) – provide (neo)liberal humanist critiques of dispossession and slavery that are wholly divorced from

Indigeneity and Blackness. Although (white) protagonists are complicit within and agents of imperial control (Jake Sully was a colonial soldier and spy before defecting), they are absolved of (white) guilt and historic responsibility on the grounds of injury.²⁸ Ironically, it is the victimization of the (settler) protagonist that enables them to liberate those racial (or alien) others whose victimization restricts them from securing their own freedom; the superior intelligence of the protagonist enables them to see and do what racial (or alien) others cannot, and their victimization endows them with “the moral authority of righteous retributive agency.”²⁹ In this way, contemporary settler sf narratives create spaces within which (white) settlers can partake in global discourses of decolonization as active (victimized) participants against oppression and avoid historic and contemporary implication within (neo)colonial systems of violence through which they have been privileged while maintaining the exclusion of Indigenous and Black subjectivities within these emancipatory narratives. Settler sf does not – or cannot – imagine alternative futures of social justice without reproducing the foundational infrastructures of (neo)liberal subjectivity that necessitate Black and Indigenous social death in its imaginings of freedom. In contrast, Afrofuturism and Indigenous futurisms prioritize embodied experiences and knowledges of and within the (anti-Black and anti-Indigenous) wake(s) to imagine possibilities for Native and Black futures that will at once end and re-shape the world.

Expanding (Beyond) Settler SF: Afrofuturism and Indigenous Futurisms as Wake Work

This chapter aims to demonstrate the productivity of exploring the intersections between Indigenous futurisms and Afrofuturisms in relation to sf to observe variable methods through which Indigenous and Black creators destabilize settler-carceral epistemologies and ontologies towards imagining and creating alternative possibilities for the future. Native futurism and Afrofuturism demonstrate the variability and potential of the sf genre by critically destabilizing

and expanding the tools and expressions used to recognize and create “science fiction”. In their common rejection of imperial victimry and fatalism within Indigenous and Black cultural production related to science, technology, imagination, and the future, Native futurism and Afrofuturism destabilize the ontologic infrastructures of social relations in the U.S. that assume social death. In showing these resonances, I want to be careful not to reduce, homogenize, or collapse Indigenous futurisms and Afrofuturisms, nor to relegate them as subgenres of sf. Rather, I want to highlight the overlapping praxes in which Black and Indigenous creators engage, destabilize, and expand the sf genre and our abilities to imagine the future by carving out a “rare discursive space” for “alternative futuring . . . a creative reimagining of the future in relation to marginalization, social critique, and the subversion of dominant ideologies.”³⁰ While some contend that Indigenous futurisms and Afrofuturisms diverge where Native sf prioritizes the need of “many Native peoples for material and cultural sovereignty *from*, rather than equal and equitable inclusion *within*, dominant systems,”³⁰ I argue that both discursive movements engage a Black Feminist Poethics to imagine and demand Reconstruction.³¹ As discussed in the Introduction, Reconstruction is the restoration of the total value expropriated through ongoing systems of violent (post)colonial extraction “of the productive capacity of native lands and slave labor.”³² Because the demands of Reconstruction – including sovereignty – for Indigenous and Afrodiasporic peoples from ongoing transformations of genocide, dispossession, and slavery converge and diverge in ways that are uncontainable and unpredictable, a firm distinction between Indigenous futurisms and Afrofuturisms is misleading and inadvertently denies the possibility for intersecting Afro-Indigenous theoretical and aesthetic futurisms. Indigenous futurism and Afrofuturism imagine alternative possibilities through which past, present, and future conditions of the (anti-Indigenous and anti-Black) wake(s) might be navigated and

reconciled utilizing Indigenous and Afrodiasporic knowledges and experiences of science, technology, time and future. This imagining does not romanticize suffering, negate historic realities, or “color” sf characters and stories, but interrogates existing conditions from unique sociohistorical positions and looks “toward the future of Indigenous peoples and people of color within a system that, reconciled or not, continues to inflict violence against racialized bodies.”³³

Indigenous futurism and Afrofuturism demand a deconstruction and expansion of the methods, motivations, and onto-epistemological foundations of sf narratives and tropes. Higgins (2016) observes Indigenous sf as a rejection of victimization despite centuries of colonial genocide and forced removal in favor of narratives of survivance and *biskaabiiyang* (“returning to ourselves”). Anishinaabe scholar and sf writer Gerald Vizenor (1998) conceptualizes survivance as “more than survival, more than endurance nor mere response, [survivance narratives offer] an active repudiation of dominance, tragedy, and victimization.”³⁴ Anishinaabe scholar Grace Dillon (2012) translates the Anishinaabemowin word *biskaabiiyang* to connote a process of “returning to ourselves,” which involves internal decolonization and “recovering ancestral traditions in order to adapt in” the (post)colonial wake of dispossession and genocide.³⁵ In a similar manner, Womack (2013) describes the Afrofuturist search for and recovery of ancient African wisdom and traditions as “a never-ending quest for wholeness” to uncover subjectivities and knowledges “deleted from the past and future.”³⁶ Like Indigenous futurism, then, Afrofuturism refuses victimry and engages a process of returning to oneself through (internal) decolonization and an imagined or actual reconnection to lost and ancestral knowledges. Indigenous and Afrofuturist creators produce survivance narratives that reject and destabilize settler colonial onto-epistemologies of Indigenous and Black subjectivities, asserting that “fatalism is not a synonym for blackness” or Indigeneity.³⁷ Such a rejection of victimry

necessitates confronting the effects of the violences of slavery and (post)colonialism on Indigenous peoples and the Black diaspora (and humanity at large) to imagine and create connections to ancestral knowledges and create a discursive space for alternative futuring where material social change, decolonization, and Reconstruction can be envisioned. In this way, Afrofuturism and Indigenous futurisms can be understood as forms of Black and Native wake work (respectively). Specifically, these praxes of Black and Native *supplementation* use imagination to reclaim ancestral knowledges, affirm Indigenous and Black experiences of life and death in the wake(s), cultivate alternative ways of being and relating, and assert the presence of Black and Indigenous bodies, knowledges, and creative production in the past, present, and future. This imagining functions to fill-in the archive with subjectivities and narratives that are ontologically rendered illegible within hegemonic knowledges because they disrupt and threaten to totally destroy the (symbolic, juridic, economic) foundations of settler-colonial (racial) capitalism, which center on Indigenous and Black erasure and expropriation.

Afrofuturism as Black Supplementation

The term “Afrofuturism” was coined by Mark Dery in 1994, after which it quickly became recognized among Black scholars and artists as a philosophical study and artistic form of knowledge production rooted in decades of Black aesthetic and epistemological practices. Dery defines Afrofuturism as an aesthetic genre related to sf that narrates African American cultural and diasporic experiences, themes, and concerns within contexts of technology, science, and the future. More than a subgenre of sf, however, Dery also recognizes Afrofuturism as an aesthetic mode navigating a variety of genres, media, and creators “who are united by their shared interest in projecting black futures derived from Afrodiasporic experiences”³⁸. Similarly, contemporary sociologist Alondra Nelson understands Afrofuturism as an exploration of “futurist themes in

black cultural production and the ways in which technological innovation is changing the face of black art and culture”.³⁸ Womack (2013), a contemporary Afrofuturist artist and author, describes Afrofuturism as a creative tool to destabilize and reimagine Blackness at the “intersection of imagination, technology, the future, and liberation . . . Both an artistic aesthetic and framework for critical theory, Afrofuturism combines elements of science fiction, historical fiction, speculative fiction, fantasy, Afrocentricity, and magic realism with non-Western beliefs.”³⁹ Thus, Afrofuturism includes, but is not limited to, Black sf, and is often in critical dialogue with settler sf in ways that interrogate and destabilize (neo)colonial social ontologies and Blackness itself. Drawing on Afrodiasporic and non-settler historic and contemporary cultural experiences and knowledges, this work expresses and grapples with the tensions of, while imagining possibilities through which, Reconstruction might be demanded. Tied intimately to dispersed, warped, and violent histories following the Transatlantic Slave Trade, this work rejects aesthetics of victimry, hopelessness, and fatalism in favor of projects of abolition and reparations. Such projects demand accountability in the confrontation of the enduring wake of settler-(neo)colonial anti-Black violence and facilitate creative reconnection with ancient and alternative ways of being to imagine and build alternate futures “within a system that, reconciled or not, continues to inflict violence against racialized bodies.”⁴⁰

Afrofuturist storytelling practices have shaped the literary and cultural history of the sf genre within national and international culture (at least) since the Transatlantic Slave Trade. In this space of gratuitous violence, Afrofuturism was “born in the minds of enslaved Africans” along the Middle Passage who imagined a reality emancipated from physical and social slavery and oppression for themselves and their descendants.⁴¹ Early Afrofuturist creators during the early 19th to mid-20th centuries engaged sf and speculative fiction to express and grapple with

sociopolitical conditions of Blackness and possibilities for Black futures within a system of extreme racial violence and inequity. This imagining enacted a radical praxis of hope and orientation towards the future against ontologic fatalism that predetermines Black social death and non-being. These narratives engaged familiar sf tropes of the time – disaster stories, (imperial) adventure stories, space travel, utopian fantasy, alien encounters, time travel – to interrogate racial social arrangements, destabilize established knowledges of the past, present, and future, and explore the possibilities through which Black futures might be empowered within and beyond the (anti-Black) wake. In the postwar era, jazz musicians like Sun Ra increasingly engaged Afrofuturist storytelling practices through Black popular music by depicting “themselves (and by extension all Afrodiasporic people) as the descendants of aliens who came to Earth to prepare humanity for its eventual destiny among the stars . . . [projecting] noble pasts for people of color while carefully crafting a heroic black face for the future as well.”⁴²

Afrofuturist music traditions have continued to shape the work of artists such as funk musician George Clinton (1970s), rap and hip hop artists such as OutKast (1990s), and contemporary R&B soul artists such as Erykah Badu and Janelle Monáe (2000s–current). As sf gained recognition in global culture in the 1960s and 1970s, Afrofuturist authors’ engagement and participation in sf culture became increasingly visible. Today, this engagement with sf is more widely recognized – even if not explicitly termed “Afrofuturist” by audiences – alongside established authors including Octavia Butler, N.K. Jemisin, and Nalo Hopkinson, filmmakers such as Jordan Peele and Ryan Coogler, and films such as *Black Panther* (2018; 2022). Indeed, these are a few examples within an ever-growing body of creative strategies through which Black futures are imagined within, after, and beyond the wake.⁴³

The establishment of Afrofuturist studies and the visibility of Afrofuturist production in popular culture since the 1990s has contrasted with the comparatively low visibility of Indigenous futurisms within the 21st century. While Indigenous futurisms have emerged alongside Afrofuturisms and (settler) sf, settler scholars and sf fans often find it difficult to believe that modern Indigenous communities exist, have literature, and possess scientific and creative knowledges that can supplement and, more significantly, destabilize settler neoliberal boundaries of “science” and “fiction”.⁴⁴ The marginalization of Indigenous futurisms can be traced to the erasure and misrepresentation of Indigenous subjectivities as pre-modern, ahistoric, and disappeared (or dying) as necessary to sustain settler claims to Native lands as *terra nullis*. In fact, it is the “very *unrecognizability*” of Indigenous subjectivity and futurism in popular sf that reveals settler colonial and imperial epistemologies and ontologies which compose the aesthetic foundations of American settler sf.⁴⁵ Representations of colonialism in popular sf – for instance, in Marvel’s *Eternals* (2021) – provide (neo)liberal humanist critiques of dispossession and slavery that are wholly divorced from Indigeneity and Blackness. In this way, writers of Indigenous futurism expose the role and complicity of popular culture, including sf, in reproducing mechanisms of gratuitous violence within settler colonial onto-epistemologies that naturalize and maintain white supremacist systems of racial capitalism.

Indigenous Futurism as Indigenous Supplementation

Like Afrofuturism (and sf), Indigenous futurism is a mode of (Indigenous) cultural production that does not have a singular definition or historical lineage. There is much debate surrounding the recognition and classification of Indigenous narratives as “science fiction”. The term “Indigenous Futurisms” was popularized by Dillon (2012) in *Walking the Clouds*, known as the first anthology of Native sf narratives. For Dillon, Indigenous peoples have held sf narrative

traditions for millennia and, more recently (following Contact), the sf genre has provided a space for Indigenous peoples to “renew, recover, and extend” Native subjectivity, knowledge, and tradition.⁴⁶ Thus, for Dillon and others, “Indigenous sf is not so new – just overlooked,” situated in a longstanding and diverse history of storytelling traditions that incorporate Native scientific and technical knowledges within imaginative narratives that are oriented in “a cultural experience of reality”.⁴⁶ In contrast, scholars such as Rader (2011), Denetale (2020), and Spires (2021) are hesitant to label Indigenous stories and storytelling traditions as sf out of concern that non-Native – especially settler – audiences will orient Native subjectivities and knowledges within trivializing ontologies as primitive superstitions. Other terms such as “Indian invention novel,” termed by Rader, offer alternative ways to conceptualize “Native science fiction,” “speculative fiction,” “engaged resistance” narratives, among others.⁴⁷ Each of these definitions is concerned with the relationship between “sf theory and Native intellectualism, Indigenous scientific literacy, and western techno-cultural science,” or “the scientific possibilities enmeshed with” global and intertribal frameworks of Native thought, storytelling, and intellectual exchange.⁴⁸ This essay uses the term “Indigenous futurisms” following Dillon’s (2012) framework to recognize Native sf within a diverse and non-exhaustive body of Indigenous narratives and storytelling practices that are related to express Native experiences and knowledges of science, technology, imagination, and the future. While settler sf is singularly rooted in Euro-Western sciences and technologies as “modern” knowledges through which to imagine the possibilities of the future, the scientific knowledges informing Indigenous sf are varying in that “Indigenous scientific literacies historically are shaped by the diverse natural environments of the groups that use them, [thus] no single set of practices summarizes the[ir] possibilities.”⁴⁹ In this way, Indigenous futurisms cannot be contained by frameworks and

languages of settler sf and “invariably change”⁵⁰ the boundaries and meanings of science, technology, imagination, and the future.

Indigenous futurisms are survivance narratives that resist aesthetic victimry and (neo)colonial assimilation and engage a process that Dillon recognizes through the Anishinaabemowin concept of decolonization: *biskaabiiyang*, a “returning to ourselves”. This process involves a confrontation of internalized colonialism towards the recovery of lost and ancestral traditions to live in the (anti-Indigenous) wake and imagine methods through which alternative futures might be created. That is, Indigenous futurisms affirm tribal relationships and identities through praxes of Native supplementation that reflect on the Native condition in worlds “liberated by the imagination” and centered on Indigenous experience⁵¹. In this way, Indigenous futurisms can be recognized as a practice of Native supplementation that works against archival and ontological erasure through the imagination and assertion of Native futures beyond tropes of victimry, primitivity, and disappearance. This does not assert Indigenous futurisms to only be an imaginative (fictional) practice but highlights the creative usage of imaginary novum alongside “the very real belief systems that undergird Indigenous knowledge and cultures” in the cultural production of Native sf narratives.⁵² Indigenous futurisms destabilize settler (colonial) notions of “science” and “fiction” in ways that challenge the supposed superiority of settler epistemes beyond projects of inclusion. Instead, Indigenous futurisms reveal the significance of Indigenous modes of thought and praxis – wake work – living within structures of contemporary social arrangements and imagining social change.⁵³

While settler sf is centered on Euro-American dialectics of science/religion and science fiction/myth rooted in linear religious temporalities, Indigenous futurisms reflect the significance of space and non-linear time within many Indigenous religions. The spatial orientation of Native

onto-epistemologies emphasizes the value of embodied knowledge (i.e., knowledge produced by what is seen, felt, and experienced) in forming reliable observations about ourselves and the world. Spires (2021) explains the effect of this within Indigenous futurist stories that position Indigenous narratives and characters to be “better prepared to accept and respond to elements of cognitive estrangement than their non-Native counterparts.”⁵⁴ This “cultural experience of reality has been around for a millennia,” and “anticipated recent cutting-edge physics, ironically suggesting that Natives have had things right all along.”⁵⁵ For instance, the people of Oceti Sakowin, Lakota ancestors, (re)produced political and scientific knowledge via warnings of a black snake that would desecrate Lakota lands and bring the destruction of the Earth. These narratives predicted the development of contemporary settler industrial pipelines such as the Keystone XL and Dakota Access Pipelines that travel through Lakota territories, poisoning the land and people.⁵⁶ (Gilio-Whitaker 2019). Such examples illustrate the lasting insight of Indigenous stories and knowledge systems that continue to make reliable observations and predictions about the world rooted in embodied experiences; i.e., to know the future.⁵⁷

Native slipstream, an Indigenous non-linear framework of space and time engaged in Indigenous futurist narratives, conceptualizes time as a fluid movement between pasts, presents, and futures.⁵⁸ The metaphysics theory of the multiverse, a new scientific framework for settler cultures, is striking in its noted similarity to Indigenous frameworks of temporality and is another example of the ways that Indigenous knowledges have predated and predicted “discoveries” made by settler (neo)liberal culture. Settler onto-epistemologies limit the methods through which science – and, by extension, sf – can observe, interrogate, and imagine past, present, and future realities. In this way, Indigenous futurisms “invariably *change* the parameters of sf,” through the

injection of Indigenous frameworks that expand and sometimes challenge existing sf elements rooted in settler onto-epistemologies.

“Custer on the Slipstream” (1978) as an Annotative Praxis of Indigenous Survivance and Psychic Decolonization

Vizenor’s (1978) short sf story, “Custer on the Slipstream,” is a survivance narrative that incorporates Indigenous temporalities to supplement the archive with a corrective history that rejects internalized victimry in favor of *biskaabiiyang* subjectivity in ways that destabilize settler ontologies which justify claims to Native land. The story follows Farlie Border, a white man working in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), who is portrayed as the spiritual and ideological resurrection of George Armstrong Custer, a celebrated American hero known by Indigenous peoples for his genocidal violence towards Natives. While Custer is not physically resurrected, he is reborn through the discursive resurrection of his anti-Indigenous ideologies and the literal resurrection of material realities reproduced through Border’s institutional policies and practices. This resurrection is not metaphorical: Vizenor destabilizes settler epistemes of linear temporality and centers Indigenous spatial orientations of temporality to recognize how a resurrection of ideologies, systems, and conditions of power and anti-Indigeneity can occur in (bodily, mental, and institutional) space(s).⁵⁹ In doing so, he uses fiction as a medium to assert a corrective history rooted in Indigenous slipstream temporalities that rejects the myth of Custer as an American martyr and reaffirms his role as an oppressive aggressor against Indigenous peoples in the settler colonial drive and desire for the productive capacity of Native lands. Simultaneously, Vizenor’s engagement of Indigenous slipstream temporalities annotates settler archives against myths of savagery, aesthetic victimry, and disappearance by affirming the continued resurrection of Indigenous praxes of survivance and self-determined sovereignty in/against the gratuitous violence of the wake(s), as well as Indigenous cultural knowledges and temporal epistemes.

In an uncertain state of consciousness, Border recalls his first interaction with a Native (“tribal person”) at fifteen years old in northern Wisconsin at his parents’ summer cabin. Border remembers one and then four tribal people who recognize him as a historical resurrection and name him General George Custer and begin mocking and teasing Border/Custer while demanding that he pay ten million dollars for attacking the animals or return his summer cabin and land to Indigenous peoples. A fifth person appears during this dialogue, an old man with shamanic powers who returns Border/Custer to his office where he remains in a daze for several hours. The old man identifies himself as “Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse and I”, resurrections of Custer’s contemporary Native opponents who led the Sioux and Lakota in battle against Custer’s defeat in 1876. Crazy Horse calmly introduces himself and watches Border grow increasingly uncomfortable and panicked. “I came on the rails not on relocation.” Crazy Horse asserts to Border, “Need some cash now, not much, but enough to make it for a time.... And some work, hard to find work, like your work, whatever you can find me to do well.” Here, Crazy Horse rejects settler colonial tropes of Native victimry by asserting that his travel is not a reproduction of colonial subjugation (removal and dispossession), nor is he asking Border for help in the form of work and money. Instead, Crazy Horse unapologetically refuses to participate in a racialized colonial labor regime that (re)produces Native subjugation as a placeholder for the earlier demands for Reconstruction made to Custer/Border in Northern Wisconsin. Crazy Horse’s refusal to accept settler colonial ontologies of subjugation and victimization embodies a *biskaabiiyang* subjectivity that interrogates and demands accountability for perpetuating conditions of oppression imposed on Indigenous peoples.

This self-assurance and self-determination destabilize the onto-epistemological foundations of Border’s settler subjectivity and ultimately lead to his disappearance. After his

interaction with Crazy Horse, Border regains consciousness on his office floor surrounded by coworkers and begins to experience nightmares that lead him to seek thrills through drugs, sex, speed, and danger to “balance his fear and boredom” until he disappears under unconfirmed rumors that “his vision crossed coming around a curve at high speed on his motorcycle and he died in the wind space behind a grain truck . . . slipping from grace in a slipstream”. His exchange with Crazy Horse’s *biskaabiiyang* subjectivity unravels the parameters of racialized hierarchies rooted in anti-Indigeneity and anti-Blackness through which Border’s settler subjectivity is configured and he is inevitably “drawn into the other’s intolerable alterity in the aftermath of glimpsing the complexity of autonomous personhood which lies beyond racist colonial stereotypes.”⁶⁰ While Border’s ideologies and practices will be resurrected through settler colonial agents and institutions, so too will Crazy Horse’s *biskaabiiyang* subjectivity through Indigenous bodies and cultures who resist colonial victimization, archival erasure, and misrepresentation and affirm Indigenous knowledges and experiences of survivance in the past, present, and future.

Conclusion

Indigenous futurisms and Afrofuturisms demonstrate the potential of imaginative praxes oriented outside of settler-carceral epistemologies to generate alternative ways of imagining and building futures in and beyond the wake(s). The co-constitutive nature of anti-Blackness and anti-Indigeneity in shaping white supremacist mechanisms of capital accumulation through enslaved labor and the appropriation of Indigenous lands also shape Black and Native futures to be co-created. Indigenous futurism and Afrofuturism – as praxes of imagining in and beyond the wake(s) at the intersections of science, technology, and the future – are, thus, interrelated. The demands of abolition necessitate the creation of conditions that enable decolonization and vice

versa. In this way, Indigenous futurisms and Afrofuturisms challenge the totality of the wake(s) by imagining possibilities in which alternative futuring might be made embodied and enacted. These praxes critically interrogate the possibilities of the past and future as they are tied to the conditions of the present to begin to imagine alternative ways of being and resisting in and against the wake(s).

CHAPTER 3

Enacting Decolonization and Abolition in the Present through Embodied Praxes of Indigenous and Black Environmental Wake Work

Introduction

The previous chapters have illustrated how Indigenous annotations affirm the legitimacy and richness of Indigenous histories and futures as they have been shaped by, within, and in resistance to the anti-Indigenous wake of settlement and the anti-Black wake of slavery in a rejection of colonial victimry and assertion of survivance. This chapter observes embodiments of Indigenous and Black annotation that assert the presence of Indigenous and Black bodies and knowledges and destabilize the settler-carceral ontologies within contemporary moments (the present). Specifically, I observe the dialogue between Black and Indigenous environmental wake work that imagines alternative ontologic relationships between people and land through the dismantling of the settler-carceral State and racial capitalism, which necessarily sustain Black and Native social death.

Indigenous and Black environmental justice activism and organizing are unique sites through which the intersecting nature of Black and Native wake work and demands for decolonization can be observed. These praxes are rooted in relational frameworks of solidarity and mutual aid that destabilize the legitimacy of State infrastructures through the embodiment of Indigenous and Black knowledges rendered unintelligible in ontological hierarchies of non/being. In this chapter, I consider the organizational frameworks enacted at Standing Rock during the #NoDAPL, #StandingwithStandingRock, #Mniwiconi, #Waterislife movement (2014/2016-2017) and in Detroit and Flint, Michigan, during the (2014-2016) water crisis. Methodologies of resistance engaged by protectors at Standing Rock, rooted in pan-tribalist Indigenous frameworks, refute ontologic narratives of aesthetic victimry and erasure. These

praxes critically destabilize the onto-epistemologic foundations upon which the settler State is imagined and materially legitimized by resisting militarized State violence against Native bodies and land that seeks to erase Indigenous sovereignty as a precursor to settlement. That is, Indigenous demands for environmental justice and sovereignty are antagonistic to the spatio-temporal foundations of the settler-carceral State, which are predicated on the disappearance of Natives and the racial capitalist economic infrastructures of anti-Black slavery. Such demands rejected justification of the construction of the DAPL predicated on the total denial of Lakota Sioux sovereignty over reservation lands. These arguments draw upon and are embedded within colonial archives in which the Settler/Master State holds sole authority to determine and claim sovereignty as an institutional and symbolic embodiment of Man. In this way, (Indigenous) demands of decolonization that engage Indigenous frameworks of environmental wake work simultaneously affirm the survivance of Indigenous communities (and sovereignties) and ways of relating (to people and land) and assert the illegitimacy of the State towards the deconstruction of the infrastructures of white supremacy that perpetuate Indigenous and Black social death. Similarly, Black environmental wake work organizes around the dismantling of State infrastructures of carcerality (the wake of slavery) that uphold Human subjectivity at the abjection of Black and Indigenous bodies. Rooted in experiences of systematic and structural neglect and vulnerability, organizers in Detroit and Flint critically interrogated infrastructures and mechanisms of the State that reproduce Black and Indigenous social death to cultivate alternative, community-based social relationships *beyond* the carceral settler State. In this way, Indigenous and Black modes of environmental wake work illustrate the intersectional nature of healing and empowerment for Black and Indigenous communities as praxes of resistance that demand Reconstruction – the total symbolic, juridic, and economic dismantling of settler

colonial infrastructures of capital – are always simultaneous calls for abolition and decolonization.

Resistance at Standing Rock: Indigenous Wake Work as Projects of Identity and Healing

The Standing Rock resistance movement started in 2016 by Standing Rock Sioux women to prevent the construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline (DAPL) for crude oil transportation less than a mile from the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe (SRST) Reservation. They established the primary organizational site of the movement, Oceti Sakowin, which was lined with dozens of tribal nation flags and eventually filled with volunteers and media agents from across the United States. Indigenous actors at the site differentiated themselves from non-Native activists and volunteers using the preferred term “water protector.” The claiming of this term signified longstanding ecological relationships between Indigenous peoples and the environment as Indigenous cultures and belief systems formed alongside and within relationships to land.¹ Their primary organizing principle was *Mni Wiconi*, a Lakota phrase meaning “Water is life,” which emphasized both the historic relationships between Indigenous peoples and land as well as the centrality of environmental destruction to settler projects of Indigenous dispossession and genocide.² That is, the destruction of water and land is the destruction of life. While the camp lasted almost a year, resistance against the pipe’s construction began in 2014 when the SRST council rejected the proposal over concerns of treaty violation and land and water poisoning. During this time, water protectors and volunteers were under continuous surveillance by police, federal agencies, and private security contractors hired by Energy Transfer Partners (ETP), the company that proposed and constructed the pipeline. Armed guards, soldiers, and police officers used rubber bullets, tear gas, water hoses, attack dogs, and more methods of harm against non-violent protectors and activists – who were treated by on-site medical volunteers because

roadways to the two local Indian Health Service hospitals were blocked by police barricades.³ Although the movement was initially silenced within the media or framed as disruptive to a legal construction project, it attracted global attention and solidarity as an active and powerful rejection of the American myth of Indigenous disappearance and assertion of sovereignty.

These assertions of Indigenous presence and self-determined sovereignty over unceded lands demonstrated the organizing power of Native women and communities in resistance to the continuation of settler colonization – that is, the anti-Indigenous wake of settlement – through the largest pan-tribal movement in modern history.⁴ Interviews with Standing Rock water protectors describe a shared spiritual and internal motivation, a “calling,” that was fueled externally watching or hearing about methods of pan-tribalist organizing at the camps. Protectors recall the camp as an embodiment of “Native collective memory” through which Indigeneity was recognized and celebrated in diversity, divesting harmful settler identity qualifications such as blood quantum and relinking Indigenous histories of solidarity, strength, and resistance that predate European settlement and reject colonial victimry.⁵ In this way, Standing Rock asserted Indigenous survivance through a rejection of victimry rooted in self-determined and self-assured relationships of sovereignty to land through a pan-tribalist framework that provided many protectors a material and psychological space “for individual identity projects and recoveries.”⁶ This archival annotation was rooted in embodied knowledges that destabilized the epistemic claims of settler sovereignty over Native lands predicated on Indigenous ontologic social death. Simultaneously, Water Protectors enacted annotation on contemporary “Native collective memory” to foster new and alternative ways of relating by relinking inter-tribal relationships disrupted by and within the wake.

The construction of DAPL was part of an ongoing settler practice to access territory through the dispossession of Native lands and denial of Native sovereignty in the promotion of racial capitalism. Upon rejecting ETP's proposal for construction, SRST council cited the 1851 Treaty of Fort Laramie and the Treaty of 1868, which were violated by white settlers almost immediately after their establishment and unenforced by the State despite tribal opposition.⁷ ETP and proponents of DAPL drew upon and reified settler archives that erase contradictory histories of treaty violation to produce a legal record which upholds the superiority and legitimacy of settler juridic systems that make (illegal) claims to Indigenous lands, arguing that the pipeline was constructed on private property rather than unceded treaty lands. Alongside the council, water protectors drew on tribal histories and experiences that recognized relationships and sovereignty to land, simultaneously rejecting and destabilizing settler archives. On October 24th, Mekasi Camp-Horinek, an Oceti Sakowin camp coordinator, released a statement that protectors had obstructed and were occupying DAPL lands, claiming 1851 treaty rights, until construction was stopped.. In response, security personnel and police conducted a forced sweep that protectors and onlookers throughout Native America noted a "chilling parallel" to the battle at Wounded Knee in 1973.⁸ In these memories, protectors drew upon Indigenous archives of history to reveal the relationships between and continuation of mechanisms of State imperialism and racial capitalist industrialization that seek to erase Indigenous voice and presence through violence against Native bodies. Such acts of Indigenous survivance and remembrance reject colonial processes of unknowing and aesthetic victimry. Water protectors refused to cede tribal lands using their bodies and memories to affirm sovereign relationships to land coded in self-determination, demonstrating that Indigenous knowledges survive and resist (in) the wake(s) through embodied and enacted relationships to land and water. In doing so, they placed Standing

Rock within a legacy of Indigenous knowledges and practices of resistance to mechanisms of gratuitous violence – dispossession, genocide, and slavery – against Native bodies alongside violence against (Native) land.

Although the DAPL was finalized in January 2017, Indigenous communities situate Standing Rock within an ongoing relationship between the settler State and Indigenous nations characterized by the attempted interruption and destruction of Indigenous cultures to legitimize settler claims to sovereignty over Native land. As Gilio-Whitaker (Colville Confederate Tribes) explains, the construction of the DAPL is merely another iteration of assaults on Indigenous sovereignty and cultures through the disruption of Native relationships to land. Gilio-Whitaker argues that environmental deprivation and disruption are the primary mechanisms through which Native cultures and communities are destabilized.⁹ Annotating evidence from settler archives through a method of Indigenous remembrance, Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) “follows the corn” to reveal that settlers systematically interrupted and destroyed agricultural resources such as crops and trade routes to disrupt cultural agricultural practices and food sovereignty, starve local Indigenous populations, and increase Indigenous people’s dependency on settlers. The privatization of land was enacted through the expansion of primarily poor “settler-farmers as foot soldiers for moving the settler frontier deeper into Indigenous territories.”¹⁰ These settlers used rape and sexual assault as tools to “wipe out tribal societies and as a means of controlling and colonizing Native peoples” alongside blood quantum and relocation policies which restricted and denied Indigenous sovereignty to ancestral lands.¹¹ Removal and relocation policies functioned to disrupt proximity and relationships to land and water, thereby preventing the practice and reproduction of cultural traditions and knowledges, while subsequently isolating Indigenous peoples onto structurally neglected reservations near industrial sites that are considered less

desirable for (white) settler populations. The proximity to industrial sites and pollution on or near reservation lands causes disproportionate health, including reproductive, issues that inhibit the reproduction of Indigenous cultures through the destruction of Native bodily health that reduces fertility, increases infant and maternal mortality, and increases overall rates of disease and mortality among Indigenous communities.¹² In this way, environmental injustice must be understood through Indigenous archival knowledges that recognize the function of environmental destruction – including settler colonization, industrialization, and globalization – to be epistemologically rooted in settler colonial ontologic relationships between people and land. Specifically, hierarchal ontologies between settlers and Natives render Indigenous bodies part of the land as readily available to be labored upon, and thus owned, by the settler and the settler State.¹³ This contrasts heavily with Indigenous ontologies between people in land rooted in relational frameworks of responsibility. In this way, water protectors and organizers at Standing Rock demanded and embodied what Gilio-Whitaker recognizes as “Indigenized” environmental justice frameworks rooted Indigenous knowledges and relationships to land within a legacy of Indigenous resistance to settler colonial dispossession and genocide through environmental disruption and destruction.¹⁴

The organizing framework, *Mni Wiconi*, centers Indigenous ways of knowing and experiencing the world to recognize the inherent relationship between (gendered) settler colonial violence toward water and land and Indigenous bodies. Echoing Native feminists, water protectors asserted that gendered processes of settler colonialism were and are predicated on the rhetorical and ontological violability of Indigenous bodies and land.¹⁵ Protectors highlighted historic patterns of settler expansion that have directly and indirectly encouraged encroachment into Indigenous lands and the disruption of Native cultural integrity enacted through violence

against Indigenous women, children, and 2SLGBTQQIA+ individuals. Such patterns prevail in contemporary industrial colonial settings where sites such as the DAPL result in primarily non-Indigenous (Settler) men working and residing in or near Indigenous communities and reservations where legal systems maintain dynamics of gendered violence by judicially protecting non-Native offenders from the consequences of attacking Native bodies (and land).¹⁶ The continued violation of Native land works alongside mechanisms of (gendered) violence against Indigenous communities while colonial processes of unknowing erase these relationships of dispossession.

Water protectors enacted an annotative praxis of survivance by connecting violence against (Native) land with ongoing experiences of gendered violence against Indigenous communities through personal storytelling and collective action oriented in mutual aid. In the VICELAND documentary series *RISE*, water protector Bobbi Jean Three Legs (Standing Rock Sioux) explains resistance against the DAPL was rooted in the understanding that the colonization of land creates and maintains conditions of coloniality which characterize life on and off the reservation across Native America, including the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation. Bobbi Jean describes the camps as spaces for water protectors to share and unpack personal experiences of settler colonial violence – “alcohol and drugs, domestic violence, sexual assault. You know, like molestation, rape” – that are shared intergenerationally.¹⁷ The prioritization of personal and community memory engages a praxis of survivance to recognize the multidirectional ways in which settler colonialism is embedded into many Indigenous communities. Simultaneously, water protectors imagined pathways for decolonization within a healing space “to forgive and love that [colonized] part of us and just grow from it and try to prevent it as much as we can,” by “just talking out loud about it.”¹⁷ As another water protector,

Caro Gonzales (Chemehuevi) describes, “through *mni wiconi*, we’ve actually been able to talk about missing and murdered Indigenous women. We’ve been able to talk about misogyny and colonial mentality.”¹⁷ In this way, protectors at Standing Rock embodied a cultural, linguistic, and psychic decolonizing and self-transformative praxis “that turns spectators and victims into actors and authors of their own language and new humanity” through which Indigenous individuals can enact autonomous self-determination in the recovery and assertion of personal and community identity.¹⁸ These enactments (annotations) of survivance rejected myths of Native disappearance, destabilizing corporate and state authority over land, and fostered alternative praxes of wake work rooted in Indigenous frameworks.

Intersections between Indigenous and Black Environmental Wake Work

Applied intersectional frames within in public discourse – predominated by the white American political imagination – fragment Black and Indigenous experiences of conquest through mechanisms of colonial unlinking such as Historical Materialism that distort the structural relationship between anti-Indigenous genocide and anti-Black slavery. However, as discussed above, Native decolonizing demands for environmental justice as sovereignty beyond the settler State have often worked alongside Black environmental wake work that promote abolitionist frameworks of critical environmental justice (CEJ) which call for the dismantling of state infrastructures. Indeed, both Black and Indigenous EJ activists and scholars foster demands for alternative community structures beyond both carcerality and the State itself.¹⁹ Rather than oppositional, Indigenous decolonization and Black abolition engage with and, in fact, embrace the tensions, antagonisms, and impossibilities that arise when the World of Man (Settler/Master/Human) encounters Black and Indigenous political demands for Reconstruction.²⁰ The co-constitutive relationship between anti-Blackness and anti-Indigeneity,

while at times conditions circumstances of survival “tethered to the death of the Other,” has shaped relationships of solidarity between Indigenous and Black communities such that their demands and/of empowerment are tied together.²¹

This solidarity is oriented in organizing frameworks that strengthen communities and divest the State of its legitimacy and authority through praxes of collective action and mutual aid. This can be seen, for instance, in the organizing at Standing Rock and Detroit and Flint, Michigan. These protests revealed the structural reproduction of Black and Indigenous death by mechanisms of the imperial settler State in the contemporary distributions of environmental racism that are always predicated on the dispossession of Native lands. These observations and critiques of the State drew on Black and Indigenous knowledges to imagine alternative social arrangements and ontological relationships to water and land and enact wake work against social death by dismantling state infrastructures of white supremacy by fostering community-based relationships.

Fostering Alternative Forms of Community in Detroit and Flint, MI

Detroit and Flint, Michigan, predominantly Black cities, have long experienced conditions of structural expropriation and neglect that often resulted in consistent issues with water quality and poor residential health. In 2014, Flint City Council transferred the city’s drinking water supply from Detroit to the Flint River, ignoring concerns voiced by residents of inadequate quality testing evidenced by foul water and rashes and hair loss. In Detroit, water shut off policies were enforced, restricting residential access to potable water. News reports initially followed the lead of local and state politicians and industrial elites who portrayed residents as incompetent and “incapable of self-governance.”²² However, the city eventually garnered national and international attention as community members took action to reveal the health

impacts of the decision and began looking towards community-based solutions not reliant on local and state-based government infrastructure.²³ With an incisive critique of the failure and neglect of government structures through systems of environmental racism, community members challenged settler (neo)liberal onto-epistemologies of land, property, humanity, and citizenship through methods of collective action and mutual aid that shifted “public consciousness around the human right to water.”²⁴ As local journalists and reporters observed, personal storytelling became a crucial part of organizing to spread awareness, connect with local, national, and global communities, “identify and process shared trauma, forge a sense of collective identity, and work collaboratively toward political transformation” through mutual aid and collective action (Howell et al. 2019).²⁴ Black/Saginaw Anishinaabe scholar Kyle Mays (2018) observes such storytelling in many forms, including through protest songs about the ongoing crises in both cities by Detroit artists such as Anishinaabe/Chinax artist Sacramento Knoxx, Monica Lewis-Patrick (co-founder of We the People of Detroit), Anishinaabe singer Christy Bieber, and Hip Hop artist Zaire Rodgers, whose songs call for continued wake work informed and empowered by “collaboration between Black and Indigenous peoples, between Detroit and Flint.”²⁵ In this way, Indigenous and Black community organizers in Detroit and Flint Michigan critically interrogate the illegitimacy of the State by challenging settler, neoliberal processes of unknowing that distort the structural and systemic relationships between environmental injustice and the production of Indigenous and Black social death. In doing so, they emphasized the interconnections between the wakes of slavery and settlement in shaping contemporary social arrangements. Simultaneously, they cultivated space to articulate the entangled nature of Black and Indigenous empowerment and their contingency on the destruction of contemporary infrastructures of racial capitalism and the settler State.

Conclusion

The resolution of Standing Rock camps upon the completion of the DAPL and the water crises in Detroit and Flint resist settler imperial interpretations of outcome and impact. Although settler narratives of aesthetic victimry frame Standing Rock as a failed movement that resulted in the eviction of the water protector camps and the construction of the DAPL, Indigenous communities assert that its impact and meanings “are not contingent upon white approval.”²⁶ (Hedlund 61). Rock fostered sites of Indigenous healing and dialogue that orient Indigenous memory and history within present conditions of settlement to cultivate modes of annotative resistance against victimry and disappearance in the wake(s). In doing so, protectors enacted projects of decolonization and intergenerational healing by drawing on ancestral memory and personal experience to cultivate wake work in the present that is oriented towards the protection of “future generations from intergenerational trauma.”²⁷

Similarly, critiques of State infrastructures in Detroit and Flint have rejected (neo)liberal frameworks of distributive justice – which assert and further embed mechanisms of the State in perpetuating or correcting in/justice – for community-based models of restoration. While water quality was declared safe in Detroit and Flint in 2016, deep-seated mistrust in government infrastructures continues to interrogate mechanisms of white supremacy that structurally condition Black and Native death in the production and maintenance of (private) property and capital. Local Black and Indigenous community leaders emphasize the importance of community-based organizing and mutual aid as a reliable and trustworthy way to structure social arrangements beyond ontologic hierarchies of Humanity that necessitate gratuitous violence towards Black and Indigenous bodies and land. This wake work pushes for alternative modes of relationality that condition and “imagine new kinds of Black and Native futures.”²⁸

CONCLUSION

Unknowing the Future

Hegemonic settler-carceral onto-epistemologies produce and justify the perpetuation of social inequities through the omission of their systemic and structural causes. Within contemporary moments of vulnerability and violence – seen in the climate crisis, housing crisis, high rates of police brutality and incarceration, the targeting of trans, queer, and women’s rights, the failing of domestic sociopolitical and economic infrastructure, and so much more – it is crucial to interrogate these omissions to recognize the foundations of inequity and social death and the mechanisms through which they are perpetuated. The mobilizations at Standing Rock and in Detroit and Flint, Michigan, powerfully illustrate that projects of social change must be rooted in Indigenous and Black embodied knowledges of abolitionist and decolonial wake work to deconstruct the interlocking mechanisms of settler imperial racial capitalism that produce and naturalize contemporary conditions of vulnerability and social death across temporal and spatial contexts. These projects are not limited to Black, Indigenous, and “minority” communities but shape the past, present, and futures of the world(s) in which current and descending generations live and die. In this way, I hope this thesis extends and encourages dialogue about creating realities rooted in ethical modes of relationality that must be predicated on the destruction of the world as it is made knowable through anti-Indigeneity and anti-Blackness. “A new relationality can imagine new kinds of Black and Native futures”¹ that will force the reckoning of settler-carceral systems and subjectivities of white (neo)liberal humanism. The empowerment of Black and Indigenous communities is, thus, the pre-cursor of (abolitionist and decolonial) social justice. This requires a detachment from fatalist determinism that naturalizes our condition(s) of conflictive and structural violence. Although the (anti-Black and anti-Indigenous) wake(s) conditions structural relations of ontologic violence, this does not have to be the chosen site

through which we continue to encounter one another as we consider possibilities of the future. Decolonial abolition necessitates a commitment, especially on the part of white settlers, to be active listeners and participants in – rather than leaders of –resistance against structures of settler-carceral imperial knowledge formation informed by Indigenous and Black frameworks of reciprocity and care. It requires us to *take care* of and for one another in the past, present, and future, and within conditions that necessitate and naturalize vulnerability, fear, and violence. I must take care to take accountability: to recognize and interrogate my subjective and positional embeddedness within ongoing arrangements and systems of harm conditioned by white supremacy. If the world is knowable through anti-Indigenous and anti-Black (gratuitous) violence, then such acts of care are praxes of unknowing the future.

NOTES

Introduction Notes

1. Goodman and Armelagos describe settler colonial genocide and dispossession against Indigenous people in a linear history of human evolutionary development wherein Indigenous lack of personal-social awareness leads to their unintentional yet inevitable detriment: “An indigenous group learns that it can trade something it has access to (sugar cane, alpacas, turtles) for something it greatly admires but can only obtain from outside groups (metal products, radios, alcohol). The group’s members do not perceive that the long-term health and economic results of such trade are usually unfavorable. Nor are all such arrangements a result of voluntary agreement.” Alan Goodman and Georgia Armelagos, “Disease and Death,” 97.
2. I use a variety of terms here to recognize diverse, multi-modal, and sometimes differing needs for care and justice. For more on anti-Black reparations, see: Nurse, “Slavery and Reparations,” 2021. For more on Indigenous sovereignty/sovereignties, see: Dennison, “Sovereignty as Accountability,” 2020.
3. These authors do not specify settlement or settler colonialism in their observations of colonialism. However, Da Silva refers to colonialism as *both* the expropriation of slave labor and the appropriation of Indigenous lands. For at least Da Silva, the dispossession and settlement of Indigenous lands is a co-constitutive part of colonial slavery and its legacies.
4. Da Silva, “Toward a Black Feminist Poethics” (*The Black Scholar*, 2014), 82.
5. For more on the term “settler colonialism,” see: Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” 2006.
6. Moreton-Robinson explains *terra nullis* under European settler colonialism in the context of settled Australia. “Under the legal fiction of *terra nullius*, the law of the colonizer prevailed and Indigenous people were placed under British jurisdiction as subjects of the Crown who were entitled formally to the rights associated with this status . . . Effectively, Indigenous people were, in the absence of being subjects of the Crown, relegated to little or no more than living in a state of nature and thus, by definition, uncivilized. The prevention of Indigenous people from taking an oath also meant that white possession and title to land could not be legally contested . . . Indigenous people became possessions of the Crown as wards of the state.” Indigenous nations were embedded within settler ontologies of rational subjecthood and citizenship. The failed promise of citizenship for Indigenous peoples, thus, enables settler configurations of property and claims to Native land and subjects as “wards of the state.” For more, see: Moreton-Robinson. *The White Possessive*, 2015.
7. See: Deer, *Beginning and End of Rape* (University of Minnesota Press, 2015). Also see: Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019). Also see: Shelby Settles Harper and Christina Marie Entekin, *Violence Against Native American Women* (Office on Violence Against Women, 2006).
8. See: Byrd, *The Transit of Empire* (University of Minnesota Press, 2011).

9. See: Wilderson, *Red, White, & Black* (Duke University Press, 2010).
10. Krupat, "Postcoloniality, Ideology, and Native American Literature" (Jackson: University of Mississippi, 2005), 73.
11. See: Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies* (London: Zed Books, 2012 [1999]). Also see: Nixon, *Resisting Paradise* (University of Minnesota Press, 2015). Also see: Hedlund, "Medicines at Standing Rock" (*American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2020).
12. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 14.
13. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 14.
14. Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019), 17. Aikau et al. "Indigenous Feminisms Roundtable" (*Frontiers*, 2015), 94.
15. Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019), 68.
16. Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019), 28.
17. Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019), 29.
18. Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019).
19. See: Wynter, "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom" (*CR: The Centennial Review*, 2003).
20. Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019), 53.
21. Cannon, "Cutting Edge" (*Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion*, 2008), 130.
22. See: Smith, "Counting the Dead" (Southeastern Oklahoma State University, 2018). Also see: World Future Fund, "Death Toll from the Slave Trade."
23. For more, see: Da Silva, "Toward a Black Feminist Poethics" (*The Black Scholar*, 2014).
24. Dillon explains that "postmodernism is already a condition for First Nation peoples, since they are seen as postindian if they do not resemble the iconic image of the late-nineteenth-century Plains Indian." Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 12.
25. See: CRC, "A Black Feminist Statement" (*Monthly Review Press*, 2019). Also See: Smith, *Conquest* (Duke University Press, 2005). Also see: Gurr, "Complex Intersections" (*Sociology Compass*, 2011).
26. Da Silva, "Toward a Black Feminist Poethics" (*The Black Scholar*, 2014).
27. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 117.
28. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 123.
29. Vizenor, *Fugitive Poses* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 15.
- 30.

Chapter 1 Notes

1. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), xx.
2. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 14.
3. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 117.
4. Harjo, *Spiral to the Stars* (University of Arizona Press, 2019), 201.

5. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 63.
6. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 207.
7. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 135.
8. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 136.
9. “Nontraditional” here refers to the ways in which Miranda engages methodologies that deviate from normative meanings and uses of history, archives, and knowledge within *both* settler and Indigenous knowledge and praxis. See Chapter 1 for more.
10. Martinez, “Intervening in the Archive” (*Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 2018), 55.
11. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), xx.
12. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 74.
13. Harjo, *Spiral to the Stars* (University of Arizona Press, 2019), 199.
14. Parreñas, *Decolonizing Extinction* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2018), 62.
15. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 22.
16. Martinez, “Intervening in the Archive” (*Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 2018), 55.
17. Martinez, “Intervening in the Archive” (*Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 2018), 63.
18. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 29.
19. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 207.
20. Martinez, “Intervening in the Archive” (*Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 2018), 63.
21. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 78.
22. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 208.
23. Martinez, “Intervening in the Archive” (*Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 2018), 66.
24. Waziyatawin, *What Does Justice Look Like?* (Living Justice, 2008), 83.
25. Harjo, *Spiral to the Stars* (University of Arizona Press, 2019), 201.
26. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 45-47.
27. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 120.
28. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 117.
29. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 45-47.
30. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 118.
31. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 123.
32. Martinez, “Intervening in the Archive” (*Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 2018), 62.
33. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 45-49.
34. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 50.
35. Furlan, “The Archives of Deborah Miranda’s *Bad Indians*” (*Sail*, 2021), 35.
36. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 50.
37. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 74.
38. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), xvii.

39. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 126.
40. Sharpe, *In the Wake* (Duke University Press, 2016), 113.
41. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 8-10.
42. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 9.
43. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 74.
44. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 9.
45. Miranda, *Bad Indians* (Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013), 10.

Chapter 2 Notes

1. Delaney, qtd. in Gaertner, “What’s a Story Like you Doing in a Place Like This?” (*Novel Alliances*, 2015).
2. See: Moskowitz, *Explorers of the Infinite*, (World Publishing Company, 1963). Also see: Aldiss, *Billion Year Spree* (London: Corgi Books, 1975). Also See: Roberts, *The History of Science Fiction* (Palgrave Histories of Literature, 2016).
3. Mark Bould and Sherryl Vint, *The Routledge Concise History of Science Fiction* (London: Routledge, 2011), 1.
4. Moskowitz, *Explorers of the Infinite*, (World Publishing Company, 1963), 242.
5. Mark Bould and Sherryl Vint, *The Routledge Concise History of Science Fiction* (London: Routledge, 2011).
6. Gernsback, “A New Sort of Magazine” (Experimenter Publishing, 1926).
7. Roberts, *The History of Science Fiction* (Palgrave Histories of Literature, 2016), 88.
8. Luckhurst, *Science Fiction* (Polity, 2005), 3.
9. Suvin, *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction* (Haven: Yale University Press, 1979).
10. Spires, *Encountering the Sovereign Other* (Michigan State University Press, 2021), xxviii.
11. See: Deloria, *God is Red* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2003). Also see: Spires, *Encountering the Sovereign Other* (Michigan State University Press, 2021).
12. Spires, *Encountering the Sovereign Other* (Michigan State University Press, 2021), xxx.
13. See: Deloria, *God is Red* (Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2003).
14. Da Silva, “Toward a Black Feminist Poethics” (*The Black Scholar*, 2014).
15. Da Silva, “Toward a Black Feminist Poethics” (*The Black Scholar*, 2014), 89.
16. Hobbes, *Leviathan* (London: Oxford University Press, 2008), 104.
17. Hobbes, *Leviathan* (London: Oxford University Press, 2008), 265.
18. Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* (Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing, 1980), 28.
19. Locke, *Second Treatise of Government* (Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing, 1980), 18.
20. Da Silva, “Toward a Black Feminist Poethics” (*The Black Scholar*, 2014), 83.
21. Qtd. in Krupat, “Postcoloniality, Ideology, and Native American Literature” (Jackson: University of Mississippi, 2005), 75.
22. Swann, *Born in the Blood* (Lincoln: University Press Nebraska, 2011), 2.
23. Da Silva, “Toward a Black Feminist Poethics” (*The Black Scholar*, 2014), 89.
24. See: Yaszek, “Afrofuturism, Science Fiction, and the History of the Future” (*Socialism and Democracy*, 2005). Also see: Higgins, “Survivance in Indigenous Science Fiction” (*Extrapolation*, 2016).

25. Higgins, "Survivance in Indigenous Science Fiction" (*Extrapolation*, 2016), 52.
26. Higgins, "Survivance in Indigenous Science Fiction" (*Extrapolation*, 2016), 53.
27. Higgins, "Survivance in Indigenous Science Fiction" (*Extrapolation*, 2016), 52.
28. Enns, *The Violence of Victimhood* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 19.
29. Higgins, "Survivance in Indigenous Science Fiction" (*Extrapolation*, 2016), 53.
30. See: Lempert, "Decolonizing Encounters of the Third Kind" (*Visual Anthropology Review*, 2014).
31. I agree with Lethabo that both Indigenous and Black analyses and resistance of conquest prioritize the "making and remaking of the human as non-Indigenous and non-Black". See: Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019), 39.
32. Da Silva, "Toward a Black Feminist Poethics" (*The Black Scholar*, 2014), 94.
33. Gaertner, "What's a Story Like you Doing in a Place Like This?" (*Novel Alliances*, 2015).
34. Vizenor, *Fugitive Poses* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998), 15.
35. Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 10.
36. Womack, *Afrofuturism* (Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2013), 80, 191.
37. Womack, *Afrofuturism* (Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2013), 11.
38. See: Yaszek, "Afrofuturism, Science Fiction, and the History of the Future" (*Socialism and Democracy*, 2005), 42
39. Womack, *Afrofuturism* (Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2013), 9.
40. Delaney, qtd. in Gaertner, "What's a Story Like you Doing in a Place Like This?" (*Novel Alliances*, 2015).
41. Crumpton, "Afrofuturism has Always Looked Forward" (*Clever*, 2020).
42. Yaszek, "Afrofuturism, Science Fiction, and the History of the Future" (*Socialism and Democracy*, 2005), 46.
43. For more on Afrofuturism, see: Yaszek, "Afrofuturism, Science Fiction, and the History of the Future" (*Socialism and Democracy*, 2005). Also see: Womack, *Afrofuturism* (Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2013).
44. See: Gaertner, "What's a Story Like you Doing in a Place Like This?" (*Novel Alliances*, 2015).
45. Higgins, "Survivance in Indigenous Science Fiction" (*Extrapolation*, 2016), 54.
46. Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 2.
47. See: Rader, *Engaged Resistance* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011). Also see: Spires, *Encountering the Sovereign Other* (Michigan State University Press, 2021).
48. Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 244.
49. Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 7.
50. Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 3.
51. Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 12.
52. Spires, *Encountering the Sovereign Other* (Michigan State University Press, 2021), 102.
53. Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 3.

54. Spires explains that “because Euro-Americans generally understand the world as a temporal progression based in a religious belief, they make certain assumptions about how the world works and what is possible within it. On the other hand, because Native peoples tend to focus on what happens within a particular place, they do not share this set of assumptions or expectations based in the linear progression of time. Where a Western European worldview defines reality by ‘what you allow your mind to accept, not what you experience,’ Native peoples are more easily able to recognize and respond to whatever events occur, no matter how unexpected or unlikely they may be. Indeed, a Native religious approach, antithetical to its Western European counterpart, might much more successfully engage with science fiction as a literature of change and difference because it emphasizes the transitive, causal relationship between religious beliefs and the present, ongoing world . . . a worldview based on spatial relations allows for greater flexibility and, thus, a more open attitude to change.” See: Spires, *Encountering the Sovereign Other* (Michigan State University Press, 2021), xxx.
55. Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012), 4.
56. See: Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019).
57. Cottom (2019) asserts that Black feminism knows the future through embodied knowledges of social death – sustained through what she observes as economies of incompetence. Similarly, I hold that Indigenous knowledges (have) know(n) the future through lived realities sustained within the settler-carceral wake.
58. See: Silko, *Almanac of the Dead* (United States: Simon & Schuster, 1991). Also see: Dillon, *Walking the Clouds* (The University of Arizona Press, 2012).
59. Higgins, “Survivance in Indigenous Science Fiction” (*Extrapolation*, 2016), 55.
60. Higgins, “Survivance in Indigenous Science Fiction” (*Extrapolation*, 2016), 58.

Chapter 3 Notes

1. Hedlund, “Medicines at Standing Rock” (*American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2020).
2. See: Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019). Also See: Hedlund, “Medicines at Standing Rock” (*American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2020). Also see: Christiansen, “The Water Protectors at Standing Rock” (*Women’s Studies in Communication*, 2021).
3. See: Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019).
4. Nagle, *Lessons Learned from Standing Rock* (Longmont, CO: Reclaiming Native Truth at First Nations Development Institute, 2018).
5. Hedlund, “Medicines at Standing Rock” (*American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2020).
6. Hedlund, “Medicines at Standing Rock” (*American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2020), 75.
7. Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019).
8. See: LaDuke, “Winona LaDuke on the Dakota Access Pipeline” (*Yes Magazine*, 2016). Also see: Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019).
9. Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019).

10. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2014), 69.
11. Shelby Settles Harper and Christina Marie Entrekin, *Violence Against Native American Women* (Office on Violence Against Women, 2006).
12. See: LaDuke, *All Our Relations* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 1999). Also see: Churchill, "Reproductive Rites and Wrongs" (Maguire: Oxford University Press, 2003). Also see: Nobiss, "Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women Need Your Attention this International Women's Day" (*Bustle*, 2018).
13. See: Goeman, *Mark My Words* (University of Minnesota Press, 2013). Also see: Deer, *Beginning and End of Rape* (University of Minnesota Press, 2015). Also see: Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019).
14. See: Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as Grass Grows* (Beacon Press, 2019).
15. See: Goeman, *Mark My Words* (University of Minnesota Press, 2013). Also see: Deer, *Beginning and End of Rape* (University of Minnesota Press, 2015).
16. See: LaDuke, *All Our Relations* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 1999). Also see: Deer, *Beginning and End of Rape* (University of Minnesota Press, 2015). Also see: Nobiss, "Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women Need Your Attention this International Women's Day" (*Bustle*, 2018).
17. Latimer, "RISE" (Vice Canada & Aboriginal Peoples Television Network, 2017).
18. See: Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (Berkeley, CA: Publishers Group West Grove Press, 2008 [1952]). Also See: Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies* (London: Zed Books, 2012 [1999]). Also See: Hedlund, "Medicines at Standing Rock" (*American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2020).
19. See: Mays, "Transnational Progressivism" (*Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 2013). Also see: Pellow, "Environmental Justice Studies" (*Du Bois Review*, 2016). Also see: Waldron, "Women on the Frontlines" (*Kalfou*, 2018). Also see: Rodriguez, "Abolition as a Praxis of Human Being" (*Harvard Law Review*, 2019).
20. See: Da Silva, "Toward a Black Feminist Poethics" (*The Black Scholar*, 2014), 82. Also see: Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019).
21. See: Spillers, "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe" (*Diacritics*, 1987). Also see: Mays, "Transnational Progressivism" (*Studies in American Indian Literatures*, 2013). Also see: Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019).
22. Sharon Howell, Michael Doan, and Ami Harbin, "Detroit to Flint and Back Again" (*Critical Sociology*, 2019).
23. See: Denchak, "Flint Water Crisis" (*NRDC*, 2018). Also see: Sharon Howell, Michael Doan, and Ami Harbin, "Detroit to Flint and Back Again" (*Critical Sociology*, 2019).
24. Sharon Howell, Michael Doan, and Ami Harbin, "Detroit to Flint and Back Again" (*Critical Sociology*, 2019).
25. Mays, "Song 'Let's Meet by the Water'" (*Indian Country Today*, 2018).
26. Hedlund, "Medicines at Standing Rock" (*American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2020), 61.

27. Hedlund, “Medicines at Standing Rock” (*American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 2020), 75.
28. Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019), 209.

Conclusion Notes

1. Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019), 209.

Bibliography

- Aikau, Hokulani K, Maile Arvin, Mishuana Goeman, and Scott Morgensen. "Indigenous Feminisms Roundtable." *Frontiers* 36, no. 3 (2015).
- Aldiss, Brian. *Billion Year Spree: A History of Science Fiction*. London: Corgi Books, 1975.
- Baume, Frank. *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*. Chicago and New York: George M. Hill, 1900.
- Bleiler, Richard. "William Wilson: The Creator of 'Science-Fiction'." *Science Fiction Studies* 38, no. 3 (November 2011): 562-564.
- Burroughs, Edgar Rice. *A Princess of Mars*. A.C. McClurg, 1912.
- Bonilla, Yarimar. "The Coloniality of Disaster: Race, Empire, and the Temporal Logics of Emergency in Puerto Rico, USA." *Political Geography* 78, (2020): 1-12.
- Bould, Mark, and Sherryl Vint. *The Routledge Concise History of Science Fiction*. London: Routledge, 2011.
- Byrd, Jodi. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
- Cameron, James. Dir. *Avatar*. United States: Twentieth Century Fox, 2009.
- Cannon, Katie. "Cutting Edge: Christian Imperialism and the Transatlantic Slave Trade." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 24, no. 1 (2008): 127-134.
- Christiansen, Jordan. "The Water Protectors at Standing Rock: Survivance Strategies for Gendered Relinking." *Women's Studies in Communication* 44, no. 3 (2021): 278-300.
- Churchill, Mary C. "Reproductive Rites and Wrongs: Lessons from American Indian Religious Traditions, Historical Experience, and Contemporary Life." In *Sacred Rights: The Case for Contraception and Abortion in World Religions*, 175-197. Maguire: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Collins, Suzanne. Dir. *The Hunger Games*. New York, YW: Scholastic, 2008.
- Combahee River Collective (CRC)*. "A Black Feminist Statement." *Monthly Review Press*, (1979): 362-72.
- Coogler, Ryan. Dir. *Black Panther*. United States: Walt Disney Studios, 2018; 2022.
- Cottom, Tressie McMillan. *Thick: And Other Essays*. La Vergne: The New Press, 2019.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43, no. 5 (July 1991): 1241-1299.
- Crumpton, Taylor. "Afrofuturism has Always Looked Forward." *Clever*, August 24, 2020. <https://www.architecturaldigest.com/story/what-is-afrofuturism>.

- Da Silva, Denise Ferreira. "Toward a Black Feminist Poethics." *The Black Scholar* 44, no. 2 (2014): 81-97.
- Deer, Sarah. *Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America*. University of Minnesota Press, 2015.
- Deloria, Vine Jr. *God is Red: A Native View of Religion*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing, 2003.
- Denchak, Melissa. "Flint Water Crisis: Everything You Need to Know." *NRDC*, November 8, 2018. <https://www.nrdc.org/stories/flint-water-crisis-everything-you-need-know#summary>.
- Denetdale, Jennifer Nez. Qtd. in Alter, Alexandra. "'We've Already Survived an Apocalypse': Indigenous Writers are Changing Sci-Fi." *New York Times*, August 14, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/08/14/books/indigenous-native-american-sci-fi-horror.html>.
- DENNISON, JEAN. "Sovereignty as Accountability: Theorizing from the Osage Nation." In *Rising from the Ashes: Survival, Sovereignty, and Native America*, edited by William Willard, Alan G. Marshall, and J. Diane Pearson, 279–304. University of Nebraska Press, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv105b94j.16>.
- Dery, Mark. "Black to the Future." In *Flame Wars: The Discourse of Cyberculture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1994.
- Dillon, Grace. *Walking the Clouds: An Anthology of Indigenous Science Fiction*. The University of Arizona Press, 2012.
- Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 2014.
- Enns, Diane. *The Violence of Victimhood*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Berkeley, CA: Distributed by Publishers Group West Grove Press, 2008 [1952].
- Furlan, Laura. "The Archives of Deborah Miranda's *Bad Indians*." *Sail* 33, no. 1-2 (Spring Summer 2021): 27-54.
- Gaertner, David. "What's a Story Like You Doing in a Place Like This?: Cyberspace and Indigenous Futurism." *Novel Alliances*, March 23, 2015. <https://novelalliances.com/2015/03/23/whats-a-story-like-you-doing-in-a-place-like-this-cyberspace-and-indigenous-futurism-in-neal-stephensons-snow-crash/>.
- Gernsback, Hugo. "A New Sort of Magazine." In *Amazing Stories*. Experimenter Publishing 1, no. 1 (April 1926): 3.
- Gilio-Whitaker, Dina. *As Long as Grass Grows: The Indigenous Fight for Environmental Justice, from Colonization to Standing Rock*. Beacon Press, 2019.

- Goeman, Mishuana. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*. University of Minnesota Press, 2013.
- Goodman, Alan, and Georgia Armelagos. "Disease and Death at Dr. Dickson's Mounds." *Natural History Magazine* 94, no. 9 (1985): 12-18.
- Gurr, Barbara. "Complex Intersections: Reproductive Justice and Native American Women." *Sociology Compass* 5, no. 8 (2011): 721-735.
- Harjo, Laura. *Spiral to the Stars: Mvskoke Tools of Futurity*. University of Arizona Press, 2019.
- Harper, Shelby Settles, and Christina Marie Entekin. *Violence Against Native Women: A Guide for Practitioner Action*. Office on Violence Against Women, 2006.
- Hartman, Saidiya. "Seduction and the Ruses of Power." *Callaloo* 19, no. 2 (Spring 1996): 537-560.
- Hedlund, Selma. "Medicines at Standing Rock: Stories of Native Healing through Survivance." *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 44, no. 4 (2020): 59-78.
- Higgins, David. "Psychic Decolonization in 1960s Science Fiction." *Science Fiction Studies* 40, no. 2 (July 2013): 228-245.
- Higgins, David. "Survivance in Indigenous Science Fictions: Vizenor, Silko, Glancy, and the Rejection of Imperial Victimry." *Extrapolation* 57, no. 1-2 (2016): 51-72.
- Hill Collins, Patricia. "Intersectionality's Definitional Dilemmas." *Annual Review of Sociology* 41, (2015): 1-20.
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. Edited by J.C.A. Gaskin. London: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Howell, Sharon, and Michael Doan and Ami Harbin. "Detroit to Flint and Back Again: Solidarity Forever." *Critical Sociology* 45, no. 1 (2019): 63-83.
- Krupat, Arnold. "Postcoloniality, Ideology, and Native American Literature." In *Postcolonial Theory and the United States: Race, Ethnicity, and Literature*, 73-94. Jackson: University of Mississippi, 2000.
- LaDuke, Winona. *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 1999.
- LaDuke, Winona. "Winona LaDuke on the Dakota Access Pipeline: What Would Sitting Bull Do?" *Yes Magazine*, August 29, 2016.
<https://www.yesmagazine.org/environment/2016/08/29/an-oil-pipeline-and-a-river-what-would-sitting-bull-do>.
- Latimer, Michelle. "RISE: Sacred Water: Standing Rock, Part I." VICE Canada & Aboriginal Peoples Television Network, 2017.
- Lempert, William. "Decolonizing Encounters of the Third Kind: Alternative Futuring in Native Science Fiction Film." *Visual Anthropology Review* 30, no. 2 (2014): 164-176.

- Lethabo King, Tiffany. *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2019.
- Locke, John. *Second Treatise of Government*. Edited by C.B. Macpherson. Cambridge, MA: Hackett Publishing, 1980.
- Lucas, George. Dir. *Star Wars: A New Hope*. United States: 20th Century Fox, 1977.
- Luckhurst, Roger. *Science Fiction: Cultural History of Literature*. Polity, 2005.
- Ludlow, Fitz Hugh. *The Hasheesh Eater Being Passages from the Life of a Pythagorean*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2006.
- Martinez, Shanae. "Intervening in the Archive: Women-Water Alliances, Narrative Agency, and Reconstructing Indigenous Space in Deborah Miranda's *Bad Indians: A Tribal Memoir*." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 30, no. 3-4 (Fall-Winter 2018): 54-71.
- Mays, Kyle T. "Transnational Progressivism: African Americans, Native Americans, and the Universal Race Congress of 1911." *Studies in American Indian Literatures* 25, no. 2 (2013): 241-261.
- Miranda, Deborah. *Bad Indians: A Tribal Memoir*. Berkeley: Heyday Press, 2013.
- Mays, Kyle T. "Song 'Let's Meet by the Water' Invites Support at Indigenous Water Ceremony in Flint." *Indian Country Today*, September 13, 2018. <https://ictnews.org/archive/song-lets-meet-by-the-water-invites-support-at-indigenous-water-ceremony-in-flint>.
- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 2015).
- Moskowitz, Sam. *Explorers of the Infinite: Shapers of Science Fiction*. World Publishing Company, 1963.
- Nagle, Mary Kathryn. *Lessons Learned from Standing Rock*. Longmont, CO: Reclaiming Native Truth at First Nations Development Institute, 2018.
- Nixon, Angelique. *Resisting Paradise: Tourism, Diaspora, and Sexuality in Caribbean Culture*. University Press of Mississippi, 2015.
- Nobiss, Christine. "Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women Need Your Attention this International Women's Day." *Bustle*, March 8, 2018.. [Missing & Murdered Indigenous Women Need Your Attention This International Women's Day \(bustle.com\)](https://www.bustle.com/p/missing-and-murdered-indigenous-women-need-your-attention-this-international-womens-day-2018).
- Nurse, Angus. "Slavery and Reparations: A Criminological View." In *Reparations and Anti Black Racism: A Criminological Exploration of the Harms of Slavery and Racialised Injustice*, 16–29. Bristol University Press, 2021. doi:10.46692/9781529216851.003.
- Parreñas, Juno. *Decolonizing Extinction: The Work of Care in Orangutan Rehabilitation*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2018.

- Pellow, David N. "Environmental Justice Studies: Black Lives Matter as an Environmental Justice Challenge." *Du Bois Review* 13, no. 2 (2016): 221-236.
- Rader, Dean. *Engaged Resistance: American Indian Art, Literature, and Film from Alcatraz to the NMAI*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011.
- Rieder, John. *Colonialism and the Emergence of Science Fiction*. Wesleyan University Press, 2008.
- Roberts, Adam. *The History of Science Fiction*. Palgrave Histories of Literature, 2016.
- Rodriguez, Dylan. "Abolition as Praxis of Human Being: A Foreword." *Harvard Law Review* 132, no. 1575 (2019): 1575-1621.
- Sharpe, Christina. *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Duke University Press, 2016.
- Silko, Leslie Marmon. *Almanac of the Dead*. United States: Simon & Schuster, 1991.
- Smith, Andrea, and Winona LaDuke. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Duke University Press, 2005.
- Smith, David. "Counting the Dead: Estimating the Loss of Life in the Indigenous Holocaust, 1492-Present." *Southeastern Oklahoma State University*, (2018).
- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books, 2012 [1999].
- Spillers, Hortense. "Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book." *Diacritics* 17, no. 2 (Summer 1987): 64-81.
- Spires, Miriam C. Brown. *Encountering the Sovereign Other: Indigenous Science Fiction*. Michigan State University Press, 2021.
- Suvin, Darko. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979.
- Swann, Brian. *Born in the Blood: On Native American Translation*. Lincoln: University Press Nebraska, 2011.
- Tatonetti, Lisa. *The Queerness of Native American Literature*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2014.
- De Quincey, Thomas. *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater*. London: Taylor and Hessey, 1822.
- United Nations. "Sustainability." Accessed March 25, 2023. <https://www.un.org/en/academic-impact/sustainability>.
- Vizenor, Gerald. "Custer on the Slipstream." 1978. In *Walking the Clouds: An Anthology of Indigenous Science Fiction*. The University of Arizona Press, 2012.

- Vizenor, Gerald. *Fugitive Poses: Native American Indian Scenes of Absence and Presence*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1998.
- Waldron, Ingrid R.G. "Women on the Frontlines: Grassroots Movements against Environmental Violence in Indigenous and Black Communities in Canada." *Kalfou* 5, no. 2 (Fall 2018): 251-268.
- Waziyatawin. *What does Justice Look Like: The Struggle for Liberation in Dakota Homeland*. Living Justice Press, 2008.
- Weinbaum, Stanley. "A Martian Odyssey." *Wonder Stories*, (July 1934).
- Wilderson, Frank. *Red, White, & Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms*. Duke University Press, 2010.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 387-409.
- Womack, Ytasha. *Afrofuturism: The World of Black Sci-Fir and Fantasy Culture*. Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 2013.
- World Future Fund. "Death Toll from the Slave Trade." Accessed March 27, 2023. <http://www.worldfuturefund.org/Reports/Slavedeathtoll/slaverydeathtoll.html>.
- Wynter, Sylvia. "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. doi:10.1353/ncr.2004.0015.
- Yaszek, Lisa. "Afrofuturism, Science Fiction, and the History of the Future." *Socialism and Democracy* 20, no. 3 (2005): 41-60.
- Zhao, Chloe. Dir. *Eternals*. United States: Walt Disney Studios, 2021.
- Zieger, Susan. "Pioneers of Inner Space: Drug Autobiography and Manifest Destiny." *PMLA* 122, no. 5 (2007): 1531-1547.

