#### Currently, Western perspectives of the environment exclude the very possibility of indigenous ideas—rather than viewing the Earth as the foundation for life, it becomes seen as a mere object available for human manipulation and domination. Instead, we must first look at the ways in which nature constructs us.
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[Mary Jane, PhD, “Being Nature’s Mind: Indigenous Ways of Knowing and Planetary Consciousness,” *Partnership for Earth Spirituality*, 2 Feb 2006, http://www.earthspirituality.org/archive/zimmerman\_seminar.htm // myost]

In this section I will describe three models of ways of knowing from the Diné, the Yup’ik, and the Cree and Ojibway (Anishinabe) cultures. There is wide variety among Native American nations, however, when contrasted in a general way to Western ways of knowing, some broad commonalities can be seen. For example, each of these ways of knowing depends on a more open and fluid egoic structure than is common in European cultures and is connected to methods of childrearing which provide that more relational ego. According to David Begay and Nancy Maryboy, writing from the Diné perspective, Native American epistemology begins with the assumption, from experience, that everything in the cosmos is connected and that all physical bodies and all minds are expressions of a deeper spiritual essence (Begay and Maryboy 277). Since the human mind is part of a whole, interrelated cosmic process, it can enter into an awareness of that process. In their conclusion of a discussion of Diné epistemology, Begay and Maryboy state that “this epistemology cannot be fully conceptualized in terms of an individual person. The mind, body and spirit is intrinsically interrelated with the cosmic whole” (323). I begin my discussion of Native American epistemologies with that quotation because it highlights such a deep assumption in Western thought, that humans are individuals knowing a world out there. If modern humans stay within that assumption, they cannot even begin to understand Native ways of knowing. Instead, invert the primacy of the individual and begin to conceive of all individuals as arising out of a greater process that they exist within. How that greater process shows up in the consciousness of the various individuals is the knowledge of the whole process coming through the individual. Begay and Maryboy try to give Western readers a sense of Diné epistemology by explaining some Navajo terms, such as dzil (mountain). Whereas in English this term has purely physicalistic connotations (“a land mass higher than a hill” (Webster’s, ctd. in Begay and Maryboy 282)), in the Diné meaning it refers to a whole set of relationships and the ongoing movement inherent in those relationships. These relationships include the life cycles of the animals and plants which grow at different elevations, the weather patterns effected by the mountain, as well as the human’s experience of being with the mountain. All of these processes are dynamic, so one can speak of the dzil nanit’a, or the movement of the mountain. Begay and Maryboy explain this term as “the dynamic interrelationship and kinetic processes that regenerate and transform life” (288). Since this motion of the mountain is not separate from the entire cosmic process, one can only really come to know the mountain by learning about “the kinetic dynamics of the whole” (288), usually through years of study and ceremonial practice. Through such study and practice, a person can enter into close knowledge of the mountain and also knowledge of what the relationship is between the mountain and human consciousness. Begay and Maryboy state that “according to traditional thinking, dzil nanit’a bee nitsisikees, the holistic movement, as conceived through the mountain, is the human consciousness” (291). The human is closely related to the mountain because both exist at the center between Mother Earth and Father Sky. The mountain thus has the power to teach and to heal: “its very essence is the healing process.... The mountain itself is medicine” (296). The interconnection between the mountain and the human is expressed as dzil bii’ iistiin (usually translated as “the inner form of the mountain”). Begay and Maryboy conclude “thus the mountain is consciousness and consciousness is the mountain” (297). How does a person come to the understanding of the close connection between the human and the mountain? Begay and Maryboy discuss intra-subjectivity, entering into a oneness with the mountain: . . . one has to take one’s mind inside the mountain and become one with the mountain. Only then can one see the psyche (dzil bii’ iistiin) of the mountain. The human mind becomes aware of the intrinsic relationship as one with the mountain. One can look back at the human with the mountain’s mind, which is the human mind. (315) I have purposely chosen this quotation and the previous ones because I thought they might be confusing to non-Native readers. I do not understand them completely myself. But it is clear to me that the traditional people with whom Begay and Maryboy spoke knew something about the possible qualities of human consciousness which they learned by becoming one with the mountain. Also, this practice of knowing through intersubjectivity is not unique to the human-mountain relationship. Although that is the main example discussed in their dissertation, Begay and Maryboy have told me that it can be applied to any aspect of the natural world. Let me emphasize that such oneness between the human mind and the natural world is not the naive, prepersonal oneness of an undifferentiated infant (Wilber 31). It is the ability to enter into another part of the cosmic whole, an ability which takes many years of practice. Begay and Maryboy state that the Diné are just as capable of thinking objectively as Western people and of using their language to make objective statements. However, they are also always aware of “an intrinsic subjective relationship which is not nullified by an objective statement” (314). The capacity of intra-subjective knowing is not done unconsciously or automatically, and it does not preclude Western ways of knowing. It is an added capacity of awareness, not a primitive one. In his book, The Way of the Human Being, Calvin Luther Martin also discusses this ability to enter into the consciousness of another part of the whole. He tells many stories of boundary crossings from the Eskimo, Yup’ik , and other tribes, stories in which a person departs from the human realm and lives as another animal for a year or two, then returns to teach the other humans how to respect and relate to this animal. He advises his Western readers not to analyze such a story or categorize it as fiction, but to put it on and wear it, as one wears a parka, to live inside it for awhile until they can begin to hear the spirit (yua) of the story (2). If approached with openness, these stories can begin to teach us about another way of knowing the world: Something else, too, may happen: the story might seem to be thinking you rather than your thinking it. This is a potent thing and it is a legitimate thing, totally against common sense but nonetheless real. Don’t reject it; this is how an Eskimo would perceive such a story: it has yua. (3) Thus he warns, at the outset, that Westerners often can’t hear the teachings of these boundary crossing stories because they don’t know how to listen to them. All of these stories are about kinship. They are about learning to look at the human from the perspective of Seal, Whale, or Fox. And as Martin reports, people introduced themselves to him by saying, “I am Puffin,” or “I am Killer Whale,” not simply “I belong to the clan of . . .” (34-37). This sense of kinship extended to experiences of mutual respect. He notes that one woman was not afraid to go jogging on the back roads where bears were often encountered because her late husband had been a Bear. The bears, therefore, protected her (37). Another story tells of a great chief who was a Bear. When he died, a number of bears came out of the woods to the road as a truck brought his body up from the dock, some of them even standing up as the truck passed by (37). Thus, these stories of kinship and connection are about real relationships of reciprocal respect, not just isolated human imaginings. In fact, from this perspective of relationship and respect, the behavior of environmental biologists at work in this region is troubling to many of the traditional people. Catching, tranquilizing, and branding the bears, pulling their teeth to calculate age, and putting radio collars on them to track their movements are all considered by the biologists to be necessary for species preservation. They need data and see this as the only way to get it. They wouldn’t think to ask the Bear people, the ones who know and feel the bears, because such a way of getting information isn’t scientific. But the older people warn that this research is disrespectful, that it is “playing” with the bears, and that it will cause the bears to go away (108-113). Martin points out that these two epistemologies, the way of kinship and the way of science, spring from two different ontologies, the ontology of trust and the ontology of fear (205). Fearing that the earth will not provide leads to ways of knowing which have the goal of manipulation and control. But a core belief and experience in Native America is that the earth does provide bountifully to those who relate to it with respect. All the hunting stories are about animals who choose to give themselves to the hunters who behave respectfully (9). Hunting begins first in the mind, by contacting an animal through song (the medicine hunt). One then asks permission to take some flesh; when permission is granted, it is a gift from the animal of its robe (67). Its spirit lives on and must be honored through ceremonies of gratitude. Balance in the world is maintained when everyone lives within an ontology and an ethic of gift-giving: In a world where everything breathes with life, has motion, is intelligent with thought, and is kinsman, equilibrium can work only when everything is exchanged as a gift, rather than through theft, strategem, or “main force.” As, for instance, when an animal being gives itself freely, with full permission, to needy human brethren. And where humans keep their demands on these other beings modest, approaching them in ceremony that speaks of the original and everlasting kinship. (62) Some stories tell of hunters who cannot find game, but the problem is not the abundance of the animals; the problem is the hunter’s lack of perception. These stories point to a participatory understanding of reality. If we see the world as a place of gift, where the earth and the beings on the earth are fond of humans and want to help them, we will experience its abundance; we will be able to “participate in the conversation of the Gift” (79). If we see it as a place of fear, we will begin grasping, and what we grasp for will elude us. As Martin says, “The real issue lies in what physicists call the problem of measurement: whether we start . . . by measuring the world in fear or in trust” (205). Thus, these Native stories show a clear awareness that human attitudes and behavior have a role in calling forth the face of reality which we see (86).

#### Nowhere is this devaluation of Earth more evident than in the process of energy extraction and production, where entire habitats are upended. The soil we stand on becomes a mere deposit for coal, oil and gas; the wind around us and the sun above us only a means for yet more consumption.
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[Tad, Harvey Mudd College, “Martin Heidegger and Environmental Ethics,” [http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html //](http://www2.hmc.edu/~tbeckman/personal/Heidart.html%20//) myost]

To uncover the essence of modern technology is to discover why technology stands today as the danger. To accomplish this insight, we must understand why modern technology must be viewed as a "challenging-forth," what affect this has on our relationship with nature, and how this relationship affects us. Is there really a difference? Has technology really left the domain of techne in a significant way? In modern technology, has human agency withdrawn in some way beyond involvement and, instead, acquired an attitude of violence with respect to the other causal factors? Heidegger clearly saw the development of "energy resources" as symbolic of this evolutionary path; while the transformation into modern technology undoubtedly began early, the first definitive signs of its new character began with the harnessing of energy resources, as we would say. [(7)](http://www2.hmc.edu/%7Etbeckman/personal/Heidart.html#N_7_) As a representative of the old technology, the windmill took energy from the wind but converted it immediately into other manifestations such as the grinding of grain; the windmill did not unlock energy from the wind in order to store it for later arbitrary distribution. Modern wind-generators, on the other hand, convert the energy of wind into electrical power which can be stored in batteries or otherwise. The significance of storage is that it places the energy at our disposal; and because of this storage the powers of nature can be turned back upon itself. The storing of energy is, in this sense, the symbol of our over-coming of nature as a potent object. "...a tract of land is challenged into the putting out of coal and ore. The earth now reveals itself as a coal mining district, the soil as a mineral deposit." {[7], p. 14} This and other examples that Heidegger used throughout this essay illustrate the difference between a technology that diverts the natural course cooperatively and modern technology that achieves the unnatural by force. Not only is this achieved by force but it is achieved by placing nature in our subjective context, setting aside natural processes entirely, and conceiving of all revealing as being relevant only to human subjective needs. The essence of technology originally was a revealing of life and nature in which human intervention deflected the natural course while still regarding nature as the teacher and, for that matter, the keeper. The essence of modern technology is a revealing of phenomena, often far removed from anything that resembles "life and nature," in which human intrusion not only diverts nature but fundamentally changes it. As a mode of revealing, technology today is a challenging-forth of nature so that the technologically altered nature of things is always a situation in which nature and objects wait, standing in reserve for our use. We pump crude oil from the ground and we ship it to refineries where it is fractionally distilled into volatile substances and we ship these to gas stations around the world where they reside in huge underground tanks, standing ready to power our automobiles or airplanes. Technology has intruded upon nature in a far more active mode that represents a consistent direction of domination. Everything is viewed as "standing-reserve" and, in that, loses its natural objective identity. The river, for instance, is not seen as a river; it is seen as a source of hydro-electric power, as a water supply, or as an avenue of navigation through which to contact inland markets. In the era of techne humans were relationally involved with other objects in the coming to presence; in the era of modern technology, humans challenge-forth the subjectively valued elements of the universe so that, within this new form of revealing, objects lose their significance to anything but their subjective status of standing-ready for human design. (8)

#### The resourcification inherent in status quo approaches to energy production is the vital internal link to cultural domination and imperialism—the appropriation of nature enables endless consumption and the disposability of entire populations.
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[Tom B.K. (Mato Awanyankapi), executive director of the Indigenous Environmental Network, “The State of Indigenous America Series: Earth Mother, Piñons, and Apple Pie,” *Wicazo Sa Review* 25.2 (Fall 2010): 11-28. // myost]

The United States consumes a third of the resources of our sacred Earth Mother. This includes the resources of the oceans. This level of consumption that feeds the addictive appetite of the United States and its industrialized society causes continued intrusions and invasions into other peoples’ territories, including our indigenous homelands. A society based upon conquest and expropriation of the sacred is not [End Page 13] sustainable. The current national and global economic system with its global corporations, financial institutions, and governmental bureaucracies cannot survive without an ever-increasing supply of natural resources: forests, industrial agriculture, minerals, coal, uranium, oil and natural gas, fish, wildlife, water, and land. The dominant society’s economic paradigm, at all levels, places rapid economic growth, the quest for individual and corporate accumulation of wealth, and a race to exploit natural resources as its foundation. This economic system disregards the finite limits of Earth Mother in terms of natural resource availability, consumption, waste generation, and absorption. These issues continue to be compounded by the increasingly toxic nature and destructive practices of energy systems and mineral extractive industries, industrial-level agriculture, and a production system that creates wasteful by-products that few people want stored in their backyards. Many Tribal Nations are located in remote areas where municipal, industrial, federal, and military toxic and radioactive wastes continue to be dumped, burned, and stored. Recently, with the popularity of waste-to-energy incinerators and biomass plants, developers are coming into indigenous territories promoting these polluting facilities as green energy and green economy ventures. Our communities and villages are high health-risk communities from decades of radioactive and toxic exposure. There is a legacy of toxic chemicals disproportionately contaminating indigenous peoples. These chemicals bioaccumulate and biomagnify in the food chain of both processed foods and indigenous traditional and subsistence food systems. Most federal environmental, ecological, and health risk assessment management and assessment models do not protect the indigenous peoples of the United States, Canada, and the world. Our children are especially vulnerable. The current extraction of materials, the production of waste, and the level of consumption within industrial development are not sustainable. Indigenous peoples and indigenous organizations in North America and worldwide understand that Earth Mother and her resources cannot sustain the consumption and production needs of this modern industrialized society, including the waste that is created. This includes the high level of energy that is required to power up industrial production and consumption. Our communities still live in the reality of outdated, toxic, and unsustainable energy policies. Colonization has always been about land and who owns and controls it. Some of our indigenous traditional territories—full of coal, oil, gas, and uranium—are under attack by mining companies. Other sources of energy development such as large hydro dam projects in North America and throughout the world have flooded our [End Page 14] territories, including our homelands, culture, history, and burial sites. This is not sustainable development. Peak Oil The end of cheap energy, what is called “peak oil,” is bringing dramatic shifts in North America and the world. Depletions of inexpensive, or conventional, oil and gas supplies threaten the survival of industrial nations and industrialism itself, at its present scale. Long distance transportation, industrial food systems, complex urban and suburban systems, and many market commodities basic to our present way of life, including autos, plastics, chemicals, pesticides, and refrigeration, are all rooted in the basic assumption of an ever-increasing, inexpensive energy supply. This is not sustainable. Unconventional oil and fossil fuel reserves remain plentiful, but have not been economically feasible to obtain and process until the recent decade. While the world is talking about mitigating climate change, it is business-as-usual with the expansion of fossil fuel development within or near indigenous territories. Under the Obama administration, the push for American energy security is opening a wide doorway for expanding unconventional fossil fuel development. Following are current unconventional oil developments in indigenous territories: 1. Our brothers and sisters at the top of the world in Alaska are being bombarded by the threats of increased oil development, both on land and offshore. Resisting Environmental Destruction on Indigenous Lands (REDOIL), an Alaska Native grassroots alliance, has been resisting efforts of the United States and Shell to pursue oil drilling in the sensitive Arctic region, including the offshore Outer Continental Shelf areas of the Beaufort and Chukchi seas. Offshore oil drilling, as proposed by President Obama, threatens Alaska Natives’ way of life, and perpetuates U.S. addiction to oil and the concentration of greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to global warming and climate change. It is of utmost importance to institute a federal time-out on the proposed offshore development within the Outer Continental Shelf areas in Alaska. It has not been proven whether cleaning up spills in broken ice conditions is possible. The implications to subsistence ways of life and human health of Alaska coastal communities have not been adequately reviewed. Impacts to polar bears and other threatened and endangered Arctic marine species have not been thoroughly studied. [End Page 15] 2. The public in the United States and even in Canada are not aware of what is happening in the tar sands “sacrifice” zone of northern Alberta, Canada. These tar sands are the second largest oil deposit in the world, bigger than Iraq, Iran, or Russia, exceeded only by Saudi Arabia. For years, the mining and processing of this heavy crude, tarlike substance was too expensive to process and was considered unconventional. Binational agreements between the United States and Canada will eventually import 80 percent of the Alberta tar/oil sands crude oil to feed U.S. energy needs resulting in unprecedented human rights violations and ecological destruction in the homelands of the Mikisew Cree, Athabasca Dene, and the Métis. Tar sands development has completely altered the Athabasca delta and watershed landscape, with deforestation of the boreal forests, open pit mining, in situ mining, dewatering of the water systems, toxic contamination, and degradation to the ecosystem. Canada is not meeting its Kyoto Protocol climate agreements due to the carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions released by the tar sands development. This tar sands expansion has been called the tip of the non-conventional fuels iceberg and consists of a fossil fuel far more carbon intensive than conventional oil. This tip of the iceberg in the development of unconventional fossil fuels includes oil shale, liquid coal, ultra-heavy oils, and ultra-deep offshore deposits. Extraction of these bottom-of-the-barrel fuels emits higher levels of greenhouse gases and creates ecological devastation. In Utah, on federal lands, there is an emerging frenzy of companies lining up to tap the tar sands and oil shale there. 3. The toxic legacy left by fossil fuel and uranium development on indigenous lands remains today and will persist for generations, even without additional development. Mines and electrical generation facilities have had devastating health and cultural impacts on our indigenous peoples at all stages of the energy cycle, ranging from cancer from radioactive uranium waste in Laguna Pueblo and the Navajo Nation in New Mexico, to respiratory illness caused by coal-fired power plant and oil refinery air emissions on and near Native lands, such as Fort Berthold Three Affiliated Tribes in North Dakota or the Navajo of the Shiprock area of northwest New Mexico, to acute respiratory illnesses of the Ponca [End Page 16] Nation in north central Oklahoma. Indigenous communities have been targeted in all proposals for long-term nuclear waste storage, such as the Western Shoshone in Nevada, or the Prairie Island Mdewankanton Dakota community in eastern Minnesota who live next door to a nuclear power reactor and are experiencing elevated incidences of cancer and other illnesses. The history of resource exploitation, including conventional energy resources, in indigenous territories was highlighted by the recently settled Elouise Cobell lawsuit against the Department of the Interior on behalf of individual Native landowners. The systematic exploitation by the U.S. government and corporations of conventional energy resources has run an equally long and often deadly course in our lands. Under federalism, our energy resource Tribes have supplied access to abundant natural resources under U.S. federal trust protection at rock-bottom prices in sweetheart deals promoted by the federal government. Yet many of our local communities and families living in remote areas of Tribal reservations often go unserved or underserved by the benefits of such development. Even the most recent U.S. energy legislation and incentives are designed to encourage the development of Tribal resources, with mechanisms for fast-tracking the siting and permitting process. Development must not be a forced choice. For the United States to provide incentives for further fossil fuels and uranium development in indigenous territories will only continue the pattern of ignoring the well-being of our communities and Alaska Native villages in favor of short-sighted proposals that exploit the vulnerabilities of poor, politically isolated communities. When considering energy and climate change policy, it is important that the White House and federal agencies, and even our emerging Tribal leaders, our youth, and Native academia, consider the history of energy and mineral exploitation and Native Nations, and the potential to create a dramatic change with innovative policies. Too often Native Nations are presented with a false choice: either to develop polluting energy resources or remain in dire poverty. Economic development need not come at the expense of maintaining spiritual principles, cultural identity, and thriving ecosystems.

#### This relationship towards the natural world is not harmless; the hegemony of Western thought endangers any context for an ethical relationship to the planet and places us on the path of collective suicide – expanding the limits of knowledge is necessary for any ethical relationship to the planet. We are all interdependent, and our patterns of thinking must reflect this.
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[Lilian, Dare to compare: Americanizing the Holocaust By: Friedberg, Lilian, American Indian Quarterly, 0095182X, June 1, 2000, Vol. 24, Issue 3]

Giorgio Agamben has argued against the use of the term Holocaust as a descriptor for the Nazi extermination of the Jews because "Jews were exterminated not in a mad and giant holocaust but exactly as Hitler had announced, 'as lice,' which is to say as bare life."[43] The notorious California Indian-killer H. L. Hall justified the murder of Native infants based on the argument that "a nit would make a louse." John Chivington, commanding colonel in the infamous Sand Creek Massacre, reformulated the sentiment to justify similar actions with the statement "Nits make lice."[44] Perplexing in this context is that Hitler's perception of the Jews as "life unworthy of living," that is, as "lice" or "bare life," is received with moral outrage in the scholarly community and in public consciousness in the U.S. and elsewhere. But when Indians are placed on the same level of the "evolutionary scale" and assigned the same status in the biopolitical order, it becomes a justifiable sacrifice made in the name of "progress." Hitler's willing executioners and the ordinary men and women of Germany had to be convinced that the Jewish population was not human; they had, after all, for centuries prior, lived and worked side by side with these people who were systematically exterminated as "like lice." Before the Final Solution could be implemented, the Jewish population of Europe had to be reduced to the level of "bare life." But for the American settlers, the notion that the life form to be clear-cut from the vast, "unpopulated" wilderness in order to make way for their American way of life was somehow not human ranked among those truths held to be self-evident; the "execrable race" of red men and women was viewed from the very onset as existing at the level of "bare life." And yet, from a perspective that acknowledges the essential humanity of indigenous populations and the sophistication of the established forms of social organization, governance, and religious ritual prevailing among the indigenous populations at the time of contact, it becomes clear that, while the Nazi Holocaust was indeed unique in scope and in kind to the twentieth century, the American Holocaust was, as Stannard has stated, "far and away, the most massive act of genocide in the history of the world."[45] Fortunately, Hitler was stopped before he could consummate the Final Solution. But some contend that Uncle Sam's willing executioners are still today engaged in the effort to eradicate what remains of the indigenous population in North America. For others, the loss of Native lives and lifeways cannot be acknowledged as homicidal, genocidal, or suicidal because the "savage" is not--however ostentatiously liberal-minded individuals and institutions in this country may contend otherwise--considered fully human: "we" are not related. While a revisionist narrative of the West would attempt to suffuse its world-view with a politically correct moral underpinning by making superficial linguistic concessions, no longer applying such terms as "savage" and "primitive" to indigenous peoples, contemporary scholarship still draws its insights and impulses from the same body of research and the same doctrine of universal superiority it now seeks to disavow and revile. The appearance of euphemisms such as "ethnocide" and "depopulation" applied to the genocide committed against Native populations is just one index of the continued resistance to the notion that this devastation involves a human tragedy. Nominally, indigenous peoples have been grudgingly adopted into the "family of man" in the prevailing paradigms of Western thought. Phenomenologically, they are still today perceived not as human others, but in fact as a separate (and inferior) "species." Depending on one's interpretation of the Latin siluaticus (of the wood; belonging to a wood), from which the term "savage" is derived, one might suspect that, in the Western biopolitical order, the "savage life" acquires the status of one less than bare life or Homo sacer. If that is the case, then what occurred in this country must be viewed as a gigantic bonfire in which neither mice, lice, nor men, women or children were sacrificed and burned for the sake of clear-cutting a space for the master race--what was sacrificed here were merely logs. Driftwood. Dead weight. Useless waste. In the world of the uniqueness proponents, the "depopulation" of the New World is on a par with "deforestation." What is perhaps "unique" about the Nazi Holocaust is that it represents the first incidence in history of genocidal assault directed at an assimilated, "civilized" (and therefore human) population in central Europe.[46] Katz refers to the phenomenon as one of "Judeocide." It might, however, more accurately be termed fratricide--brothers killing brothers--squabbling sons of the same God in a serial rerun of Cain and Abel. This is not to imply that fratricide is any less grievous a crime against humanity than genocide, merely to clarify the relationship of spiritual kinship existing between perpetrators and victims in the Nazi Holocaust and the way this works to influence our perception of the event's primacy. It could in fact be argued that fratricide is indeed the more heinous crime since it involves the extermination of life that is dearly defined as "human" in the Judeo-Christian paradigm. Brothers killing brothers is classified as a mortal sin by the religious doctrines governing moral standards in both religions, but brothers killing savages is apparently sanctioned by the moral dictates of both these dominant world religions. If the ideology of Manifest Destiny is, on the other hand, subsumed under the mandate to "be fruitful and multiply," then the extermination of indigenous populations is indeed ordained by the supreme deity common to the Christian and the Judaic faiths. From this perspective, mass murder is the implied mandate of Manifest Destiny. Churchill speaks in terms of the need for a "denazification ... a fundamental alteration in the consciousness of this country."[47] I would suggest that "demanifestation" is a more apt designation for the paradigmatic shift requisite for decentering the hegemonistic reign of the "master narratives" of Manifest Destiny and the master race that govern our understanding of history as it relates to national identity in the United States. Thinking in terms of "de-manifestation" has the advantage of disaggregating the specific modalities of similar, but not identical, historical phenomena and of dislocating--geographically and intellectually--the source of the "problem" from the site of European history to that of American history. What follows is an attendant shift in temporal focus that allows us to properly place the postulates of Manifest Destiny and the master race in historically correct chronological order with relation to the subsequent emergence of theories of Lebensraumpolitik and the assumed superiority of the Aryan race on the European continent. Whereas "denazification" clearly connotes a "thing of the past," "de-manifestation" implies a present, "manifest" reality. From this vantage point, the German Sonderweg is rerouted and an already trammeled trail of rampant plundering, pillage, and mass murder is revealed to have been blazed in the forward wake of the historical caesura that the Nazi Holocaust represents. [HOLOCAUST IN CONTEMPORARY CONTEXT: COLLECTIVE SUICIDE](http://ehis.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.lib.ou.edu/eds/detail?vid=2&hid=115&sid=41bfcb58-c42e-478c-b039-f30bcd57366d%40sessionmgr114&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmU%3d#toc) Most importantly, perhaps, what distinguishes the American Holocaust from the Nazi Holocaust is what is at stake today. The Nazi Holocaust represents a historical event that threatened the entire Jewish population of Europe. Relegating this event to the archive of oblivion would involve a fatal miscalculation resulting in wholesale moral bankruptcy for the entire Western world. But the worldwide Jewish population can hardly be said to be at risk of extermination today--certainly not in the United States. American Jews stepped up their efforts to direct attention to the Nazi Holocaust at a time when they were by far the wealthiest, best-educated, most influential, in-every-way-most-successful group in American society--a group that, compared to most other identifiable minority groups, suffered no measurable discrimination and no disadvantages on account of that minority status.[48] Norman Finkelstein cites the Jewish income in the United States at double that of non-Jews and points out that sixteen of the forty wealthiest Americans are Jews, as are 40 percent of Nobel prizewinners in science and economics, 20 percent of professors at major universities and 40 percent of partners in law firms in New York and Washington.[49] Native Americans, by contrast, have long been subject to the most extreme poverty of any sector in the present North American population, and still have the highest rate of suicide of any other ethnic group on the continent.[50] Highschool dropout rates are as high as 70 percent in some communities. As Anishinabeg activist and Harvard-educated scholar Winona LaDuke notes with regard to the Lakota population in South Dakota: "Alcoholism, unemployment, suicide, accidental death and homicide rates are still well above the national average."[51] Alcoholism, intergenerational posttraumatic stress, and a spate of social and economic ills continue to plague these communities in the aftermath of the American Holocaust. As Peter Novik has made abundantly clear in his study of the way the Holocaust functions as a sort of"civil religion" and signifier of identity for American Jews, much of the commemoration rhetoric and practice propagated in this country centers on maintaining a consensual symbol of unity for American Jews who thus experience the Holocaust "vicariously." As Novik states, while most American Jews (and Gentiles) may be saddened, dismayed, or shocked by the Nazi Holocaust, there is little evidence to suggest that they have actually been traumatized by it.[52] The Americanization of the Holocaust, according to Novik's analysis, serves a symbolic function for American Jews, ascribing victim status to a community that demonstrates little sign of actual victimization in a culture where the victim is victor. Norman Finkelstein, the vociferous Goldhagen critic who lost most of his family in the death camps and ghettoes of Nazi-occupied Europe, has expressed similar views. His forthcoming publication asserts that the "Holocaust industry" was born with the Six-Day War in June of 1967. Before that, there was little mention of the Holocaust in American life.He argues that the development of the "Holocaust industry" in the United States is part of a strategic campaign to justify American political interests in Israel.[53] This is not to deny or diminish the clear and present danger in the ominous resurgence of anti-Semitic sentiments reflected in isolated incidences of racial violence against Jews and Jewish institutions both here and abroad. However, the material realities confronting the Native American population remain, in many instances, comparable to those prevailing in Third World countries. The Native American experience of persecution is not a vicarious one. For substantial portions of this population, it is a lived reality. What is more, an unrelenting sentiment of Indian-hating persists in this country: There is a peculiar kind of hatred in the northwoods, a hatred born of the guilt of privilege, a hatred born of living with three generations of complicity in the theft of lives and lands. What is worse is that each day, those who hold this position of privilege must come face to face with those whom they have dispossessed. To others who rightfully should share in the complicity and the guilt, Indians are far away and long ago. But in reservation border towns, Indians are ever present. ... The poverty of dispossession is almost overwhelming. So is the poverty of complicity and guilt. In America, poverty is relative, but it still causes shame. That shame, combined with guilt and a feeling of powerlessness, creates an atmosphere in which hatred buds, blossoms, and flourishes. The hatred passes from father to son and from mother to daughter. Each generation feels the hatred and it penetrates deeper to justify a myth.[54] Attempts on the part of American Indians to transcend chronic, intergenerational maladies introduced by the settler population (for example, in the highly contested Casino industry, in the ongoing battles over tribal sovereignty, and so on) are challenged tooth and nail by the U.S. government and its "ordinary" people. Flexibility in transcending these conditions has been greatly curtailed by federal policies that have "legally" supplanted our traditional forms of governance, outlawed our languages and spirituality, manipulated our numbers and identity, usurped our cultural integrity, viciously repressed the leaders of our efforts to regain self-determination, and systematically miseducated the bulk of our youth to believe that this is, if not just, at least inevitable."[55] Today's state of affairs in America, both with regard to public memory and national identity, represents a flawless mirror image of the situation in Germany vis-hvis Jews and other non-Aryan victims of the Nazi regime.[56] Collective indifference to these conditions on the part of both white and black America is a poor reflection on the nation's character. This collective refusal to acknowledge the genocide further exacerbates the aftermath in Native communities and hinders the recovery process. This, too, sets the American situation apart from the German-Jewish situation: Holocaust denial is seen by most of the world as an affront to the victims of the Nazi regime. In America, the situation is the reverse:victims seeking recovery are seen as assaulting American ideals. But what is at stake today, at the dawn of a new millennium, is not the culture, tradition, and survival of one population on one continent on either side of the Atlantic. What is at stake is the very future of the human species. LaDuke, in her most recent work, contextualizes the issues from a contemporary perspective: Our experience of survival and resistance is shared with many others. But it is not only about Native people. ... In the final analysis, the survival of Native America is fundamentally about the collective survival of all human beings. The question of who gets to determine the destiny of the land, and of the people who live on it--those with the money or those who pray on the land--is a question that is alive throughout society.[57] "There is," as LaDuke reminds us, "a direct relationship between the loss of cultural diversity and the loss of biodiversity. Wherever Indigenous peoples still remain, there is also a corresponding enclave of biodiversity."[58] But, she continues, The last 150 years have seen a great holocaust. There have been more species lost in the past 150 years than since the Ice Age. (During the same time, Indigenous peoples have been disappearing from the face of the earth. Over 2,000 nations of Indigenous peoples have gone extinct in the western hemisphere and one nation disappears from the Amazon rainforest every year.)[59] It is not about "us" as indigenous peoples--it is about "us" as a human species. We are all related. At issue is no longer the "Jewish question" or the "Indian problem." We must speak today in terms of the "human problem." And it is this "problem" for which not a "final," but a sustainable, viable solution must be found--because it is no longer a matter of "serial genocide," it has become one of collective suicide. As Terrence Des Pres put it, in The Survivor: "At the heart of our problems is that nihilism which was all along the destiny of Western culture: a nihilism either unacknowledged even as the bombs fell or else, as with Hitler or Stalin, demonically proclaimed as the new salvation."[60] All of us must now begin thinking and acting in the dimension and in the interest of the human species--an intellectual domain of vita activa that indigenous people have inhabited since time immemorial. It is this modality of thought as a process of reflection that the "civilized" nations must learn from the "savage" ones. Vine Deloria, in "Native American Spirituality," has attempted to clarify this distinction: American Indians look backwards in time to the creation of the world and view reality from the perspective of the one species that has the capability to reflect on the meaning of things. This attitude is generally misunderstood by non-Indians who act as if reflection and logical thought were synonymous. But reflection is a special art and requires maturity of personality, certainty of identity, and feelings of equality with the other life forms of the world. It consists, more precisely, of allowing wisdom to approach rather than seeking answers to self-generated questions. Such an attitude, then, stands in a polarized position to the manner in which society today conducts itself.[61] It is not a matter of moral bookkeeping or of winners and losers in the battle of the most martyred minority. It is not a matter of comparative victimology, but one of collective survival. The insistence on incomparability and "uniqueness" of the Nazi Holocaust is precisely what prohibits our collective comprehension of genocide as a phenomenon of Western "civilization," not as a reiterative series of historical events, each in its own way "unique." It is what inhibits our ability to name causes, anticipate outcomes, d, above all to engage in preemptive political and intellectual action in the face of contemporary exigencies. In Tabori's 1990 production Weisman and Rotgesicht, the "calculus of calamity" is taken to hilarious heights to reveal the grave truth of the matter. In his 1994 discussion of "The Contemporary German Fascination for Things Jewish," Jack Zipes states of Weisman und Rotgesicht: The resolution that Tabori offers, though hilarious, is meant to be taken seriously: a verbal duel so that both sides can expose themselves and realize how ridiculous it is to quarrel with one another. Hilarity becomes a nomadic means of questioning majority culture and of reversing identities so that understanding between different groups can be generated.[62] Ultimately, fostering a "solidarity of memory" that might fundamentally challenge majority culture must he the aim of any comparison of "minority" situations, but the conclusion Zipes draws from this particular conflation of identities in conflict is flawed by a misapprehension of the play's historically and culturally specific geographic setting in the Western wilderness and its relationship to indigenous peoples. As I have argued elsewhere, while Tabori does not specify the site of the duel in the desert, the play could be interpreted to be set in what is now the state of Colorado.[63] This is the site of the Sand Creek Massacre--a historical event with culturally specific meaning to the Native American people. It is at once a site of sanctity, of sacrifice, and of sacrilege. It represents the rampant desecration that has devastated an entire civilization and its way of life. But according to Jack Zipes's analysis: "There are many parallels that one can draw with the conflict in this play: Jews and blacks in the States, or blacks and Koreans; Jews and Turks in Germany; Jews and Arabs in the Middle East."[64] Clearly, other subaltern Others share similar relationships to other, more distant desert lands and wilderness landscapes, but Zipes's analogies are flawed on several counts. In the case of the conflicts between the first two groups cited, the element of violent conquest and the dispossession of lands at the heart of the American Indian-European immigrant "dispute" is absent: Jews and blacks, like Jews and Koreans, are engaged in a struggle for cultural, racial, economic, and social equity in territories to which they have been introduced as Others--either as slaves, immigrants, or refugees. In the German-Turkish situation, the "minority" group is the "alien element" or, as the German euphemism would have it, "guest workers." None of these struggles involves legal agreements between sovereign nations--that is to say treaties between sovereign political entities-the terms of which have not been upheld by an outlaw state whose legitimacy as a "world power" is nevertheless recognized by the international community. As Seth Wolitz has stated in this regard, "the text can also be read allegorically as a version of the Israeli-Palestinian encounter between two subalterns squabbling over land which the 'Gewittergoi', the imperialist powers, can always regain and control."[65] The problem with this allegory, though, is that the North American territories that function as the setting and backdrop for the territories at issue in the Indian-immigrant conflict have yet to be manumitted from colonialist bondage. The lands remain in control of the "imperialist power." Precisely this is central to understanding the double-edged ironies and conflicts addressed in Weisman und Rotgesicht. The setting involves a geographical site that is readily associated with the actual site of a massacre and, as such, the site itself is ambiguous: it signifies both a site of (ongoing) sanctity and one of (ongoing) desecration. If the parallel is to be drawn between the Jewish and American Indian subaltern situations, the course of history as well as the present state of affairs must be taken into account: the fact is that Hitler lost the war and the State of Israel was formed as partial reparation for the losses sustained by the Jewish population as a result. However, the United States government, even as it sought to help absorb the losses sustained by the Jewish population in Europe not only through its support of Israel, but by offering refuge to Jewish immigrants in territories seized from the indigenous populations, won its war against the Indians.[66] The crucial difference between a regime whose demise was rooted in genocide and one for whom genocide was its foundational principle and the prerequisite to its existence is elided by this analogy. Moreover, at the level of sheer abstraction, the solidarity between subaltern groups that the Jewish-American tradition of "spoofing" Jewish-Indian relations seeks to evoke is marred by its unilateral initiative -- emanating from the Jewish perspective in the context of a Judeo-Christian framework that demonstrates little regard for or knowledge of the cultural and religious world-views of Native Americans, either as a collective entity or as heterogeneous individual nations--each with its own relationship to specific geographic sites within the boundaries of occupied territories now defined as the United States. The land, "the Wilderness" or "the Desert" which has come to signify a "wasteland" in the symbolic and spiritual orders of other peoples, has never been associated with anything but abundance and eternal sustenance for indigenous peoples because revelation is rooted in the life of reflection on and with the land, not in catastrophic upheaval or divine intervention. Vine Deloria explains the "problem" of misconstrued understandings of this relationship in this way: Almost every tribal religion was based on land. ... Some of the old chiefs felt that, because generations of their ancestors had been buried on the lands and because the sacred events of their religion had taken place on the lands, they were obligated to maintain the tribal lands against new kinds of exploitation. ... Especially among the Pueblos, Hopi, and Navajo, the lands of the creation and emergence traditions are easily identified and are regarded as places of utmost significance. ...Government officials have ruthlessly disregarded the Indians' pleas for the restoration of their most sacred lands, and the constant dispute between Indians and whites centers around this subject.[67] If anything sets the American Indian apart from other victims of genocide or oppression in this country, it is this: Native Americans are not, in the strictest sense of the word, a "diasporic" people.[68] While the policies of Indian Removal certainly served to disperse, displace, disparage, and dislocate Native cultures and identities from coast to coast, imposing upon Native North American peoples conditions of existence that might be described as "diasporic" in a Judeo-Christian or postcolonialist context, I would caution against the appropriation of the diasporic metaphor with regard to the state of Native North America. The traditional Deuteronomic narrative of the Diaspora implies divine punishment in response to a breach of covenant. In order for a "diasporic" situation to prevail, the peoples of the diaspora must have entered into a contract with the divinely intervening deity. But indigenous peoples of this country stood in no such relationship to the Judeo-Christian God and his sovereign representatives on Earth. The notion of a "Native Diaspora" in the United States presupposes an adherence to the doctrine of Manifest Destiny as divine intervention on the part of the Judeo-Christian God in His effort to create "living space" or Lebensraum for His children--"chosen" and "unchosen" alike. Even if we were to accept the contemporary permutations of the concept in the postcolonialist attempt to subvert and decenter traditional narratives of nationalism and imperialism as these relate to identity formation and the location of culture, the diasporic metaphor is inapplicable because the peoples and lands at issue here have yet to be manumitted from neo-colonialist bondage. Uprootedness, homelessness, exile--these are maladies forced upon Native North American populations by the invading Europeans. What Simone Weil has written about this affliction in reference to Euro-African relations in Africa applies equally to the situation on Turtle Island. [T]he white man carries [uprootedness] about with him wherever he goes. The disease has even penetrated the heart of the African continent, which had for thousands of years, nevertheless, been made up of villages. These black people at any rate, when nobody came to massacre them, torture them, or reduce them to slavery, knew how to live happily on their land. Contact with us is making them lose the art. That ought to make us wonder whether even the black man, although the most primitive of all colonized peoples, hadn't after all more to teach us than to learn from us.[69] Native Americans have been "extirpated" as "savages" and as "barbarians" on their own soil. That soil has been contaminated by pestilence, poisons, toxins, oil spills, nuclear waste dumps and all the other deadly by-products Western "civilization" inevitably leaves as its legacy. Sacred sites have been effaced; graves have been robbed. Synagogues and churches can be rebuilt, but Mount Rushmore is not likely to be restored to its original glory by geological cosmetic surgery. Taken literally, James Young's figurative language in "America's Holocaust: Memory and the Politics of Identity," is laced with mordant irony: By themselves monuments are of little value, mere stones in the landscape. But as part of a nation's rites or the objects of a people's national pilgrimage, they are imbued with national soul and memory. For traditionally the state-sponsored memory of a national past aims to affirm the righteousness of a nation's birth, even its divine election. The matrix of a nation's monuments emplots the story of ennobling events, of triumphs over barbarism, and recalls the martyrdom of those who gave their lives in the struggle for national existence--who in the martyrological refrain, died so that a nation might live. In assuming the idealized forms and meanings assigned this era by the state, memorials tend to concretize particular historical interpretations. They suggest themselves in indigenous, even geological outcroppings in a national landscape; in time, such idealized memory grows as natural to the eye as the landscape in which it stands."[70] [emphasis mine] The irony of his statements is certainly not lost on Young, who concludes his discussion with a section titled "Against a Culture of Competing Catastrophes," and states:"In the end we must recognize that memory cannot be divorced from the actions taken in its behalf, and that memory without consequences may even contain the seeds of its own destruction."[71] The "national monument" at Mount Rushmore represents the geographic and symbolic site in which the principles of Manifest Destiny and the master race are literally set in stone.[71] Only when the sanctity in the hearts and minds of the indigenous population of this "vast, untamed wilderness" itself has been duly acknowledged-when the dominant culture finally comes to grips with the fact that the ground they walk upon is not like a temple to the American Indian--it is the temple-then, and only then, will the nature of the devastation and desecration be driven home to them. Once that has been established, the essentially suicidal nature of Western intellectual endeavor will also become apparent. The savage--an entity reduced in the Western scheme of things to the level of "bare (and hence disposable) life" on a par with the plant--reveals himself, in the Native American world-view, to be precisely that: nothing more and nothing less than the tree itself--equals in a covenant and an evolutionary chain that does not shackle or bind, but merely bonds. To the Native American sense and sensibility, the tree represents life itself, and there is no split between the life of the tree and the life of the human. They are holistically, historically, and happily related in the nexus of mutually sustainable symbiosis. If, following Agamben, "homo sacer is life that may be killed but not sacrificed ... life that may be killed by anyone without committing homicide," then no crime has been committed in the American Holocaust, nor is the dearth of "academic moves," "scholarly turns," and "paradigmatic shifts" toward a fundamental rethinking and reshaping of American national identity of any consequence in global, local, or national terms.[73] There has been no "human" sacrifice in the conquest of the West.Nothing but the forest has been lost to the victor culture. But, if Native theorists, religious leaders, and activists who have survived the holocausts are correct in asserting, as they do, that the fate of the forest will be that of man, then the master race is, in fact, engaged in the specter of committing collective suicide--exercising the authority of the sovereign over life and death on all our behalf. If we are to divert the disaster, Mount Rushmore must be placed on a par with burning synagogues, whose fires can never be extinguished, and with black churches in the South subjected to racially motivated acts of arson. If the "Jews are the Indians of Germany," then Mount Rushmore is Bitburg, writ large and indelible, engraved not only in our collective memory, but spat on the very floor of the temple--a civic memorial to a people and a way of life sacrificed to someone else's "God."[74] But it is also here that the master race, ex altera terra, has signed and sealed its own fate on this continent as that of homo sacer: A life that, excepting itself in double exclusion from the real context of both the profane and the religious forms of life, is defined solely by virtue of having entered into an intimate symbiosis with death without, nevertheless, belonging to the world of the deceased.[75] The stones speak volumes that continue to fall on the deaf ears of an American public more German than the Germans in its persistent refusal to come to terms with a "little matter of genocide," choosing instead to adopt as its own the foundling stone of a historical marker--that coveted historical caesura everyone wants to have, but no one wants to own in the "Americanization of the Holocaust."[76] But in the canyons of deep memory, the song of the stones still echoes and rings true for the three million survivors of the American Holocaust.

#### So what should be done? Instead of abandon the resolution or offer yet another policy option that futilely attempts to order the world, Tess and I affirm openness to Indigenous epistemologies of energy production, freeing ourselves from the violent domination of Western rationality.

#### This space is an opportunity to deploy Red Pedagogy, a praxis which foregrounds Native intellectualism. Red Pedagogy allows us to create a decolonized space. Vote for the team which best activates indigenous political agency.

Grande 8 [Sandy, Associate Professor of Education at Connecticut College, “Red Pedagogy: The Un-Methodology,” *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, eds. Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, p 249-250]

From the standpoint of Red pedagogy, the primary lesson in all of this is pedagogical. In other words, as we are poised to raise yet another generation in a nation at war and at risk, we must consider how emerging conceptions of citizenship, sovereignty, and democracy will affect the (re)formation of our national identity, particularly among young people in schools. As Mitchell (2001) notes, "The production of democracy, the practice of education, and the constitution of the nation-state" have always been interminably bound together. The imperative before us as citizens is to engage a process of unthinking our colonial roots and rethinking democracy. For teachers and students, this means that we must be willing to act as agents of transgression, posing critical questions and engaging dangerous discourse. Such is the basis of Red pedagogy. In particular, Red pedagogy offers the following seven precepts as a way of thinking our way around and through the challenges facing American education in the 21st century and our mutual need to define decolonizing pedagogies: 1. Red pedagogy is primarily a pedagogical project. In this context, pedagogy is understood as being inherently political, cultural, spiritual, and intellectual. 2. Red pedagogy is fundamentally rooted in indigenous knowledge and praxis. It is particularly interested in knowledge that furthers understanding and analysis of the forces of colonization. 3. Red pedagogy is informed by critical theories of education. A Red pedagogy searches for ways it can both deepen and be deepened by engagement with critical and revolutionary theories and praxis. 4. Red pedagogy promotes an education for decolonization. Within Red pedagogy, the root metaphors of decolonization are articulated as equity, emancipation, sovereignty, and balance. In this sense, an education for decolonization makes no claim to political neutrality but rather engages a method of analysis and social inquiry that troubles the capitalist-imperialist aims of unfettered competition, accumulation, and exploitation. 5. Red pedagogy is a project that interrogates both democracy and indigenous sovereignty. In this context, sovereignty is broadly defined as "a people's right to rebuild its demand to exist and present its gifts to the world ... an adamant refusal to dissociate culture, identity, and power from the land" (Lyons, 2000). 6. Red pedagogy actively cultivates praxis of collective agency. That is, Red pedagogy aims to build transcultural and transnational solidarities among indigenous peoples and others committed to reimagining a sovereign space free of imperialist, colonialist, and capitalist exploitation. 7. Red pedagogy is grounded in hope. This is, however, not the future-centered hope of the Western imagination but rather a hope that lives in contingency with the past—one that trusts the beliefs and understandings of our ancestors, the power of traditional knowledge, and the possibilities of new understandings. In the end, a Red pedagogy is about engaging the development of "community-based power" in the interest of "a responsible political, economic, and spiritual society." That is, the power to live out "active presences and survivances rather than an illusionary democracy." Vizenor's (1993) notion of survivance signifies a state of being beyond "survival, endurance, or a mere response to colonization" and of moving toward "an active presence ... and active repudiation of dominance, tragedy and victimry?" In these post-Katrina times, I find the notion of survivance—particularly as it relates to colonized peoples—to be poignant and powerful. It speaks to our collective need to decolonize, to push back against empire, and to reclaim what it means to be a people of sovereign mind and body. The peoples of the Ninth Ward in New Orleans serve as a reminder to all of us that just as the specter of colonialism continues to haunt the collective soul of America, so too does the more hopeful spirit of indigeneity.

#### Our openness fundamentally alters science’s ontological relationship to the world which destroys the concept of interconnectedness. Let me be clear—we are not a rejection of all science, but rather a demand for a science which permits alternative ways of engaging the world.

Zimmerman 6

[Mary Jane, PhD, “Being Nature’s Mind: Indigenous Ways of Knowing and Planetary Consciousness,” *Partnership for Earth Spirituality*, 2 Feb 2006, http://www.earthspirituality.org/archive/zimmerman\_seminar.htm // myost]

Those caveats having been mentioned, I think, and many of my Native teachers and colleagues agree, that bridge-building and dialogue now needs to begin, if done in a genuine way, with a real appreciation on the part of the Europeans for the gulf which they need to travel within themselves in order to be ready, at last, to see and hear the subtle knowledge, wisdom, and awareness which is held and practiced by the peoples indigenous to this land. This bridge-building is now being called for by the planet itself. (I would suggest that anyone who thinks that they have individually chosen to pursue a knowledge of indigenous ways for their own personal fulfillment is still thinking in limited Western egoic terms.) I see the dialogue between Native Americans and Europeans as part of a planetary shift, a move towards greater human self-reflexive awareness as a species and possibly towards integration of the various modes of consciousness developed by different cultures into a synergy we cannot yet imagine. I do believe that the ways of knowing described above are human potentials which are accessible for those of other cultures. The deep spiritual and psychological growth work that has been done by many in the Western culture over the past few decades is the kind of reparenting which can restructure the psyche enough to allow for other ways of knowing to become possible. In fact, I see the whole cultural phenomenon of therapy as a planetary occurance, a human expression of our hunger for connection with the real, the kind of connection which we need in order to come back into balance with other planetary systems. It might make therapy more powerful to begin to see it in such an eco-centric rather than ego-centric light, as cosmological therapy. If our own healing and inner reconnection is understood as a planetary activity--one might even call it the self-healing of the planet--then we are already making the Gestalt shift to understanding the individual in a more connected way and to creating ceremonies of healing that would be helpful in reconnecting modern urban people to each other and the greater earth community. Such cosmological therapy is not just about our own human needs, however; I believe it truly is called forth by a planet which is out of balance and which needs the recovered sensitivities of open, trusting humans in order to move forward. In particular, I think that the dominant Western culture needs to realize that the problems which have occurred under its sway will not easily be solved using our normal objective, analytical habits of thought. As Einstein said, you cannot solve a problem with the same mind which created it. Complexity theorists from both the scientific and sociological perspectives have pointed out that many Western attempts to solve complex problems, such as plans for managing ecosystems or well-intentioned development projects which try to bring more food or clean water to needy areas, create new problems because the designers of the projects do not have the ability to see all the factors involved or the system of interconnectedness (see Homeland Earth, by Edgar Morin, and the last chapters of How the Leopard Changed Its Spots, by Brian Goodwin). As Brian Swimme teaches, before taking more action, we need to become aware of how our minds have been shaped, by both evolution and culture, or the action we take will simply perpetuate the current state of affairs. For those from the Western culture, this may mean questioning our assumption that management and control are what is needed as well as beginning the deconstructive and reconstructive psychological work necessary to open up to Gestaltic and relational ways of knowing. It may mean having the humility to realize that that there are other ways of knowing just as, and in many ways, more valid than Western science. Vine Deloria, Jr., reports that in 1919, a missionary interested in how the Sioux elders would respond to scientific ideas recorded that “the Western Sioux believed that each being, a rock for instance, is an actual community of persons with ample locomotion among themselves” (Deloria, Jr., 42). Furthermore, this idea was based on “the belief that not a few of their people actually had the ability to see into and through a rock, discerning its make-up, similarly as we look into a community or grove of trees” (42). The elders found that the ideas of physics and chemistry matched their view of things and they were open to the European’s talk of progress, yet they pronounced the scientific view inadequate: “Not bad or untrue, but inadequate to explain, among many other things, how man is to find and know a road along which he wishes and chooses to make this said progress unless the Great Spirit Manitoo by his spirit guides the mind of man, keeping human beings just and generous and hospitable” (43). This split between science and ethics, which the Sioux elders immediately grasped, has been disastrous to the Western world. As complexity theorist Edgar Morin emphasizes, knowledge is always circular; we now need the humility to see that our science is never in reality split off from values, and that our supposed objectivity is a way of seeing which colors what we see. From complexity theory, cognitive science, and postmodern thought, we are getting the message that mind and world are embedded and that we are in a participatory universe where how we know is just as important as what we know. Maybe those in the dominant culture can now begin to recognize the true subtlety of the indigenous awareness of how important the human role is in sustaining the harmony of the cosmos. We live in an exciting time, where the interaction between different cultures has the potential to bring all of us into more consciousness about how we both structure and take in reality. We also live in a perilous time, a time which needs this new level of cultural self-awareness in order to survive. Thus the dialogue between cultures is crucial and it is especially important that the dominant culture begin to listen more humbly and respectfully to those cultures which still embody the relational ways of knowing which have atrophied in the West. Out of this dialogue may come a kind of consciousness that is now difficult for any of us to imagine. One of my Native American teachers, Ghyontonda Mota, once told me that I must learn to be both a part of the circle of life and tangential to it at the same time. Soon after that, I heard Robert Thurman, the great Tibetan scholar, say that we must bring together the Asian sense of the whole and the Western sense of the parts. I believe that in these dialogues we are groping towards a resolution of what seems like a paradox from within either worldview, and that getting to that resolution will require the kind of growth in consciousness which the planet needs. Out of this dialogue may come new planetary humans, humans with what Jean Gebser calls integral consciousness, able to move between worldviews and use the whole range of perceptive abilities necessary for the next stages of life on earth.

#### The demand for an instrumental affirmation of the resolution is used as a way to exclude Indians from discussion—under the paradigm of western thought, Indian perspectives are limited out, and seen as irrelevant. This violent mode of thinking creates a cycle of rhetorical imperialism that reproduces dominant western modes of thinking.

Grande 8

Sandy, Professor of Education at Connecticut College, “Red Pedagogy: The Un-Methodology,” Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies, p 244

However the question of indigenous sovereignty is resolved politically, there will be significant implications on the intellectual lives of indigenous peoples, particularly in terms of education. Lyons (2000) views the history of colonization, in part, as the manifestation of "rhetorical imperialism;' that is, "the ability of dominant powers to assert control of others by setting the terms of debate'' (Lyons,2000, p. 452). Indeed, throughout the history of federal Indian law, terms and definitions have continually changed over time. Indians have gone from "sovereigns'' to "wards” and from "nations" to "tribe” while the practice of "treaty making" has given way to one of agreements (Lyons, 2000). As each change served the needs of the nation-state, Lyons argues that "the erosion of Indian national sovereignty can be credited in part to a rhetorically imperialist use of language by white powers" (Lyons, 2000, p. 453). Thus, just as language was central to the colonialist project, it must be central to the project of decolonization. Indigenous scholar Haunani-Kay Trask (1993) writes, "Thinking in one's own cultural referents leads to conceptualizing in one's own world view which, in turn, leads to disagreement with and eventual opposition to the dominant ideology" (p. 54). Thus, where a revolutionary critical pedagogy compels students and educators to question how "knowledge is related historically, culturally and institutionally to the processes of production and consumption;' a Red pedagogy compels students to question how knowledge is related to the processes of colonization. It furthermore asks how traditional indigenous knowledges can inform the project of decolonization. In short, this implies a threefold process for education. Specifically, a Red pedagogy necessitates (a) the subjection of the processes of Whitestream schooling to critical pedagogical analyses; (b) the decoupling and dethinking of education from its Western, colonialist contexts, including revolutionary critical pedagogy; and (c) the conceptualization of indigenous efforts to reground students and educators in traditional knowledge and teachings. In short, a Red pedagogy aims to create awareness of what Trask terms "disagreements;' helping to foster discontent about the "inconsistencies between the world as it is and as it should be" (Alfred, 1999, p. 132).

#### The narrative of American exceptionalism reinforces a Eurosupremacist ideology that we as a country are superior—that only the all-wise, omniscient West can correctly represent reality. Only by reexamining the way we look at the state can we change the chokehold that Western ideology has over the way we make decisions.

McLaren 5

Peter Professor, UCLA Graduate School of Education, author and editor of over 40 books, Capitalists and Conquerors, p 313-315.

How was Bush able to subordinate the national trauma over 9/11 to his religious triumphalism and, with the help of his policy makers, reignite the mythological mission of the United States as securing the world order for Christ by waging war against the infidels? In other words, how did the Bush administration so effectively manage to rewrite the securing of U.S. strategic interests such as oil and natural gas reserves in Afghanistan and Iraq as the battle of Christian civilization over the barbarism of the infidel? The answer, according to Donald Pease (2004 ), can be found in recognizing that, on September 11, 2001, the trauma of America's founding moment-the genocide of Native Americans-returned with a vengeance after centuries of repression. Furthermore, this birth-of-a-nation trauma-repressed by the myth of the United States as an unsullied land whose redemptive role is to prepare the nations of the world for democracy and reactivated by the terrorist attacks of 9/11-has been cathected to the image of a wounded nation, one in which the narrative of America as an unsullied Virgin Land could no longer be sustained once the airplanes crashed into the Twin Towers and the Pentagon. The reaction of the Bush gang to the terrorist attacks against the United States attacks that exiled the American people from their dream of being part of an innocent redeemer nation and that needed to be punished by preventative strikes-recalled at the same time the repressed historical memory of genocide against native peoples. Pease compellingly argues that the reaction of the Bush administration to the attacks of September 11, 2001-the bombing of Afghanistan, the invasion of Iraq, the Patriot Act, and the creation of the Department of Homeland Security-makes visible the very violence that characterized the founding moments of U.S. history with the genocide of its native peoples. Such violence had been repressed, according to Pease, in part through the creation of master narratives of America as the Virgin Land, Redeemer Nation, American Adam, Nature's Nation, and Errand into the Wilderness that, "freighted with metaphorical significance and possessed of performative force," have been sedimented into the structural unconscious of the nation. The claim that the master narrative of the United States as the world's peacekeeper and ambassador of democracy has overdetermined the American public's view of themselves as a national people cannot be easily dismissed. This master narrative has been secured for centuries through the ideological state apparatuses, most particularly through public education, the media and the culture industries. Slavoj Zizek (2004a) contends that "Americans have historically seen their role in the world in altruistic terms" and maintains that movies such as John Ford's The Searchers and Martin Scorsese's Taxi Driver or books like Graham Greene's The Quiet American help shed important light on what he calls "the naive benevolence of Americans. Zizek (2004a) has elaborated on what he calls the good intentions underlying the ideological dream of America: The supposition underlying these good intentions is that underneath our skins, we are all Americans. If that is humanity's true desire, then all that Americans need to do is to give people a chance, liberate them from their imposed constraints, and they will embrace America's ideological dream. The mythological themes that help to construct the ideological dream known as America provide, in Pease's (2004) terms, "the transformational grammar through which the state attempts to shape the public's understanding of contemporary political and historical events" (p. !). Bush's policy makers have reinscribed such themes through a relay of signifiers between 9/11 and the security state that Pease refers to as a "regulatory intertext that transmits a normative system of values and beliefs from generation to generation" (p. I), subordinating the terrorist attacks of 9/11 to these mythological themes and then fashioning imaginary resolutions to them. In his addresses to the nation, Bush and his administration have been able to use phrases and discursive strategies that, in the words of Pease, "inaugurated a symbolic drama that would subsequently transform the primary integers in the narrative the nation has formerly told itself with the aid of a new lexicon-with terms such as Ground Zero, Homeland, Operation Enduring Justice, Operation Iraqi Freedom-that authorized the Bush administration's state of emergency" (p. 2). In the end, the Bush administration was able to effect "a shift in the nation's governing self-presentations-from secured innocent nation to a wounded, insecure emergency state" (Pease 2004, p. 3) and established a "newly formed structure of govemmentality." Playing on the fact that America was a Virgin Land that had never before been subjected to foreign violation, the Bush administration supplied this myth with a moral rationale. It utilized both historical as well as mythological registers, by describing, as Bush did, the attacks on 9/11 as a "wound to our country" (Pease 2004, p. 3). Pease is worth quoting at length: The wound was directed against the Vrrgin Land as well as the U.S. people's myth of themselves as radically innocent. The state of emergency Bush erected at Ground Zero was thereafter endowed with the responsibility to defend the Homeland because the foreign violation of Virgin Land had alienated the national people from their imaginary way of inhabiting the nation. This substitution anchored the people to a very different state formation. It also drastically altered the national people's foundational fantasy about their relationship to the national territory, redefining it in terms of the longing of a dislocated population for their lost homeland. (p. 3) Not only did the state of emergency erected by Bush trouble the fantasy of the United States as a nation unstained by the violence of the Other, but recalled from the pit of the structural unconscious the horror that had been disavowed and suppressed when the myth of the Virgin Land was first constructed over the killing fields of native peoples. As Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz (2003) notes, "the very origin of the United States is fundamentally imperialist" as the quest for empire driven by white supremacist thinking has been a fundamental way of rationalizing American "civilization" since its beginnings. She elaborates as follows: "American" supremacy and populist imperialism are inseparable from the content of the U.S. origin story and the definition of patriotism in the United States today. And it began at the beginning, even before the founding of the United States, not as an accident or aberration in the progression of democracy. The founding of the United States marked a split in the British Empire, not an anticolonial liberation movement. The very term "frontier," used to define the border between independent Native American nations and the United States, implies a foreign country on the other side of a demarcation line-a country to be invaded, its inhabitants controlled and then expelled, while settlers move in protected by the army. Everything accounted for in the first hundred years plus as "movement of the frontier" was plain and simple imperialism, fitting all the definitions thereof. (p. 90)

#### The affirmative is a prerequisite to liberation—dominant ideologies of the environment have led to theory that deprioritizes decolonization in favor of static conceptions of nature and create the conditions which permit oppression
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(Walter [Semiotician @ Duke]; DELINKING: THE RHETORIC OF MODERNITY, THE LOGIC OFCOLONIALITY AND THE GRAMMAR OF DE-COLONIALITY; Journal of Cultural Studies Duke University Press; kdf)

The thesis advanced in the last paragraph lead us, directly to the grammar of de-coloniality. The time has come, and the process is already in motion, for the re-writing of global history from the perspective and critical consciousness of coloniality and from within geo- and body-political knowledge. Part of the project of de-linking is, as Waman Puma clearly saw it at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the need to write ‘nuevas coro´nicas’. That is, we must formulate a critical theory that goes beyond the point to which Max Horkheimer carried the meaning of critique in Kant. Horkheimer was still working within the frame of the ego-politic of knowledge and the radicalism of his position must be understood within that frame, and his critical concept of theory could offer no more than a project of ‘emancipation’ (epistemic, political, ethical, economic) within the conceptual frame of the modern/ colonial world. Traditional theory was, to summarize Horkheimer’s position in a nutshell, constructed on the basis of givens, on the empirical acceptance, for instance, of laws in nature that science has only to discover. Critical theory, on the other hand, would interrogate the very assumptions that Nature is governed by ‘laws’; and will also open the question on the consequences of such assumptions in and for a capitalist society. Critical theory should now be taken further, to the point and project of de-linking and of being complementary with decolonization. That is, as the foundations of the nonEurocentered diversality of an-other-paradigm. 68 The Eurocentered paradigms of knowledge (its theo- and ego-political versions) has reached a point in which its own premises should be applied to itself from the repository of concepts, energies and visions that have been reduced to silences or absences by the triumphal march of Western conceptual apparatus. 69 The hegemonic modern/ colonial and Eurocentered paradigm 70 needs to be decolonized. But how does epistemic decolonizaion works? What is its grammar (that is, its vocabulary, syntax and semantics)? There are at least two procedures here. One would be to show the partiality and limitations of the theo and ego politics of knowledge and understanding. The other is offered by the grow and expansion of the geo and body-politics of knowledge and understanding. Both are de-linking procedures. It will not suffice to denounce its content while maintaining the logic of coloniality, and the colonization of knowledge, intact. The target of epistemic de-colonization is the hidden complicity between the rhetoric of modernity and the logic of coloniality. For critical theory to correspond with decolonization, we need to shift the geography of knowledge and recast it (critical theory) within the frame of geo- and body politics of knowledge. Thus, the first step in the grammar of decolonization could be cast, using an expression coming from the documents of the Universidad Intercultural de los Pueblos Indı´genas del Ecuador, learning to unlearn. 71 Dussel and Fanon give us two solid starting points to do so the first connected with epistemic geopolitics and the second with epistemic body politics.