UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Settler/Colonial Violences: Black and Indigenous Coalition Possibilities through Intergroup Dialogue Methodology

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1s5637rr

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 43(2)

ISSN
0161-6463

Authors
John, Kelsey Dayle
Brown

Publication Date
2019-03-01

DOI
10.17953/aicrj.43.2.john_brown

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

DOI 10.17953/aicrj.43.2.john_brown

Settler/Colonial Violences: Black and Indigenous Coalition Possibilities through Intergroup Dialogue Methodology

Kelsey Dayle John and Kimberly Williams Brown

For us, feminist thinking means that we raise tensions and questions about possibilities for coalition and work through these questions by using connective postures and dialogue.[1] We understand that the conversation of Black and Indigenous solidarity is one to be approached with great consideration and care, so we propose a methodological intervention reflected in a writing and dialogic style we describe as a narrative of questions, tensions, and possibilities. This methodological intervention is about holding tensions and multiplicities concomitantly in method, theory, and practice. In our transdisciplinary conversations, tensions, and coalitions, we invite readers to think through how the process of making decisions about methodological or theoretical frames in research, teaching or daily living, is the method.

We began with layers of questions that materialize from our theoretical locations; these eventually branch out to tensions and finally coalitional possibilities. As transnational feminist scholars, we believe that our individual and collective subjectivities are forced to cross spiritual, physical and intellectual borders if we are to see each other

Kelsey Dayle John (Diné) is a postdoctoral research associate with a joint appointment in American Indian studies and gender and women's studies at the University of Arizona. Her work is centered on animal relationalities, particularly horse/human relationships as ways of knowing, healing, and decolonizing education. She holds a PhD and MS in cultural foundations of education from Syracuse University. Kimberly Williams Brown is an assistant professor in education and africana Studies at Vassar College, where she serves as a member of the Forced Migration Steering Committee. Her academic areas of focus are immigration/migration studies, women's and gender studies, Black and Indigenous Studies, and intergroup dialogue. She holds a PhD from Syracuse University in cultural foundations of education and master's degrees in human resource management and communication and rhetorical studies.

across the racial, economic and sociopolitical gaps that divide us. We believe that the location of our work is constructed against and within domains of dominance and oppression that are meant to keep us from seeing each other. To highlight this, we ground ourselves in several camps of thought—transnational feminist, Indigenous, Black, and settler colonial studies. From there, we raise six tensions that reflect the nuances of our original questions regarding land, knowledge, indigeneity, blackness, and spirituality. Finally, we close with three possibilities for coalition that provide a starting point for collaborative work.

We talk together across difference in this paper by using a dialogue model that highlights instances in which we can/cannot speak together. These are signaled by change of pronouns from first-person "we" to third-person "Kim" or "Kelsey." Most importantly, we examine closely these entanglements and resist the intricate ways in which oppression creates responses that are horizontal, not coalitional.

Positionality

We believe that locating our positionality is key for this article. We choose to locate our positionality through the lens of transnational feminist work because this was a shared intellectual space for us. Also, we find transnational feminist frames that are able to sustain multiple lived realities across geographic and discursive borders without universalizing them, to be meaningful for communicating our whole selves in academic/critical/anti-colonial/decolonial feminist praxis.

Kelsey. As a Diné feminist scholar, I found a pathway into transnational feminist work for three key reasons. First, transnational feminism has been helpful for me to communicate and frame Navajo sovereignty, of which I am a tribal member, and how it functions internationally in regards to legal and political structures intertwined with the US settler state. I engage in advocacy work for Navajo Nation using settler colonial studies to fight against Diné erasure. Indigenous is the theoretical frame I use to speak about global political solidarities. These two projects are different and the same. I am Indigenous, but I am Diné. With a transnational lens, I can be both at the same time because transnational feminism incorporates epistemic frameworks that support zooming in and out of locations—globally and locally.[2] Therefore, I find myself globally located as an Indigenous person, in alliance with other Indigenous peoples (like Kim), and locally located as a Diné woman. With these lenses, both positionalities inform one another rather than conflict.

Second, I find that transnational Indigenous lenses help me hold in tension the necessity of borders, like Indian nations/reservations (or blood quantum and tribal enrollment), while also understanding that Western borders are not the traditional way of Diné life.[3] Diné are instructed to stay in our ancestral lands but these spaces are not indicative of institutions forced on us through government policy (reservations, blood quantum, land allotment). In the Diné way, I would not call them borders or boundaries; instead, they're a map of the land that helps us understand ourselves in relationship. At the same time, Diné (and other American Indian peoples) are constantly dealing with borders that have been imposed on us through settler

colonialism. The reality of these borders cannot be ignored even if they don't match our traditional understanding of relationships to land.

Third, Indigenous studies is transdisciplinary by nature. I find solidarity with transnational feminist scholarship which seeks to go beyond race, class, gender, sexuality, and disability in order to make sense of larger networks of oppression and survivance.[4] Transnational feminist scholarship interrogates interlocking, overlapping, entangled oppressions without collapsing their connections in a way that erases peoples and ways of life. I find that positioning settler colonial studies within the frame of transnational feminism makes space for Diné to be distinct and sovereign people who refuse structures of settler colonialism while at the same time relating our concerns globally. In transnational feminist literature, the global informs the local and the local informs the global, and the connections, disconnections, and conversations between the two are centered.

I lived and worked on Navajo Nation for two years. I often struggled once I moved away from my local ancestral land because during my time on Navajo land, I was intentional about being immersed in my worldview and way of being. I unknowingly took the attitude that the world was Navajo and everyone else. This was a posture of protection I had to take to advocate for my people. However, after leaving the closeness of my community, I struggled with how to communicate with other marginalized folks, like Black folks, without referencing the Indigenous struggle as the most foundational struggle in the US settler state. In my conversations with Kim and with others, I started to unpack networks and entanglements of oppression and learned that different projects require different ways of being. In particular, I worked to expand my ideas of erasure, violence, settler colonialism, and removal to see that some peoples are not who I speak back to, but should be who I speak with.

Kim. I use transnational feminism to help me locate Black immigrants who migrate willingly or unwillingly to North America and to locate Black people enslaved and violently brought to North America (the United States). We know the effects of the US imperial colonization are still actively affecting many bodies including Black ones. So, although I write in the United States and through the US academy, I see blackness as a transnational experience. I draw on the works of Mohanty and Perry and Kahn, with whom I agree that transnational feminist praxis makes possible solidarities of blackness across and within geographic boundaries. I also rely upon Perry and Khan for their articulated vision for diasporic Black feminist thought, which helps me imagine how to sit in community with Black people not culturally similar to me and how to respond to anti-blackness.[5] Transnational feminist praxis also makes it possible for me to be in relationships of solidarity with Indigenous scholars in violent settler states like Kelsey. Although Kelsey is positioned differently than I, we seek to understand how our racialized differences are structured through white supremacy and therefore begin the work to disentangle from its web.

One of the things that I think about frequently is the idea that blackness is not indigenous to this part of the world and so through its colonial construction and decolonial embodiment, how do I (we) begin to make sense of the people who inhabit this flesh in this North American context? So, transnational for me is about the crossing of

physical borders as much as it is about crossing terminological and linguistic barriers that construct our realities of race.

As a Black woman from the Caribbean, my own location in the US settler state is precarious and dangerous. Dangerous in a multiplicity of ways. Dangerous because I have no anchor to my ancestral home. Dangerous because my migration to the US settler state was fraught with misunderstandings and excitement. I came as a student and nowhere in my education over six years, undergraduate and graduate studies, did I learn about Indigenous people or the violent histories associated with the United States and Indigenous death and dispossession. I bring this up because like me, most people I know who are entering the United States as immigrants do not know or experience it as a settler state and are sold and they subsequently buy into the "American dream."

Issues of border and removal from land were not yet a part of my consciousness. Today, as I write about and live into a transnational feminist understanding of race and state, I am still unsettled reminiscing about my miseducation about the American Dream in a moment when immigrant families are being torn apart and jailed. It goes without saying that the American dream is a myth that was never achievable given the various ways in which particular groups have been excluded from the prospect of that dream. Borders have become literal walls or the threat of them in this settler state.

As a Black person then, what does it mean to come to this space as an immigrant or to have been brought here involuntarily as a slave? What is my/your anchor to ancestral land that you/I may have never known and will never know? What does it mean to come to this land looking for a better life? While destroying and possibly continuing to be a settler and therefore contributing to the violences of a settler colonial state? Eve Tuck and Wayne K. Yang have articulated that immigrants themselves become settlers and therefore responsible for the continued dispossession of Indigenous people.[6] While I agree that Black people's ignorance and miseducation about state-sanctioned violence and disappearing of Indigenous people cannot be overlooked, are there possibilities beyond the Black/red binary of settler/non-settler not explored? It seems too simple to say that all of us who come to the United States or were brought here by force are unwitting settlers.

What of the possibilities of this work that Kelsey and I are doing together to not just discursively think differently but to *be* different in the world? The violences resulting from the legacies of colonialism have implicated all of us, have made it so that immigrant bodies looking for a better life continue to displace Indigenous bodies who have always been here. At the same time, the white working class and capitalist owners elected Donald Trump partly because they feel they have lost the access to land, capital and financial freedom. Black Americans' continued dispossession through redlining and other state policies must also be addressed even as we continue to fight for deeper understandings of Indigenous dispossession. What does this mean for how we as a people interact with each other and what does it mean in particular for Black bodies that continue to be killed by the state—in spite of the slogan and the liberatory realities—that "Black Lives Matter?" What does it mean that state-sanctioned Indigenous death and disappearance are less visible to those outside of Indigenous communities? We must hold these truths together as we work together to create a liberated world.

United States Settler State

We write specifically as scholars who work and are currently located in the US settler state. Therefore, our contextual experience (though transnational) is positioned currently in conversation with a settler colonial state. This centers particular concerns about the land on which we currently sit, a space framed not only by colonialism, but settler colonialism specifically. As we describe our own positionalities, we complicate the static US settler state boundaries (both around and within the United States) through our transnational feminist lenses. Kelsey's Indigenous nation (Navajo Nation) finds itself interlocked with the US settler state in particular ways that inform her work as a Diné, feminist scholar. After living in the United States as a Black immigrant, Kim's growing consciousness of the United States as a settler state heightened her awareness of white supremacy's chokehold on all racially minoritized people. By reflecting on this, we could better understand multiple erasures as a part of the fractured locus and situate identities that emerge as individual communities strive for resistance and agency.[7] We therefore argue that there are three ways in which our coalitional work materializes in the act of centering land-based solidarity. We think of these realizations through (1) spirituality; (2) dismantling the carceral state as a neoslavery dispossession; and (3) reimagining our ideas about borders.

Theoretical Framings

Our theoretical framework demonstrates our transdisciplinary approach. We use an assemblage of theoretical frameworks in conversation to contextualize and make possible our ability to speak, hear, and locate ourselves in conversation with one another. We collage theories of settler colonialism, critical race theory, decolonization, and transnational feminism together as a political act, knowing that without the assemblage of these theories we can never *be* fully in any one academic space.

As scholars in the US settler state, we naturally turn toward settler colonialism's critique of land-based practices which remove and erase all things Indigenous (bodies, cultures, lands, worldviews, languages, religions). In settler colonial states, the continuation of the settler state is based on the erasure and removal of the Indigenous population. In settler nations, settlers come to stay and their permanence makes settler colonialism "a structure, not an event."[8] Because of the invisibility of settler colonialism, Indigenous scholars theorize settler colonialism specifically to avoid further Indigenous erasure (a characteristic of settler colonialism itself).[9] Here we find Tuck and Yang's "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor" a useful text to think with and against. This piece speaks to the specificity of our subjectivities and can be a tool that helps us avoid collapsing the experiences of Indigenous and Black people as homogenous or to fall into the trap that locates our oppressions as the same or in competition with one another. We also think with Tiffany King here, as we imagine new grammars or ways of understanding what is possible when we theorize Black folks as Indigenous peoples who think in conversation with American Indian peoples and create together.[10]

However, Lorenzo Veracini describes how the framework of settler colonialism is necessary to speak within a space of coalitional possibility.[11] At the same time,

Veracini explains that "colonialism and settler colonialism are not merely different, they are in some ways antithetical formations (again, this is not to say that these antithetical formations do not intertwine in practice: they remain compatible, and the settler colonial polities routinely operate colonially and settler colonially at once)."[12] Treading with care the binary of settler/Native, Veracini explains that the irony of this dichotomy is that it is mutually exclusive: Indigenous is Indigenous insofar as there are settlers, but who is a "settler" becomes a complex question in alliance work.

This point of paradoxical tension, where the antithetical meets the compatible, we hope to pause and add to this conversation by recognizing the "incommensurabilities," while simultaneously looking toward coalitional possibilities or "co-resistances."[13] Tuck and Yang remind us both to stay honest about the questions we ask and to think about how these questions might resemble a move to settler innocence. They center land by defining decolonization as not simply a metaphor, but a material practice. In other words, decolonization is "the repatriation of indigenous land and life."[14] Tiffany King's work around Black Shoals and her use of the word shoal is a metaphor for Indigenous and Black not being knowable or static. The shoal is an "alternative space always in formation" that is neither land nor sea and that situates neither Black people as only liquid, nor Indigenous people as only land-based.[15] Her work allows us to think about what possibilities for coalition building exist for Black and Indigenous people when we think together and create alternative knowledges and ways of living in the world. This is important because we hope to both use and problematize theories of land for the purpose of coalition.

Framing decolonization in conversation with critical race theory and settler colonialism also helps us to address biopolitical constructions of race as they are tied to occupation, presence, and access to land. Management of and access to land is entangled with the racialization or regulation of identity. With critical theory, we find a framework to speak about racialization. Critical theory has been helpful in locating, articulating, and negotiating racial, ethnic, and national identities and the ways in which these identities have been systematically defined through racialization as a method to erase, oppress, and marginalize. In conversation with critical theory, Grande explains that Indigenous identity is rooted in place-based understandings of creation, spirituality, being, belonging, and connection and does not fit neatly within the frame of "race."[16] However, both Indigenous peoples and Black peoples have been racialized in processes that reflect aspects of "you work for me" and "you go away."

Finally, we turn toward transnational feminist frames to make sense of our positionalities, and to help us converse on multiple sites of violence and struggle—personal and political. Our path to transnational feminism was through our engagements with both Black feminist thought and Indigenous feminism. As Jasbir Puar moves from intersectionality to assemblage, we find this location to be a meeting point where Indigenous communities might pause and explore productive tensions with non-Indigenous people.[17] Lugones theorizes about the fractured locus as the site of resistance and agency for people who have marginalized identities.[18] We like the wording of both "assemblage" and "fractured locus" because they explain that oppressions/colonialisms don't linearly overlap, but rather assemble, converge, diverge, and fracture in complex

and messy ways. Adding another layer, transnational feminist lenses open up space for differences within Black and Indigenous communities. Black and Indigenous people are similarly constructed, not homogenous. Lugones's work urges us to remember that although colonialisms try to take from and erase Indigenous and Black people, their humanity and their dignity, the attempts failed, and we have emerged a people who refuse to be subjugated or erased. Transnational theory helps us to frame land beyond the American Indian sovereignty-based discussion of land. For coalitional discussion, we challenge ourselves to think differently about movements and removals on land. Land is not based on American Indian sovereignty alone and forced relocations do not erase a person's indigeneity.

Methodological Framing

Our method is critical conversation across difference, interweaving our subjectivities with theoretical and epistemic frameworks. We question our ontological frames to be able to understand deeply our individual locations and then to think together about how our ontologies allow us to create a new way of understanding the world and working together across, between and through our Black and Indigenous identities. To do this, we engage in intergroup dialogue, which is a critical dialogical strategy that promotes student engagement across cultural and social divides, fostering learning about social diversity and inequalities, and cultivating an ethos of social responsibility.[19] This model of dialogue was specifically designed for college campuses and is an attractive model for us as we seek to understand radical imaginings of difference and coalitional possibilities by engaging in dialogue about blackness and indigeneity.

Intergroup dialogue was developed in the 1980s at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, in a moment when there was much social unrest on college and university campuses. We find this model useful because of its origins in critical scholarship within the disciplines of psychology, sociology, education, communication, social work and women's and gender studies. Also, as we talked across our differences, we thought it was useful to anchor our dialogue in a method that is complex in its attempt to balance subjectivity and structures of oppression and violence. Instead of what is commonly understood as dialogue, which can be centered around debate, intergroup dialogue prompts us to engage in dialogue across difference for a deeper understanding of each other, both for perspective-taking, and for the possibility of creating new meaning and understanding. We thought an intergroup dialogue methodology would strengthen our claims for developing coalition possibilities as transdisciplinary scholars who experience the world differently because of our subjectivities. Others have used similar dialogic models,[20] but importantly, intergroup dialogue's goal is coalition building: rooted in interdisciplinary theories, its focus is critical, empathetic, and strategic dialogue across difference and commonalities. It is also significant that we were in conversation together for about five years (although informally), as feminist scholars, teaching assistants in women and gender studies, and as educational studies scholars in cultural foundations of education.

We have been in more formal conversation about this for three years thinking through our individual and collective questions. We met virtually every two weeks because Kim lives in New York and Kelsey lived in New Mexico and now lives in Arizona. Between meetings, we wrote, read and sent each other articles. At three academic conferences sponsored by the National Women's Studies Association (NWSA), Critical Race Theory in Education (CRSEA), and the American Studies Association (ASA), we received critical feedback that allowed us to move our work in particular ways. At one conference, a woman identifying as Native and Chicana challenged our use of Tuck and Yang's work on decolonization—a particularly poignant conversation.[21] After the conferences, and our three-year-long process, we invited readers into our collaborative writing, because we see it as both a part of our transnational praxis and our deliberate efforts to make transparent what in academe seems opaque. In addition, contributors to this special issue formed a most significant dialogue space at the American Studies Association meeting, where we used the presentation space to dialogue and read each other's work. Our use of the keywords "grammars" and "postures" in this article stems from this dialogue with the work of Reid Gómez and Circe Sturm, respectively.

The following two sections summarize our observations during candid, prolonged conversations and peer feedback. The process of staying in sustained dialogue over a three-year period through written, oral, and in-person communication strengthened our relationship; in some ways, we needed the time to grow as scholars and as people. Intergroup dialogue proved to be a reliable method for helping us work through the six tensions we encountered while we centered land in our conversations about our transnational experiences as Black and Indigenous people. Next, we discuss how our theoretical locations provide possibilities for coalition. These areas of tension and possibility emerged as critical to our discussions of land, indigeneity, and spirituality.

Tensions

1. How do we talk about land without erasing "Indigenous" people's right to ancestral lands in the US settler state and without erasing other Indigenous people's rights to lands outside this continent?
2. The US state's role in deciding Indianness and blackness through blood quantum laws and the "one drop rule" is a tension that is difficult to navigate because for so long this is how we have come to understand who is Indigenous and who is Black. How do we redefine these identities through a decolonial framework that does not privilege colonial narratives and laws?
3. How are we good guests on lands that are not our own?
4. Our individual faith as Christian, Diné, feminist women allowed us to enter this dialogue as we discussed what it means to be critical scholars while practicing our faith, which is often seen as anti-critical. We know that Christianity and Diné practices have epistemically located us as much as our formal and experiential education, so how do we locate our faith practices as much as we locate our

positionalities, the theories from which we pull, and our experiences as Black, Diné women?
5. If borders, fences, and boundaries are violent but also utilized for protection, how can we frame them in our conversations in a way that does the least violence to land, animals, and people?
6. How do we address anti-blackness as an organizing principle that has seeped into communities of color and dictated ideas about Black people?

Coalition Possibilities

In the possibilities described below, we envision what might be new ways of knowing and understanding if we extend beyond our comfortable disciplinary and ontological boundaries. We believe that Black, Indigenous, and critical theorizing often ask us to imagine beyond what is obvious and that there are always people living "otherwise" and demonstrating possibilities that we are usually remiss to see or understand, as Hortense Spillers, Saidiya Hartman, and Farah Griffin have theorized.[22] We argue that there are three ways in which our coalitional work can come to be materialized. We think of these realizations through (1) spirituality, (2) dismantling the carceral state as a neoslavery dispossession and tool of erasure, and (3) reimagining our ideas about borders. Our coalitional possibilities center around the concept of land. Land is not something we possess, so we start our conversation by locating ourselves in relationship to land, not based on ideas of ownership but of relationality. Because land ownership and working the land for the purpose of wealth are sites of violence for both of us, we must dialogue through alternative relationalities to land. We aim to understand places within a network of right relationships with the land, recognizing the layers of violence that have occurred on this land and turn to its first inhabitants, knowers, and caretakers to lead us in recovery. How did settler colonialism fracture first peoples' relationships with land, people, and animals? And if that relationship is destroyed, how do we learn from Indigenous people while still making room to heal from the violences of other people groups as they have been layered on the land?

Often, conversations of land that center dispossession and repatriation decenter the spirituality of land. In our understanding of land, we must be willing to know all the ways in which we are all affected by multiple erasures, dispossessions and oppressions, although differently affected and implicated.

Possibility I: Faith Communities (Spirituality)

As we have situated our work, thought about our collegial relationships, and created a partnership, we have often mused about our Christian identities and discussed how we do not neatly fit the often patriarchal and overly religious confines of the church or the open and secular dimensions of academe. Yet, we found each other through our struggle to be both spiritual and intellectual and have learned over the years together that it is not just being Christian that has brought us together but it is our deep understanding that we are not who we are without our spiritual struggles informed by our multiple theoretical lenses, faith communities of color, and questions/critiques

that are tightly woven together as indicated through our thoughts in conversation with one another. For us, the coalition possibilities were realized when we began to have conversations in classroom spaces that no one else was having and that were taboo at best.

Those conversations about our deeply held personal beliefs created space for us to think about our whole selves and not just the most critical academic sides of us—even if those selves were fractured locales, or assemblages. We could talk about our deeply rooted faith communities of color while criticizing heteronormative, racist, patriarchal, settler colonial foundations of the church as a tool of colonization. We made space to understand the layers of negotiation and resistance that happens when transnational, feminist, women of color, participate in faith communities and made space to say this is more than an "assimilation." At the same time, we found space to critique the deepest foundations of our ontological and cosmological beliefs in dialogue making it more comfortable to have conversations about blackness and indigeneity.

Spiritual and faith communities, we came to understand, have radical potential to organize how we think and the types of coalitions we can forge, and are, in so many ways, the nonacademic communities we hope to be in conversation with. Our interactions with noninstitutional forms of spirituality inform rather than contradict this dialogue. These dialogues, spaces, and ideas become places that can be more inaccessible by the state. People in these faith communities work across the differences that may exist between them to address the critical issues of our times. Similarly, in academe, faith may be a mode through which we are able to connect with each other, to do activist work that interrogates cosmological and ontological assumptions. This dialogue is about having space to expand our ontological assumptions of "religion" in the colonial context because the current understanding of "religion" does not fit our assemblages of spiritual and religious being. It is the same as our transdisciplinary methodology, where we cannot simply locate ourselves in one religious definition because the religious definitions provided are colonial, meaning they are meant to separate, oppress, and divide. We must be engaged through multiple religious frames at all times to fully experience each other and to be able to see the possibilities for coalition. Our interactions with faith communities signal us toward different ways of inhabiting spaces intentionally, critically, and coalitionally.

Kelsey. My intersections with Christianity are informed, challenged, and critiqued through my connection with my ancestral land and lands I am a guest on. The institution of the Christian church in the US settler state promotes the consumption of Indigenous land through the doctrine of discovery. I am aware of this deep contradiction, which is why mine (and my family's) love of land has directly challenged this practice, keeping us accountable to our Indigenous relatives (both human and nonhuman). We often said, "our faith community is the nonhuman world (land and horses)."

My family now owns a ranch in Colorado (not Diné ancestral land but Ute and Cheyenne Arapaho). For most of my life, I have been a guest on other Indigenous peoples' lands, but through my father's instructions to love land (a practice he learned growing up on Diné Bikeyah), I learned what it meant to be a good guest on land as a

reflection of what it means to be Diné anywhere. Being a guest is a spiritual practice I learned by watching my dad communicate using actions, postures, and remembrances that showed us how to love the land.

During my engagement in the Christian faith communities (some positive, others negative), I have learned to be comfortable asking "hard," sometimes "unanswerable," questions about faith, institutions, settler colonialism, and my presence on land. Mostly, I always asked myself, how can we (my family) be Diné and Christian? Now, I bring these theorizations into my work while holding the tensions and incommensurabilities that reproduce within my own life experiences. I can't say there is a simple answer to this question, but I value the method.

I practice loving land, critiquing my institutional positionalities, and allowing for dialogue to inform that practice. I don't view the project of decolonizing religion any differently than the project of decolonizing education, insofar as it pushes us to expand the definition of "faith community" as we expand the definition of education. In fact, I see these projects fold into one another. Before my conversations with Kim, I was scared to bring my own contradictions into the academic arena, but as I have brought in this side of myself to the dialogue, I grew more open to having tough conversations, confronting tensions, and facing the incommensurabilities so as to not be complicit in the very same violence I work so hard to combat.

Kim. As part of the ontological framings for communities that are grappling with issues of spirituality and land are works by particular scholars centering Afro-diasporic religions as grounding places for those of us who are struggling to understand our connections and disconnections from land. What is our view of the world and how do we come to understand ourselves through our spiritual beliefs or our rejections of these beliefs? In particular, M. Jacqui Alexander describes the ways in which the cosmologies of the Afro-descendant people being brought to the Americas traveled across time and space to new lands and inhabited these new lands.[23] Most telling, in Alexander's descriptions of how the African cosmologies come to inhabit Western soil, they exist external to the African peoples and take root as part of the landscape and of the earth, raising the question of whether African and Indigenous belief systems coexisted. King, for example, describes the ways in which Indigenous and Black life and death have been bound up together over time and in this part of the world.[24] Following King's work, I additionally imagine that as modes of survival and resistance, Indigenous and Black spiritualities were also bound up together. Many of these spiritual lineages are observed through "Lwa Guinee, Spirits of Haiti, Lucimi of Cuba (More popularly known as Santeria, Shango of Trinidad, the Orixas, minkisi (medicines), Vodun of Candomble in Brazil, the Winti system in Suriname, and the Vodou of New Orleans and the southern United States."[25]

These varieties of spiritualities that migrated with the African slaves are not to be dismissed as old, dead, or of consequence only to a small segment of the Afro-diasporic tradition, because they live on in many of our traditions explicitly and implicitly. For example, in my Caribbean background many of what we thought of as "superstitions" were/are practices that Afro-descendant folks inhabited because it was accessible to them and because it was a part of their ancestral memory. Despite

my staunchly Pentecostal Christian upbringing, I was practicing African spiritualities through folklore and superstitions that my parents and extended family members assumed was a mundane part of our culture.

In the Christian tradition, to which we both proudly adhere, we have been for a while, thinking more about Christianity as a colonial tool and also as liberatory. Holding these two contradictory thoughts in tension have given us permission to discuss the deeply personal and uncomfortable realities of organized religion. Liberation theology and Black Pentecostalism[26] might be important frames as we engage in a conversation about Christianity as liberatory. We do not delve deeply into either of these themes in this paper but raise them as important parts of our conversations together and as flashpoints that made possible coalition building. In particular, the practice of speaking in tongues, a feature that is instrumental to the belief of Pentecostalism is, in fact, liberatory and subversive, and moves beyond a colonially imposed Christian aesthetic. Although we do not extensively write about the pockets of liberatory practice in Christianity, we mention it here to mark that African cosmologies, which are indigenous to a different part of the world but forcibly brought to the United States through the slave trade, Indigenous spiritualities and Christianity do not exist in their silos but in conversation with each other. These create possibilities for coalitions across difference, even religious and spiritual difference.

In some ways, we were comfortable confronting and holding incommensurabilities because it was natural to an ongoing conversation we started about spirituality years prior. We have been constantly and consistently confronting and holding these tensions in our identification as both critical, anticolonial, transnational feminist scholars and Christians. We find that bringing spirituality into a space of critique is a project akin to working at a university while still "refusing the university."[27] Also, knowing that many of the people from communities we find ourselves a part of and advocating for are deeply spiritual in their ways of knowing and often "nonacademic." This doesn't mean that nonspiritual people cannot dialogue, or do not equally possess the ability to hold things "in tension"; rather it is a space in which we offer practical examples of how we saw coalitional possibility and comfort with incommensurability and tensions by sharing honestly about beliefs that were sometimes difficult to articulate and sometimes not easy to admit but which provided a method for imagining Black and Indigenous futures.

Possibility II: Neoslavery Dispossession through Internal and External Colonization

One of the most profound ways in which we continue to experience both slavery and Indigenous erasure is through the carceral system. For decades, Angela Davis and other prison abolitionist activists have argued that the prison industrial complex is a direct reflection of the racialization that occurs in the United States as a new enslavement.[28] Theorizing about fugitivity and abolition by Alexis Pauline Gumbs asks us to consider spaces of possibility in the most violent and unusual places.[29] Although Gumbs's work is not necessarily about the physicality of prisons, her words offer us ways of coming

to coalition around a system that seems too big and too monied to be dismantled. We think the issue of the neoslavery practice of prisons is instructive for coalition building because of the differential yet similar ways in which Black and Indigenous people are imprisoned and erased. Although we commonly talk about Indigenous people being disappeared so that their land can become available to settlers and that Black people are valued for reproducing more labor, we articulate with this possibility that Black and Indigenous people are disappeared and erased together through the prison industrial complex for the purpose of settler wealth. We therefore argue that the goals of the prison-industrial complex for Black and Indigenous people are not only similar, but serve the same end—and should, through coalition, be jointly destroyed.

As we aim to theorize together, we think about some important points to keep in mind. One important distinction to make between prison experiences, for example, is that Indigenous folks have too encountered policing and war since contact. Policing has always been a project to erase Indigenous sovereignty and land ownership. Robert Nichols warns critical prison studies not to theorize exclusively about racial overrepresentation in prisons because this sets the state and the carceral system as a benevolent actor. Instead, they explain how Indigenous scholarship challenges the very foundation of the settler state and its systems, including but not limited to the prison system. He frames the carceral system alongside the history of settler colonial violences against Indigenous peoples, writing: "the settler colonial state has not gone away at all, or even become less of a physical, material presence—it has merely shifted its site of operation, perhaps most symbolically from the residential school to the prison."[30] To support this, he explains that the political function of the carceral system is one driven by settler colonialism that erases Indigenous bodies and sovereignty by camouflaging the obvious connection between the military (read war) and the police (read criminalization).

With Nichols's work in mind, we find it useful to articulate particular numerical disparities to situate the current and historical function of prisons. According to a recent report from the Prison Policy Initiative, Black men in the United States were 40 percent of the prison population, although they were 13 percent of the US population.[31] According to Johanna Rincon, in many US states with large populations of Indigenous people, such as Montana, Indigenous incarceration is four times as high as non-Indigenous populations.[32] The implication here is that Black and Indigenous people are disproportionately incarcerated compared to white settlers.

Beyond resistance to incarceration, we would like to raise the point that death and incarceration can serve multiple purposes. For Indigenous people, imprisonment is continued erasure which foregrounds settler state projects that continue to remove Indigenous peoples for the purpose of access to land. Native Americans are the racial group most likely to be killed by the police.[33] Indigenous peoples' invisibility in carceral systems and police violence shows how incarceration operates invisibly in two ways—high rates of police violence, murder, and incarceration are not visible while at the same time, these systems work to erase Natives rendering them more invisible. Just as Veracini explains, systems of colonialism erase people and also erase the process of their erasure.[34] With regard to the prison system, we see prison erase Indigenous

peoples, while the statistics of Native people are rarely reported, obscuring their overrepresentation. The system erases the people while also erasing itself.

For Black people, high rates of incarceration continue to disempower communities to provide cheap labor for the state but also to disrupt the stability of families and communities. This is an erasure that removes Black people and makes them useful for the state. Monique Morris's (2016) book is telling about the ways in which Black women and girls continue to be pushed out of schools with little attention paid to the ways in which the process of colonization is gender nonconforming in the most violent of ways. During slavery, Black "women" (many were younger than 18) were not protected from manual or other work and in similar ways today, Black "women" are not protected from the carceral system on the basis that they are "women."[35] Furthermore, we see how women are targeted in both Indigenous and Black communities, adding layers to the carceral system's patriarchal framework.

Luana Ross explains that the "War on Drugs" disproportionately affects marginalized and oppressed populations like Native Americans, Black folks, and women. She theorizes transnationally to explain how incarceration is a patriarchal tool that uses penal measures to remove individuals addicted to drugs. Because of other forms of violence within Indigenous communities, Ross explains that women are more likely to experience depression, violence, and trauma, making them more likely to self-medicate with drugs.[36] From here, the cycle prevails and generations of women become susceptible to addiction. This is especially troubling because addiction, as Ross urges, is not a matter of personal choice, but is a medical condition where individuals need treatment instead of punishment.

Both Indigenous and Black women, therefore, are particularly vulnerable to being incarcerated because of the pushout they experience from places such as schools that should nurture them but do not, and because of this they self-medicate with illicit drugs to cope with the trauma in their communities. We see this gender disparity, which is often overlooked in the literature on prisons, as a place for building coalitions between communities. We see the connections between incarceration and larger systemic issues such as poverty, racism and sovereignty as fundamental to the prison-industrial complex (PIC).

Many Black scholars theorize that the goal of the PIC is the continued internal and external dispossession as well as a continued neoslavery. With much attention focused on police violence in Black communities, missing from the conversation is the rate at which Native Americans are killed by police. It is important to note that when Black bodies are not easily subjugated, erasing and disappearing them becomes the goal of the state through police brutality. Although Black erasure is not understood to be about disappearance and dispossession for greater access to Indigenous lands, the structural knowledge that understands Black and Indigenous people as disposable is the same, and therefore their disappearance from the settler state has the same result. The prison industrial complex serves as a place for disappearances understood multiply and differently because Indigenous erasure and Black disappearance should be understood differently because of the different histories attached to them. These

erasures and disappearances allow us new ways to theorize about dismantling the prison industrial complex, together.

The carceral system which disproportionately imprisons Black and brown bodies has become a new line of inquiry in our desire to understand layers of Black and Indigenous dispossession. Of course, we are aware that the carceral system is neoslavery or "the new jim crow," according to Michelle Alexander,[37] but we are inclined to ask questions about a continued dispossession of personhood when excess people are removed from the land with the goal of that removal squarely situated within white settler colonialism.

With differing theories, we do not aim to say that any understanding of the PIC is wrong; rather, we hope that theorizing together about the root of these systems makes room for more resistive dialogue and coalition. This means holding firm in the resistance-based theorizations of the colonial carceral systems in the ways that they specifically target specific populations while at the same time holding these theories in tension, to make new foundations that connect rather than separate us. This helps to create possibilities for us to understand how Black and Indigenous communities are in this together. Neither theoretical location is more foundational than the other.

When these bodies are removed from the land, what does it mean for all of our humanity? Tuck and Yang touch on what they call the "collapsibility of native-slave, again, for the purpose of reinvasion resettlement, reinhabitation." With this we see how the carceral system imprisons, erases, and stacks "bodies on top of one another in public housing and prisons, in cells kept from the labor market making labor for others (guards and other corrections personnel), making money for states—human-homesteading."[38] They also explain that Black people are kept landless by neoslavery (incarceration) and labor (wage labor), which we mark as a result of the settler-colonial space Black people find themselves engulfed in. Even by working for equality through the work of reparations (land), Black people are still engulfed in the already-present systems of settler colonialism which erase Indigenous land presence.

Our coalition possibilities therefore are realized through working against the prison system by understanding that there are different goals for different populations and different experiences as a result. From here, our responsibility is to develop a posture that understands this system to be overlapping by describing how the prison system merges, shifts, and hides itself in the folds of another group's oppressions to prevent dialogue and coalitional resistance. We hear more about the injustices and the incarcerations of brown and Black men (although only in particular ways) and would like to use this piece to draw attention to the disproportionate incarceration of Indigenous men as well as Indigenous and Black women. What we have come to know is that deeper than the lack of knowledge about Indigenous incarceration is the deliberate state effort to continue to create a discourse of blackness as inherently violent and inherently worthless and policies that validate inhumane approaches to Black life. At the same time, this removes any conversation or visibility of Indigenous peoples; they are not necessarily "violent," they are simply gone (and gone under the guise of Black folks constructed as "violent"). As we pull both these perspectives into view and hold them in tension, we believe there are many possibilities for dialogue, coalition, and eventually, joint resistance.

Possibility III: Rethinking Borders—Postures of Protection, Postures of Coalition

Borders are indeed violent but have been utilized by marginalized communities to respond to colonialisms and protect their self-determination. With this coalitional possibility we tie together an idea about postures or the intention behind the foundations of the theory we draw from. Theories that respond to the settler-colonial state for protection, we see as *postures of protection* and others are *postures of coalition*.[39] Postures of coalition keep theories of protection in our periphery, while acknowledging that the same theories might not be a compatible foundation for meaningful coalition with allied marginalized groups. Both postures are necessary, but in different moments and in different contexts.

To illustrate this in this conversation, we use physical and intellectual borders. Grande explains how the reservation borders are necessary for upholding Native sovereignty and preserving Native relationalities that make up an Indigenous worldview.[40] Ideally these borders should not have to exist because the land belongs to Indigenous people, but because of its violences, settler colonial logics make it necessary to impose borders for the purpose of protection not violence. We should not read these borders, physical and otherwise, as a sign of acquiescence. Instead, we should view them as symbolic and literal preservation of land, culture, language, resources, and religions.

In our conversation, we pushed ourselves to reimagine how we think of the borders that separate us. We push Anzaldua's 1987 construction of borders as a hybrid by putting her work in conversation with Grande (2000) and others who have critiqued Anzaldua's idea of a borderlands.[41] These critiques challenge a hybrid identity that does not recognize the grounded, place-based identities of Indigenous people. We instead think about the borders that disallow us to see, hear, and interact with each other across our differences and within our frameworks of similarities. We want to reimagine the borders that promote anti-Black sentiment and the borders that prevent us from knowing the disproportionate rates at which Indigenous people are incarcerated.

From our conversations, we learned that our dialogues (both our own and others) help us to inhabit spaces differently, which in turn teaches us to think about when building borders is necessary for protection and when it impedes our desire for coalition. The most important part of this was recognizing our "bordered" or protective postures generated from particular theoretical locations. We decided that borders are complex, semi-permeable, metaphorical and literal entities. In this conversation, we think about them transcending "good" and "bad" and are utilized by marginalized communities for self-preservation in a violent settler colonial state, and sometimes semi-permeable because we should get to decide when others are let in.[42]

We find that even as borders protect Native people (think a white settler can't just get a homesite lease on Navajo Nation) they also erase them at the same time. I, Kelsey, have lived in two border towns: Syracuse, New York, just a few miles down the road from Onondaga Nation, which is 9.3 square miles; and Farmington, New Mexico, which borders the 27,413 square-mile Navajo Nation. When I was in Syracuse, I encountered many non-Natives who "never knew they were so close to a reservation." I

originally thought this could be because of its size, until I encountered individuals in Farmington who didn't know where Navajo Nation began or even how far they were from it. I realized that the borders of a reservation do not simply protect erasure, but create a particular type. The reservation—politically, jurisdictionally, socially, economically, and environmentally—becomes a site of "nothingness." This can be exemplified in phrases like "there's nothing going on out there," "there's nobody out there," or "they're not doing anything out there."[43]

Natives are erased, even as violence in Native communities is erased, because they are located on or in Native-designated spaces (reservations, border towns, ghettos, prisons, schools, and the like). As Veracini describes settler colonialism's elusiveness, "Settler colonialism thus covers its tracks and operates towards its self-supersession. . . . Colonialism *reproduces* itself . . . settler colonialism, by contrast, extinguishes itself." [44] These layers of erasure show how settler colonial erasures and violences fold into one another in ways that make violences invisible. Borders are not just physical, but also metaphorical, and can make it impossible to see and understand the experiences of Indigenous folks because of their vast erasure from education and visibility.

At the same time, borders are deeply physical and spiritual. A Diné identity connects to our placement between the four sacred mountains, which was mapped for us before the creation of the reservation.[45] This leads to a location-based development of relationality, being, and identity that are central to a critique of identity politics, intersectionalities, and affect, while at the same time the survival of Diné people depends upon the acknowledgment of otherness (Diné and non-Diné). The acknowledgment is situational in that it is employed for the survival of our life, land, animals, and way of being, but must be tethered to not become the method of othering and erasure employed by settler colonialism—what seems to be an impossible tension. Being Diné was never "intersectional" but was/is a holistic ontology between categories of what is now spoken about as race, class, sex, gender, religion, etc. . . . all were intertwined into the gift of being created Diné in emergence on Diné Bikeyah (Navajo Land).

The assertion of a Diné identity in the present settler-colonial structure is not without its critique; it is not immune to the contexts of oppression, regulation, and confusion. But in the contradiction of survival, the very borders that regulate Diné have kept us in connection to a life-giving relationality of land, animals, and being in our created space. Our "identity" is not one of becoming, situatedness, state-sanctioned, postmodern, post-structural illusion, but rather an ontology given by the Holy People instructing Diné beyond present frames, contexts, and structures. From this place, Diné find resistance, healing, and resurgence, and ultimately service to land, peoples, and relationships beyond Diné. To do what Puar suggests,[46] that is, abandon identity due to state-sanctioned regulations, surveillance and violence, would be to abandon the tenuous point at which Diné connect to our identities (violence included in that maintenance). Native peoples will often live on their land, endure violence, or return amidst state surveillance and abuse, to maintain the ontology through a connection given to them before the creation of the state.

In similar ways, Black identity crosses physical, identity and spiritual borders. Being Black in America is already bordered by what people think they know of blackness. In physical ways, Black bodies are subject to perpetual violence that pull from a long legacy of violent interactions with the state. What if we rethought these borders that already construct blackness? We could move beyond tropes that only create one possibility for "being" a racialized Black as both identity and condition. We might also be able to address anti-blackness in all communities, including Black and Indigenous communities, if we were able to move through the borders that disallow us from living full lives.

Black spirituality is reduced to the Black church in America, but is so much more than that. In the spiritual communities that I, Kim, inhabit, Black spirituality is multidimensional and dynamic. Yet we rarely understand the intricacies of these spiritualities because we are limited by the borders that regulate our understandings of African cosmology and Christian hegemony. If we removed these borders, new worlds that break the barriers between African cosmology and Christian hegemony would be possible. There are Black people in communities who understand how to rework these borders and have therefore embraced spirituality in ways that allow them to live connected and spiritually grounded lives that are neither oppressive nor limited in scope because of the possibilities of resistance to state and violence they forge for those who practice them.

We see borders as spaces for coalition possibility because borders allow us to think about multiple possibilities that give us space to see each other's complex histories and relationships to colonial powers that are situated differently but push us to be deliberate in our work with each other. In other words, borders are a significant part of the different faces of oppression—whether colonial or settler colonial—although the effects of violences are different based on the communities. Conversations about borders force us to confront and center land within our move to coalitions. That's important because the land on which we sit has been disturbed by bordered settler logics in which we all navigate.

We must think deeply about layers of relocations and border drawing that have separated Indigenous folks from space, yet not rendering them "landless." If we believe in colonial borders, instead of only using them to *respond* to the settler state, we will never be able to build coalition.

Conclusion

In the modern US settler state, Black and Indigenous erasure are the premises for many injustices. We think our coalitional possibilities lie in thinking deeply about what borders are created around our subjectivities, what borders we create for ourselves, and how we may be able to have conversations both within and beyond these borders. This is how we hope to begin to understand why issues such as high rates of death and incarceration for Indigenous people are not widely discussed, or why Black bodies seem to be a "natural" part of incarcerated settings. Dialogue is important for giving people an understanding about how to look at land and its use differently than our

commercial and developmental understandings. Indeed, recognition of the sovereignty of land is missing from our popular lexicon. Of course, many Indigenous communities have been dispossessed of their lands and we cannot speak for them or about their experiences, but instead draw attention here to the complex connections that many Indigenous communities have to land, and specifically to their reservation lands.

We end by asking, where can we find possibilities to dialogue about Black people experiencing death and incarceration at high rates and make their lives and histories visible, but without erasing the lives and histories of Indigenous people? It takes education to make this possible, but also dialogue across difference. In our conversations with one another, we realized that theoretical and methodological choices are backed by intention. For Indigenous peoples, border-building is intended as a form of protection. In committing to dialogue, we had to take down these borders in order to build a connection. It was challenging for both of us. This act is intentional, not literal. We had to create a posture of coalition. We had to realize that our self-determinations were not ontologically based on the exclusion of another Indigenous person's desire for self-determination—that would be colonial.

Although we do not have "answers" necessarily to our original questions, we do find that through conversations we have productive pathways to begin to address these complex questions. We have come to know the importance of sitting in conversation with one another (and others) over time while holding the tensions of incommensurabilities. We understand this process to be helpful through building a relationship with one another over the course of five years. Even though we weren't having this particular conversation for five years, the foundation allowed us to begin to explore these conversations and perhaps the possibilities for our future.

We find that solidarities within spaces (where violences have happened not just in time, but in particular spaces), help us create coalition. Centering land helps us allow for both the tensions and the coalitions. Centering land allows us to understand movements across land and relationships to the land. The land has knowledge, sharing with us how to be good guests on lands. Centering land knowledge ultimately prevents the erasure of Indigenous first knowledges and first knowers from the conversation, but it does not erase the violences taking place on the land at this time through the arm of colonialism. Borders, incarceration, and spirituality all center land in particular ways that allow for both stories to be told as they overlap and diverge from one another.

Settler colonialism is not one-pronged, but layered. These complex layers, although not hierarchical, position Black and Indigenous people differently. Our hope is that through this paper, we see where we are different, respect it, and find ways to engage through our similar struggles and demand for liberation. We hope our scholarly work empowers deeper conversations at a deeper level, about activism, and sitting in communities of difference. Where we cannot dialogue we try not to speak in grand narratives about our lived experiences, but rather in ways that engage an assemblage of subjectivities and world views. We must locate ourselves and our dialogues within particular moments, particular experiences, and particular places. We can then create larger connections, to co-construct one type of grand narrative, but to only speak from a grand narrative makes people angry, and hopeless.

The ability to zoom in and zoom out from grand narrative to located personal experiences that draw connections is an important part of sitting in community and dialoguing across difference to build coalition. It makes the dialogue more located and contextual, and less superficial. To dialogue you have to have the tools to zoom in and zoom out by being located but also tapping into each other's histories and you must recognize the difference between a posture of defense and a posture of coalition.

Notes

1. "Connective postures" is a phrase that came from our dialogue session with other contributors to this special issue at an American Studies Association meeting. Specifically, we think about how Circe Sturm brought forth the word "posture" to help us think together in dialogue. See Reid Gómez, Kelsey Dayle John, Jessie Quizar, Circe Sturm, and Kimberly Williams-Brown, "Black and Red Call and Response: Grounds We Build and Fight On," conference presentation, American Studies Association annual meeting, Honolulu, HI, 2019.

2. Maile Arvin, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill, "Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy," *Feminist Formations* 25, no. 1 (2013): 8–34, https://doi.org/10.1353/ff.2013.0006; Jennifer Denetdale, "Securing National Boundaries: War, Patriotism, and the Diné Marriage Act of 2005," *Wicazo Sa Review* 24, no. 2 (2009): 131–248, https://doi.org/10.1353/wic.0.0034.

3. Maria Lugones, "Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System," *Hypatia* 22, no. 1 (2007): 186–209, https://doi.org/10.1353/hyp.2006.0067; Aracely Rivera-Cohen, "Transnational Practices of the Yaqui Nation," research presentation, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ, 2019; Cheryl Suzack, "Indigenous Women and Transnational Feminist Struggle: Theorizing the Politics of Compromise and Care," *CR: The New Centennial Review* 10, no. 1 (2010): 179–93,

https://doi.org/10.1353/ncr.2010.0031; Michael Lerma, *Guided by the Mountains: Navajo Political Philosophy and Governance* (Oxford University Press, 2017); Luis Urietta Jr., "Critical Latinx Indigeneities and Education," *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal* 13, no. 2 (2019): 145–73, http://dx.doi.org/10.24974.13.2.432.

4. *Survivance* means not just "survival," but draws attention to the ways in which oppressed peoples thrive even under systems of oppression. It also notes the autonomy individuals in oppressed populations have. See Gerald Vizenor, "Aesthetics of Survivance: Literary Theory and Practice," in *Survivance: Narratives of Native Presence*, ed. Gerald Vizenor (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008), 1–24.

5. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, "'Under Western Eyes' Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28, no. 2 (1986): 499- 535, https://doi.org/10.1086/342914; Keisha-Khan Perry and Y. Khan, "The Groundings with My Sisters: Toward a Black Diasporic Feminist Agenda in the Americas," *The Scholar & Feminist Online* 7, no. 2 (2009), http://sfonline.barnard.edu/africana/perry_01.htm.

6. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 1–40.

7. Lugones, "Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System."

8. Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (2006): 387–409, https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240.

9. Audra Simpson, "Whither Settler Colonialism"? *Settler Colonial Studies* 6, no. 4 (2016): 438–45, https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473x.2015.1124427.

10. Tiffany Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019). We thank Reid Gómez for sharing the word "grammars" at our dialogue meeting at the 2019 American Studies Association conference, where she helped us think about how to name language and rhetoric.

11. Lorenzo Veracini, "Introducing *Settler Colonial Studies*," *Settler Colonial Studies* 1, no. 1 (2011): 1–12, https://doi.org/10.1080/2201473X.2011.10648799.

12. Ibid., 3.

13. Tuck and Yang use "incommensurables" to refer to two agendas that cannot be compared; for more on incommensurability, see Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor," 23–30; Sandy Grande, "Refusing the University," in *Toward What Justice?*, ed. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (New York: Routledge, 2018), 47–65.

14. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," 9, 21.

15. King, *The Black Shoals*, 8.

16. Sandy Marie Anglas Grande, "American Indian Geographies of Identity and Power: At the Crossroads of Indígena and Mestizaje," *Harvard Educational Review* 70, no. 4 (2000): 467–99, https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.70.4.47717110136rvt53.

17. Jasbir K. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2018).

18. Lugones, "Heterosexualism and the Colonial/Modern Gender System."

19. Ximena Zúñiga, "Bridging Differences through Dialogue," *About Campus* 7, no. 6 (2003): 8–16, https://doi.org/10.1177/108648220300700603.

20. Colette N. Cann and Eric J. DeMeulenaere, "Critical Co-Constructed Autoethnography," *Cultural Studies—Critical Methodologies* 12, no. 2 (2012): 146–58, https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708611435214.

21. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor."

22. Hortense Spillers, Saidiya Hartman, Farah Jasmine Griffin, Shelly Eversley, and Jennifer L. Morgan, "'Whatcha Gonna Do?': Revisiting 'Mama's Baby, Papa's Maybe: An American Grammar Book': A Conversation with Hortense Spillers, Saidiya Hartman, Farah Jasmine Griffin, Shelly Eversley, and Jennifer L. Morgan, *Women's Studies Quarterly* 35, nos. 1/2 (2007): 299–309.

23. M. Jacqui Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing: Meditations on Feminism, Sexual Politics, Memory, and the Sacred* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005).

24. King, *The Black Shoals.*

25. Alexander, *Pedagogies of Crossing*, 205.

26. Ashon T. Crawley, *Black Pentecostal Breath: The Aesthetics of Possibility* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2016).

27. Grande, "Refusing the University."

28. Angela Yvonne Davis, "The Prison Industrial Complex," audio recording of lecture, 1999.

29. Alexis Pauline Gumbs, *Spill: Scenes of Black Feminist Fugitivity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016.

30. Robert Nichols, "The Colonialism of Incarceration," *Radical Philosophy Review* 17, no. 2 (2014): 435–55, https://doi.org/10.5840/radphilrev201491622. 205

31. Wendy Sawyer and Peter Wagner, "Mass Incarceration: The Whole Pie 2018," Prison Policy Initiative press release, March 19, 2019, https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2019.html.

32. Johanna Rincon, "Overrepresentation of Indigenous Peoples in Incarceration is a Global Concern," *Cultural Survival*, August 1, 2013, https://www.culturalsurvival.org/news/overrepresentation-indigenous-peoples-incarceration-global-concern.

33. Mike Males, "Who Are Police Killing?," Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice weblog, August 26, 2013, http://www.cjcj.org/news/8113.

34. Veracini, "Introducing *Settler Colonial Studies*."

35. Monique Morris, *Pushout: The Criminalization of Black Girls in Schools* (New York: The New Press, 2016.

36. Luana Ross, "Native Women, Mean-Spirited Drugs, and Punishing Policies," *Social Justice* 31, no. 4 (2004): 54–62.

37. Michelle Alexander, "The New Jim Crow," *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law* 9, no. 1 (2011): 7–26.

38. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," 33.

39. Gómez, et al., "Black and Red Call and Response: Grounds We Build and Fight On."

40. Grande, "American Indian Geographies of Identity and Power."

41. Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera*, vol. 3 (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1987). Among others who have critiqued Anzaldua's idea of a borderlands, see ibid.

42. Laura Jaffee and Kelsey John, "Disabling Bodies of/and Land: Reframing Disability Justice in Conversation with Indigenous Theory and Activism," *Disability and the Global South* 5, no. 2, 1407–29, https://disabilityglobalsouth.files.wordpress.com/2018/08/dgs_05_02_04.pdf.

43. Tracy Voyles, *Wastelanding: Legacies of Uranium Mining in Navajo Country* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015).

44. Veracini, "Introducing *Settler Colonial Studies*," 3.

45. Michael Lerma, *Guided by the Mountains: Navajo Political Philosophy and Governance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017).

46. Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*.