ABSTRACT

Articulating a Decolonial Materialist Rhetoric

Robert Joshua Michael, M.A.

Chairperson: Matthew Gerber, Ph.D.

This thesis is preoccupied with challenging the way current rhetoricians approach criticism of Native discourse, that which is produced within and by Native communities. Beginning with Ronald Greene's "A Materialist Rhetoric," this thesis injects Native intellectual scholarship into the field of rhetoric, forming what I call a decolonial materialist rhetoric. A decolonial materialist rhetoric issues two unique challenges to the field of rhetoric. The first posits a new style of criticism that demonstrates why one should no longer be satisfied with scholarship that simply names Native communities as historical objects. The second challenge of a decolonial materialist rhetoric is directed at the rhetorician, challenging their disembodied approach to criticism. Throughout this project I will challenge previous scholars' views of Native discourse, provide counter narratives of Native mythology, and charge rhetoricians with a new purpose as academics.

Articulating a Decolonial Materialist Rhetoric

by

Robert Joshua Michael, B.S.

A Thesis

Approved by the Department of Communication

_____

David W. Schlueter, Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of

Master of Arts

Approved by the Thesis Committee

_____

Matthew Gerber, Ph.D., Chairperson

_____

Martin J. Medhurst, Ph.D.

_____

Anne-Marie Schultz, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School

May 2019

_____

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

Page bearing signatures is kept on file in the Graduate School.

Copyright © 2019 by Robert Joshua Michael

All rights reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take a brief moment to acknowledge those that have supported and assisted me throughout my time as a graduate student. Primarily, I would like to acknowledge my family – Robert, Matt, Karen, Alex, Mikayla, and Jasmine. Your constant encouragement has pushed me to continue with my studies and has sustained me through the most difficult times. Additionally, I would like to thank my cohort – Jack, Fielding, Dan, Jesse, and Lucia. Without your companionship this project would have remained insurmountable. Next, I would like to thank the graduate faculty of Baylor's Communication Department – Dr. Gerber, Dr. Hahner, Dr. Varda, Dr. Medhurst, and Dr. Schlueter. Each of you have gone beyond the requirements of your position, ensuring that I thrive both inside and outside of academia. Your countless late-night edits and frustrating conversations about how to best meld rhetorical and Indigenous theories were integral to the completion of this thesis. Finally, I would like to give a special thank you to my mother, Alicia. Your constant support and tireless efforts, in the face of your other responsibilities as a business leader, wife, and mother, are quite frankly the only reason I finished this journey. Thank you.

DEDICATION

For the countless Native women who have suffered to make this project a possibility

CHAPTER ONE

A Cursory Exploration of a Decolonial Materialist Rhetoric

Introduction

Settler colonialism is a pervasive, violent structure that demands the attention of rhetorical scholars. Cohered within the very structures that make this scholarship legible, settler colonialism gives rise to resistance, multifaceted and coordinated. From the confines of the academy, Native intellectuals struggle to reclaim the value of colonized Indigenous knowledges. To exert such effort is to strive toward a decolonial rhetoric that exposes the historical violence enacted against Native communities. Turning to a decolonial materialist rhetoric, scholars can utilize a framework that shatters the façade dividing theory and practical action.

The field of rhetoric has long attempted to articulate a method capable of analyzing the relationship between discourse and materiality. Respected scholars such as Edward Schiappa, Michael Calvin McGee, Barbara A. Biesecker, Maurice Charland, Raymie McKerrow, and Dana L. Cloud have each labored to provide a useful theorization of material rhetoric.[1] While this thesis does not possess the space necessary to undertake a genealogical account of such theories, I hope to extend previous theorizations to include decolonial critiques. Drawing on the works of Ronald Walter Greene, Aman Sium, Chandni Desai, Eric Ritskes, la paperson, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, Eve Tuck, Audra Simpson, and several other Native scholars, I articulate a

theory of decolonial materialist rhetoric that forefronts Native epistemologies and bridges the divide between theory and material actions.[2]

Similar to Greene, I find "The most unlikely suspects are undermining the theoretical effort to create a materialist rhetoric."[3] Rhetoricians currently conceptualizing decolonization suffer from tunnel vision, unable to express how their academic tools can be wielded outside of the university. Satisfied with "spotlighting both colonized people's efforts to decolonize in their own times and contexts, and Native epistemologies,"[4] rhetoricians have concerned themselves with the simple task of proving that Native rhetors possessed agency under settler colonial governance, evidenced by their ability to "talk back"[5] to the settler. This narrow focus takes for granted the tremendous spread of Indigenous knowledge throughout the academy. The past twenty years have borne witness to the establishment of an environment in which "Treaties on empire, imperialism, settler, and other colonialisms are no longer relegated to the margins of academic discourse and have become central to a variety of fields and disciplines."[6] Such scholarship has taken root within Indigenous Studies and Critical/Cultural programs, yet few disciplines have recognized the unique value of this counter-hegemonic knowledge.

A decolonial materialist rhetoric issues two unique challenges to the field of rhetoric. The first posits a new style of criticism that demonstrates why one should no longer be satisfied with scholarship that simply names Native communities as historical objects. Instead, when analyzing Native discourses, the object of study should be firmly situated within the broader network of social relations that define Native existence. This allows scholars to gain a full appreciation for the style of rhetoric adopted by Native

communities and opens up the possibility of sketching temporal linkages between various historical movements.

The second challenge of a decolonial materialist rhetoric is directed at the rhetorician. Traditionally, rhetoricians concerned with Native discourse have distanced themselves from their object of study, rarely talking about their own social position within settler relationships. This disembodied approach ensures two outcomes. First, the radical potential of decolonial movements is evacuated. Second, rhetorical criticism is simply circulated within academic settings. Instead, a decolonial materialist rhetoric urges scholars to contribute to Native resistive movements outside of the academy that aim to dismantle settler structures. The labor of such efforts is demonstrated by Native intellectuals like Leanne Simpson, who rebukes colonial domination through activist efforts within and beyond the university's confines. As Simpson notes, "the fight" lies not solely in academia, but in "communities like Grassy Narrows."[7] If the discipline is genuine in its desire to support marginalized communities, then it should strive to do more than simply publish scholarship.

Method

This thesis is primarily concerned with bridging the divide between existing critical Native literature and rhetorical methods of analysis and criticism. As such, a wide range of texts have been selected and must be interrogated in turn. To ensure the completion of a thorough critique, this thesis will attempt to render a full account of rhetorical scholarship that takes Native rhetoric as its object of study. As a newly emergent interest to the discipline, there exists few authors who have produced articles on the matter. This thesis will begin by tracing the development of the field's interest,

beginning with Randall A. Lake, and then moving through the scholarship of Mary E. Stuckey, Danielle Endres, Casey Ryan Kelly, and Jason Edward Black. The purpose of this review is to illuminate the field's previous misconceptions concerning Native discourse and expose its disregard for material demands forwarded by Native communities.

To facilitate this process, this thesis will draw heavily on the corpus of critical literature authored by Native intellectuals over the past two decades. Employing the figure of the Trickster, this thesis will attempt to engage previous scholarship as a mode of (re)mapping, "to interrogate our ever-changing Native epistemologies that frame our understanding of land and our relationships to it and to other peoples." (Mark My Words Page 3) To effectuate this (re)mapping, I will rely heavily on three interrelated concepts: decolonization, Trickster as a methodology, and materiality. As will be discussed in further depth in chapter two, this thesis endorses a vision of decolonization consistent with that of contemporary Native intellectuals in which, "Decolonization is the rematriation of Indigenous land and life."[8] While there obviously exist minor discrepancies across a plethora of books and articles with regard to the textual definitions of "decolonization," the general framework remains consistent throughout Indigenous endorsements of the political strategy.[9] Decolonization, as a political objective, remains unique to Indigenous communities because it "is a distinct project from other civil and human rights-based social justice projects."[10] While the realization of decolonization might benefit other marginalized populations, the core interest of decolonization remains the physical return of Turtle Island to Native nations.

The second concept central to this thesis is the use of Trickster values as a method of subversion. The figure of the Trickster is a pedagogical construct utilized by a multitude of Native nations, meant to assist in the transmission of intergenerational cultural teachings. While each nation holds a different view of the Trickster's responsibilities, there persists a common ideal that "the trickster assists people in conceiving of the limited viewpoint they possess. The trickster is able to kindle these understandings because his actions take place in a perplexing realm that partially escapes the structures of society and the order of cultural things."[11] A greater exploration of the Trickster will be undertaken in chapter three, but for the sake of this chapter, one can grasp that this thesis functions similarly to la paperson's efforts to subvert academia from within. After learning the purpose and limits of rhetorical criticism and theory, this thesis turns those methods back upon the field, excising its scholarship from its colonial epistemological attachments; this is not to simply gesture toward the Trickster's existence, but to embody and quite literally perform its core values as a Native figure. Acting as a Trickster, this thesis will serve to hold a mirror up to the field, revealing its attachment to outdated tropes and understandings of Native life.

Finally, I turn to the concept of materiality as it relates to rhetorical discourse. Threaded throughout the thesis' analysis is an attempt to convey the importance of understanding the ways in which "rhetoric becomes a discourse of power."[12] While this type of analysis is embedded within the scholarship of previous rhetoricians, Greene argues the historical tracing of power becomes locked into a logic of representation absent an application of one's understanding of how that history shapes the present. A logic of representation, in effect, serves to decontextualize the relationship between a text

and its spatial/temporal setting, evacuating it of any true rhetorical force. Greene's theory of materialist rhetoric, as informed by Grossberg's previous work in *We Gotta Get Out of this Place: Popular Conservatism and Post Modern Culture*, offers "the possibility of abandoning a 'logic of influence' for a 'logic of articulation'…opening up an escape route for materialist rhetoric from the orbit of representational politics."[13]

Articulations as "the production of identity on top of differences,"[14] transforms meaning making from the extraction of value from fragments to an analysis of a fragment's value generated as part of a larger "structure of signification."[15] This approach to analysis reconfigures the material nature of rhetoric. No longer disembodied, Greene's theorization exposes rhetoric "as a technology of deliberation that allows a series of institutions to make judgments about the welfare of a population."[16] As an extension of such logic, this thesis situates its rhetorical analysis of Native discourse within the larger history of settler colonialism, demonstrating how rhetorical scholars can "investigate the organizational and historical dynamics of a governing apparatus."[17] What separates this work from Greene's is its recognition that decolonial movements demand "the rematriation of land, the regeneration of relations, and the forwarding of Indigenous and Black and queer futures."[18]

While the framework of a decolonial materialist rhetoric outlined thus far performs important theoretical work, there remains the question of its circulation within and beyond the University. Settler colonial discourse is effectuated through an assemblage of technologies. Acting as a nodal agent, the United States federal government disseminates its power through a network of relations, deputizing disparate entities in its fight to complete settlement. The University is one such entity. In *A Third*

University is Possible, la paperson notes, "Universities do not exist in some abstract academic place. They are built on land, and especially in the North American context, upon occupied Indigenous lands."[19] Public universities have contributed greatly to the dispossession of Native communities. Benefitting from the Morrill Act, land-grant universities have been funded by the state's commodification and selling of Indigenous lands. Institutions like Cornell University "traded 532,000 acres of scrip in New York to acquire timber-rich lands in Wisconsin. The 'Western Lands,' as they were appropriately dubbed, fueled Cornell University from 1865 until the land scrip was finally liquidated in 1935. Therefore land-grant universities are built not only *on* land but also *from* land."[20]

Even Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (la paperson's "other-I")[21] in "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor," further implicate academia by highlighting the way white scholars enact a double-effacement of Indigenous intellectuals. Not only do white academics occupy positions of privilege within institutions constructed on stolen land, but they also adopt the language of decolonization without crediting Native intellectuals. Tuck and Yang express,

> [W]e have observed a startling number of these discussions make no mention of Indigenous peoples, our/their struggles for the recognition of our/their sovereignty, or the contributions of Indigenous intellectuals and activists to theories and frameworks of decolonization. Further, there is often little recognition given to the immediate context of settler colonialism on the North American lands where many of these conferences take place.[22]

By reading violent discourse against the University as a backdrop, the efforts of Tuck and Yang/paperson demonstrate how a decolonial materialist rhetoric can "bring attention to how settler colonialism has shaped schooling and educational research…concerned with how the invisibilized dynamics of settler colonialism mark the organization, governance, curricula, and assessment of compulsory learning."[23]

la paperson's indictment of the University leaves rhetoricians with a pressing question that demands a response. Can decolonial efforts be effectively implemented within a colonial institution? There is no agreed upon answer. Sium, Desai, and Ritskes grapple with this question when they acknowledge "we write from the (relatively) privileged position of the Western academy."[24] While they refuse to provide a definite resolution to the quandary, they echo the sentiments of Glen Sean Coulthard, who "believes that when we seek to be made visible through the acceptance of colonial institutions, we reinscribe the colonial as arbiter and validator, and recognize its authority to regulate and dictate Indigenous life."[25] la paperson, conversely, begins with the premises, "Within the colonizing university also exists a decolonizing education…Regardless of its colonial structure, because school is an assemblage of machines and not a monolithic institution, its machinery is always being subverted toward decolonizing purposes."[26] However, these efforts shift a decolonial materialist rhetoric's focus from the production of scholarship to the actions of the scholar. Once one understands and commits to a style of scholarship that forwards decolonial demands, there remains the question of how scholars crystallize these efforts within their own lives, moving theory into the realm of action.

Literature Review

While the field of rhetoric has recently turned its attention to Native discourse, the discipline has historically given little credence to such discourse. Randall A. Lake was the first rhetorician to seriously explore and critically engage rhetoric constructed and circulated by Native communities, authoring "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric," in 1983.[27] In this seminal article, Lake

"argues for this alternative perspective," in which Native protest rhetoric is classified as consummatory self-address, as opposed to rhetoric circulated for the benefit of white civil society.[28] Analyzing rhetoric associated with the Red Power Movement, led by Dennis Banks, Russell Means, Clyde Bellecourt, and Vernon Bellecourt, Lake argues that the American Indian Movement's (AIM) political demands functioned as a form of "ritual self-address" that materialized in the form of resistive movements.[29] Lake returned to the topic of Native rhetoric in 1991, again privileging the role of protest rhetoric in "Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric."[30] Similarly published in the prestigious *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, Lake's article presents a sweeping treatise on the nature of Native time as an oppositional construct to the metaphysical nature of Euramerican time. Counterposing ritual time as cyclical, Lake argues that religious rhetoric disrupts temporal narratives of linear progress that facilitates the spread of settler society, creating the possibility for Native resistance.

Lake would again take a hiatus from the topic of Native rhetoric until 1997. Following the popular reception of the critically acclaimed film *Dances with Wolves*, Lake penned "Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in *Dances with Wolves*."[31] Attempting to navigate the dialectical praises and critiques of the film, Lake provides "a cautionary tale about key aspects of this 'Cliffordesque' view of culture and identity."[32] Opposing "an overly simple reading of identity as *either* essentialist *or* conjunctural," he argues, "that identity is better understood as a dialectical site where these tensions mediate each other."[33] Through sporadic in its appearance, Lake's collective effort to engage Native discourse served as a catalyst, attracting the attention of additional prominent rhetorical critics.

The last decade of the twentieth century contributed little by way of forging new modes of analysis of Native rhetoric. Instead, the discipline remained fascinated with protest rhetoric generated by AIM and the events surrounding the Reoccupation of Wounded Knee in 1973. Published the year before Lake's "Between Myth and History," Richard Morris and Philip Wander's "Native American Rhetoric: Dancing in the Shadows of the Ghost Dance," analyzed rhetoric of the 1973 protest, and argued that "understanding the rhetorical efforts of Native Americans to overcome the imposition of a fundamentally mistaken identity has significant implications for our understanding of Native American rhetoric."[34] Following a brief description of the Ghost Dance Movement of the 1880s and 1890s, Morris and Wander outline the various rhetorical tactics deployed by those protesting at Wounded Knee a century later. While the authors conclude "the protestors at Wounded Knee accomplished much more than simply recalling the Ghost Dance Movement…the protestors brought the Ghost Dance Movement into the present by becoming part of it,"[35] Lake argues that the article's focus is too narrow, closing his own article with two pages of criticism of Morris and Wander's text.[36]

The only other contributions to the field with regard to Native rhetoric came in the form of two articles authored by John Sanchez and Mary E. Stuckey. Though they published six articles together between 1998 and 2000, only two of them pertained to the field of rhetoric. In their first article, "Communicating Culture Through Leadership: One View from Indian Country," Sanchez and Stuckey outline the political and interpersonal characteristics of Native leadership styles, focusing on notions such as respect, sacred politics, and abstraction.[37] The article's conclusion posits, "An acceptance of an

indigenous view could also focus our attention on the consequences of national political speech and political action for those who are the least privileged among us."[38] This article was quickly followed by another expose of AIM's protest movement in "The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s."[39] Despite the text's heavy reliance on Lake's previous scholarship, Sanchez and Stuckey provide a unique argument, within the discipline at least, arguing "We may need to derive more of that theory from the experiences of marginalized peoples by listening more closely to those experiences and to those who tell of them. This would also mean broadening perspectives on what 'counts' as academic discourse, and how such discourse 'ought' to be presented."[40]

The past two decades have witnessed an increase in attention paid to Native communities and rhetoric produced by Native leaders. Three rhetoricians in particular have led this renewal, writing concurrently on overlapping issues. First amongst them is Danielle Endres, a scholar predominately concerned with the rhetoric mobilized by environmental movements and the controversy surrounding Yucca Mountain as a disposal site of nuclear waste. While there exists substantial literature contesting the United States' policy of dumping nuclear waste on Native lands, Endres' work remains unique because it explores the value systems endorsed by the Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute that frame Yucca Mountain as a sacred site. Beginning within this framework, Endres is able to rearticulate the legal arguments privileged by the United States and instead prioritize animist views of the environment.[41] Though Endres has also touched on other subjects, such as Leonard Peltier[42] and Native approaches to scientific argument,[43] she has recently taken up the issue of Native mascoting. Similar to Black, Endres argues that mascoting, while endorsed by several Native nations, "'further

perpetuates white hegemony.'"[44] Finally, Endres has approached questions of place in protest, arguing that "place-as-rhetoric" remains an undertheorized analytic given the predominance of "place-based arguments."[45]

The second rhetorician to be recognized is Casey Ryan Kelly, a student of Lake's. Picking up where Sanchez and Stuckey left off, Kelly's first article concerning Native rhetoric highlighted the relationship between AIM and the FBI. However, rather than focus on rhetoric produced by AIM, Kelly's "Rhetorical Counterinsurgency: The FBI and the American Indian Movement," details how the FBI labored to combat what it perceived as Native insurgency through "a systematic and strategic set of communicative techniques or instruments which, when used in combination, manage, dissipate, and suppress radicalism," between 1971 and 1976.[46] What sets this article apart from its predecessors is its acknowledgement of hostile constrains on AIM's resistance tactics. Lake, Sanchez, and Stuckey examine the internal production of AIM's discourse and attempt to diagnose its shortcomings, yet Kelly admits, "AIM was unable to achieve any of their twenty point demands expressed during the Trail of Broken Treaties. While it may have been that AIM was unable to craft a palatable message to achieve their political goals, there were factors beyond their control that limited the reception of any radical political message. Material and rhetorical constraints doomed AIM's warrior culture to be approached with fear and misunderstanding."[47]

Continuing his focus on oppressive governmental rhetoric, Kelly's "Orwellian Language and the Politics of Tribal Termination (1953-1960)" examines three ideographs: termination and emancipation, termination and self-reliance, and reservations and prisons.[48] Kelly's analysis highlights the manner by which government officials

assaulted tribal sovereignty by framing their proposed policies as benefits to Native communities. His text, "'We are not Free': The Meaning of <Freedom> in American Indian Resistance to President Johnson's War on Poverty," continued to analyze key ideographs in the wake of the termination era.[49] While attempting to explain shifting power dynamics during the transition from the termination era to the Red Power movement, Kelly avers, "For the BIA, <freedom> was enacted through the maximization of one's labor power and personal initiative free of either coercion or assistance. Thus, American Indian Progress toward <freedom> was indexed by rates of assimilation, acculturation, and urbanization."[50]

In 2011, Kelly broke ranks with his contemporaries, writing an article that focused on Native rhetoric produced after the Red Power/AIM era. In "Blood-Speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity," Kelly attempts to navigate the controversy surrounding Churchill's excommunication from his alleged Native community in the wake of allegations he plagiarized various scholars throughout his own scholarship.[51] Prominent throughout Kelly's article is an interrogation of blood quantums as a legitimate standard of determining communal identity, making him the first rhetorician to truly challenge the efficacy of such policies. Despite this unique angle, Kelly quickly shifted his attention back to the AIM movement with his article, "Détournement, Decolonization, and the American Indian Occupation of Alcatraz Island (1969-1971)."[52] This is the first time, however, Kelly forwards the demand for decolonization as a central tenant of Native political demands, adopting the process throughout his article as "a critical methodology for reading texts in the context of colonialism and a strategic rhetoric adopted by subaltern resistance movements."[53]

The integration of decolonial language was due in large part to the efforts and scholarship of Kelly's close counterpart, Jason Edward Black, who published his first article on Native rhetoric, "Authoritarian Fatherhood: Andrew Jackson's Early Familial Lectures to America's 'Red Children,'" in 2005. Concerned with exposing the epistemological foundations of the United States' strong sense of nationalism, Black explores how Jackson's paternal rhetoric "situated American Indians in a socially subordinate position," through the rhetorical themes of "fatherly guidance, fatherly punishment, and fatherly demagoguery."[54] His analysis of how the United States continued to oppress Native populations through legal measures was developed in his scholarship concerning the Plenary Power Doctrine and the United States Supreme Court *Lone Wolf* ruling.[55]

Black truly pushed the limits of the discipline, however, in his article "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse."[56] In this text, Black forwards a decolonial analytic through which he renarrativizes the discourse surrounding the removal of the Five Civilized Tribes from the southeastern United States, giving voice to Native resistance strategies that delayed their removal. By coding Native discourse as decolonial, Black attempts to imbue these rhetorical strategies with an agency previously overlooked by rhetorical scholars. In 2017, Black expanded this project with his book *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment*, which sketched his vision of decolonization as an analytic that can be utilized by future rhetorical scholars.

In 2018, the discipline took a collective step forward with the publication of Black and Kelly's edited book, *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-*

Determination. Containing contributions from Lake, Stuckey, Black, Endres, and Kelly, and several other scholars, the text attempts to rhetorically analyze issues such as Native humor, art, battlefield memorials, and resistance to the Dakota Access Pipeline.[57] Though this exploration of the field's previous contributions is by no means exhaustive, chapter two will return to select texts outlined in the form of an extensive critique. In addition to the texts and authors outlined in this section, there exists an entire corpus of literature authored by and focused on Native communities, generated within Indigenous Studies departments and grassroots organizations located throughout Turtle Island. While this chapter does not permit for a full exploration of this body of literature, such texts will be heavily relied upon throughout the rest of this thesis.

Preview

The remainder of this chapter will highlight the content of future chapters and the various methods of analysis embedded within each. In chapter two, I will lay the foundation for my critique of rhetoricians previously concerned with Native communities. Returning to the scholars aforementioned, I will outline several ways in which they have misunderstood and misrepresented Native communities and their political objectives. This chapter is not meant to suggest that one should disavow the entirety of their efforts as rhetoricians, but to illuminate the historical trajectory of a field in desperate need of revision.

This process will require reading previous works simultaneously as individual texts and as a larger, undifferentiated body of literature. Structured in chronological fashion, I will start with Lake's scholarship before moving through the scholarship of those that followed, noting how once innocuous misperceptions became foundational

characteristics of our field. There will be three major critiques forwarded throughout the chapter. First, despite the recent proliferation of articles concerned with Native communities, the field has maintained an exceptionally narrow focus, often concerned exclusively with the Ghost Dance era or the Red Power era. Second, despite the vibrant and growing field of Indigenous studies, rhetoricians rarely reference or cite such intellectuals. This criticism not only posits that citational practices are integral for maintaining the academic integrity of rhetoric's contributions to academia, but also argues that the lack of engagement with Native academics leads rhetoricians to detrimentally skew inherently Native concepts such as decolonization. Third, there remains little engagement, on the part of rhetoricians, with their own subject location as settlers when contemplating Native politics. Such an oversight stands in direct contrast to popular Native texts that demands scholars recognize their institutional privilege and contributes to rhetoric's misconceptions of decolonization.

In light of the criticisms outlined in chapter two, the remainder of this thesis will turn its attention to the construction of a decolonial materialist rhetoric. However, this process will not simply sketch the contours of a decolonial materialist rhetoric. Rather, it will attempt to perform the process of enacting a decolonial materialist rhetoric over the course of both chapter three and chapter four. Chapter three will begin by taking Robert L. Ivie and Oscar Giner's *Hunt the Devil: A Demonology of US War Culture* as its object of study. Throughout the text, Ivie and Giner analyze the United States' historical militarized relationship with Indigenous nations. Embedded in their criticism is a search for the mythic figures of the Devil and the Trickster, two entities that dialectically stoke and restrain the body politic's war-like nature. In criticizing this book, chapter three will

set out to establish several arguments. First, Ivie and Giner's conflicted attachments to democratic governance ensure the violence system's survival. While they repeatedly recognize its destructive nature, the authors remain unable to abandon their redemptive project in favor of tribal models of governance. Second, Ivie and Giner fundamentally misunderstand the generative forces that sustain the Devil and the Trickster. In contrast to their focus on democracy, I focus primarily on the settler as the root of settler colonial violence. Finally, I provide a counter narrative that reconfigures one's conception of the Trickster, opening up new avenues for how Native populations may resist the United States' militarized impulses.

However, the unique value of this chapter is not confined solely to the criticism of Ivie and Giner's scholarship. Rather, it is located in the process that generates my criticism and ultimately serves as an epistemological break from normalized methods of conducting rhetorical criticism. Despite the discipline's insistence that new rhetorical scholarship give deference to its predecessors, I strive to demonstrate how rhetorical criticism can be generated outside of our field. In essence, I illuminate how scholars beyond our department develop tools that should be imported and disseminated within the discipline to push the boundaries of what is coded as rhetorical criticism.

Such a model of rhetorical criticism would remain incomplete, however, absent an account of the scholar's role in the production of their criticism. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, for too long rhetoricians have been content with a disembodied approach to analyzing Native communities and the discourse they produce. Chapter four, in response, advocates for rhetoricians to transcend their current efforts in the hope of sealing the chasm between theory and action. This chapter will proceed in two related

sections. The first will challenge the isolated nature of rhetorical critics. This is not simply an indictment that presumes rhetoricians forego conversations with academics beyond their field. Rather, it will explore how the bounded notion of the discipline inhibits the spread of rhetorical methods of criticism to complimentary disciplines, such as Indigenous Studies. The second section of this chapter will explore the impact produced when one connects their scholarship to their lived realities. Drawing inspiration from Native activists, I will demonstrate how these activists use their experiences as a constructive force, adding new layers of analysis to their texts. Chapter five will serve as a moment of reflection, assessing the merits and possible shortcomings of this project. Finally, I will highlight possible avenues for future research.

Notes

1. Barbara Biesecker, "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation from within the Thematic of *Difference*," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 22 (1989): 110-130.; Dana L. Cloud, "The Materiality of Discourse as Oxymoron: A challenge to Critical Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Communication* 58 (1994): 141-163.; Michael Calvin McGee, "Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture," *Western Journal of Communication* 54 (1990): 274-289.; Raymie E. McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Communication Monographs* 56 (1989): 91-111.

2. Chandni Desai, Eric Ritskes, and Aman Sium, "Towards the 'Tangible Unknown': Decolonization and the Indigenous Future," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education &*Society 1 (2012): I-XIII; Ronald Walter Greene, "Another Materialist Rhetoric," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15 (1998): 21-41.

3. Greene, "Another Materialist Rhetoric," 21.

4. Jason Edward Black, *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2015), 7.

5. Black, *Removal and Allotment*, 6.

6. Sandy Grande, *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political* Thought, rev. ed. (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 1.

7. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, "Land as Pedagogy: Nishnaabeg Intelligence and Rebellious Transformation," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3 (2014): 21.

8. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Introduction: Born Under the Rising Sign of Social Justice," in *Toward What Justice?: Describing Diverse Dreams of Justice in Education*, eds. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (New York: Routledge, 2018), 9.

9. See Chapter Two's discussion of Decolonization for further examples.

10. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1 (2012): 2.

11. John Borrows, "Frozen Rights in Canada: Constitutional Interpretation and the Trickster," *American Indian Law Review* 22 (1997): 40.

12. Greene, "Another Materialist Rhetoric," 32.

13. Greene, “Another Materialist Rhetoric,” 34.

14. Greene, “Another Materialist Rhetoric,” 35.

15. Greene, “Another Materialist Rhetoric,” 35.

16. Greene, “Another Materialist Rhetoric,” 39.

17. Greene, “Another Materialist Rhetoric,” 21-22.

18. la paperson, *A Third University Is Possible* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), xv.

19. paperson, *A Third University is Possible*, 25-26.

20. paperson, *A Third University is Possible*, 27.

21. paperson, *A Third University is Possible*, 68.

22. Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” 2-3.

23. Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” 1.

24. Desai, Ritskes, and Sium, “Towards the ‘Tangible Unknown,’” 4.

25. Desai, Ritskes, and Sium, “Towards the ‘Tangible Unknown,’” 4.

26. paperson, *A Third University is Possible*, xiii.

27. Randall A. Lake, “Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69 (1983): 127-142.

28. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 128.

29. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 128.

30. Randall A. Lake, “Between myth and history: Enacting time in Native American protest Rhetoric,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 123-151.

31. Randall A. Lake, “Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in Dances with Wolves,” *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (1997): 66-89.

32. Lake, “Argumentation and Self,” 67.

33. Lake, "Argumentation and Self," 68.

34. Richard Morris and Philip Wander, "Native American Rhetoric: Dancing in the Shadows of the Ghost Dance," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76 (1990): 166.

35. Morris and Wander, "Native American Rhetoric," 185.

36. See Lake's "Between Myth and History."

37. John Sanchez and Mary E. Stuckey, "Communicating Culture Through Leadership: One View from Indian Country," *Communication Studies* 50 (1999): 103-115.

38. Sanchez and Stuckey, "Communicating Culture Through Leadership," 112.

39. John Sanchez and Mary E. Stuckey, "The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s," *Communication Quarterly* 48 (2000): 120-136.

40. Sanchez and Stuckey, "The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism," 133.

41. Danielle Endres, "Animist Intersubjectivity as Argumentation: Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute Arguments Against a Nuclear Waste Site at Yucca Mountain," *Argumentation* 27 (2013): 183-200.; Danielle Endres, "Sacred Land or National Sacrifice Zone: The Role of Values in the Yucca Mountain Participation Process," *Environmental Communication* 6 (2012): 328-345.

42. Danielle Endres, "American Indian Activism and Audience: Rhetorical Analysis of Leonard Peltier's Response to Denial of Clemency," *Communication Reports* 24 (2011): 1-11.

43. Danielle Endres, "Expanding Notions of Scientific Argument: A Case Study of the Use of Scientific Argument by American Indians," in *Communicating Science: New Agendas in Communication*, eds. LeeAnn Kahlor and Patricia Stout (New York: Routledge, 2009), 187-208.

44. Danielle Endres, "American Indian Permission for Mascots: Resistance or Complicity within Rhetorical Colonialism," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 18 (2015): 653.

45. Danielle Endres, "Location Matters: The Rhetoric of Place in Protest," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97 (2011): 257-282.

46. Casey Ryan Kelly, "Rhetorical Counterinsurgency: The FBI and the American Indian Movement," *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 10 (2007): 224.

47. Kelly, "Rhetorical Counterinsurgency," 254.

48. Casey Ryan Kelly, "Orwellian Language and the Politics of Tribal Termination (1953-1960)," *Western Journal of Communication* 74 (2010): 351-371.

49. Casey Ryan Kelly, "'We are not Free': The Meaning of <Freedom> in American Indian Resistance to President Johnson's War on Poverty," *Communication Quarterly* 62 (2014): 455-473.

50. Kelly, "'We are not Free,'" 457.

51. Casey Ryan Kelly, "Blood-Speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity," Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies 8 (2011): 240-265.

52. Casey Ryan Kelly, "Détournement, Decolonization, and the American Indian Occupation of Alcatraz Island (1969–1971)," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 44 (2014): 168-190.

53. Kelly, "Détournement," 173.

54. Jason Edward Black, "Authoritarian Fatherhood: Andrew Jackson's Early Familial Lectures to America's 'Red Children,'" *Journal of Family History* 30 (2005): 249.

55. Jason Edward Black, "Plenary Rhetoric in Indian Country: The Long Wolf v. Hitchcock Case and the Codification of a Weakened Native Character," *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 11 (2008): 59-80.

56. Jason Edward Black, "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95 (2009): 66-88.

57. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black, *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination* (New York: Peter Lang, 2018).

CHAPTER TWO

A Break from Tradition

Introduction

The prominence of Native discourse within the academic discipline of rhetoric remains a newfound interest. Despite the fact "'American Public Address' has long been an important part of the curriculum in rhetorical studies…very little of that tradition's course is generally dedicated to indigenous rhetoric."[1] Some scholars attribute this lack of attention to the convenient excuses that "authenticating such speeches can be difficult; it is hard to place indigenous rhetors in the context of hegemonic Western discourse; there are over 500 distinct nations and a multiplicity of cultures, making generalizations problematic."[2] The truth, the *uncomfortable* truth, is that the social and political exclusion of Indigenous populations within the territorial boundaries of the United States is mirrored in the epistemological and pedagogical exclusion of Indigenous knowledges within academia.[3] Rhetoric is not hampered by a lack of access to authentic Native knowledges, given the plethora of Native-authored scholarship found throughout academia, but fears lending credence to Native rhetors and knowledges that risk rupturing the foundations of rhetoric.

This chapter aims to bring about the realization of this fear by rebuking normalized modes of rhetorical criticism as it relates to Native discourse. The first step in this process requires one to journey through the archives of rhetorical criticism, challenging taken-for-granted assumptions that frame our approaches to and

understandings of Native communities; one must commit to a radical break from the status quo, excising their scholarship from rhetoric's settler colonial traditions. To accomplish this goal, I will undertake a genealogical criticism of scholarship authored by Randall A. Lake, Mary E. Stuckey, Danielle Endres, Casey Ryan Kelly, and Jason Edward Black, reading their work alongside scholarship authored by Native intellectuals. Taking up Greene's argument that one must simultaneously interrogate textual fragments and analyze texts against institutions of power, this chapter will proceed in two sections. The first section will focus on two articles penned by Lake, illuminating key arguments and themes considered integral to the discipline today. This section will primarily treat individual texts as their own objects of study, carefully evaluating the value of their arguments. The second section will turn its attention to younger rhetoricians that have assumed the mantle of Lake and Stuckey's previous projects. Ultimately, this section will approach their literature from a different angle, highlighting common themes that persist throughout and across several publications.

In the criticism that follows, two challenges are issued to the traditional manner by which rhetorical scholars analyze Native discourse. First, it challenges the scope of previous scholarship, indicting its atemporal and isolated nature. To demonstrate these claims, I will analyze the term *decolonization* as a political strategy, as outlined by Kelly and Black. Second, it unsettles the rhetorician as a neutral evaluator of Native political discourse. Turning to citational practices employed by rhetoricians, I argue that contemporary scholars actively promote their own scholarship at the expense of the Native communities they analyze. Before concluding this chapter, I will give thought to

the state of rhetoric's relationship with Native discourse today, illuminating promising paths for future research.

Foundations

In 1953, under the Eisenhower administration, Congress approved House Concurrent Resolution 108 (the Termination Act), which suggested, "Congress should, 'as quickly as possible, move to free those tribes listed from federal supervision and control and from all disabilities and limitations specifically applicable to Indians'…even though Indian cooperation may be lacking in certain cases."[4] Termination revoked what few unique rights Natives possessed, dissolving territorial claims, relocating Native families to urban cities, and undermining Native nations' status as sovereign entities by assimilating Native communities into the larger body politic. In response to this violence, twenty-six Native activists formed the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC). Founded by notable activists such as, "Gloria Emerson and Herb Blatchford (both Navajo), Clyde Warrior (Ponca from Oklahoma), Mel Thom (Paiute from Nevada), and Shirley Hill Witt (Mohawk)," the NIYC believed it could serve "as an engine for igniting local organizing, marshalling community organizing projects."[5] In 1968, the American Indian Movement (AIM) was officially founded by Russell Means, Dennis Banks, Clyde Bellecourt, and Vernon Bellecourt. As a complimentary organization to the NIYC, AIM labored to mobilize grassroots resistance movements that culminated in the infamous occupation of Alcatraz Island in 1969 and the Reoccupation of Wounded Knee in 1973.

A decade following the spectacle at Wounded Knee, while a professor at the University of Southern California, Randall A. Lake published his first article related to Native communities in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, titled "Enacting Red Power: The

Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric."[6] Fascinated by the Red Power movement's circulation of "militant" rhetoric, Lake "argues for [an] alternative perspective," that recognizes the audience of AIM's rhetoric as Native communities rather than settler populations.[7] This new perspective is meant to redeem the intrinsic value of Native protest rhetoric previously perceived as ineffective when circulated amongst white populations. However, it is evident Lake's foray into Native politics is hampered by his disembodied relation to his object of study. This article suffers from two methodological shortcomings. First, the crux of Lake's contribution relies on the implicit disavowal of white spectatorship, evacuating his analysis of any sustainable value. Second, Lake fundamentally misconstrues the relationship between language and identity, creating a hostile framework that undermines Native protest rhetoric.

The primary thrust of this article is revealed in Lake's claim that, "Most Red Power rhetoric is directed at movement members and other Indians for purposes of gathering the like-minded, and is addressed only secondarily to the white establishment."[8] Turning to the consummatory aspects of ritual self-address, Lake sketches Native protest rhetoric as a privileged form of communication, which contains meanings that escape settler consciousness. Given this interpretation, Lake's scholarship becomes bifurcated by two competing claims. On one hand, Lake's argument is meant to be received by a Native audience that he admits already understands the linguistic and generative nuances of ritual self-address. On the other, Lake presents his argument to a white audience that he concedes maintains no interest in respecting the value of Native discourse; this lack of interest is the very exigency Lake details to justify his criticism.

This dilemma leaves one with the following question: what intended function is this article meant to serve?

As is made evident by Russell Means' statement, "I don't really care whether my words reach whites or not," AIM was not primarily concerned with white spectators' opinions of their discourse.[9] While recognizing that Native protest rhetoric is not produced for the benefit of white audiences, Lake continues to position himself as a white intermediary, a translator responsible for interpreting Native concepts on behalf of the white citizenry. Taking more of an anthropological approach, a tactic widely resented by Native communities,[10] Lake invites himself to analyze and expose the true essence of tribal ritual discourse. However, for Lake to transcend the circular logic that enframes his argument, his scholarship would need to proscribe a method by which white audiences could attune themselves to the demands of Native protestors. Unfortunately, when this moment presents itself, Lake only reiterates his self-congratulatory claim that "This essay has examined the tension between a Native American worldview and the putative constraints that are placed on protest rhetoric directed to the American government and public."[11]

In the conclusion of his article, Lake avers, "Failure to acknowledge this worldview leads to the condemnation of Native American protest rhetoric for alienating white audiences."[12] If this statement is true, the reader is left to determine who maintains the burden of overcoming the current ideological divide between Natives and settlers. Lake, predictably, opts for the former. Gesturing to previous rhetorical theories of protest authored by Richard Gregg and Robert Cathcart, Lake suggests his analysis provides Native rhetors with the tools to finally influence white audiences. First, he liberates

Native protest rhetoric from the burden of acknowledging "guilt and complicity with the corrupt establishment," recognizing, "Indian militants deny that they have ever been part of our society or that they are in any sense guilty of sustaining it."[13] Second, he attempts to recharacterize Native calls for "withdrawal from whites," as a successful strategy.[14] However, he instantly reverses his position, alleging withdrawal "perpetuates the conditions of life which white assistance could ameliorate. Enactment does not eliminate the realities of abject poverty, poor health, low educational achievement, and premature death."[15] This disavowal of ritual self-address, as a vehicle for resistance in its own right, is further substantiated by Lake's assertion, "Realistically, the support of both whites and Indians may be required if the Red Power movement is to achieve its goals."[16] Ultimately, Lake presents readers with a confusing and often contradictory set of advocacies. While the majority of the article advocates for Native protest rhetoric as a consummatory model of dialogue, he concludes, with the air of one resigned to an unfortunate reality, that such dialogue is useless unless valued by white audiences; a reality, he concedes, not likely to materialize given "militant Indians have chosen tradition."[17]

The second methodological flaw pertains to section two of Lake's article. Highlighting the Red Power movement's turn to the "Old Ways," Lake establishes, "Two restrictions concerning the nature of human action and the capacities of language suggest that Native American protest rhetoric, when seen from its own metaphysical viewpoint, is not addressed primarily to whites."[18] Each will be analyzed independently. The first restriction argues language's capacity as an agent of change is limited by cultural boundaries, implying "The ability of language to exert such influence is circumscribed in

Indian metaphysics, wherein the experiential character of all knowledge is emphasized."[19] Arguing that rhetoric based in experience evacuates the "persuasive capacities of language," Lake concludes humans lack the "ability to influence others."[20] This logic prompts one to question the logical coherence of the remainder of Lake's article. Primarily, it creates an overly restrictive framework in which every individual's unique set of experiences renders communicate on impossible in an interpersonal setting. Lake's description of Wintu as an experiential linguistic system, in conjunction with his claim "Between 1,000 and 2,000 Indian languages exist in North and South America, all of which are mutually unintelligible," forecloses the possibility of pan-Indigenous political organizing.[21] Obviously, Lake's understanding of linguistics is not reflective of reality. The mere existence of AIM, an organization founded by Native leaders of different nations, and its successful organization of the Trail of Broken Treaties disproves Lake's argument. Interestingly, if one were to agree with Lake, the logical extreme of his argument presumes that Lake is incapable of influencing his readers, who lack access to his experiential knowledge.

The second restriction Lake details assumes a context in which language *can* exert persuasive power across cultural boundaries yet fails due to the historical misuse of language by white rhetors. Exploiting the difference between the predominant use of written and oral traditions, Lake argues that any Native contact with settler linguistics remains "dangerous."[22] Such analysis presents three problems for Lake. First, it implicates the efficacy of his scholarship as a written artifact. If contact between settler and Native societies is potentially harmful, then his uninvited interpolation of their resistance tactics for settlers to comprehend constitutes an act of violence. Lake goes on

to devalue his own text, reiterating that Native audiences should remain skeptical of white authors by citing a 1787 Delaware Chief who "charged: 'There is no faith to be placed in their words.'"[23]

Second, Lake's analysis presents a romanticized view of Native communities in which everyone has access to their traditional culture. Ignoring the historical repercussions of institutions like the Carlisle schools, Lake fails to account for the vast number of Native activists that only have access to the English language. When Lake *does* assume Native engagement with English, he alludes to the idea that Natives simply lack the capacity to grasp its nuances. Ultimately, Lake's view ascribes to the belief that Native populations either remain too dated to communicate with white society, or, barring that interpretation, are unable to match the wits of those "foxy" white people who are "so smart with words."[24]

Finally, Lake demonstrates his own misguided relationship to rhetorical systems of settler antagonisms, repeatedly labeling AIM members as "militants." Despite his inclusion of Russell Mean and Clyde Bellecourt's self-described return "to traditional Indian religion and its values and concepts," Lake adopts hostile rhetoric that casts AIM members as subversive threats.[25] As Kelly Young notes, overemphasizing Native resistance as militant "frames Native American acts of confrontation through stereotypical cultural and media frames that code these activists as criminal savages, which highlights the spectacular tactics rather than the cause."[26] While Lake could simply replace *militant* with *community leaders* or *elected officials,* his critique of language as "experientially confined"[27] allows him to believe such rhetorical slippages are anything but "aggressive."[28]

While Lake remains occupied justifying every possible reason Native people cannot, and just *should not*, communicate with white audiences, he obscures the reality that communication between Native and settler communities fails because white audiences maintain no interest in accurately interpellating Native protest demands. Lake, ironically, performs the most negative aspects of his criticism in this sense, applying "a majority culture critical perspective" onto a "minority culture discourse."[29] Beginning with white society's settler framework, which inherently privileges settler linguistics and devalues Native discourse, Lake is unable to appreciate instances in which Native protests shattered cross-cultural boundaries and won concessions from United States institutions. For example, Lake cites the revered Vine Deloria, Jr. as proof that linguistics are restrictive. Yet, he strategically ignores Deloria's record as a successful legal advocate for various Native nations and time as president of the National Congress of American Indians, during which time he manipulated United States legal institutions for the benefit of Native nations.

An Academic Rift

In 1990 and 1991, consecutive issues of the *Quarterly Journal of Speech* contained articles that interrogated the temporal dimensions of Native protest rhetoric. The first article, "Native American Rhetoric: Dancing in the Shadows of the Ghost Dance," was authored by Richard Morris and Philip Wander.[30] Its central thesis argues, "understanding the rhetorical efforts of Native Americans to overcome the imposition of a fundamentally mistaken identity has significant implications for our understanding of Native American rhetoric and, more broadly, of how rhetoric functions externally and internally for groups marginalized by hegemonic blocs."[31] After providing an extensive

historical examination of the events surrounding the Reoccupation of Wounded Knee, the authors turn their attention to rhetoric circulated by the protestors. The second article, titled "Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric," was authored by Lake. In this article, Lake explores Euramerican/native relations and analyzes "the temporal metaphors that" suture each group's relation to temporality.[32]

This thesis is not interested in contesting the central claims of either article or staking a claim with regard to which is the "better" of the two articles. More qualified authors, such as Vine Delora, Jr. and Mark Rifkin, have already contoured Native notions of and relations to temporality as a settler construct.[33] Additionally, Lake outlines a plethora of ways in which his scholarship aligns with similar principles endorsed by Morris and Wander's article, stating:

> Both studies examine the ways Native Americans have been silenced, their tribal identities displaced; both examine the relevance of the past to the activist diagnosis of their problems and to their solutions, noting, for example, that the 1973 siege of Wounded Knee seems grounded in the nineteenth century Ghost Dance Movement; both comment on the diverse ways in which activists attempt to revitalize their tribal identities through traditional religious practices, the reconstruction of warrior societies, and so on; both discover an activist concern to avoid secular, chronological time and restore the sacred hoop. The studies examine many of the same materials, and occasionally employ virtually the same quotations.[34]

Rather, this thesis is interested in analyzing the conflict born out between Lake and Morris and Wander throughout the endnotes of their respective articles. While Morris and Wander never explicitly attack Lake's 1983 "Enacting Red Power" in the body of their article, endnote fifteen contains a lengthy discussion in which they attempt to distinguish their work from Lake's understanding of linguistics.[35] While a majority of their criticisms are consistent with my own views of Lake's scholarship, the amount of time and space they dedicate to these issues hardly carries the pessimistic tone I have adopted. Lake

responded in kind, however, dedicating a full two pages of his conclusion to a critique of Morris and Wander and continued his indictment for another page in his endnotes.[36]

The initial tone of Lake's defense appears to approach the conflict with the possibility of reconciliation in mind, outlining the various ways "each [article] contributes to the other."[37] However, the subtext of this discussion exudes an air of aggression, rendered palpable by Lake's hostile position established in his endnotes. Primarily, he accuses Morris and Wander of failing to grasp the nuance of his analysis, stating:

> In fact, they may be more guilty than I of erecting a cultural monolith in suggesting that many if not most activists from many different tribes can address each other, using (the same?) language instrumentally to build coalitions and forge a transcendent identity; in contrast, I have taken pains to stress that the enactment of tribal traditions tends to divide the movement due to the differences among those traditions.[38]

Affectively, this defense appears sufficient. Unfortunately, Lake's claim to due diligence is tenuous at best, given his reduction of ritual analysis to solely Sioux beliefs simply because it represented "the tribal background of most AIM leaders."[39] The baffling reality, however, is that this conflict has no bearing on the actual implications of their research.

At best, this conflict represents an academic afterthought, the effects rarely registered by contemporary rhetoricians. At worst, it represents a settler mentality in which the value of Indigenous knowledges is determined by competing views issued by non-Native academics. The failure of these articles lies not in their varying opinions concerning Native temporality, but in their retreat to a form of academic one-upmanship where each author becomes more concerned with defending their text from the other's assaults. This mentality overdetermines any potential radical value each critique could

have offered real Native protest movements, directing the reader instead to evaluate the logical structure of the author's arguments.

One might regard this view as too harsh, believing Lake was right to respond to an unwarranted challenge. I would be inclined to agree with this sentiment in a different context. However, the fact that this conflict plays out in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, the discipline's most prominent journal, guaranteed that any repercussions would be felt throughout the field of rhetoric. Such an impact was immediately noticeable in Lake's article. Lake does not simply indict Morris and Wander throughout his endnotes. He reorganizes his entire conclusion, prioritizing his criticism of their text and then filters all implications through his alleged academic victory. The textual arrangement of Lake's article physically designates his discussion of Native temporality as an afterthought, valuable only by virtue of his status as the rhetorician with a superior understanding of Native discourse. If one disagrees with this characterization, the following question must be answered: Why has Lake's scholarship stood unchallenged for nearly three decades, unscathed by even a single article?

The New Vanguard

The twenty-first century brought about a renewed interest in Native discourse from rhetoricians. Believing "there is more work to be done,"[40] a select group of scholars set out to "interrogate both the continuing rhetorical legacy of colonialism as well as American Indian efforts to decolonize American political and legal discourse, mass media representations, history and public memory, and everyday discourse."[41] As the students of Lake and Stuckey became established rhetoricians in their own right, a unified corpus of literature began to cohere.

This section will strike to the center of this rhetorical project; foregoing an attempt to disarticulate the intricate web of articles and books authored by Kelly, Endres, and Black, a project that would surely prove too arduous, I will read across a select number of texts to substantiate my criticisms. I will provide three criticisms in total, embedding tactics capable of remedying the discipline's shortcomings along the way. First, I will analyze the disembodied approach adopted by most rhetoricians, noting their failure to implicate their own subject positions as settlers, even while theorizing about marginal identities. Second, I will undertake an extensive discussion of the term *decolonization* as it is deployed by rhetoricians. By drawing predominately on the scholarship of Indigenous feminist authors, I will explore the nuances of a decolonial praxis that exceed normative rhetorical analysis. Finally, I will interrogate rhetoric's relationship with Indigenous Studies and Native intellectuals, charging that the insular nature of our discipline prevents rhetoricians from formulating truly radical decolonial demands.

Disclosure

Integral to settler expansion throughout North America, accompanied by the Enlightenment's construction of humanism, was the settler's epistemological reconceptualization of Turtle Island as *terra nullius*, a land devoid of previous inhabitants.[42] Dismissal of the Native's very existence set the foundation for, and has since justified, violent systems of extraction and genocide. Beginning with the colony at Plymouth Rock, the settler's appeals to legal and religious doctrine in the new world gave rise to what Robert A. Williams terms the Doctrine of Discovery. Williams states:

> The Doctrine of Discovery and its discourse of conquest assert the West's lawful power to impose its vision of truth on non-Western peoples through racist, colonizing rule of law. In the United States, the doctrine has proved itself to be a perfect instrument of empire…[T]he discourse of conquest derived from the Doctrine of Discovery has been interpreted to permit the denial of other fundamental human rights of Indian tribal peoples in the United States. Violent suppression of Indian religious practices and traditional forms of government, separation of Indian children from their homes, whole-sale spoliation of treaty-guaranteed resources, forced assimilative programs, and involuntary sterilization of Indian women represent but a few of the practical extensions of a racist discourse of conquest.[43]

The Doctrine of Discovery quickly became constitutive of civil society, perpetuating endless violence against Indigenous populations.

It remains impossible for one to articulate a subject position that escapes settler modes of governance which abound within the territorial confines of the United States. Settler colonialism functions as a unique form of colonialism, "in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain."[44] The violent theft and continued occupation of land, as the most coveted resource of Turtle Island, inflicts "a profound epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence," on Native communities by rupturing their unique relationship to land.[45] To solidify their claim as the rightful occupants of Turtle Island, the settler is compelled to "disappear" Indigenous communities through the deconstruction of their very identity category. Simultaneously, "settler colonialism involves the subjugation and forced labor of chattel slaves, whose bodies and lives become the property, and who are kept landless."[46] Settler identity springs forth from this crucible of violence, establishing the settler as the "superior and normal" occupant of Indigenous land.[47] Bearing in mind Patrick Wolfe's poignant claim, "invasion is a

structure not an event," one is forced to acknowledge the temporal durability of this triadic relationship between the Native, settler, and slave.[48]

While the United States no longer carries out overt campaigns of genocide and enslavement against its red and black citizens, settler colonialism demands the continuation of violence in subtler forms. Acknowledgement of and resistance to these new tactics of violence has become the central theme of emerging Indigenous Studies programs. Sustained by organizations such as Minnesota Press, Duke Press, *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, and *Settler Colonial Studies*, along with several others, Native and black scholars have been able to effectively sustain critiques of United States sovereignty, anti-black policing policies, racialized modes of capitalism, and settler patriarchy. While a full account of such efforts would necessitate a larger project of study, a crucial component of such projects remains the disclosure of one's subject location within the context of their scholarship.

Within prominent texts authored by Native intellectuals, beginning with Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, exists a moment in which the author discloses their identity. For example, Smith's introduction details her position "as an indigenous woman," as defined by her "*whakapapa* or descent lines" of the Ngati Awa and urban Maori.[49] Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, throughout her career, has ensured to filter her research through her existence as a Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg woman.[50] Audra Simpson's status as a Mohawk of Kahnawà:ke informs and guides her criticisms of "nested sovereignty," recognition politics, and political anthropology.[51] Even if one's positionality does not serve as the framework for their advocacies, biographical information located on the back cover of books privileges such

associations with Native communities. For example, Glen Sean Coulthard's *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, Jodi Byrd's *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*, and Elizabeth Cook-Lynn's *A Separate Country: Postcoloniality and American Indian Nations* each confirm their statuses as Yellowknives Dene, Chickasaw, and Crow Creek Sioux, respectively, and textually arranges such information prior to their university positions.[52]

This disclosure is not a mere formality, granting Indigenous authors the right to theorize around Native issues. Rather, the act of disclosure serves as the bridge between embodied Indigenous knowledges and academic theorization that possesses the potential to impact Indigenous communities. As articulated by Smith:

> Indigenous methodologies tend to approach cultural protocols, values and behaviors as an integral part of methodology. They are 'factors' to be built into research explicitly, to be thought about reflexively, to be declared openly as part of the research design, to be discussed as part of the final results of a study and to be disseminated back to the people in culturally appropriate ways and in a language that can be understood.[53]

An often-neglected benefit of constructing criticism around one's identity, highlighted by Smith, is the generative nature of research once circulated throughout Indigenous communities. This final step necessitates researchers shift the foundational intentions of their projects from theorizing *about* Indigenous populations to theorizing *for* Indigenous populations.

Rhetoric has struggled to adopt this style of theorizing, opting for an assumed view of objectivity. Holding their objects of study at a distance, Kelly, Endres, and Black rarely, if ever, acknowledge their privilege as settlers. This shortcoming fosters a research method in which "The embodied self is bracketed and deemed irrelevant to theory."[54] As a result, white rhetoricians tend to over step their moral authority by intervening in

conflicts endemic to Native communities, criminalizing those with which they disagree. To demonstrate this claim, I analyze Kelly's "Blood-Speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity."[55]

Kelly's historical account provides a detailed description of the controversy surrounding Churchill's excommunication from academia and Suzan Harjo's rebuke of his claims to Native identity. In 2005, following accusations of academic misconduct, Churchill's self-proclaimed association with the United Keetoowah Band (UKB) of Cherokee was called into question. An outpouring of criticism quickly emanated from Indigenous communities, and many critics' sentiments could be found in editorials published consistently in *Indian Country Today*. None was more adamant than Suzan Harjo, who charged, "'in Churchill's case, he says 1/16 Cherokee although he's not been able to produce any evidence to support any claim of being any Indian of any nation.'"[56] She continued her critique of Churchill for years, citing his lack of authentic Native aesthetics and shifting claims to Cherokee, Creek, Muscogee, and Metis identity. Even the UKB issued a statement, confirming Churchill "'does not speak for the United Keetoowah Band and he is not a member of the UKB.'"[57]

Other Native academics, however, disagreed with criticisms directed at Churchill. Kim Tallbear criticized the logic of resorting to blood quantums as a metric of Native identity, arguing "the racial ideology that accompanies blood discourse conflates biological essence with cultural membership and works to the exclusion of" marginalized Native populations.[58] The conflict remained inconclusive, succeeding only in dividing Native communities. Jodi Byrd captured this feeling, expressing "he is a 'liminal figure who is invalidated or invalidating Indianness through his presence, activism, and

scholarship [that] has created a quagmire in which it is difficult to criticize or support Churchill without reproducing colonialist understandings of Indianness.'"[59] Using this division as an entry point, Kelly strives to define the parameters of "Indianness," denouncing the use of blood quantums by Native nations.

Kelly's ostensibly valuable analysis embodies a grotesque form of ally-ship that only succeeds in criminalizing Native activists seeking to protect their identity. Adopting the stance of a benevolent interlocuter, Kelly frames his article as a proverbial moment of calm amidst the maelstrom of conflict, revealing in a moment of clarity the error of those that wished to condemn Churchill. Under the auspice of "'making visible' oppressed communities," Kelly explains to Native intellectuals the possible negative ramifications blood quantums as a metric of Native identity.[60] Kelly's warning, however, completely ignores the historical construction of blood quantums, feigning as if it is the fault of Native communities for their continued implementation.

Accompanying the dawn of the twentieth century, settlers adopted assimilative strategies intended to attack the identity category of Native populations. These strategies included the creation of Rolls Systems, the establishment of blood quantums, and the enactment of termination policies.[61] Working in tandem, Rolls Systems and blood quantums physically limited the number of citizens who could claim Native identity. The rising popularity of Rolls Systems coincided with the creation of the Wallace and Kern-Clifton Rolls. Concerned with the state of citizenship of former slaves held by the Cherokee Nation, both Rolls validated the process through which the United States controlled who could claim access to Native identity. The most comprehensive and well-known Roll was finalized by the Dawes Commission in 1907. The unique contribution of

this Roll was the establishment of a "Blood Roll" and a "Freedman Roll," in which the former outlined which citizens were Cherokee by blood, while the latter established which members were Cherokee by virtue of being a descendent of former slaves.[62]

Similarly, blood quantums were forced onto Native nations, requiring that one possess a requisite amount of Native blood to claim Native identity. This simultaneously harmed Native communities while benefitting white individuals. The former was disenfranchised from their identity after intermarrying with white families, as successive generations possessed less Native blood, while the latter was granted access to Native identity through legal doctrine such as the Racial Integrity Act of 1924. Under this statute, "a white person is one with no trace of the blood of another race."[63] This phrase represents the logic of the one-drop rule, a product of racist sociality meant to maintain the purity of white blood. The end of the clause creates an exemption, however, in which, "a person with one-sixteenth of the American Indian, if there is no other race mixture, may be classified as white."[64]

In recent decades, Native communities have contested the epistemological justifications of blood quantums, reappropriating the historically unjust tool in the name of protection and survival. While Kelly exclusively views blood as "a common-sense idiom to ascribe racial identity,"[65] blood can also be viewed "as a way to preserve an already existing, closed community."[66] It is because of academics like Churchill, one who wished "to jump on the bandwagon and claim Indian heritage for their own personal gain," that nations such as the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa adopt blood quantums.[67] Given this reality, one is implored to question the value of Kelly's assault on

Native logics of preservation. What is to be gained from criminalizing those already bound by a "colonial Catch-22?"[68]

Upon closer inspection, Kelly's criticism mirrors the misguided methodologies employed by Lake's "Enacting Red Power." Concerned with protecting "well-intentioned allies, and even race traitors who may potentially advance American Indian causes," Kelly's article functions as a redemption tour for the disgraced Churchill.[69] Rather than simply accede to Native respondents that found Churchill's actions violent, an act that would ostensibly demonstrate respect for their perspective, he invests a considerable amount of energy into defending "the real contributions…of Churchill's scholarship." [70] Ultimately, Kelly dismisses those who value identity as it relates to authorship, claiming that questions of authenticity sacrifice pragmatic "coalitional politics."[71] This nod to coalitional politics replicates Lake's very claim that Native society needs the help of white communities, as if settler understandings of pragmatism ever benefitted Native communities.

Kelly's project of redemption is a necessity if he is to justify his own right to pontificate on what he believes is the essence of Native identity. If Kelly were to disavow Churchill, he would indict his own ability to be a good ally, simply advocating for Natives in lieu of "the dearth of visible Indian scholars."[72] Writing under the illusion that Native communities need white academics to speak on their behalf contributes to a model of scholarship harmful to Native intellectuals. Eliding questions of identity and authenticity within theoretical frameworks authorizes white scholars to artificially elevate the value of their scholarship to that equal to Native knowledges. When confronted by Native intellectuals that find their scholarship inaccurate, white scholars can simply

dismiss their grievances in the name of pragmatism. As such, Kelly's "whiteness of authorship" is shielded by an intellectual framework that translates his identity into "a form of authority."[73]

My solution is not to simply bar white academics from publishing scholarship about marginalized communities. I have little doubt such gatekeeping would be vehemently protested by white academics claiming they possess valuable insight into Native issues that exceed their experiences as settlers. Rather, my argument is that white academics must forefront their identity, admitting their scholarship is inflected through their experiences as settlers. This self-disclosure is not meant to denigrate the work of white academics but forces a confrontation with their "presumed entitlement and structural advantages."[74] To assist in this transformation, "Non-Native scholars writing about Native peoples…must make themselves accountable to the peoples and communities we write about and in some way with."[75]

Decolonization as an Analytic

As Black and Kelly have developed their research, they have increasingly turned to *decolonization* as the analytic through which they theorize Native forms of resistance. Black first used the term in his 2009 article, published in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse." Analyzing rhetoric generated by the "Five Civilized Tribes" in the face of Andrew Jackson's removal policies, Black avers Native nations "appropriated the government's discourse of territoriality, republicanism, paternalism, and godly authority, thus decolonizing these discourses from within."[76] As such, Black conceptualizes decolonization as "a resistive rhetoric through which subaltern groups appropriate

dominate discourses and turn them around to expose the problems and duplicity of these discourses."[77] Colloquially, decolonization allows Native groups to "talk back"[78] to government institutions.

Kelly was the next rhetorician to grapple with the concept of decolonization in his article "Détournement, Decolonization, and the American Indian Occupation of Alcatraz Island (1969-1971)." Gripped by rhetoric generated in the wake of the Indians of All Tribes' (IOAT) occupation of Alcatraz Island, Kelly "examines how subversive appropriations of Euro-American texts prompts American Indian audiences to engage in the intellectual process of decolonization."[79] Kelly's understanding of decolonization as an analytic, however, is far more nuanced than Black's original interpretation. Drawing on the scholarship of Guy Debord, Kelly classifies détournement as a necessary precondition to the realization of decolonial tactics. As a strategy of "subversive *mis*appropriation of dominant discourse," détournement serves as an intermediary channel through which rhetoricians expose the epistemological flaws of hegemonic texts in service of decolonial desires.[80] Kelly thus positions rhetoricians as agents charged with realizing the liberation of subaltern voices.

Black returned to his project concerning removal policies with the publication of *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment*. Combining his previous definition of decolonization with Kelly's explanation of détournement, Black established:

> Decolonization is the process by which those who are colonized attempt to critique the narratives 'offered from the colonizer's perspective and [instead] champion their own narratives' in order to demystify their 'master narratives.' Decolonization can also mean the contemporary scholarly and activist methods of spotlighting both colonized peoples' efforts to decolonize in their own time and contexts, and Native epistemologies…Détournement, according to Guy Debord, is about repurposing the rhetoric of those in power in order to drain the original

> language of its oppressive assaults in the service of propping up the disempowered.[81]

With this framework in mind, Black journeys through the nineteenth century identifying moments in which Native communities successfully effectuated decolonization. The parameters of *decolonization* established by Kelly and Black attempt to accommodate the efforts of rhetoricians concerned with identifying hegemonic discourse, but their project fails to account for the political nuances of decolonization as articulated by Native feminist scholars.

Central to the political project of decolonization is the rematriation of land to Indigenous communities. Smith first articulated decolonization as "a process which engages with imperialism and colonialism at multiple levels. For researchers, one of those levels is concerned with having a more critical understanding of the underlying assumptions, motivations and values which inform research practices."[82] This interpretation surely encompasses Kelly and Black's scholarship, providing cover for a variety of disciplines to contribute to Indigenous resistance strategies. However, the "big tent" model of scholarship was challenged by Native intellectuals concerned with the question, "*Who…will define the presence of sovereign Native nations in the landscape of twenty-first-century America as the First Nations struggle toward sovereignty?*"[83] Indigenous Studies and Native intellectuals responded by imbuing the term with characteristics and goals indicative of Native protest movements. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn asserted "decolonization, then, or resistance to coloniality, is not merely a process of opposition to dominance."[84] Instead, it is akin to Sandy Grande's interpretation, decolonization "is about doing."[85] The call for material action has resulted in various political projects, but the defining characteristic of decolonizing movements rests upon

"the rematriation of Indigenous land and life."[86] I believe that alongside the developing nature of Indigenous politics, rhetoricians should shift their understanding of *decolonization*, filtering their analysis through Native understandings of resistance.

Adopting a view of decolonization that orients research toward the reclamation of territorial sovereignty by Native populations transforms the manner by which rhetoricians conduct research. First, it ruptures temporal conceptions of decolonization, expanding the historical durability of particular decolonizing tactics. Too often, analysis of decolonizing tactics assume a narrow window of efficacy, deeming them a success or failure based on their immediate results. In his examination of Native resistance tactics throughout the 1830s, Black concludes, "the Choctaw, Creek, Chickasaw, and Seminole nations decolonized the Indian Removal Act."[87] The finality with which Black describes decolonization not only ignores the physical removal of the Five Civilized Tribes, but also belies the transcendent nature of decolonizing struggles as "'neither achievable nor definable, rendering it ephemeral as a goal, but perpetual as a process.'"[88]

Reconceptualizing decolonization as an enduring project premised on land return broadens the rhetorician's horizon with regard to which resistance tactics deserve analysis. Historically, an overwhelming majority of rhetorical scholarship dedicated to Native communities has privileged resistance movements prior to the 1980s, focusing on the Jacksonian era, the Ghost Dance Movement, and the Red Power era. These historical eras persist as alluring areas of study for rhetoricians because of the ease with which textual fragments from these eras can be verified. Yet, scholars remain ignorant of the political manifestations that suture atemporal resistance. While analyzing the historical connections between the Ghost Dance Movement and the Reoccupation of Wounded

Knee, Morris and Wander point to the form of resistive rhetoric as proof of the movements' similarity. They miss, however, the most obvious connection; the resistance movements were generated and sustained by the same traditional Lakota Sioux lands. While they focus on the rhetorical nuances of reclaiming sovereignty, they fail to grasp how the prior reclamation of territory serves as a precursor, a well from which this discourse springs forth. In essence, land becomes the generating force responsible for resistive discourse. Contemporary movements demonstrate the existence of struggles rhetoricians should explore moving forward. Exclusively analyzing resistance movements of past generations concretizes the impression that Native communities have simply accepted the United States' decimation of Native sovereignty; this view is obviously mistaken.

In 2014, the federal government approved a permit, allowing Dakota Access to construct a "1,172 mile, 3.78-billion-dollar," oil pipeline.[89] By 2016, the Sioux Standing Rock Reservation was the focus of national media attention as Indigenous water protectors worked in tandem to prevent construction of the pipeline. The impetus for this pan-Indigenous grassroots movement was the energy project's redirection "to cross the Missouri River near the Standing Rock Indian Reservation…citing the original location,"[90] of Bismarck, North Dakota "as a 'high consequence area.'"[91] Once again, activists located at Standing Rock adopted rhetorics of resistance rooted in the space they sought to defend. While specific images of the Ghost Dance were not invoked, several tactics relied on attempts to draw parallels between the present moment and earlier conflicts. When criticizing the United States' militaristic response, Native intellectual Kim Tallbear remarked, "'they did that in the 19th century, they did that in the 16th

century…This is not new…The contemporary tactics used against Indigenous people might look a little bit more complex or savvy, but to me, I can read it all as part of a longstanding colonial project.'"[92] Central to the water proctors' demands was not simply a call for the United States' recognition of Native rhetoric, but a broader desire for land return and the restoration of sovereignty. Current-day Native protest movements demand the attention of rhetoricians. Rather than replay tired criticisms of movements long expired, rhetoricians should struggle to understand and extend the influences of Native movements that strive for the betterment of their communities today. I will return to this subject throughout Chapter 4 for further analysis.

Citation Practices

The question yet remains, what sustains the disconnect between rhetoricians and Native intellectuals when theorizing decolonization? The mere existence of Indigenous Studies' scholarship would suggest rhetoricians have easy access to scholarship informed by the very worldviews they wish to discuss. In the analysis that follows, I argue this ideological chasm persists because of citational practices commonly employed by Lake, Stuckey, Kelly, Endres, and Black. Citation exceeds its normalized function as academic due diligence, acting "as a rather successful reproductive technology."[93] Citational practices, effectively, define the parameters of what discourse is acceptable within a discipline, codifying which epistemological frameworks are worth reinforcing in future publications. The current citational model endorsed by rhetoricians engaging Native discourse fosters a dogmatic arena that securitizes against challenges to predominant views of such scholarship. This defensive stance is part-and-parcel of a larger project, of

which all five rhetoricians I have outlined are complicit, to promote the scholarship of white academics at the expense of the intellectuals they theorize about.

Here I return to the question, "Why has Lake's scholarship concerning Native temporality remained the benchmark for rhetorical theorizations concerning Native culture?" Why has this honor eluded numerous Native authors that conducted such criticisms in the decades preceding and following Lake? The unspoken reality is that contemporary rhetoricians stood to gain more by circulating scholarship endemic to their discipline than by maintaining fidelity to Native knowledges; even a cursory investigation of the articles I have interrogated so far demonstrate the manner by which rhetoricians promote their own work. Lake began this tradition in his 1991 "Myth and History." While responding to Morris and Wander, Lake asserts, "this essay corroborates earlier findings that much Native American protest rhetoric is not simply instrumental *but also* consummatory in purpose."[94] Ironically, Lake exclusively cites his 1983 "Enacting Red Power" as this corroborating evidence. Since this time, rhetoricians have viewed Lake as a pioneer of Native issues in rhetoric. Mary E. Stuckey and John Sanchez's "The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s," and "Communicating Culture through Leadership: One View from Indian Country," cite Lake's scholarship a combined fifteen times.[95] Nearly every article published by Kelly, Endres, and Black, in some manner, cites Lake as foundational scholarship upon which they expand. Similarly, these authors cite each other incessantly. For example, Endres' "American Indian Permission for Mascots: Resistance or Complicity within Rhetorical Colonialism?" is nearly identical to Black's "The 'Mascotting' of Native America: Construction, Commodity, and Assimilation."[96] The article begins by drawing on Black's (warrantless)

assertion that "'the mascotting of American Indian culture further perpetuates white hegemony," and continues to cite Black another twelve times.[97] Further in the article, Endres acknowledges the academic efforts of "Black, Casey Kelly, Stuckey, Randall Lake, and others," and shoves every Native-centered article previously published into the same footnote.[98]

Black continued Lake's model of self-referential citation, proliferating his previous articles throughout every new text he authored. Additionally, his first book, *Removal and Allotment*, is literally covered in the praise of his contemporaries. The back cover of his text proudly displays gracious quotes from Stuckey, Kelly, *and* Endres, dubbing the text "an important resource for scholars of American Indian and American national history, decolonialism, and political rhetoric."[99] Kelly even went so far as to author a book review of Black's text in the *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, proclaiming "*Removal and Allotment* has the potential to shape future scholarly conversations not only on American Indian resistance rhetoric, but also on theories of citizenship, decoloniality, and the politics of racial identity in U.S. public culture."[100] Even the Acknowledgement of his "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse," the precursor to his book, explicitly thanks Stuckey for providing the article with direction. While I have no doubt Stuckey's feedback was integral to the article's success, it remains a curious trend that no one gives thanks to Sanchez, Stuckey's Apache co-author.

An Indict of Postcolonial Rhetoric

One might characterize my previous critique as inconsequential; of course scholars cite other academics that write about similar issues. My argument exceeds this defense. My claim is that when given the option to cite or acknowledge the contributions of Native academics, rhetoricians make an active choice to forego their contributions, frequently turning to competing academic disciplines that seek to denigrate the efforts of Native scholars. To substantiate this criticism, I turn to Black's *Removal and Allotment*. While I will set aside my lengthy list of grievances with this text for the sake of brevity, I wish to interrogate the theoretical framework through which he establishes his understanding of decolonial strategies. Black establishes this framework early in his introduction, and to ensure I provide the full context for my criticism, I will quote him at length. Black states:

> Colonization is a foundational framework for the analysis of Native and governmental discourse that follows. Reading texts with such a framework is part of a much larger project in the humanities. Accordingly, Raka Shome notes that this 'postcolonial condition' attends to the tragedies of colonization by exposing 'the imperialism of Western discourses.' Colonization, to borrow from Derek Buescher and Kent Ono, begins when 'colonizers appropriate land, conquer indigenous people, and found colonialist governments to oversee the efficient operation of property and labor…[They then] teach the colonized the language, logic, and history of the colonizer.' Postcolonial studies examines the ways in which these hierarchical relationships functioned over time and continue to function through issues beyond labor and territory.[101]

There are a variety of issues present just within this passage that prevent Black from conducting an accurate analysis of Native discourse.

The first methodological flaw is revealed in his adoption of *colonialism* as a descriptor of United States governance. Drawing from the research of non-Native rhetoricians, as opposed to Native authors, Black eviscerates key distinctions that

separate *colonialism* from *settler colonialism*. As Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang argue in "Decolonization is not a Metaphor," colonialism operates upon the dialectical models of external and internal colonialism. External colonialism describes techniques of violence by which the metropole exerts physical force against the colony in the form of military occupation and resource extraction. Internal colonialism, by contrast, manifests in "the biopolitical and geopolitical management of people, land, flora and fauna within the 'domestic' borders of the imperial nation."[102] Settler colonialism functions in a unique manner by eliminating the spatial barrier between the colony and metropole, implementing techniques of internal and external colonialism simultaneously. This violent form of governance continues to affect Indigenous populations of Turtle Island uniquely via violent schooling practices, resource extraction, ecological devastation, and the imposition of a reservation system.

The second methodological flaw lies in Black's turn to postcolonial theory as a remedy to settler colonial antagonisms. Postcolonial theory fails to account for the unique relationship between settler and Native populations throughout Turtle Island because of its temporal characteristics. The complimentary analytics of colonialism and postcolonialism assumes a temporal narrative in which progress is possible; it assumes a time in which the identity of the colonized can radically change, no longer overdetermined by their subordination to the colonizer. The United States has never known such progress. It has always been and continues to be a settler colonial nation premised on the devaluation and extermination of Native life. If Black believes otherwise, I would urge him to locate a Native academic that shares such views.

Black's adoption of postcolonial theory is especially problematic given his reliance on Raka Shome. Postcolonial theory was an emergent academic interest of critical scholars in the early 1990s. Heavily contested by decolonial literature and challengers of the "post-" turn in critical theory, postcolonial theory originally struggled to gain purchase within previously established disciplines. Shome staked her claim within the growing field in "Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An 'Other' View."[103] Relying heavily on Gayatri Spivak's scholarship, Shome attempts to combine methodological approaches endemic to postcolonial theory and rhetoric. Her work, however, fails to accurately describe political relations between Native and settler communities in the United States and often denigrates the very decolonizing movements Black seeks to recuperate.

In the first half of her article, Shome sketches three perspectives that contribute to postcolonialism: discursive imperialism, hybrid and diasporic cultural identities, and postcolonial academic self-reflexivity. While outlining her theory of discursive imperialism, Shome states, "Whereas in the past, imperialism was about controlling the 'native' by colonizing her or him territorially, now imperialism is more about subjugating the 'native' by colonizing her or him discursively."[104] This sentiment is a mirror image of Black's view of colonization. The temporal distinction between territorial and discursive colonization elides the manner by which settler colonialism shapes our everyday modes of spatial inhabitance and induces settlers to believe that they have progressed beyond their violent past. Shome's exclusive focus on the discursive power of the United States' media coheres an intellectual project that foregoes the necessity of land return. Accepting

the established presence of United States sovereignty, Shome urges "natives" to carve out space within a hostile environment, rather than fight to upend that environment.

Shome continues to preach passivity throughout her discussion of cultural hybridity and diasporic identity. In order to confront hegemonic discourse, Shome advocates for Native communities to work through the cultural intersections they inhabit as both Native subjects and United States citizens. In the following section, Shome attacks the cultural integrity of Native activists, asserting, "taking refuge in a pre-Western past and indigenous traditions as a source for articulating identities is a 'native chauvinism' that…rearticulates the binary of 'us' versus 'them.'"[105] This passage alone exemplifies her disregard for decolonizing strategies as generated within Native communities and echoes Lake's implication that Native people should just accept the presence of settler society.

Independent of my criticisms of Shome, Native intellectuals have clearly established their disdain for postcolonial theory. Jodi Byrd's *Transit of Empire* criticizes postcolonial scholars that perceive American Indian studies "as a nativist project," turning instead "to the potential liberatory spaces of cosmopolitanism and diasporic movements."[106] Byrd continues to dismantle the postcolonial tradition, arguing postcolonial texts "demonstrate a colonialist trace that continues to prevent indigenous peoples from having agency to transform the assumptions within postcolonial and poststructuralist conversations."[107] la paperson, a non-Indigenous scholar, picks up this critical thread in *A Third University is Possible*, boldly stating, "The word *postcolonial* is disappointing as far as bringing about decolonization and is at best shorthand for the complexities of contemporary colonial crap."[108] Explicitly indicting the temporal

assumptions of postcolonialism, la paperson continues, "Posts+ are not 'exit signs' from colonialism."[109] No critique is more thorough, however, than that articulated by Elizabeth Cook-Lynn.

In *A Separate Country*, Cook-Lynn interrogates postcolonial theory, providing a nuanced criticism of academics that endorse the analytic within the context of the United States. Postcolonial theory, in her view, functions by "dazzle-ing" misguided academics who hope for an easy "end to the sprawling aggression of colonialism and resistance to it."[110] This dream, however, is academically irresponsible, as it induces scholars to ignore the cultural nuances of decolonial movements and collapses "various locations so that specificities of all of them are blurred."[111] This is realized in Shome's scholarship, in which she writes about an undifferentiated "native," yet gives no thought to the differences between Indigenous populations of Canada and the United States. Ultimately, Cook-Lynn avers, "[Postcolonialism] relies on the status quo or empirical history rather than substantive change in the relationship between colonists and indigenes."[112]

Given the overwhelming contempt for postcolonial theory that emanates from Native intellectuals, why does Black continue to frame it as the cornerstone of his scholarship? The convenient answer may be that he is simply unaware of the scholarship I have isolated. A cursory glance of his endnotes would suggest Vine Deloria, Jr. is one of the few Native scholars with which he is familiar. However, even a quick search for indicts of postcolonial theory provides one with a veritable mountain of contrarian views; not to mention the fact that Byrd and Cook-Lynn's books are considered germinal texts in Indigenous Studies and were published three years before Black's book. The harsh reality is that Black can not afford to cite or recognize the efforts of Native intellectuals that

indict postcolonialism without implicating his entire academic corpus. Shome's scholarship is not simply the cornerstone of *Removal and Allotment* but has guided the development of several of Black's academic texts.[113] While the criticism seems targeted to Black's scholarship specifically, one should not be fooled into believing such citational problems do not extend to Kelly and Endres as well. Endres' "American Indian Permission for Mascots," cites Shome alongside Buescher and Ono, investing in the same postcolonial frame as Black's *Removal and Allotment*.[114] Similarly, Kelly's "Occupation of Alcatraz Island," cites Shome in the same endnote as Black, Endres, and Stuckey.[115] While one might have been able to minimize the influence of Shome's scholarship by claiming it was contained to Black's theorization of decolonization, the proliferation of her article throughout the discipline signals the urgency with which this must be confronted.

In light of this criticism, one must concede citational practices radically alter the nature of a discipline's development. Internalizing this truth, rhetoricians simply have to do better with regard to conducting genuine engagement with Indigenous intellectuals. At times, rhetoricians must make the hard choice to sacrifice the promotion of their own discipline in favor of Indigenous literature. This sacrifice goes beyond simply replacing the cites of rhetoricians with an indistinguishable list of Native names but demands that rhetoricians take the time to research and understand the epistemological nuances that contour Indigenous Studies. Most importantly, it requires that rhetoricians respect the enactment of traditional Native identities, renouncing those that would call for their dissolution.

The Discipline Today

In 2018, the discipline took a step forward with the publication of Black and Kelly's edited book *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*. Composed of articles authored by Lake, Stuckey, Kelly, Endres, Black, and several other scholars, the text rhetorically analyzes issues such as Native humor, art, battlefield memorials, and resistance to the Dakota Access Pipeline. As proof that I am not entirely pessimistic about rhetoric's relationship to Native discourse, I found several articles in this text to be extremely insightful. Catherine Palczewski's "Women at the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument: Remapping the Gendered/Sexed Circumference of Memory," beautifully synthesizes a Burkean scenic analysis with Mishuana Goeman's theory of (re)mapping to rupture "the scenic circumference imposed on the space by the dominance of the battlefield story," revealing the presence of women in a traditionally masculine setting.[116] Similarly, Margret McCue-Enser's "Intersectional Rhetoric and the Perversity of Form: Ada Deer's Confirmation Statement as Resistive Rhetoric," explores the resistive potential of Native feminist rhetoric, demonstrating how such rhetoric can challenge institutional logics "from within the very institutions that administer them."[117] Finally, Kelly Young's "The Rhetorical Persona of the Water Protectors: Anti-Dakota Pipeline Resistance with Mirror Shields," explicates how "Lakota environmental and cultural philosophies…offered a powerful mode of collective agency for the protestors," by challenging the United States' militarization of Lakota Sioux lands.[118] Each of these articles illuminates subtle ways in which rhetoricians can align themselves with Native demands, giving voice to their movements within a hostile setting.

Despite the valuable contributions of the text's various authors, the volume exudes an air of hesitancy, noticeable in the book's larger intellectual framework. The foreword, authored by Stuckey, constructs a rhetorical framework in which authenticity is held in a perpetual state of liminality. Parroting Kelly's criticism of authenticity in "Blood-Speak," Stuckey concludes "the question…is a messy one, involving thorny issues of blood quantum," which can not be resolved by the current project.[119] Foregoing the advocacy of Native intellectuals, which pleads with rhetoricians to allow Native communities to decide such questions on their own, Stuckey endorses Black's complication of authenticity embedded in debates over "mascoting."[120] Thus, Stuckey again equalizes the value of criticism authored by white rhetoricians with that of Native scholars. Stuckey's closing thoughts hedge back against the project of decolonization before the book even begins, leaving readers with "the question of whether indigenous rhetoric can ever be truly decolonial when North American (and other) nations continue to perpetuate colonial relations with Native nations?"[121]

Similarly, Black and Kelly remain hesitant to endorse a politics of land rematriation. Throughout the introduction, Black and Kelly forward their desire to fulfill Darrell Allen Wanzer's project to epistemically delink rhetoric from settler colonialism. At the crucial moment, however, they shy away from questions of land return and instead rely on Black's previous method of "spotlighting" discursive forms of resistance.[122] This framework privileges a temporally restricted view of decolonial tactics, freeing Black and Kelly from the tasking effort of manifesting linkages between disparate historical movements, and weakens the radical potential of decolonial demands. By assuming Native communities are already etched into the fabric of American society, integral to its

historical development, Black and Kelly foreclose the possibility of a future in which decolonization can be actualized. Selectively quoting Glen Sean Coulthard, Black and Kelly frame settler colonialism as an abstract set of antagonisms, eliding the effects of structural dispossession experienced by Native communities. Ultimately, they remain unwilling to adopt Coulthard's radical demand

> That we begin to collectively redirect out struggles a*way* from a politics that seeks to attain a conciliatory form of settler-state recognition for Indigenous nations toward a *resurgent politics of recognition* premised on self-actualization, direct action, and the resurgence of cultural practices that are attentive to the subjective and structural composition of settler-colonial power.[123]

Instead, Black and Kelly retreat to the comfort of Raka Shome's scholarship,[124] which recommends to Coulthard one should not hold "onto some notion of an indigenous cultural or national identity."[125]

In the extensive criticism that I have outlined throughout this chapter, it has not been my intent to foreclose the possibility of radical change within the discipline; quite the opposite. It is my belief that such issues can be remedied by a reorientation to the very communities rhetoricians proclaim to assist. Rather than dig one's heels in when confronted by Native intellectuals, rhetoricians should demonstrate deference to their perspective. Rather than cling to outdated theorizations of coloniality, rhetoricians should adopt conceptions of settler colonialism as they relate specifically to Indigenous populations of Turtle Island. The following chapter provides a model of how scholarship can be approached and constructed while respecting the various complaints aforementioned.

Notes

1. Mary E. Stuckey, "Foreword: The Questions of Decolonization," in *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, eds. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black (New York: Peter Lang, 2018), xi.

2. Stuckey, "Foreword," xi.

3. While I predominately target my critiques at the United States and its resulting colonial institutions, Mishuana Goeman reminds us of the ways in which these criticisms can be applied on a grander scale. Goeman states,"Academics have too often separated the Native policies of Canada and the United States and not explored junctures of power that support ongoing spatial violence. I contend that, while we must scrutinize the particularities around how each nation-state has incorporated and expunged Natives, and must do so at the local scale as well, it is also important to examine how inflicted violence supported suppression and colonization *throughout the Americas.*" See Mishuana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 21.

4. Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States* (Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 2014), 173-174.

5. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 181-182.

6. Randall A. Lake, "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69 (1983): 127-142.

7. Lake, "Enacting Red Power," 128.

8. Lake, "Enacting Red Power," 128.

9. Randall A. Lake, "Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 141.

10. Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indigenous Manifesto* (New York: Avon, 1969), 83-104.; Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2014), 95-114.

11. Lake, "Enacting Red Power," 140-141.

12. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 141.

13. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 142.

14. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 142.

15. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 142.

16. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 142.

17. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 142.

18. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 133.

19. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 133.

20. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 134.

21. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 138.

22. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 135.

23. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 134.

24. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 135.

25. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 129.

26. Kelly Young, “The Rhetorical Persona of the Water Protectors: Anti-Dakota Pipeline Resistance with Mirror Shields,” in *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, eds. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black (New York: Peter Lang, 2018), 270.

27. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 134.

28. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 134.

29. Lake, “Enacting Red Power,” 141.

30. Richard Morris and Phillip Wander, “Native American Rhetoric: Dancing in the Shadows of the Ghost Dance,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76 (1990): 164-191.

31. Morris and Wander, “Native American Rhetoric,” 166.

32. Lake, “Between Myth and History,” 125.

33. Vine Deloria, Jr., *God is Red: A Native View of Religion*, 3rd ed. (Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum Publishing, 2003), 61-76.; Mark Rifkin, *Beyond Settler Time: Temporal Sovereignty and Indigenous Self-Determination* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2017).

34. Lake, “Between Myth and History,” 139.

35. Morris and Wander, “Native American Rhetoric,” 188.

36. Lake, “Between Myth and History,” 139-141, 145-146.

37. Lake, “Between Myth and History,” 139.

38. Lake, “Between Myth and History,” 145.

39. Lake, “Between Myth and History,” 135.

40. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black, “Introduction: Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric,” in *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, eds. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black (New York: Peter Lang, 2018), 6.

41. Kelly and Black, “Introduction,” 5.

42. Pal Ahluwalia, “When Does a Settler Become a Native? Citizenship and Identity in a Settler Society,” *Pretexts: Literary and Cultural Studies* 10 (2001): 64-65.

43. Robert A. Williams, Jr., *The American Indian in Western Legal Thought: The Discourses of Conquest* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 325-326.

44. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1 (2012): 5.

45. Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” 5.

46. Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” 6.

47. Tuck and Yang, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” 6.

48. Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1999), 2.

49. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 2nd ed. (New York: Zed Books, 2012), 12-13.

50. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

51. Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*, 11.

52. Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).; Jodi Byrd, *Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).; Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country: Postcoloniality and American Indian Nations* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2012).

53. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 15-16.

54. George Yancy, "Whiteness and the Return of the Black Body," *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 19 (2005): 215.

55. Casey Ryan Kelly, "Blood-Speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity," *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 8 (2011): 240-265.

56. Kelly, "Blood-Speak," 251.

57. Kelly, "Blood-Speak," 242.

58. Kelly, "Blood-Speak," 244.

59. Kelly, "Blood-Speak," 242.

60. Luis J. Beltrán-Álvarez, "Working Intersectionally to Abolish White Supremacy:An Interview with Alyosha Goldstein," *Critical Ethnic Studies: Student Interview Series Part XI*, August 14, 2018, http://www .criticalethnicstudiesjournal.org/blog/2018/8/14/student-interview-series-part-xi.

61. Kelly, "Blood-Speak."

62. National Archives, “Dawes Records,” National Archives, January 26, 2017, https://www.archives.gov/research/native-americans/dawes.

63. Library of Virginia, “The New Virginia Law to Preserve Racial Integrity,” Library of Virginia, 2018, https://s3.amazonaws.com/omeka-net/3933/archive/files/a21dd53f2a098fca5199e481433b4eb2.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAI3ATG3OSQLO5HGKA&Expires=1525320232&Signature=xBekismiyf%2FJUqtmiBAjRRoFs7g%3D.

64. Library of Virginia, “The New Virginia Law.”

65. Kelly, “Blood-Speak,” 245.

66. Shereen Marisol Meraji, “It’s not just about the Blood,” *NPR*, February 7, 2018, https://www.npr.org/templates/transcript/transcript.php?storyId=583753149.

67. Meraji, “It’s not just about the Blood.”

68. Meraji, “It’s not just about the Blood.”

69. Kelly, “Blood-Speak,” 258.

70. Kelly, “Blood-Speak,” 258.

71. Kelly, “Blood-Speak,” 259.

72. Kelly, “Blood-Speak,” 241.

73. Yancy, “Whiteness and the Return of the Black Body,” 215.

74. Beltrán-Álvarez, “Working Intersectionally to Abolish White Supremacy.”

75. Beltrán-Álvarez, “Working Intersectionally to Abolish White Supremacy.”

76. Jason Edward Black, “Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95 (2009): 67.

77. Black, “Native Resistive Rhetoric,” 70.

78. Black, “Native Resistive Rhetoric,” 67.

79. Casey Ryan Kelly, "Détournement, Decolonization, and the American Indian Occupation of Alcatraz Island (1969–1971)," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 44 (2014): 170.

80. Kelly, "Occupation of Alcatraz Island," 170.

81. Jason Edward Black, *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2015), 7, 12.

82. Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 21.

83. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, 19.

84. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, viii.

85. Lakota Pochedly, "Keep Calm and Decolonize: Response 5," in *Red Pedagogy*, ed. Sandy Grande, 10th Anniversary ed. (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), 289.

86. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Introduction: Born Under the Rising Sign of Social Justice," in *Toward What Justice?: Describing Diverse Dreams of Justice in Education*, eds. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (New York: Routledge, 2018), 9.

87. Black, "Native Resistive Rhetoric," 80.

88. Pochedly, "Keep Calm and Decolonize," 290.

89. Rachel Presley, "Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Rhetorical Strategies for Environmental Protection and Tribal Resistance in the Dakota Access Pipeline Movement," in *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, eds. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black (New York: Peter Lang, 2018), 285.

90. Presley, "Between a Rock and a Hard Place," 285.

91. Presley, "Between a Rock and a Hard Place," 285.

92. Leah Donnella, "The Standing Rock Resistance Is Unprecedented (It's Also Centuries Old)," National Public Radio November 22, 2016, https://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2016/11/22/502068751/the-standing-rock-resistance-is-unprecedented-it-s-also-centuries-old.

93. Sara Ahmed, "Making Feminist Points," *feministkilljoys*, September 11, 2013, https://feministkilljoys.com/2013/09/11/making-feminist-points/.

94. Lake, "Between Myth and History," 140.

95. John Sanchez and Mary. E Stuckey, "The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s," *Communication Quarterly* 48 (2000): 120-136.; John Sanchez and Mary E. Stuckey, "Communicating Culture through Leadership: One View from Indian Country," *Communication Studies* 50 (1999): 103-115.

96. Jason Edward Black, "The 'Mascotting' of Native America: Construction, Commodity, and Assimilation," *American Indian Quarterly* 26 (2002): 605-622.; Danielle Endres, "American Indian Permission for Mascots: Resistance or Complicity within Rhetorical Colonialism?" *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 18 (2015): 649-690.

97. Endres, "American Indian Permission for Mascots," 652.

98. Endres, "American Indian Permission for Mascots," 655, 680.

99. Mary E. Stuckey, *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2015).

100. Casey Ryan Kelly, "American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 102 (2016): 421.

101. Black, *Removal and Allotment*, 8.

102. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor," 4.

103. Raka Shome, "Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An 'Other' View," *Communication Theory* 6 (1996): 40-59.

104. Shome, "Postcolonial Interventions," 42.

105. Shome, "Postcolonial Interventions," 44.

106. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, xxxi-xxxii.

107. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, xxxiii.

108. la paperson, *A Third University Is Possible* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), xxi-xxii.

109. paperson, *A Third University is Possible*, xxii.

110. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, xiii.

111. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, 31.

112. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, 6.

113. All Black Articles/Books where he uses Shome.

114. Endres, "American Indian Permission for Mascots," 654.

115. Kelly, "Occupation of Alcatraz Island," 172.

116. Catherine Palczewski, "Women at the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument: Remapping the Gendered/Sexed Circumference of Memory," in *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, eds. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black (New York: Peter Lang, 2018), 57.

117. Margret McCue-Enser, "Intersectional Rhetoric and the Perversity of Form: Ada Deer's Confirmation Statement as Resistive Rhetoric," in *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, eds. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black (New York: Peter Lang, 2018), 246.

118. Kelly Young, "The Rhetorical Persona of the Water Protectors: Anti-Dakota Pipeline Resistance with Mirror Shields," in *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, eds. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black (New York: Peter Lang, 2018), 271.

119. Stuckey, "Foreword," xii.

120. Stuckey, "Foreword," xii.

121. Stuckey, "Foreword," xiv.

122. Kelly and Black, "Introduction," 7.

123. Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 24.

124. Kelly and Black, "Introduction," 5.

125. Shome, “Postcolonial Interventions,” 44.

CHAPTER THREE

The Devil H(a)unts You

Introduction

In contrast to the scholarship explored in chapter two, a decolonial materialist rhetoric is sustained by a commitment to the rematriation of territory to Native communities. Traditionally, such Native-centered projects have begun by isolating discourse generated by Native movements, seeking to illuminate how Native activists either contribute to or challenge settler colonial epistemologies. This critical approach has done well to illuminate various ways in which the United States disseminates its power, yet it has remained trapped by its postcolonial ambitions and cruelly optimist desire for liberal social reforms. To avoid the pitfall of a critical materialist rhetoric, in which the goal "becomes one of unmasking this form of domination,"[1] a decolonial materialist rhetoric requires "a geographically informed research protocol committed to mapping the temporal and spatial coordinates of the different elements which traverse and structure the deliberative logics of a governing apparatus."[2] This chapter attempts to embody the core principles of a decolonial materialist rhetoric. After adopting a text, I will labor to expose its settler colonial assumptions while maintaining fidelity to Native epistemologies. In essence, this chapter serves as a potential rubric rhetoricians should adhere to when they engage questions of settler colonialism and Native discourse.

Mishuana Goeman's decolonial text *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations* describes (re)mapping as "the labor Native authors and the communities

they write within and about undertake to generate new possibilities."[3] Extending Goeman's scholarship, Catherine Palczewski, in "Women at the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument: Remapping the Gendered/Sexed Circumference of Memory," synthesizes the concept of (re)mapping with a Burkean interpretation of scenic circumference.[4] Similar to Palczewski, this chapter exerts pressure against an established rhetorical scene by analyzing Robert L. Ivie and Oscar Giner's *Hunt the Devil: A Demonology of US War Culture*.[5] While *Hunt the Devil* is a beautifully written rhetorical criticism, the value of the text's arguments remains subject to scrutiny by Native intellectuals.

This chapter is divided into two sections and sets out to accomplish several goals in its critique of Ivie and Giner's scholarship. The first section will analyze and challenge the text's analytic framework, noting a litany of contradictions present throughout the book. Primarily, Ivie and Giner dedicate a majority of the text to a scathing critique of the democratic myth yet continue to invest hope in its redemption, unable to relinquish the myth to fade to obscurity. Second, this section will challenge the authors' understanding of the relationship between democracy and the Devil. I argue the Devil is not a figure constitutive of democratic governance, as assumed by Ivie and Giner, but springs forth from the fractured psyche of settler communities. The second section of this chapter will criticize Ivie and Giner's conception of the Trickster. I argue the Trickster is a figure of Native mythos who assists Native communities in their struggles against settler colonialism. By constructing a counter narrative in which the Trickster abandons the project of recapturing an idyllic demos, I strive to challenge rhetoricians' perceptions of

Native mythos, "influencing the way in which one interprets agent's acts contained within it."[6]

Democracy Reflected

Ivie and Giner's *Hunt the Devil* is a rhetorically insightful text that blends a genealogical analysis of cultural myths with an unabashed critique of democratic governance. Searching for a way to resist the culture of war that sutures the fabric of American society, Ivie and Giner trace militarism's rise through the United States' history from the moment of contact with Indigenous communities to the present-day War on Terror. By "tracing invocations of devil imagery from the present all the way back to Puritan Salem," the authors argue the mythic figure of the Devil, rooted in the consciousness of the citizenry, is responsible for the weaponization of America's democratic ideals.[7] As a corrective to the nation's impetus for war, Ivie and Giner introduce the mythic counter-figure of the Trickster; rarely manifested, this Trickster arrives during moments of national crisis to expose the violent nature of the body politic, forcing an internal confrontation that results in the citizenry's restraint of their warring impulses. Holding a mirror up to society, the Trickster is "a figure of fluidity and ambivalence…that undermines the unquestioned authority of petrified archetypes."[8]

The introduction of this text seems poised to challenge the very foundation of the reader's identity. Rhetorically dismantling the façade of peace and equality erected by the democratic mythos, Ivie and Giner repeatedly expose the United States for its true being – an anxiety-riddled country incapable of reconciling its violent history with its rhetoric of peace, constantly searching for release in the form of repeated international conflicts. Instead, Ivie and Giner offer a glimmer of hope, arguing "Only through a courageous

acknowledgement of our own evil, and a noble acceptance of the fated struggle 'in the agonized womb of consciousness' with the devil within us, will we come to realize our true commitment to democracy."[9]

Their unwillingness to abandon the democratic myth and its rhetorical agents is illuminated by their discussion of George W. Bush and his role in the War on Terror. There exists little doubt the authors view Bush as instrumental to the United States' 2003 invasion of Iraq and its continued occupation of the Middle East. Several quotes represent their disdain for the former President:

> Bush's war rhetoric allowed little to no room for critical thinking. Every consideration, domestic and foreign, became a matter of national security viewed through the moralizing lens of an evil threat. National security was equated with health security, retirement security, economic security, and more. A doctrine of pre-emptive war was advanced to rid the world of evil before it could strike the United States.[10]

> Under such trying circumstances, Bush suggested, America and the world needed strong, decisive executive leadership…He expressed this theme of presidential power by representing himself as the decider. 'I'm the decider,' he said, 'and I decide what is best.' The president had told reporter Bob Woodward a few years earlier that 'I'm the commander…That's the interesting thing about being the president…I don't feel like I owe anybody an explanation.[11]

Ivie and Giner then take the next step, explicitly indicting Bush's political project as emblematic of demonic logic:

> The diabolical incantations of presidential war rhetoric functioned overall as an inducement to evacuate the political content of democracy, leaving a empty signifier in its place.[12]

> Evil's flat exterior was the rhetorical foundation of the president's image of terror. The defacement of America's terrorist enemies set the stage for a classic psychological projection, defined as '*an unintentional transfer of a part of the psyche which belongs to the subject onto an outer object*.'[13]

> Here is where the president's rhetorical demonology is especially revealing. As a deadly earnest exercise in political myth, it spins a beguiling story for the willing

> consumption of a nervously receptive public, a story that positions the nation resolutely but precariously as a heroic avenger on a salvic errand.[14]

Inexplicably, following this thorough critique of Bush and his rhetoric, Ivie and Giner absolve Bush of his sins, stating "We do not conclude from the above that George W. Bush was the devil."[15]

Herein lies the problem with *Hunt the Devil*. Ivie and Giner falsely locate the originating object of violence as America's democracy, as opposed to the settler citizens that manipulate its function; this is evidenced by the way Ivie and Giner criticize Bush's "diabolical" rhetoric yet refuse to hold him accountable, in favor of a critique of democracy. Ivie and Giner construct a narrative in which democracy represents a broken tool that, once mended, could be wielded to bring about tremendous change across the globe. If the body politic only invested a little more energy into this national project, "the devil's deadly grip on the nation's defining sense of mission will surely loosen."[16] Ivie and Giner fail to grasp the simple fact that democracy is not broken. It has and continues to function exactly as intended.

Democracy, in its inception, was not meant to be an equitable form of governance but was instead constructed so that the power of the citizenry was diluted by systems of representation. Citing Alexander Hamilton, Ivie and Giner concede, "'liberal democracy's sturdiest cages are reserved for the People,' who are admired for their proud individuality but considered dangerous as a madding crowd."[17] Similarly, James Madison noted the "republic of representative governance, the 'wisdom,' the 'enlightened views,' and the 'virtuous sentiments' of a superior view – the natural aristocracy – substituted for the degradations of 'factious tempers,' 'local prejudices,' and 'sinister designs,' all of which were 'sown in the nature of man' and thus inherent to popular rule."[18] The

following section will detail various ways in which democracy's exclusive norms continued to harm Native communities well into the twenty-first century.

Here this chapter departs from the work of Ivie and Giner to state what they are unwilling to admit, challenging their insistence that democracy is the lynchpin of the United States' war culture. Ultimately, the settler, a subject cohered by the disappearance and subjugation of Native and black populations, is responsible for sustaining the United States' insatiable desire for conflict. I argue that the settler's adoption of democratic norms in the eighteenth century did not quell frontier violence but legitimized its existence. Holding a mirror up to Ivie and Giner's scholarship, I will expose the way in which settlers wield the myth of democracy to realize their violent fantasies.

Navigating the Abyss

This section states plainly, in contrast to Ivie and Giner's view, that the Devil does not reside within the conscious of every member of the United States' citizenry. Ivie and Giner deploy the rhetoric of "us" and "we" throughout their text, homogenizing the body politic and distributing blame for the existence of war culture equally amongst all citizens.[19] I contend that the figure of the Devil is a unique construct of settler consciousness, absent from that of Indigenous individuals. It is important to question the temporal rubric through which Ivie and Giner theorize the emergence of democratic peace. If their defense of democratic governance is correct, how do they explain the continuation of Native genocide after 1776? Falling victim to the seductive allure of the democratic myth, Ivie and Giner mistake today's "peaceful" relations between settler and Native populations as proof of their argument. In the following paragraphs, I argue that

democracy not only failed to hinder settler violence, but actively assisted the process of settlement.

At the moment of contact between Indigenous populations and European settlers, an ontological distinction was instantiated within civil society that stripped Native identity of value. Violence born of this ontological divide can be witnessed as early as Columbus' first encounter with Indigenous groups of the Caribbean. After establishing a settlement, Columbus returned to Spain burdened by Gold and Indigenous slaves. In 1493, Columbus undertook another voyage to the Caribbean. Upon discovering his first settlement's destruction, he proceeded to establish a new base before decimating the local Arawak population through military campaigns and enslavement.[20]

Accompanied by this violence was the settler's epistemological reconceptualization of Turtle Island as *terra nullius*, a land devoid of previous inhabitants.[21] Retroactive dismissal of the Native's very existence set the foundation for, and has since justified, violent systems of extraction and genocide against Native communities. Enforced by papal authority, "The Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494 divided the 'New World' between Spain and Portugal," giving rise to the Doctrine of Discovery.[22] Appealing to this unique mixture of legal and religious doctrine, settlers at Jamestown extended the British Empire's reach into North America. The intervening years between settlement and independence became marred by the constant ebb and flow of vicious frontier wars. Within two years of establishing Jamestown, settlers began to wage war with the Powhatan Confederacy. The war dragged on intermittently until 1622, before an attack on English settlements killed 350 colonists, "a third of the settler population."[23] In 1644, settlers reignited the conflict, "continuously raiding Indigenous villages and fields

with the goal of starving the people out of the area."[24] The settlers of Plymouth Rock similarly engaged the Pequot in a total war of annihilation, "killing women and children or taking them hostage."[25] Such wars became commonplace well into the 1700s. Military expeditions were frequently sponsored by wealthy slavers throughout the South. Profiting from the sale of captives, "between 1670 and 1720, Carolinians exported more Indians out of Charleston, South Carolina, than they imported Africans into it."[26] James Oglethorpe led settlers in several campaigns against the Cherokee of Georgia until 1732 in hope of acquiring territory. Finally, between 1750 and 1763, settler expansion west of the Appalachian mountain range led to a series of frontier skirmishes that culminated in a pan-Indigenous revolt known as Pontiac's rebellion.

One should not be lured into believing these wars were fought in the name of survival. The grotesque practice of scalping, in conjunction with the privatization of Indian hunting, demonstrates how settlers perceived colonial expansion as sport for profit.[27] This ideology was so thoroughly engrained in settler society that settlers frequently sought to exterminate Indigenous populations even when they posed no danger to settler communities. For example, in the aftermath of the Pequot war, "Fewer than two hundred half-starved Pequots remained."[28] Despite their lack of resistance:

> The colony commissioned the mercenary [John] Mason and his murderous crew of forty men to burn the few remaining homes and fields. Puritan William Bradford wrote at the time in his *History of Plymouth Plantation*: 'Those that scaped the fire were slaine with the sword; some hewed to peeces, others rune throw with their rapiers, so as they were quickly dispatchte, and very few escaped. It was conceived they thus destroyed about 400 at this time. It was a fearful sight to see them thus frying in the fyre, and the streams of blood quenching the same, and horrible was the stincke and sente there of, but the victory seemed a sweete sacrifice, and they gave the prayers thereof to God, who had wrought so wounderfully for them, thus to inclose their enemise in their hands, and give them so speedy a victory over so proud and insulting an enimie.[29]

Such descriptions of Native genocide were commonly transcribed by religious leaders of this time, and they reinforced the belief that Natives were a constant threat to settler communities. On an unconscious level, the perverse joy derived from these scenes of slaughter betrays the settler's deep-seated need for violence against the Other. Ivie and Giner posit the rise of democratic institutions effectively tempered the intensity with which settlers assaulted Native nations in the following centuries; I argue that they are mistaken.

Savagery, Civilization, and the Devil

Ivie and Giner unwittingly provide an explanation as to how the settler's violent nature was inculcated prior to the advent of democracy. Enmeshed in the societal influences of Judeo-Christian doctrine, the settler conjured the figure of the Devil from their conscious, "a reflection of our shadow within – a mirror image of our darkness, the reign of Hell opposed to the Kingdom of Heaven in our souls…an external threat that is amplified by our own demons; our very own devil projected onto our political enemies."[30] Unsure of how to calm their anxiety, settlers displace the devil imagery onto an external object, justifying an externalization of their self-hatred against the Native.

Throughout the eighteenth century, importing the technological advancements of modernity and the humanistic value systems of the Enlightenment, settlers distinguished themselves from Indigenous populations through the dialectical rhetorical constructions of "civilization" and "savagery."[31] In conjunction with Judeo-Christian values prevalent throughout early settlements, the rhetorical trope of savagery became synonymous with the Devil. This connection between the Devil and the Native endured well into the nineteenth century where "Behind the mask of the devil…there was always the face of

the American Indian – natural and mysterious, alien and threatening, a sign of Otherness and a constant symbol of violence, danger, and distance from the natural landscape of the Americas."[32]

While Ivie and Giner posit that democracy reduced overt forms of violence committed by settlers throughout the nation's first century, the historical record demonstrates otherwise. Thomas King's *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America* details how the trend of Native massacres continued until the 1890s, stating:

> Whites massacred Indians at a pretty good clip. In 1598, in what is now New Mexico, Juan de Onate and his troops killed over eight hundred Acoma and cut off the left foot of every man over the age of twenty-five. In 1637, John Underhill led a force that killed six to seven hundred Pequot near the Mystic River in Connecticut. In 1871, around one hundred and forty Pinal and Aravaipa Apaches were killed in the Camp Grant massacre in Arizona Territory. Two hundred and fifty Northwestern Shoshoni were killed in the 1863 Bear River massacre in what is now Idaho, while General Henry Atkinson killed some one hundred and fifty Sauk and Fox at the mouth of the Bad Axe River in Wisconsin in 1832. And, of course, there's always the famous 1864 Sand Creek massacre in Colorado, where two hundred peaceful Cheyenne were slaughtered by vigilantes looking to shoot anything that moved, and the even more infamous Wounded Knee in 1890, where over two hundred Lakota lost their lives.[33]

The commission of these atrocities not only became the norm within America's democracy, but was actively celebrated. Rather than restrain its citizenry, democracy served as the national vehicle through which settlers could channel and focus their collective hatred for Native populations. Several democratic leaders responsible for the Union's expansion throughout the 1800s were once revered *because* of the violence they sanctioned against Native communities.

Elected to the presidency upon a wave of populism, Andrew Jackson was well known and admired for his time as an "Indian killer."[34] As a colonel of the Tennessee

militia, Jackson waged war against the Muskogee Nation and then led settler efforts throughout the Seminole Wars until their conclusion in 1818. As president, Jackson leveraged democratic ideals, such as due process and rule of law, to facilitate the removal of Native nations from the Southwest in the wake of the Marshall Trilogy; thousands of Natives died in the resulting Trail of Tears. Abraham Lincoln, "touted as a great humanitarian," is equally guilty of enflaming hateful sentiments against Native communities along the frontier.[35] In response to a Dakota Sioux uprising in 1862, Lincoln dispatched Union troops to quell the rebellion. After the killing ended, "Three hundred prisoners were sentenced to death."[36] Lincoln, however, was gracious enough to ensure only "thirty-eight were selected at random to die in the largest mass hanging in US history."[37] This left many Native communities with the impression that Lincoln was simply "a man of his time, a white supremacist, and a crafty politician."[38]

The nation soon turned its affections to Ulysses S. Grant, a well-known Union general who served under Lincoln. As president, Grant employed General William Tecumseh Sherman to clear the Western frontier of its Indigenous inhabitants. Despite his Native namesake, Sherman carried out a campaign of Indigenous slaughter until 1883.[39] Near the close of the nineteenth century, the spectacular manner by which settlers assaulted Native populations diminished. Ivie and Giner incorrectly gesture toward this decrease in violence as proof of democracy's long-term efforts to restrain settlers. In contrast, I believe democracy simply ensured this violence changed in content while maintaining its form, shedding is spectacular grandeur in favor of more insidious tactics. No longer was violence marked by the commission of a military campaign. Instead,

democracy weaponized the rule of law to reduce Native communities to a mere shadow of their former selves.

Violence Reconstituted

In the wake of the Massacre at Wounded Knee, the United States adopted a different approach to deal with its "Indian problem." As discussed previously in chapter two, the turn of the century was accompanied by the United States' adoption of assimilative strategies meant to include Native populations within the larger body politic. The first two strategies codified, Rolls Systems and blood quantums, served to racialize Native identity and undermine Native claims to sovereignty. By racializing Native identity, the United States positioned Native communities within the larger citizenry, equating their status with that of ethnic minorities. Primarily, this allowed the United States to legally equate black and Native communities, despite their insistence on treating each racial construct differently. For black citizens, racialization functions as an inescapable construct, staticized by the presence of black flesh and blood. Indigeneity, conversely, became a mutable signifier to be adopted or discarded at will by those wishing to claim both white and Native identity. To be Native was no longer a question of one's physical attributes, but the legal authority to assert one's claim to Native identity.

Second, the racialization of Native identity shifted the ontological nature of Indigeneity away from questions of political sovereignty. In 1924, the United States codified the Indian Citizenship Act, "granting" all Indigenous people American citizenship. While the United States viewed this as an easy way "to absorb Indians into mainstream American life," many Natives felt citizenship "was 'thrust upon them without

their consent.'"[40] By pulling Native communities into the purview of American jurisprudence, the United States forcibly subjected all Indigenous populations to a legal authority that remained mutually exclusive with the existence of tribal governance. However, democracy's internal contradictions ensured the Indigenous citizens were discriminated against even after their acceptance into the demos. This is evident in the way most states barred Native citizens from voting until 1962, only granting them such rights under the cover of the Civil Rights Movement. Native sovereignty was further eroded by the Major Crimes Act and Public Law 280. In essence, these laws barred Native governments from prosecuting settlers for crimes committed on Native land. Additionally, they "turned over 'criminal/prohibitory' judicial procedures to states," granting states the right to manipulate the judicial powers of regulatory bodies established within the territorial boundaries of a reservation.[41]

Ivie and Giner's focus on democracy and their acceptance of an undifferentiated citizenry contributes to the epistemological erosion of Native sovereignty. Primarily, Foregoing a delineation between settler and Native populations sets the stage for "an enduring struggle between 'native indigeneity' and 'settler indigeneity' in which indigenous peoples in the Global North 'have been forced to compete for *indigenous* status with European settlers and their descendants eager to construct new identities that separate them from European antecedents.'"[42] However, it is not enough to merely acknowledge the distinction between settlers and Natives. Simply, recognizing Natives as part of a larger ethnic minority "risks leaving those very colonial structures intact…allowing all experiences of oppression within settler colonialism to step forward as colonized."[43]

Second, Ivie and Giner's homogeneous view of the United States' body politic similarly effaces the process through which settler colonialism domesticates black struggles within a framework of anti-racism, rather than a framework of anti-colonial struggle.[44] Anti-blackness is effectuated through the disappearance of settler colonialism, rendering black populations as the internal property of the United States. As such, anti-black struggle is contained within a domesticated anti-racist framework that cannot challenge the settler state's existence. Thus, not only are black communities rendered the property of the settler state, but black-led struggles remain its property – confined within the bounds of the nation.[45] The perception of anti-black racism is then minimized, viewed solely as a question of stolen labor, whereas Indigenous genocide pertains to stolen land and resources. The false dichotomy constructed between stolen labor and stolen land obscures how the relationship between black fungibility and the disappearance of Indigenous labor rests on the commodification of land as property, which proscribes the terms of anti-colonial struggle safely within nation-state governance.

Ivie and Giner's ultimate mistake is believing the solution to democratic violence lies in moving *through* democratic institutions. However, democracy has proven time and time again that it is unwilling to hold itself accountable. Though one could point to individual pieces of legislation as forms of racial and social progress, "these reforms serve more of a symbolic value rather than functional."[46] This leaves one with only option moving forward, which is to move *outside* the democratic system, turning to traditional forms of Native governance.

Contemporary attacks on Native identity function on an interpersonal level, evading the jurisdiction of democratic recourse. A seemingly benign process, settlers

rhetorically claim Native identity while removing the Native's jurisdiction to contest such claims. Democratic leaders have spectacularized this process over the past twenty years. During an educational summit hosted by former president Bill Clinton in 1998, an exchange transpired between Clinton and Native intellectual Alexie Sherman, in which Clinton stated, "My grandmother was one-quarter Cherokee."[47] This statement represents the settler's adoption of rhetorical tools such as the enthymeme to assume Native identity. At no point does Clinton explicitly claim that he is Native, but instead prompts one to follow the causal logic: if Clinton's grandmother possessed Native blood, then, by default, Clinton must be Native as well.

Massachusetts Senator and presidential hopeful Elizabeth Warren recently replicated this form of enthymematic logic in a speech presented before the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) on February 14, 2018.[48] Warren used the opportunity to defend her previous claims to Native heritage against President Donald Trump's speeches, which referred to her as "Pocahontas."[49] The rhetoric enunciated throughout her speech illuminates the false nature of her claims to Native identity. Warren only mentions her lineage once, stating, "my mother's family was part Native American."[50] Similar to Clinton, Warren relies on the audience to employ enthymematic logic to validate her claims to Native heritage. At no point does Warren explicitly claim her mother is Native but displaces that signifier on to her broader family from which her mother then claims Native associations. From there, the relationship, ostensibly, transfers to Warren. Ironically, Clinton and Warren claimed to be of Cherokee descent yet failed to specify from which Cherokee nation they hailed, of which there are three. Ultimately, Clinton and Warren's claims to Native identity represent a violent form of socialization

in which settler assaults on Native identity are dismissed as myopic and not worthy of immediate confrontation. By focusing exclusively on violence enacted by larger systems of power, Ivie and Giner leave uncontested the "everydayness" of settler power.[51]

This current section argues that the afflicting war culture of the United States is not sustained by a failed democratic model but is instead constitutive of the ever-present conflict between settler and Native communities. Ivie and Giner appear to be under the impression that the settler's conflict with Native populations is temporally contained to the 1800s, averring "America blindly persists in its patriotic battle with terrorist evildoers, a fight that occurs in mythic time on the symbolic terrain of Indian country."[52] This statement paints a picture in which the United States once vanquished Native nations, only to move on to the next enemy. The illusion that Native nations no longer exist is integral to the democratic project; to consolidate sovereignty into an exclusive governing body eliminates any residual notion of "nested sovereignty," rendering democratic power absolute.[53] However, to realize the annihilation of Turtle Island, the settler must cast its prized possession as a violent construct. Understanding the democratic myth will never be "fixed," the settler prolongs the moment in which they will be forced to exercise restraint over their own violent tendencies. To this end, Ivie and Giner capitulate to the settler's desires, turning to a white-washed version of the Trickster they know is incapable of resolving the true source of settler violence. The next section will dissect Ivie and Giner's interpretation of the Trickster before offering a new interpretation capable of combatting the settler's violent conscious.

A New Trickster

Calling upon "the spirit of Coyote, that fleeting and friendless figure Mark Twain admired for its ability to make our 'head swim' and its potential to save our soul by tricking us into a humbling state of reflection," Ivie and Giner posit the only hope for democracy lies in the Trickster's ability to exercise the Devil from America's conscious.[54] If Ivie and Giner can so easily identify the fatal flaw of democracy, there remains the question as to why the Trickster has allowed democracy to function unabated for several centuries; the simple answer lies in the notion that the Trickster and democracy are incompatible. I contend the authors' analysis falters because they are incapable of grasping the cultural nuances that give rise to this distinct Native construct. Foregoing a genealogical analysis of the Trickster's formation, Ivie and Giner extract the figure from its mythic framework, sculpting its traditionally vibrant exterior into a dull visage.

While Ivie and Giner conceptualize the Trickster as a static entity, I turn to John Borrows' discussion of the figure as a counter-model. Borrows states:

> First Nations have an intellectual tradition that teaches about ideas and principles that are partial and incomplete. The elders teach these traditions through a character known as the trickster. He has various persona in different cultures. The Anishinabe (Ojibway) of the Great Lakes call the Trickster Nanabush; the First Nations people of the coastal North-west know him as Raven; he is known as Glooscap by the Mi'kmaq of the Maritimes; and as Coyote, Crow, Wisakedjak, Badger, or Old Man among other First Nations people in North America. The trickster offers insight through encounters which are simultaneously altruistic and self-interested….The trickster also displays transformative power as he takes on new persona in the manipulation of these behaviors and in the achievement of his objectives.[55]

Leanna Betasamosake Simpson's "Land as Pedagogy: Nishnaabeg Intelligence and Rebellious Transformation," similarly describes Nanabush as a "Spiritual Being" that

speaks to the internal contradictions inherent to Native subjects.[56] Relying on this interpretation of the Trickster, I argue that Ivie and Giner's rhetorical criticism is flawed in two ways.

Primarily, Ivie and Giner's analysis fails because the rhetorical tools they wield to construct the Trickster are born of a settler colonial framework. Excising the figure from its cultural settings, Ivie and Giner can appreciate the Trickster's utility only insofar as it is able to strengthen their academic project. Their faux-appreciation of the Trickster is emblematic of a larger academic tradition in which Native epistemologies are siphoned into academic departments, only to be shallowly regurgitated and passed off as a unique theory by non-Indigenous scholars. Simpson urges us to remember, "Nanabush does not teach at a university, nor is Nanabush a teacher within the state school system. Nanabush also doesn't read academic papers or write for *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*."[57] Rather, Nanabush exceeds the textual bounds of Ivie and Giner's project. As a figure that speaks directly to the internal contradictions of Native subjectivity, "The academic complex does not and cannot provide the proper context for Nishnaabeg intelligence."[58]

By reducing the Trickster to a mutable analytic, Ivie and Giner engage in a futile search for political and social leaders that exhibit similar characteristics. Beginning with Martin Luther King, Jr.'s "Beyond Vietnam," the authors claim, "The Reverend King's penetrating gaze portrayed America, seen through Vietnamese eyes, as a strange liberator: a violent oppressor and exploiter with a poisoned spirit."[59] However, King's description as a Trickster elides the way in which material gains of the Civil Rights Movement have been eviscerated by legislative orders in the following decades. While

the Voting Rights Act of 1965 "gave African-American voters the legal means to challenge voting restrictions and vastly improved voter turnout," the Supreme Court has recently rolled back several of the law's provisions.[60] In 2013, the Supreme Court gutted the law's enforcement mechanism, allowing nine states "to change their election laws without advance federal approval."[61] By discarding the use of preclearance, the Supreme Court allowed predominately southern states to implement strict voter ID laws and close polling stations in low-income areas, disproportionately affecting people of color.[62]

The second Trickster Ivie and Giner gesture toward is former President Barack Obama. Saddled with the previous administration's war in the Middle East, Obama was forced to rhetorically reformulate the relationship between the United States and war to sustain public support for the war effort. Employing the rhetoric of partnership, "This image of collaboration, rather than debunking or abandoning the myth of US exceptionalism and national mission, imbued an otherwise chauvinistic myth with a democratic spirit."[63] To be clear, Obama was no Trickster. Instead, he was an agent of the democratic order who succeeded in sanitizing American violence committed abroad. While reducing the United States' troop presence in Iraq, he spearheaded the drone program responsible for 563 drone strikes that killed between 384 and 807 non-combatants during his presidency.[64]

The fundamental misconception to which Ivie and Giner fall prey is the notion that the Trickster can manifest as a lone individual. This perspective renders moot authentic conceptions of the Trickster as an affect, an ephemeral being that temporarily coheres as a physical entity and fleeting in nature. The generative capacities of the Trickster are simply too immense to be contained or employed by any one individual,

because they lack the capacity to speak directly to another's inner nature. Ivie and Giner, in a later passage, concede this truth, admitting:

> [Obama's] guiding metaphor of partnership started well but foundered for want of a transcendent image with which to integrate a fractured national identity. The war culture was so engrained, the messianic myth of American exceptionalism so strong, and the legacy of Manichean moralizing so intense that the most any trickster might achieve was to reveal the struggle facing the nation and point to the possibility of reforming itself.[65]

Even in this closing thought, Ivie and Giner simply shift the burden of institutional reform to the very structure in need of change, acknowledging the Trickster's inability to influence democratic governance. It also remains a curious trend that Ivie and Giner fail to isolate any Native leaders as possible representations of the Trickster.

The second mistake Ivie and Giner commit is revealed in their attempt to use the Trickster to solve settler democracy's ills. Positioning the Trickster within a democratic institution, Ivie and Giner argue the figure is capable of rearranging democracy's inner machinations in such a way that would assuage its compulsion for war; both assumptions present in the previous statement rely on flawed logics. First, the existence of the Trickster cannot be reconciled with the expansion of settler sovereignty. The first half of this chapter illuminates the settler's historic attempts to thoroughly annihilate Native communities and their epistemologies. Even if such knowledges were accepted by the United States, their use would represent a mere stop-gap in the refinement of empire, serving a specific purpose before their eventual purge from settler pedagogies.

Second, Ivie and Giner misinterpret the Trickster's historic mission, mistaking it for a figure willing to labor on behalf of all of civil society; this is not the case. In contrast to Ivie and Giner's view that the Trickster and Devil are complimentary figures that reside within the depths of all citizens, I argue that the figures remain mutually

exclusive to Native and settler populations respectively; such a claim gains purchase in the wake of the authors' failure to explain how the Devil is necessarily constitutive of Native being. As an exclusive figure of Native society, however, the Trickster acts in ways antithetical to the interests of settler governance. While the Trickster surely comes into contact with settler society, it does so by "moving through the realm of the colonized into the dreamed reality of the decolonized…navigating the lived reality of having to engage with both at the same time."[66] In light of the critiques I have outlined against Ivie and Giner's text, the next section will provide a counter narrative that properly realizes the complex manner by which the Trickster challenges democratic governance. Inverting Ivie and Giner's interpretation of the Ghost Dance, I argue the event represented a Trickster ethos that continues to antagonize settler society to date.

The Ghost Dance

The inauguration and spread of the Ghost Dance throughout Native nations of the Plains in the late 1880s represents a moment in which the Trickster's efforts can be analyzed. Burdened with rage following the Civil War, the United States turned its warring impulses back upon Native nations, dispatching Brevet Major General George Armstrong Custer's Seventh Calvary to hunt those of the Sioux Nation. While Crow scouts employed by the United States' military warned the American regiment of their impending demise, "By sundown, naked bodies of the Seventh Calvary lay sprawled on the same Montana Bluffs where Sitting Bull had prayed."[67] Bringing the full force of their rage to bare on their enemy in the following years, the United States offered the Sioux of the Great Sioux Reservation "three choices: die in battle, starve to death, or agree 'to cede the Black Hills, to give up their other rights outside the permanent

reservation.'"[68] The Native inhabitants of the Plains suffered greatly in the ensuing years, witnessing the decimation of buffalo herds, deadly epidemics, and starvation. Then, the Trickster revealed itself to the Sioux, assaulting the psyche of white settlers, twisting and fueling the anxiety that plagues their being.

The Impact of the Ritual

Coinciding with the new year, "on January 1, 1889, an eclipse of the sun occurred over Mason Valley, Nevada. A full-blood Paiute by the name of Wovoka was struck down with a high fever and was taken up to Heaven."[69] There Wovoka was granted a vision of those who perished before him and was entrusted with a ritual that would facilitate their return to life. After spreading to the Arapaho and Shoshoni, the religious doctrine reached the Sioux. While the responsibility for leading the Ghost Dance among the Sioux initially belonged to Kicking Bear, the duties quickly fell to Sitting Bull after Kicking Bear was removed from the reservation by United States authorities. Fearing Sitting Bull's empowerment of his people, Bureau of Indian Affairs agent James McLaughlin requested the presence of U.S. troops and marched on the Pine Ridge Reservation with the intent to arrest Sititng Bull. In the chaos that broke out on the morning of December 15, 1890, Sitting Bull was killed. With Sitting Bull's death, the ritualized performance of the Ghost Dance ended, but its teachings took on new forms in the coming years.

The Ghost Dance was more than a spiritual ceremony, embodying a Trickster ethos that labored to simultaneously reclaim Native sovereignty and disrupt settler modes of governance. As discussed earlier, the Trickster is not a physical entity or cohered in any one particular act. Rather, it is a set of ideals that can be mobilized affectively

throughout Native communities, spurring larger movements. The Ghost Dance represents one such movement that was particularly successful, facilitating the resurgence of traditional governance. The ritual was broken into four sections, in which the first two required one to dance in a circular pattern before falling into a trance-like state. At this moment, one was granted a vision that portrayed the destruction of settler society; in its aftermath, the dead of Native communities returned. While the dance itself was of little consequence, the implication of its doctrine has facilitated two inter-generational responses.

First, the ritual labored to antagonize the settler's conscious, stealing from the religious doctrine of Christians in an attempt to construct images of their civilization's destruction. Appropriating apocalyptic images from the book of Revelations, "The vision of an apocalypse that only Indians would survive was entirely believable for whites immersed in Bible prophecies…The Ghost Dance turned their prophecy of the end of days against them. Whites were the damned ones, the followers of Antichrist, the force of evil that would perish."[70] White communities were not afraid of the dance, but of "the profound psychological threat conjured by ecstatic physical and spiritual movement in an orderly dominant culture."[71] Ivie and Giner, following in the footsteps of anthropologist James Mooney, argue that the Ghost Dance's influence dissipated once it failed to realize the physical destruction of the United States; this perspective is far too narrow. Clearly the Trickster does not wield the power of the elements, capable of conjuring tornadoes and hellfire within white communities, but works by stoking anxiety buried deep in the settler's conscious. The manifestation of apocalyptic images acted as a mirror to the settler's psyche, acting as a permanent imprint that currently haunts their existence.

Today, "Settlers love to contemplate the possibility of their own extinction."[72] Despite the historical persistence of settler colonial structures, the settler is h(a)unted by images of their own destruction. Ivie and Giner claim this practice arises from demonic influence over the settler, but "narratives of settler extinction are acts of ideological mystification, obscuring the brutal inequalities of the frontier behind a mask of white vulnerability."[73] Such narratives of extinction are clearly visible throughout the United States' history. Beginning with the Cold War, rhetoric used by American politicians hoping to de-escalate the conflict relied on images of nuclear holocaust across the globe. Fearing destruction at the hands of the weapon they created, the United States raced to create a nuclear arsenal capable of deterring Russian aggression. Even two decades after the end of the Cold War, rhetoric of extinction is still espoused by scholars such as Anthony Barrett. As a Fellow at the RAND Stanton Nuclear Security Fellows Program, Barrett claimed, "War involving significant fractions of the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals…could have globally catastrophic effects…leading to collapse of modern civilization worldwide and even the extinction of humanity."[74] It is in this rhetoric one can witness the long-lasting effects of the Ghost Dance. Prior to the Ghost Dance, settlers viewed their domination of the continent as an uncontestable inevitability, a divine right ordained by providence. The Ghost Dance, however, represents a temporal break that ruptured the settler's presumption that settler society would continue to flourish unabated. Introducing doubt to their surety of existence, the Ghost Dance forced the settler to ask, "What if settler society faltered?"

The second effect of the Ghost Dance is illuminated through a historical account of Lakota lands as sites of resistance. Transforming the very territory that represents

Lakota lands, the Ghost Dance imbued the site with a generative sense of durability. Witness to the Battle of the Greasy Grass, the Ghost Dance, the Massacre at Wounded Knee, the Reoccupation of Wounded Knee, and NoDAPL resistance, Lakota lands have served as a unique "place of contest" and have been consecrated by Native blood as a nodal space of power.[75] I am not interested in highlighting the rhetorical similarities of resistance movements that have transpired on Native lands over the past century; other rhetoricians have exhausted this topic. I am more interested in analyzing how the Ghost Dance imbued land as the generative force behind such movements.

Searching for a way to demonstrate the importance of land, the Trickster associated land with cultural resurgence and vitality. In Wovoka's vision, he witnessed the reclamation of land by Native communities. However, tribal resurgence did not end here. Rather, the return of land served as a precursor to the revival of Native individuals who previously perished under settler governance. By linking cultural survivance with land, the Ghost Dance created a framework in which assimilation became impossible for Native wards unless they relinquished their titles to land. Thus, the defense of land became a central tenant of Native resistance to settler colonialism.

Land has since functioned as a sword and shield for Indigenous communities. Land has frequently been a motivating factor in the implementation of blood quantums, creating a system in which only citizens of the Native nation may claim reservation lands. The termination policies of the 1950s and 1960s were vehemently protested on the ground that termination removed Native families from their communal lands. Similarly, the construction of oil pipelines and nuclear waste sites have been met with resistance because of their propensity to destroy the surrounding environment. This rhetorical

ideograph has similarly been adopted by activists and scholars. The organization Land Is Life was founded in 1992, and it strives to defend Indigenous territorial rights and build pan-Indigenous alliances. Scholars such as Patrick Wolfe have since contoured the depth of the phrase "Land is life," demonstrating how land functions as a durable, epistemological source of cultural power.[76] In direct contest with Ivie and Giner's view of settler colonialism as a meta-structure that solely impacts institutional governance, the perception of land *as* life redirects one's attention back to everyday modes of survival enacted by Native activists.

Conclusion

While *Hunt the Devil* remains a well written text, this chapter has enacted a decolonial materialist rhetoric to invert the very framework through which Ivie and Giner theorize. To effectuate this decolonial critique, this chapter first exposed several contradictions fundamental to the author's work. The myth of democracy, an ideal burned in the minds of the American citizenry, can never be fully realized. Constructed in a manner meant to dilute the power of the populace, democracy remains just beyond the demo's reach. In a moment of clarity, Ivie and Giner appear ready to abandon the democratic project in favor of self-reflection. In the end, however, they remain unable to overcome their own demons, opting to once again blame democracy for their own shortcomings.

Rereading Ivie and Giner's text against the historical formation of the United States, I illuminate the methods by which settlers extended their war against Native communities beyond the 1800s, well into the twenty-first century. This counter history functions as part of a decolonial materialist rhetoric's desire to substantiate linkages

between the present and historical injustices. While Ivie and Giner frame settler conflicts with Native nations as past events, it is more appropriate to view these conflicts through the settler's belief that "'Our Indian wars are not over yet.'"[77]

Finally, this decolonial materialist rhetoric turned its attention to Native academics and their embodied epistemologies, reconceptualizing the Trickster through a genealogical exploration of the mythic figure. As a construct of Native lore, the Trickster exists beyond the grasp of the settler. Rather than occupying the conscious of a single agent, the Trickster is a communal agent capable of grappling with settler colonial violence leveraged against Native communities. This reconceptualization of the Trickster does more than forward Indigenous knowledges. It also provides rhetoricians with a perspective that assists them in rupturing settler colonial logics.

The chapter's final section examines the Ghost Dance and inverts the metric by which rhetoricians judge decolonizing movements as successes or failures. As an alternative, I posit that rhetoricians should labor to recognize the temporally resurgent nature of land-based politics that sustain Native lifeways. Ultimately, this chapter calls for rhetoricians to use their scholarship in such a manner that privileges Native knowledges, without repurposing them for the refinement of settler society. In the next chapter, I detail the remaining aspects of a decolonial materialist rhetoric. While its most obvious implications are immediately recognized in the way future scholarship contoured, a decolonial materialist rhetoric also demands rhetoricians engage with Native epistemologies in ways that transcend the publication process. Ultimately, rhetoricians must traverse the chasm between theory and praxis, redefining their role as settler academics.

Notes

1. Ronald Walter Greene, "Another Materialist Rhetoric," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15 (1998): 22.

2. Greene, "Another Materialist Rhetoric," 22.

3. Mishuana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 3.

4. Catherine Palczewski, "Women at the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument: Remapping the Gendered/Sexed Circumference of Memory," in *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, eds. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black (New York: Peter Lang, 2018), 48-77.

5. Robert L. Ivie and Oscar Giner, *Hunt the Devil: A Demonology of US War Culture* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2015).

6. Palczewski, "Women at the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn," 55.

7. Eric C. Miller, "Hunt the Devil: A Demonology of U.S. War Culture, by Robert L. Ivie and Oscar Giner," *The Communication Review* 19 (2016): 156.

8. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 9.

9. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 10.

10. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 13.

11. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 23.

12. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 29.

13. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 20.

14. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 18.

15. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 29.

16. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 144.

17. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 15.

18. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 15.

19. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 1-31.

20. Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History of the United States* (Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 2014), 43.

21. Pal Ahluwalia, "When Does a Settler Become a Native? Citizenship and Identity in a Settler Society," *Pretexts: Literary and Cultural Studies* 10 (2001): 64-65.

22. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History,* 42.

23. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 61.

24. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 61.

25. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 62.

26. Andrés Reséndez, *The Other Slavery: The Uncovered Story of Indian Enslavement in America* (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2016), 172.

27. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 64-66.

28. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 63.

29. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 63.

30. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 27.

31. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 32-48.

32. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 40.

33. Thomas King, *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013), 5.

34. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 96.

35. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country: Postcoloniality and American Indian Nations* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2012), 55.

36. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 136.

37. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 136.

38. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, 56.

39. Dunbar-Ortiz, *An Indigenous Peoples' History*, 136.

40. ICT, "Native History: Citizenship Thrust Upon Natives by U.S. Congress," *Indian Country Today*, June 2, 2014, https://newsmaven.io/indiancountrytoday/archive/native-history-citizenship-thrust-upon-natives-by-u-s-congress-diZuPnKVq0C3vugN0JlgQQ/.

41. Goeman, *Mark My Words*, 96.

42. Jodi Byrd, *Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), 54.

43. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, 54.

44. Frank Wilderson III, *Red, White & Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2010).

45. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1 (2012): 29-30.

46. Tansy Woan, The Value of Resistance in a Permanently White, Civil Society (New York: Proquest, 2011), 19.

47. Elizabeth Shogren, "Clinton Calls for New Approach to 'Affirmative Action,'" *Los Angeles Times*, July 9, 1998, *http://articles.latimes.com/1998/jul/09/news/mn-2235*.

48. National Congress of American Indians, "Senator Elizabeth Warren Addresses Native Heritage and Commits to Indian Country at the National Congress of American Indians 2018 Winter Session," *National Congress of American Indians*, February 14, 2018, http://www.ncai.org/news/articles/2018/02/14/senator-elizabeth-warren-addresses.

49. Donald J. Trump, "Native American Code Talkers, November 27, 2017," *C-Span*, https://www.c-span.org/video/?437799-1/president-trump-honors-native-american-code-talkers.

50. Elizabeth Warren, "Elizabeth Warren Address to the National Congress of American Indians' Executive Council Winter Session & Tribal Nations Policy Summit," *National Congress of American Indians*, February 14, 2018, http://www.ncai.org/Elizabeth_Warren_Address_to_the_National_Congress_of_American_Indians.pdf.

51. Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, xviii.

52. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 31.

53. Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States* (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2014), 11.

54. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 10.

55. John Borrows, "Frozen Rights in Canada: Constitutional Interpretation and the Trickster," *American Indian Law Review* 22 (1997): 39-40.

56. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, "Land as Pedagogy: Nishnaabeg Intelligence and Rebellious Transformation," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3 (2014): 16.

57. Simpson, "Land as Pedagogy," 16.

58. Simpson, "Land as Pedagogy," 17.

59. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 117.

60. N.A., "Voting Rights Act of 1965," *History*, September 12, 2018, https://www.history.com/topics/black-history/voting-rights-act.

61. Adam Liptak, "Supreme Court Invalidates Key Part of Voting Rights Act," *New York Times*, June 25, 2013, https://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/26/us/supreme-court-ruling.html.

62. Rob Arthur and Allison McCann, "How the Gutting of the Voting Rights Act Led to Hundreds of Closed Polls," *Vice*, October 16, 2018, https://news.vice.com/en_us/article/kz58qx/how-the-gutting-of-the-voting-rights-act-led-to-closed-polls.

63. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 121.

64. Jessica Purkiss and Jack Serle, "Obama's Covert Drone War in Numbers: Ten Times More Strikes than Bush," The Beurau of Investigative Journalism, January 17, 2017, https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/stories/2017-01-17/obamas-covert-drone-war.

65. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 125.

66. Simpson, "Land as Pedagogy," 17.

67. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 50.

68. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 61.

69. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 62.

70. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 67.

71. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 67.

72. Hamish Dalley, "The Deaths of Settler Colonialism: Extinction as a Metaphor of Decolonization in Contemporary Settler Literature," *Settler Colonial Studies* 8 (2018): 30.

73. Dalley, "The Deaths of Settler Colonialism," 33.

74. Anthony M. Barrett, "Analyzing and Reducing the Risks of Inadvertent Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia," *Science and Global Security* 21 (2013): 106.

75. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 62.

76. Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (2006): 387.

77. Ivie and Giner, *Hunt the Devil*, 69.

CHAPTER FOUR

Adopting a Decolonial Materialist Rhetoric as a Rhetorician

Introduction

In the two previous chapters, this thesis focused primarily on the scholarship of rhetorical critics, demonstrating how a decolonial materialist perspective might alter or enhance the veracity of such scholarship's arguments. This chapter serves a complimentary role in this project by turning its attention to the scholars that author rhetorical criticism and the academic institutions in which they labor. Quite simply, I argue that the discipline's expansive reach into adjoining disciplines, in conjunction with its desire to maintain a distinct enclave within an exclusive academic department, serves to fracture our field along several faults.

Rather than continue on our current path, I urge rhetoricians and the professors that codify pedagogical practices in academic courses to reevaluate how they approach the discipline's growth. This chapter begins with a brief account of the discipline's state today, remarking on the interconnected manner by which it engages other academic fields. Drawing from Edwin Black's *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method*, I argue that rhetoric maintains an intellectual fantasy in which it can serve as an important academic tool to a variety of other disciplines while solely benefiting its own development.[1] I then turn my attention to the scholars that staff rhetoric departments, analyzing the manner in which they enforce this epistemology through their curriculum. Within this discussion, I will first explore the impact that rhetoric's insulated nature has

on the academic departments it strives to assist, arguing that its diffuse nature places an erroneous focus on the production of scholarship. Second, I will analyze how this perspective impacts students, giving special attention to students of color and Native students. After illuminating these issues, I turn to a series of correctives posited by a decolonial materialist rhetoric, demonstrating how the telos of rhetoric might be changed to strengthen rhetoric's contributions to academia.

One should note that this chapter is markedly different than its predecessors in both tone and its method of analysis. Rather than perform a close reading of a text, I wish to speak directly to the experiences I have accumulated as an aspiring rhetorician. By no means is this chapter's content meant to serve as a final judgement on the value of rhetoric but is instead a contribution to a historically-contested tradition. By detailing a decolonial materialist rhetoric's remedies to the field's current challenges, I simply hope to foster thought from contemporaries on how they can best approach the production of their scholarship in the future.

The Field's State

Rhetorical critics have long labored to grapple with their field's unique identity as it relates to contemporary academic traditions. Overshadowed by the historical legacy of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the discipline initially struggled to progress, developed "by two millennia of feeble echos and the babbling murmur of second-rate minds."[2] In the late 1940s, however, the discipline experienced a moment of clarity, recognizing it could no longer exist as a sub-discipline within English and Literary academic departments. The following decade was marked by a series of academic upheavals in which determined rhetorical critics attempted to gain purchase within the broader academic complex.[3]

Black's *Rhetorical Criticism*, published in 1965, marks a true temporal break in the discipline's history, inaugurating an era of revivalism in which the discipline flourished. As a scholar in the midst of such academic strife, Black believed academia compelled scholars:

> to adopt both more modest and more ambitious aspirations than their predecessors. The modesty has been in their efforts at carving scholarship into self-sufficient and independent units, making for greater specialization by critics, and inducing each critic to take a smaller fragment of the world as his field. The ambition lay in the attempt to create an articulate methodology where before there has been only the naïve and direct thrust for enlightenment in a study.[4]

Black's germinal text proceeds to distinguish the intended functions of rhetorical criticism and rhetorical theory, attempting to shatter the monotonous and overwhelming proliferation of neo-Aristotelian scholarship indicative of his era.

The text generated its intended effect, spurring a rhetorical renaissance in which critics expanded the scope of their research beyond the analysis of speeches delivered by public figures. In the wake of Black's book, rhetorical scholars began to grapple with the sentiment that "Aristotle could define the scope and technique of the deliberative orator, but he did not write on the scope and technique of the critic of deliberative oratory."[5] Seeking to contour the bounds of rhetorical theory, rhetoricians publishing in the late 1960s and 1970s sought to define the constitution of a rhetorical situation and whether rhetoric could be leveraged as a form of argumentation.[6] In 1981, Stephen E. Lucas authored "The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship," illuminating the ahistorical manner by which rhetoricians articulated criticism of texts.[7] Lucas' text charged rhetoricians to adopt a more historicized approach when conducting analysis, suggesting that a text's historical influences should be privileged. Calls to holistically examine a text's features and rhetorical nuances culminated in the methodological tradition of close reading. By

prioritizing the text and its constitutive characteristics, close reading inverted the normalized relationship between theory and a text, calling the rhetorician to suspend their desires to script theory on to a text. This method of analysis also placed a greater emphasis on textuality, displacing the traditional privilege of a text's orator.

As academia's critical tradition began to flourish in the 1990s, rhetoric began to expand the purview of its interests. Positioning itself as a useful theoretical tool to a litany of academic interests, rhetoric became intimately associated with feminist, postcolonial, and post-structural traditions.[8] Though each topic was rooted in an academic tradition distinct from rhetoric's origins, such scholarship can now only be disarticulated after considerable effort. Today, rhetoric's corpus is composed of a wide-ranging set of topics concerning the formation of publics, liminal identities, democratic values, science, memory studies, war memorials, and protest rhetoric.[9] Such diversity is undoubtedly valuable for the discipline and the various academic fields to which rhetoricians contribute. Yet, the rapid diffusion of rhetoric into other fields fosters an inevitable tension within the field, spurring debate amongst rhetoricians about how best to protect the integrity of their discipline. In the following discussion, I argue that the desire to restrict the scope of rhetorical scholarship leads to several unintended consequences.

Professors and Academic Departments

On one hand, rhetorical criticism can be defined as "that which critics do."[10] The unbounded nature of this perspective leads one to believe that rhetoric possesses the capacity to undergird the intellectual foundations of every other discipline; rhetoric, in effect, transcends the compartmentalized rubric of university departments, acting more as

a general heuristic through which to construct worldviews. To those first introduced to the field, this unbounded quality represents an unhindered approach to study whatever they find interesting. On the other hand, however, if rhetorical criticism represents those qualities most indicative of other disciplines, what remains to distinguish rhetoric within the academy? This fear that rhetoric's nature might facilitate its dispersal into competing academic departments persists amongst faculty and saturates the very method by which they instruct their students. To explore this dynamic, I turn my attention toward my own training as a rhetorician.

During my first semester as a prospective master's student, it was required that I attend a seminar meant to survey the field of rhetoric. While the class' focus remained the exposition of rhetorical scholarship across a wide range of topics, the first class represented the way in which I was expected to interpret the seminar's lessons. Upon beginning the class, my professor posed the question, "What constitutes the performance of criticism?" Each student provided their interpretation, and after an hour of refining our perspectives into a single definition, we were surprised by our professor's response. They did not contest the central thesis of our perspective. Rather, they responded with the question, "Then what limitations do you believe exist to prevent rhetorical analysis from becoming superfluous compared to other academic endeavors?" The class attempted to justify its response for the remainder of class, but we were met repeatedly with questions that begged us to explain how we differed from psychology, sociology, or social science departments. It was in this moment I realized that the content of our definition of rhetoric criticism mattered only insofar as we could justify our discussion as a uniquely rhetorical inquiry as adjudicated by the broader university system.

If this exchange had taken place only once, I might have given it little consideration. Yet, upon further reflection, I came to understand that this desire to conceptualize rhetoric as an exclusive project formed the pedagogical cornerstone of my graduate studies; every class discussion, every meeting with a professor about a paper proposal, every question concerning my thesis' content begged the question of how my work could be located as an exclusively rhetorical endeavor. Throughout this process, I came to realize Black's poignant criticism of academia, in which each scholar ultimately becomes concerned with justifying their scholarship's existence, has regretfully come to describe the collective efforts of rhetoricians. I argue that the drive to securitize the pedagogical benefits of rhetorical programs perpetuates several adverse effects amongst the scholars responsible for their maintenance and the students that compose graduate cohorts. I would like to begin by analyzing the impact that rhetoricians exert against competing academic departments.

It exists as a sad truth that the maintenance and growth of academic departments within a university remains an inherently political enterprise. Colleges and their academic departments are not valued merely on the basis of their contributions to their intellectual focus, but on the monetary and cultural value they accumulate for the university. Funding lines, faculty appointments, administrative support, and infrastructural resources are allocated in a zero-sum fashion in which scientific, artistic, and educational departments flourish at the expense of their contemporaries. It would be easy for one to dismiss this struggle as one that exceeds the concerns of a typical associate professor, relegated to the meeting rooms of administrative department chairs. However, this perspective ignores

how a department's incessant fight for survival in the university system is often dependent on the efforts of its faculty.

I argue that the university's constant need for innovative scholarship drives rhetorical scholars to subscribe to a parasitic model of authorship in which the knowledge accumulated from disparate academic interests is wielded to exclusively promote the field of rhetoric. This burden is uniquely present for rhetoricians, whose success as an academic is determined almost entirely by the amount of journal articles or books they have published. Some might optimistically view this increase in article production as proof of the field's growing popularity. In contrast, I contend this publish-or-perish model of knowledge production incentivizes rhetoricians to draw heavily off of the work of other academic projects for their own benefit. To explore this claim, I analyze the tenuous relationship between Indigenous Studies and rhetoricians fascinated by Native discourse.

The emergence of Indigenous Studies from English and History departments mirrors that of rhetoric's struggle to gain recognition within academia. Prior to 1960, there existed few Native intellectuals that were accepted into university systems. The termination policies of this era promoted ideals of assimilation and acculturation that stood in direct contrast to the expression of uniquely Indigenous knowledges within academic settings. However, in 1960, a movement took place within these departments in which Native intellectuals demanded the recognition of Native worldviews as their own humanistic project, worthy of the same resources allocated to social science programs. While this model persisted throughout the 1970s, the "big tent" approach failed to appeal to prominent activists such as Vine Deloria, Jr., who believed issues of Native law and

treaty rights should hold prominence in Native Studies. Ultimately, he and several other prominent Native intellectuals called for Indigenous knowledges to be divorced from traditional Humanities departments altogether. The results have been mixed at best. While some institutions have accommodated the demands of Indigenous intellectuals, Cook-Lynn argues that "the hiring of adjunct rather than faculty members on tenure track in the discipline,…the intrusion of anthropology, history, and literature,…[and] the hiring of CEOs as chairpersons of the campuswide department or program," have served to limit the growth of Indigenous Studies.[11]

Independent from the struggles of Indigenous Studies programs, the past two decades have witnessed the vast proliferation of Indigenous-authored scholarship throughout the United States and Canada. Beginning with Linda Tuhiwai Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Native intellectuals and activists have increasingly carved out enclaves for their academic pursuits.[12] Such efforts have led to the valorization of scholarship authored by Eve Tuck, Jodi Byrd, Audra Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, Sandy Grande, Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, Phillip Deloria, and Glen Sean Coulthard.[13] As a result, the visibility of Native scholarship within academia has inspired a new generation of Native activists that mobilize such scholarship throughout their communities as a method of grassroots organizing against settler colonial power. However, the visibility of Native scholarship has also ensured that such counter-hegemonic knowledges are easily identifiable by rhetoricians desperate for new subjects to explore.

I argue that the growing prominence of Indigenous scholarship has served as an alluring resource from which rhetoricians have continually extracted Native

epistemologies from their cultural framework for their own benefit. The historical similarities are simply too striking to ignore. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, Vine Deloria, Jr., served as one of the few Native intellectuals who commanded the attention of Western academia. Similarly, throughout this time period, Randall A. Lake was recognized as the sole rhetorician to engage Native discourse. One could argue that Lake was simply a rhetorician ahead of his time, cognizant of the rich value of Native epistemologies previously marginalized by settler colonial institutions. I believe, however, that Lake was simply the first to figure out how to import Native knowledges into the discipline. The relative dismissal of Native knowledges simply ensured that another critic could not produce scholarship similar to Lake's without being accused of simply replicating Lake's labor.

The truth remains that even Lake's scholarship, widely recognized as original within the field of rhetoric, remains a shadow of Deloria's *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indigenous Manifesto* and *God is Red: A Native View of Religion*.[14] While Lake's "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric," is commonly viewed as the first rhetorical article to engage Native protest rhetoric, Deloria's *Custer Died for Your Sins* explored the same topic fourteen years earlier in its ninth chapter, titled "The Problem of Indian Leadership."[15] Similarly, Lake's "Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric," is credited as the first rhetorical article to interrogate the antagonistic relationship between Native and Euramerican conceptions of time.[16] Yet, I struggle to delineate this article's contributions from that of Deloria's fourth chapter in *God is Red*, titled "Thinking in Time and Space."[17] Ironically, after Deloria once again retreated into the realm of legal

activism, Lake ceased publishing articles concerning Native discourse. Only after Ward Churchill rose to prominence in the mid-1990s did Lake again turn his attention to Native culture with his article "Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in Dances with Wolves," in which Lake wields Churchill's scholarship to dismantle Clifford-esque views of Native culture.[18]

Such coincidences extend beyond Lake's career. Only after Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* was published in 1999 did Mary E. Stuckey co-author two articles, in 1999 and 2000, concerning the rhetoric of Native leadership with John Sanchez.[19] Similarly, Black published his first article about Andrew Jackson's removal policies only one year after Sandy Grande's transformative *Red Pedagogy* was published in 2004.[20] This trend has only continued since then, evident in the way that prominent rhetorical publications consistently follow in the wake of Native-authored texts that grapple with the same exigencies and content.

What drives my skepticism, in large part, is the manner by which rhetoricians assign credit to their contemporaries for being the *first* in their field to explore marginalized Native rhetoric. Yet, the only true action these rhetoricians seem to have taken is to replicate these discourses *within the field of rhetoric.* I have frequently engaged in conversations with professors that reference Jason Edward Black as the first rhetorician to publish a book dedicated to Native discourse. Yet, as chapter two illuminated, such academic work had already been completed three years earlier in Byrd's *Transit of Empire*. Additionally, Casey Ryan Kelly and Black's *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination* boasts of being the first rhetorical volume to bring "together recognized scholars and emerging voices in a series

of critical projects that question the intersections of civic identity, including how American indigenous rhetoric is complicated by or made more dynamic when refracted through the lens of gender, race, class, and national identity."[21] It is important to note that Alvin M. Josephy, Jr.'s, *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom* and Grande's tenth anniversary edition of *Red Pedagogy* similarly tackled such subjects with contributions from Andrew Hermequaftewa, Clyde Warrior, the Indians of All Tribes, the Pit River Indian Council, Vine Deloria, Jr., John Tippeconnic III, Audra Simpson, Jodi. A Byrd, Eve Tuck, and Lakota Pochedly; Kelly and Black's volume, by contrast, contains contributions exclusively from non-Indigenous scholars.[22]

What emerges as evident through this analysis is that the academic success of rhetoricians such as Lake, Stuckey, Kelly, Endres, and Black is not due to their original contributions to Indigenous epistemologies. Rather, they are considered innovative simply because they were the first to replicate Indigenous knowledges within a rhetorical framework. This revelation should not be dismissed as overly critical or unfair in light of their other rhetorical efforts. My criticism is reminiscent of earlier warnings first issued in Kendall R. Phillips' "Rhetoric, Resistance, and Criticism: A Response to Sloop and Ono."[23] At the height of the critical tradition's growth, John M. Sloop and Kent A. Ono's "Out-law Discourse: The Critical Politics of Material Judgement,"[24] claimed "'the role of critical rhetoricians is to produce 'materialist conceptions of judgements,' *using* out-law judgements to disrupt dominant logics of judgment.'"[25] In effect, rhetoricians were charged with seeking out and adopting marginalized discourses in order to evaluate their efficacy as a truly disruptive force. While Phillips outlines numerous criticisms of this pedagogical approach, his most poignant criticism details how rhetoric's relationship

with marginalized discourses serves to "siphon the political energy of out-law discourse into academic practice."[26] In light of the criticisms detailed throughout chapters two and three, I struggle to view Phillips' statement as anything other than a regrettable truth.

The Impact on Rhetoric's Students

One might feel compelled to intervene at this moment, defending the valuable research of Lake and his contemporaries. The mutual existence of rhetoric and Native Studies programs must disprove the existence of any negative effects rhetoricians might have exerted against Indigenous academics. In response, I would urge this individual to take a closer look at the treatment of Indigenous academics within the university. Though there exists a new-found sense of belonging for Native epistemologies in academia, the antagonistic relationship between settler institutions and Native intellectuals continues to frustrate the progress of Native scholarship. For those that wish to challenge settler colonialism openly, there remains the risk that "he or she may be targeted by those who disagree about the functions of colonization in the modern world and will very likely be exposed as a dissident of the academy or, worse yet, incompetent and wrong!"[27] Such disparities can also be noticed with regard to the appointment of professors to tenure track positions. While one would struggle to simply name more than one Native rhetorician, it takes little effort to recognize that authors like Kelly and Black earned tenure while primarily writing about Native culture.[28]

This insidious pedagogical framework is not exclusive to established academics. Rather, I contend that these pedagogical practices are passed along to and inculcated within students. Too often, I have received feedback from journal reviewers imploring me to cite more rhetoricians, as opposed to Native intellectuals who fail to deploy the

term rhetoric throughout their texts; too often, I have been told "Canadian" Indigenous scholarship is not germane to critiques of American governance, eliding the entire criticism of Western-imposed geographical boundaries; too often, I have been asked "Are you sure you don't want to change some of your arguments so that this essay might better fit in a rhetoric journal?" The everyday reiteration of these rhetorical moments serves to instill in students a belief that their scholarship is only worthwhile if it remains rhetorical in focus.

Tiffany Lethabo King's "Humans Involved: Lurking in the Lines of Posthumanist Flight," notes how "graduate students of color experience this kind of stress, anxiety, and unease as they confront the pressure to 'take up' more contemporary impulses within Western 'critical theory.'"[29] Because this process remains difficult for Native students and students of color who are more likely to demonstrate deference to a different corpus of scholarship, these students often find themselves subject to the scrutiny of their white contemporaries. When Native students or students of color produce scholarship that disrupts normative, comfortable conceptions of history, identity, or academic practice, they are targeted by their confounded classmates. An excerpt from Cook-Lynn's *A Separate Country* is especially illuminating. She states:

> Not long ago, I was at a meeting in Denver, pointing out some of this [settler colonial] history to an audience, and a young white man, a graduate student, asked, 'Well, what do you want us to do?' This is a guy probably getting an MBA, or, worse yet, a Master's of Fine Arts, and so the question what do you want us to do is surely a rhetorical one from his point of view.[30]

Rather than just listen and grapple with the knowledge being shared by Cook-Lynn, this student's first impulse is to challenge the telos of her efforts, casting calls for decolonization as a project exclusive with his own academic project. I have not

forwarded this criticism solely for the sake of being a contrarian. I gain no pleasure from denigrating the scholarship of those I am expected to work alongside one day. However, I believe that rhetoricians have forgotten Phillips' plea that "Our attempts to extend our domains of knowledge and expertise (authority) must not be pursued unreflexively."[31] To usher in this moment of reflection, I turn to a decolonial materialist rhetoric and the potential it holds for restructuring how rhetoricians approach the production of scholarship.

An Alternative Heuristic

Indigenous scholars and students have few illusions concerning their current potential progress within the settler colonial university. As Cook-Lynn avers, "It is not realistic to expect that universities are going to systematically and quickly overhaul their long-held power enclaves in order to make a place for the long-neglected study of the indigenes in any other place than anthropology."[32] However, I see this as no excuse for rhetoricians to allow such injustices to continue unabated. As this thesis nears its conclusion, I find it imperative that I return to a discussion of how rhetoricians should not only change the manner by which they engage Native discourse in their articles and books, but how one should change the process by which they engage Native knowledges in the mundane moments of their day. Here, I turn to a decolonial materialist rhetoric, not as a theoretical practice, but as a heuristic that rhetoricians should adopt when contemplating Indigenous epistemologies. This approach is by no means perfect, and its immediate impact might go unnoticed by large swaths of the rhetorical community. However, its impact will be immediately distinguishable by Native students and the professors that guide their scholarship.

Prior to the production of scholarship, a decolonial materialist rhetoric insists "The first thing American scholars must do is come to grips with their own history and treatment of the indigenes, and how they have allowed that interpretation of their history to shape their own cultural identities."[33] This requires that scholars and students acknowledge and respect the antagonistic relationship that sutures settler colonial relations. Additionally, it urges them to use their positions of privilege to explore and forward the history of Indigenous communities in an effort to disrupt settler colonialism's project of historical erasure. Here I want to return to the confrontation between Cook-Lynn and the graduate student. When responding to the student's challenge, Cook-Lynn did not command the student to abandon his entire academic project in favor of decolonial critique. Instead, she simply stated:

> I don't want that young man to do anything *except to know this history*. His generation must know this history, and he must know that much of what results from this history in terms of the law *is wrong* – politically, ethically, morally, and legally…What Indians ant is a fair playing field, and this young man must access historical archives to know that there is nothing 'fair' in a colonial and imperialist history that oppresses Native populations. Rather, this history expresses elimination as a solution.[34]

In essence, Cook-Lynn desires for students to simply learn about and respect the knowledges forwarded by Native intellectuals.

This process is not easy, and often requires aspiring rhetoricians to conduct research in fields that exceed the scope of rhetoric. This thesis, however, serves as a testament to the depth of knowledge that can be gleaned from such efforts. One not only comes to understand settler colonialism's violent history but becomes aware of violence embedded within popular scholarship. Critics must ask themselves how reading decolonial texts such as *The Transit of Empire, Mohawk Interruptus, or Beyond Settler*

Time might radically transform their view of Native epistemologies and how they interact with parts of scholarship that they view as constitutive of hegemonic knowledges.

One such area in which this quandary can be explored is in the disconnect between rhetorical scholarship and Native activism. Currently, rhetoric places no compulsion on rhetoricians to extend their politics beyond the classroom. The university's focus on publication substitutes for the discipline's telos, which contributes to the divide between theory and praxis detailed in chapter one. In contrast, Native-authored scholarship frequently situates the text itself as a rallying cry for material action outside of the academy. Leanne Simpson's *As We Have Always Done* represents a fantastic example.[35] While the first half of her text is dedicated to exploring the intersections between decolonial thought and capitalism, internationalism, and queer normativity, the final three chapters situate this discourse within a broader scene of resistance carried out by Native activists beyond academia's halls.

When rhetoricians attune their efforts at knowledge production to the political demands forwarded by Native intellectuals, two results are produced. First, rhetoricians begin to realize the possibility of a form of rhetorical scholarship that privileges the decolonial demand for land rematriation. While chapter two extensively details the centrality of land in decolonial texts, this section demonstrates how the authentic adoption of this demand by rhetoricians restructures their scholarship. Land, also referred to as "Aki" by Simpson, function as a cultural analytic, exceeding the academic nuances of rhetoricians. Grounding scholarship in the concept of land allows for the formation of enduring relationships between a place and its occupant and induces rhetoricians to contemplate the historical legacy of the space they occupy. More importantly, however,

this relationship "challenges settler colonial dissections of our territories and our bodies into reserve/city or rural/urban dichotomies."[36] This perspective forces rhetoricians to reexamine what they register as decolonial moments. Decolonization is not simply a spectacular moment of rupture within the colonial order. Rather, it is the everyday process of wresting the means of cultural production away from settler populations back into the care of Native communities. Such efforts not only function rhetorically by challenging settler notions that script Native reserves as places of wilderness; they also function through continual engagement with land-based practices, ensuring spectacular ruptures of the colonial order are even possible the next day.

The second result of engaging Native scholarship on its own terms is the realization that Native epistemologies have much to contribute to rhetorical methods of analysis. Leanne Simpson's "Land as Pedagogy" serves as a illustrative exemplar of this point. The article begins by recounting the story of Kwenzens, a Native child of Annishnaabeg heritage who spends their day exploring their relationships with the surrounding environment. While a traditional rhetorical close reading of this story might privilege the way in which Kwenzens communicates with Ajidammo, the only other sentient creature in the story, the injection of Native epistemologies into this rhetorical analysis enables a unique set of rhetorical criticism to be enunciated.

Primarily, a reliance on Native conceptions of time urge the reader to not mistake this story as an idyllic fantasy of a pre-colonial time. Instead, this criticism urges the reader to conceive of the story as taking place in all places and all times throughout Native communities, as the series of events detailed throughout the story could be reflective of any Native community that continues to value traditional relationships with

the environment. Additionally, Simpson's reliance on Native conceptions of interpersonal interaction endemic to Native communities privileges notions of reciprocity and respect as it is actualized between younger and older members of Native communities. While a settler colonial interpretation of interpersonal relationships might presume that Kwenzen's mother commands a level of respect not equally afforded to Kwenzens due to her age, Simpson demonstrates how Native relations function differently by granting equal levels of respect to even the youngest members of society.

These seemingly small differences should demonstrate to rhetoricians that much of the scholarship authored by Native intellectuals is already rhetorical. By engaging in close readings of texts, speeches, and political events, Native scholars often engage in the same methods of rhetorical analysis rhetoricians believe to be exclusive to their own discipline. Ultimately, this means that Native scholarship does not required a rhetorical interpretation of its content but is in fact a contribution to an already expansive rhetorical corpus. This claim is not meant to script all Native scholarship as rhetorical. Instead, it is meant to reveal to rhetoricians that there exists work beyond their field that accomplishes the same goals without contributing to a model of academia premised on exclusivity and departmental infighting. If rhetoricians are to benefit from the sentiment that "Criticism is that which critics do," then they would do well move rhetoric's confines, as opposed to drawing Native scholarship within its grasp.

Conclusion

As this chapter has briefly explored, a decolonial materialist rhetoric functions not only as a theoretical lens through which to conduct research, but also as an epistemological heuristic rhetoricians can adhere to. Currently, rhetoric finds itself at a

crossroads, torn between an expansionist movement into disparate academic fields and a desire to maintain a unique academic identity. While the former fosters a sense of epistemic plurality, the latter ensures that such growth and diversity comes at the expense of similarly marginalized academic departments. This securitization remains a dangerous practice for rhetoricians and their pupils. Primarily, it induces professors to artificially limit the scope of their students' project, directing them toward more rhetorical frameworks. Additionally, it sends a signal to Native students and students of color that they should subordinate their traditional epistemologies to dominant rhetorical theories, lest they be subject to scrutiny from their peers.

Here a decolonial materialist rhetoric intervenes, providing paths to recourse for professors and students alike. The first step is to reevaluate what constitutes rhetorical criticism. While scholarship produced within the halls of Indigenous Studies programs might appear overly concerned with Native pedagogies, there remains a sense that portions of this work are already rhetorical in nature. Instead of simply replicating this scholarship in rhetoric departments, rhetoricians should take the initiative to move out toward other academic interests. This also spurs rhetoricians to grapple with the material implications of their scholarship. No longer is academia simply an enterprise oriented toward the production of scholarship. Rather, it is a staging ground for resistance amongst Native communities. By recognizing decolonial demands as they are articulated within their own cultural framework, rhetoricians have a greater chance of contributing to such movements, as opposed to limiting their potential. Only by demonstrating deference to Native intellectuals in this manner can rhetorical critics ensure their scholarship is constructed "*in* the service of resistance."[37]

Notes

1. Edwin Black *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965).

2. Black, *Rhetorical Criticism*, xvii.

3. Ernest J. Wrage, "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33 (1947): 451-457.

4. Black, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 3.

5. Black, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 3.

6. Lloyd F. Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968):1-14.; Wayne Brockriede, "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60 (1974):165-174.

7. Stephen E. Lucas, "The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 67 (1981): 1-20.

8. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, "Rhetorical Feminism," *Rhetoric Review* 20 (2001): 9-12.; Joseph P. Zompetti, "Toward a Gramscian Critical Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Communication* 61 (1997):66-86.; Raka Shome, "Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An 'Other' View," Communication Theory 6 (1996): 40-59.

9. Bradford Vivian, *Commonplace Witnessing: Rhetorical Invention, Historical Remembrance, and Public Culture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).; J. David Cisneros, "A Nation of Immigrants and a Nation of Laws: Race, Multiculturalism, and Neoliberal Exception in Barak Obama's Immigration Discourse," *Communication, Culture & Critique* 8 (2015):356-375.

10. Black, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 4.

11. Elizabeth Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country: Postcoloniality and American Indian Nations* (Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2012), 118.

12. Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 2nd ed. (New York: Zed Books, 2012).

13. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1 (2012): 1-40.; Jodi Byrd, *Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).; Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life*

Across the Borders of Settler States (Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2014).; Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, "Land as Pedagogy: Nishnaabeg Intelligence and Rebellious Transformation," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3 (2014): 1-25.; Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998).; Glen Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

14. Vine Deloria, Jr., *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indigenous Manifesto* (New York: Avon, 1969).; Vine Deloria, Jr., *God is Red: A Native View of Religion*, 3rd ed. (Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum Publishing, 2003).

15. Randall A. Lake, "Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69 (1983): 127-142.; Deloria, *Custer Died for Your Sins*, 196-221.

16. Randall A. Lake, "Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77 (1991): 123-151.

17. Deloria, *God is Red*, 61-76.

18. Randall A. Lake, "Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in Dances with Wolves," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (1997): 66-89.

19. John Sanchez and Mary. E Stuckey, "The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s," *Communication Quarterly* 48 (2000): 120-136.; John Sanchez and Mary E. Stuckey, "Communicating Culture through Leadership: One View from Indian Country," *Communication Studies* 50 (1999): 103-115.

20. Jason Edward Black, "Authoritarian Fatherhood: Andrew Jackson's Early Familial Lectures to America's 'Red Children,'" *Journal of Family History* 30 (2005): 247-264.

21. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black, in *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, eds. Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black (New York: Peter Lang, 2018).

22. Alvin M. Josephy, Jr., *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom* (New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing, 1971),; Sandy Grande *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought* 2nd ed. (New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2014).

23. Kendall R. Phillips, "Rhetoric, Resistance, and Criticism: A Response to Sloop and Ono," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 32 (1999): 96-102.

24. John M. Sloop and Kent A. Ono, "Out-law Discourse: The Critical Politics of Material Judgement," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 30 (1997): 50-69.

25. Phillips, "Rhetoric, Resistance, and Criticism," 98.

26. Phillips, "Rhetoric, Resistance, and Criticism," 100.

27. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, 21.

28. If one pays close attention to the time period in which Black and Kelly pursued Tenure, it becomes clear that a majority of the articles published during this time concerned Native rhetoric. Yet, after being granted Tenure, Kelly ceased publishing articles that centered Native communities.

29. Tiffany Lethabo King, "Humans Involved: Lurking in the Lines of Posthumanist Flight," *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3 (2017): 163.

30. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, 72.

31. Phillips, "Rhetoric, Resistance, and Criticism," 101.

32. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, 122.

33. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, 24.

34. Cook-Lynn, *A Separate Country*, 72.

35. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

36. Simpson, "Land as Pedagogy," 23.

37. Phillips, "Rhetoric, Resistance, and Criticism," 96.

CHAPTER FIVE

Reviewing the Impact of a Decolonial Materialist Rhetoric

Summation

Settler colonialism remains a persistent threat to the survival of Indigenous communities and their knowledges. Yet, in the face of a centuries-long campaign of extermination, Native intellectuals continue to labor on behalf of their communities; these efforts not only facilitate the reproduction of Native epistemologies within settler institutions but move beyond the academy to generate grassroots movements that demand the rematriation of Indigenous land and life. It is time for rhetoricians to adopt and proliferate these decolonial demands. As agents of a settler institution such as the academy, rhetoricians possess an obligation to orient their research and scholarship toward the liberation of Indigenous knowledges. Throughout the course of this thesis, I have struggled to wade through the intersections of rhetorical studies and Native studies, illuminating numerous ways in which rhetoricians can better actualize a decolonial politics. As this project comes to a close, I would like to review the various contributions present throughout this thesis.

This thesis began by first searching for a theoretical foundation that possessed the possibility of realizing the full potential of decolonial scholarship within rhetoric's bounds. Turning to Greene's view of materialist rhetoric, I outline the necessity of analyzing texts against institutions of power, exploring contingent historical influences that gave rise to the text's existence. Fleeing from a logic of representation, this method

of analysis fittingly endorses a logic of articulation in which material linkages betray violence social norms when texts are analyzed as part of a larger system. This gave rise to my brief analysis of the university as a settler institution, capable of effectuating the dispossession of Native communities from their lands and the dismissal of Native epistemologies.

Chapter two continued this thread of analysis, exploring how rhetorical perspectives of Native knowledges often fail to perceive how their interaction can invite violence against Native communities. While there exists a desire to engage Indigenous discourses, there is little engagement with the intellectual foundations of Native activism. Using citational practices as an analytic frame, one can easily determine that rhetorical scholarship continues to distance itself from popular texts authored by Native intellectuals. Primarily, this leads rhetorical critics to draw from competing intellectual understandings of colonialism, flattening the difference between settler colonial and postcolonial subjects. While this distinction might appear trivial, the misrecognition of settler colonial subjects often induces society to dismiss the grievances of Native communities. Additionally, failure to properly cite Native intellectuals leads rhetoricians to narrow the scope of Native demands for decolonization. Rather than appreciate the value of land return and the restoration of sovereignty, the ability to speak back to the colonizer becomes the telos of decolonial tactics.

As a corrective to the criticisms outlined in chapter two, I utilize chapter three by illuminating how a decolonial materialist rhetoric can function as a rhetorical tool when analyzing a text. To demonstrate this process, I turn to Robert L. Ivie and Oscar Giner's *Hunt the Devil: A Demonology of US War Culture*, inverting their popular understanding

of Native culture. They posit that only the constant refinement of democratic norms possesses the ability to restrain the violent war-like impulses of America's body politic; deploying the Trickster as a universal figure, they argue that only an exceptional public figure can effectively wield its peaceful ethos to combat the Devil. To contest their claims, I begin by exposing how settler violence remained unabated well after the establishment of America's democracy. To support this analysis, I trace the spread of settler violence across Turtle Island from 1492 to 1890, explaining how democracy often facilitated the very violence it claimed to abhor. Additionally, Ivie and Giner treat America's demos as an undifferentiated populace following the dawn of the 1900s, yet I outline the various methods used by Native communities to resist assimilation. Finally, I provide a different conceptualization of the Trickster in which it represents a communal affect capable of sustaining intergenerational, land-based resistance.

Chapter four serves a complimentary role to chapter three, outlining the role of a decolonial materialist rhetoric as it relates to rhetoricians. While rhetoricians tend to believe that their discipline can serve as a valuable tool to other academic endeavors, there remains an air of hesitancy concerning what might happen if rhetoric exceeded its departmental boundaries. This fear induces scholars to assimilate marginalized knowledge within a rhetorical frame at the expense of similar academic pursuits. This fear not only permeates the department's halls, but seeps into the very practices passed down from professor to student. Rather than securitize one's own position within academia, rhetoricians should embrace their role as cross-disciplinary critics, striving to export rhetorical methodologies beyond their programs. Adopting a decolonial materialist rhetoric assists in this process for rhetoricians drawn to Native rhetoric. As a heuristic, a

decolonial materialist rhetoric implores rhetoricians to change more than just their citational practices, inviting them to view decolonial texts as already rhetorical in nature. Additionally, it urges rhetoricians to contemplate the full extent of decolonial demands, giving special deference to the use of land as a generative source of Native culture.

Limitations

Despite the various contributions forwarded by this thesis, there remain several limitations that might restrict the efficacy of this criticism. The first limitation is one of audience will power. While I have gone to great lengths to expose the various shortcomings of scholarship authored by Lake, Stuckey, Kelly, Endres, and Black, the exigency of my work relies on the notion that rhetoricians have simply failed to give credit to Native perspectives in the past. There is no guarantee that this text will be treated with any greater degree of care; in fact, as the sparring between Lake and Morris and Wander demonstrates, this text is simply likely to invite condemnation from those criticized.

The second limitation that exists pertains to the durability of academic departments. While I wish for rhetoricians to embrace their role as versatile scholars, the fear of a department's dissolution will continue to drive rhetoricians back to their own programs. It might yet be possible to change the manner by which pedagogical practices are passed down to students. However, I fear that it might remain an insurmountable struggle to convince rhetorical administrators that their departments should not be privileged over the value of intersectional research.

Future Research

Due to the restrictions of a Master's thesis, there are several issues that I was not able to cover that represent avenues for future research. One possible interest of study concerns how a decolonial materialist rhetoric might be deployed in a classroom setting. If pedagogical practices truly are inherited and are circulated through everyday modes of learning, what might it look like if an entire course's curriculum were filtered through Native conceptions of rhetoric? What impact might this have on Native students who previously felt their research did not belong within rhetoric programs?

A second possible avenue for research concerns the process of applying a decolonial materialist rhetoric to a primary source text, such as a speech. I am aware that my thesis is predominately theoretical in nature and deals primarily with secondary sources. While I believe that a critique of the discipline is necessary to generate new ideas for rhetorical criticism, it remains unseen how the analytic I have sketched might alter our perceptions of popular oratory. One might view such efforts as trivial within the broader network of settler colonial relations. However, seemingly mundane research is necessary to actualize the broader ethic of a decolonial materialist rhetoric and disrupt everyday instances of settler colonial violence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahluwalia, Pal. "When Does a Settler Become a Native? Citizenship and Identity in a Settler Society." *Pretexts: Literary and Cultural Studies* 10, no.1 (2001): 63-73.

Ahmed, Sara. "Making Feminist Points." *feministkilljoys*, September 11, 2013. https://feministkilljoys.com/2013/09/11/making-feminist-points/.

Arthur, Rob, and Allison McCann. "How the Gutting of the Voting Rights Act Led to Hundreds of Closed Polls." *Vice*, October 16, 2018, https://news.vice.com/en_us/article/kz58qx/how-the-gutting-of-the-voting-rights-act-led-to-closed-polls.

Barrett, Anthony M. "Analyzing and Reducing the Risks of Inadvertent Nuclear War Between the United States and Russia." *Science and Global Security* 21, no. 2 (2013): 106-133.

Biesecker, Barbara. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation from within the Thematic of *Difference*." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 22, no. 1 (1989): 110-130.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1, no. 1 (1968):1-14.

Black, Edwin. *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965.

Black, Jason Edward. *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2015.

Black, Jason Edward. "Authoritarian Fatherhood: Andrew Jackson's Early Familial Lectures to America's 'Red Children.'" *Journal of Family History* 30, no. 3 (2005): 247-264.

Black, Jason Edward. "The 'Mascotting' of Native America: Construction, Commodity, and Assimilation." *American Indian Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (2002): 605-622.

Black, Jason Edward. "Native Resistive Rhetoric and the Decolonization of American Indian Removal Discourse." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 1 (2009): 66-88.

Black, Jason Edward. “Plenary Rhetoric in Indian Country: The Long Wolf v. Hitchcock Case and the Codification of a Weakened Native Character.” *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 11, no. 1 (2008): 59-80.

Borrows, John. “Frozen Rights in Canada: Constitutional Interpretation and the Trickster.” *American Indian Law Review* 22, no. 1 (1997): 37-64.

Brockriede, Wayne. “Rhetorical Criticism as Argument.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60, no. 2 (1974): 165-174.

Byrd, Jodi. *Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.

Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. “Rhetorical Feminism.” *Rhetoric Review* 20, no. 1 (2001): 9-12.

Cisneros, J. David. “A Nation of Immigrants and a Nation of Laws: Race, Multiculturalism, and Neoliberal Exception in Barak Obama's Immigration Discourse.” *Communication, Culture & Critique* 8, no. 1 (2015): 356-375.

Cloud, Dana L. “The Materiality of Discourse as Oxymoron: A challenge to Critical Rhetoric.” *Western Journal of Communication* 58, no. 3 (1994): 141-163.

Cook-Lynn, Elizabeth. *A Separate Country: Postcoloniality and American Indian Nations*. Lubbock: Texas Tech University Press, 2012.

Coulthard, Glen Sean. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

Dalley, Hamish. “The Deaths of Settler Colonialism: Extinction as a Metaphor of Decolonization in Contemporary Settler Literature.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 8, no. 1 (2018): 30-46.

Deloria, Philip J. *Playing Indian*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1998.

Deloria, Vine Jr. *Custer Died for Your Sins: An Indigenous Manifesto* New York: Avon, 1969.

Deloria, Vine Jr. *God is Red: A Native View of Religion*, 3rd ed. Golden, Colorado: Fulcrum
Publishing, 2003.

Desai, Chandni, Eric Ritskes, and Aman Sium. “Towards the ‘Tangible Unknown’: Decolonization and the Indigenous Future.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education &*Society 1, no. 1 (2012): i-xiii.

Donnella, Leah. “The Standing Rock Resistance Is Unprecedented (It's Also Centuries Old).” *National Public Radio*, November 22, 2016. https://www.npr.org/sections /codeswitch/2016/11/22/502068751/the-standing-rock-resistance-is-unprecedented-it-s-also-centuries-old.

Dunbar-Ortiz, Roxanne. *An Indigenous Peoples’ History of the United States*. Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 2014.

Endres, Danielle. “American Indian Activism and Audience: Rhetorical Analysis of Leonard Peltier’s Response to Denial of Clemency,” *Communication Reports* 24, no. 1 (2011): 1-11.

Endres, Danielle. “American Indian Permission for Mascots: Resistance or Complicity within Rhetorical Colonialism.” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 18, no. 4 (2015): 649-690.

Endres, Danielle. “Animist Intersubjectivity as Argumentation: Western Shoshone and Southern Paiute Arguments Against a Nuclear Waste Site at Yucca Mountain.” *Argumentation* 27, no. 2 (2013): 183-200.

Endres, Danielle. “Expanding Notions of Scientific Argument: A Case Study of the Use of Scientific Argument by American Indians.” In *Communicating Science: New Agendas in Communication*, edited by LeeAnn Kahlor and Patricia Stout, 187-208. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Endres, Danielle. “Location Matters: The Rhetoric of Place in Protest.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 97, no. 3 (2011): 257-282.

Endres, Danielle. “Sacred Land or National Sacrifice Zone: The Role of Values in the Yucca Mountain Participation Process.” *Environmental Communication* 6, no. 3 (2012): 328-345.

Goeman, Mishuana. *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.

Goldstein, Alyosha. “Working Intersectionally to Abolish White Supremacy: An Interview with Alyosha Goldstein.” Interview by Luis J. Beltrán-Álvarez. *Critical Ethnic Studies: Student Interview Series Part XI*, August 14, 2018. http://www .criticalethnicstudiesjournal.org/blog/2018/8/14/student-interview-series-part-xi.

Grande, Sandy. *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*, rev. ed. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.

Greene, Ronald Walter. "Another Materialist Rhetoric." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 15, no. 1 (1998): 21-41.

History. "Voting Rights Act of 1965." *History*, September 12, 2018. https://www.history.com/topics/black-history/voting-rights-act.

ICT. "Native History: Citizenship Thrust Upon Natives by U.S. Congress." *Indian Country Today*, June 2, 2014. https://newsmaven.io/indiancountrytoday/archive/native-history-citizenship-thrust-upon-natives-by-u-s-congress-diZuPnKVq0C3vugN0JlgQQ/.

Ivie, Robert L., and Oscar Giner. *Hunt the Devil: A Demonology of US War Culture*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2015.

Josephy, Alvin M. Jr. *Red Power: The American Indians' Fight for Freedom.* New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing, 1971.

Kelly, Casey Ryan. "American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 102, no. 4 (2016): 418-429.

Kelly, Casey Ryan. "Blood-Speak: Ward Churchill and the Racialization of American Indian Identity." Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies 8, no. 3 (2011): 240-265.

Kelly, Casey Ryan, and Jason Edward Black. *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*. New York: Peter Lang, 2018.

Kelly, Casey Ryan. "Détournement, Decolonization, and the American Indian Occupation of Alcatraz Island (1969–1971)." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 44, no. 2 (2014): 168-190.

Kelly, Casey Ryan, and Jason Edward Black. "Introduction: Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric." In *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, edited by Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black, 1-23. New York: Peter Lang, 2018.

Kelly, Casey Ryan. "Orwellian Language and the Politics of Tribal Termination (1953-1960)." *Western Journal of Communication* 74, no. 4 (2010): 351-371.

Kelly, Casey Ryan. “Rhetorical Counterinsurgency: The FBI and the American Indian Movement.” *Advances in the History of Rhetoric* 10, no. 1 (2007): 223-258.

Kelly, Casey Ryan. “‘We are not Free’: The Meaning of <Freedom> in American Indian Resistance to President Johnson’s War on Poverty.” *Communication Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (2014): 455-473.

King, Thomas. *The Inconvenient Indian: A Curious Account of Native People in North America*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013.

King, Tiffany Lethabo. “Humans Involved: Lurking in the Lines of Posthumanist Flight.” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3, no. 2 (2017): 163-185.

Lake, Randall A. “Argumentation and Self: The Enactment of Identity in Dances with Wolves.” *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34, no. 2 (1997): 66-89.

Lake, Randall A. “Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 2 (1991): 123-151.

Lake, Randall A. “Enacting Red Power: The Consummatory Function in Native American Protest Rhetoric.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 69, no. 2 (1983): 127-142.

Library of Virginia. “The New Virginia Law to Preserve Racial Integrity.” Library of Virginia. Last modified 2018. https://s3.amazonaws.com/omeka-net/3933/archive/files/a21dd53f2a098fca5199e481433b4eb2.pdf?AWSAccessKeyId=AKIAI3ATG3OSQLO5HGKA&Expires=1525320232&Signature=xBekismiyf%2FJUqtmiBAjRRoFs7g%3D.

Liptak, Adam. “Supreme Court Invalidates Key Part of Voting Rights Act.” *New York Times*, June 25, 2013. https://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/26/us/supreme-court-ruling.html.

Lucas, Stephen E. “The Schism in Rhetorical Scholarship.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 67, no. 1 (1981): 1-20.

McCue-Enser, Margret. “Intersectional Rhetoric and the Perversity of Form: Ada Deer’s Confirmation Statement as Resistive Rhetoric.” In *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, edited by Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black, 244-267. New York: Peter Lang, 2018.

McGee, Michael Calvin. “Text, Context, and the Fragmentation of Contemporary Culture.” *Western Journal of Communication* 54, no. 3 (1990): 274-289.

McKerrow, Raymie E. “Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis.” *Communication Monographs* 56, no. 2 (1989): 91-111.

Meraji, Shereen Marisol. “It’s not just about the Blood.” *NPR*, February 7, 2018. https://www.npr.org/templates/transcript/transcript.php?storyId=583753149.

Miller, Eric C. “Hunt the Devil: A Demonology of U.S. War Culture, by Robert L. Ivie and Oscar Giner.” *The Communication Review* 19, no. 2 (2016): 156-158.

Morris, Richard and Philip Wander. “Native American Rhetoric: Dancing in the Shadows of the Ghost Dance.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 76, no. 2 (1990): 164-191.

National Archives. “Dawes Records,” National Archives. Last modified January 26, 2017. https://www.archives.gov/research/native-americans/dawes.

National Congress of American Indians. “Senator Elizabeth Warren Addresses Native Heritage and Commits to Indian Country at the National Congress of American Indians 2018 Winter Session.” *National Congress of American Indians*, February 14, 2018. http://www.ncai.org/news/articles/2018/02/14/senator-elizabeth-warren-addresses.

Palczewski, Catherine. “Women at the Greasy Grass/Little Bighorn Battlefield National Monument: Remapping the Gendered/Sexed Circumference of Memory.” In *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, edited by Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black, 48-77. New York: Peter Lang, 2018.

paperson, la. *A Third University Is Possible*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

Phillips, Kendall R. “Rhetoric, Resistance, and Criticism: A Response to Sloop and Ono.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 32, no. 1 (1999): 96-102.

Pochedly, Lakota. “Keep Calm and Decolonize: Response 5.” In *Red Pedagogy*, edited by Sandy Grande, 10th Anniversary ed., 289-294. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.

Presley, Rachel. “Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Rhetorical Strategies for Environmental Protection and Tribal Resistance in the Dakota Access Pipeline Movement.” In *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, edited by Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black, 285-302. New York: Peter Lang, 2018.

Purkiss, Jessica, and Jack Serle. “Obama’s Covert Drone War in Numbers: Ten Times More Strikes than Bush.” *The Beurau of Investigative Journalism*, January 17, 2017. https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/stories/2017-01-17/obamas-covert-drone-war.

Reséndez, Andrés. *The Other Slavery: The Uncovered Story of Indian Enslavement in America*. Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2016.

Rifkin, Mark. *Beyond Settler Time: Temporal Sovereignty and Indigenous Self-Determination*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2017.

Sanchez, John, and Mary E. Stuckey. “Communicating Culture Through Leadership: One View from Indian Country.” *Communication Studies* 50, no. 2 (1999): 103-115.

Sanchez, John, and Mary E. Stuckey. “The Rhetoric of American Indian Activism in the 1960s and 1970s.” *Communication Quarterly* 48, no. 2 (2000): 120-136.

Shogren, Elizabeth. “Clinton Calls for New Approach to ‘Affirmative Action.’” *Los Angeles Times*, July 9, 1998. *http://articles.latimes.com/1998/jul/09/news/mn-2235*.

Shome, Raka. “Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An ‘Other’ View.” *Communication Theory* 6, no. 1 (1996): 40-59.

Simpson, Audra. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2014.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. “Land as Pedagogy: Nishnaabeg Intelligence and Rebellious Transformation.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 3, no. 3 (2014): 1-25.

Sloop, John M., and Kent A. Ono. “Out-law Discourse: The Critical Politics of Material Judgement.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 30, no. 1 (1997): 50-69.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 2nd ed. New York: Zed Books, 2012.

Stuckey, Mary E. *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2015.

Stuckey, Mary E. “Foreword: The Questions of Decolonization.” In *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, edited by Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black xi-xvii. New York: Peter Lang, 2018.

Trump, Donald J. “Native American Code Talkers, November 27, 2017.” *C-Span*, November 27, 2017. https://www.c-span.org/video/?437799-1/president-trump-honors-native-american-code-talkers.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. “Introduction: Born Under the Rising Sign of Social Justice.” In *Toward What Justice?: Describing Diverse Dreams of Justice in Education*, edited by Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, 1-17. New York: Routledge, 2018.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1-40.

Vivian, Bradford. *Commonplace Witnessing: Rhetorical Invention, Historical Remembrance, and Public Culture*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Warren, Elizabeth. “Elizabeth Warren Address to the National Congress of American Indians’ Executive Council Winter Session & Tribal Nations Policy Summit.” *National Congress of American Indians*, February 14, 2018. http://www.ncai.org/Elizabeth_Warren_Address_to_the_National_Congress_of_American_Indians.pdf.

Wilderson, Frank III. *Red, White & Black: Cinema and the Structure of U.S. Antagonisms*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 2010.

Williams, Robert A. Jr. *The American Indian in Western Legal Thought: The Discourses of Conquest*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Woan, Tansy. *The Value of Resistance in a Permanently White, Civil Society*. New York: Proquest, 2011.

Wolfe, Patrick. “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native.” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 387-409.

Wolfe, Patrick. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1999.

Wrage, Ernest J. “Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 33, no. 4 (1947): 451-457.

Yancy, George. “Whiteness and the Return of the Black Body.” *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 19, no. 4 (2005): 215-241.

Young, Kelly. “The Rhetorical Persona of the Water Protectors: Anti-Dakota Pipeline Resistance with Mirror Shields.” In *Decolonizing Native American Rhetoric: Communicating Self-Determination*, edited by Casey Ryan Kelly and Jason Edward Black, 268-284. New York: Peter Lang, 2018.

Zompetti, Joseph P. “Toward a Gramscian Critical Rhetoric.” *Western Journal of Communication* 61, no. 1 (1997):66-86.