



PROJECT MUSE®

Decolonizing Settler Public Address: The Role of Settler
Scholars

Taylor N. Johnson, Danielle Endres

Rhetoric & Public Affairs, Volume 24, Number 1-2, Spring-Summer
2021, pp. 333-348 (Article)

Published by Michigan State University Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/803166>

DECOLONIZING SETTLER PUBLIC ADDRESS: THE ROLE OF SETTLER SCHOLARS

TAYLOR N. JOHNSON AND DANIELLE ENDRES

We argue that decolonization must be a future direction for the study of rhetoric and public address. Settler rhetoricians must not only recognize that the field is founded on settler colonialism but also commit to an ongoing process of unsettling the field and making both mundane and extraordinary tangible engagements with decolonization. What the field needs is to begin charting a path for all rhetoricians to participate with decolonization struggles, particularly settler scholars. Drawing from research from Indigenous scholars and Native American and Indigenous studies, we focus on tactics for settler scholars to engage with this important research trajectory. This essay teases out the distinctions between theories of postcoloniality, decoloniality, and decolonization; highlights the active role rhetoric plays in settler colonialism; and lays out tactics for settler rhetorical scholars to enact forms of accountability and responsibility in their research, at their universities, and in the field of rhetoric.

The offices in which we have written this essay are on stolen land. We live and work in a place, now called “Utah” by the settler nation, that belongs to Ute, Shoshone, Diné (Navajo), Goshute,

TAYLOR N. JOHNSON *an Assistant Professor in the Department of Race, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse.* DANIELLE ENDRES *is a Professor of Communication and affiliate faculty member in Environmental Humanities at the University of Utah.*

© 2021 Michigan State University. All rights reserved. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* Vol. 24, No. 1-2, 2021, pp. 333-348. ISSN 1094-8392.

and Paiute peoples who populated these lands since time immemorial. There are now nine Indigenous nations that share borders with the state of Utah: Confederated Tribes of Goshute, Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah, San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe, Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation, Skull Valley Band of Goshute, Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, White Mesa Community, and Navajo Nation. The University of Utah and our house/apartment are on Ute land that was taken by settlers under the name of Manifest Destiny. One of the privileges underlying our work is our complicity with a system of settler colonialism and our use of land “owned” by our university, our landlord, and ourselves. We are not the rightful heirs of this land but what Hokulani Aikau has called “uninvited guests.”¹ Given our positionality as White settler women living and working on occupied land, benefitting from the structures of settler colonialism, and also devoting our careers to studying Indigenous rhetorics, we ask how can we, as well as others in the field of rhetoric, not only recognize the land and life of Indigenous peoples but also participate in the destruction of colonial structures and ideas?

It has been eight years since Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang unequivocally stated that “decolonization is not a metaphor.”² Their essay called for rejecting settler “moves to innocence” in research and classrooms, to recognize that decolonization is not a synonym for social justice within settler society, and to support “the repatriation of Indigenous land and life.”³ Their essay has been taken up broadly within Native American and Indigenous studies (NAIS) and is part of a larger scholarly conversation about decolonization as a framework and method for research in the context of settler colonialism. However, scholars in rhetoric have been slower to adopt this perspective, often linking with related theories of postcoloniality and decoloniality.⁴ Indeed, Tiara Na’puti argues that rhetorical studies is “a system of knowledge that has overwhelmingly perpetuated erasure and effacement of Indigenous work.”⁵ Because of the centrality of classical Greek theory and democratic deliberation to much rhetorical scholarship, rhetoricians have struggled to shed ties to the settler colonial nation-state that, from an NAIS perspective, must be destabilized.

This is not to say that rhetoricians have not taken up Tuck and Yang’s call nor engaged with settler colonialism and decolonization; there is a growing contingent of rhetorical scholars calling for sustained attention to this rich literature, particularly within Indigenous rhetoric. Yet, the field

needs more. The field needs to begin charting a path for *all rhetoricians* to participate with decolonization. We argue that decolonization must be a future direction for rhetorical scholarship, including public address. This entails not only recognizing that the field is founded on settler colonialism but also committing to an ongoing process of unsettling the field and making both mundane and extraordinary tangible engagements with decolonization.

Building from Na'puti's call for rhetorical studies to embrace "Indigeneity as analytic," or "addressing the discursive and communicative dimensions of Indigeneity as ancestry/kinship—not through the logics of blood quantum, race, ethnicity, or nationality," we focus on how rhetoricians can unsettle colonial structures, narratives, and processes in the field and align with decolonization, particularly as defined by Tuck and Yang.⁶ We focus on tactics for settler scholars to use, building from a substantial scholarly conversation dedicated to Indigenous research that highlights the need for methods and approaches grounded in Indigenous epistemologies, rejects forms of colonial violence prevalent in settler research about Indigenous people, models forms of ethical engagement with Indigenous people, and discusses how settler scholars can participate in decolonization.⁷

It is important to note that the arguments in this essay are neither unique nor new. Indigenous scholars and NAIS have been calling for attention to decolonization, settler colonialism, and Indigeneity in scholarship for years.⁸ We take the opportunity of this special issue to work in conversation with Na'puti's call for the field to listen to, learn from, use, and act on the theories, methods, and contributions from NAIS and an Indigeneity analytic. We offer to this conversation a set of tactics that settler rhetoricians can enact to do so.

In what follows, we tease out the distinctions between theories of post-coloniality, decoloniality, and decolonization; highlight the active role rhetoric plays in settler colonialism; and lay out tactics for settler rhetorical scholars to enact forms of accountability and responsibility in their research, at their universities, and in the field of rhetoric.

SETTLER COLONIALISM AND DECOLONIZATION

Theories of settler colonialism account for colonial projects in which the goal is to eliminate and replace Indigenous peoples in a particular place to

create a new nation-state, such as what settlers now call the United States, Canada, or Australia.⁹ By Indigenous peoples we mean the original inhabitants of places who maintain spatial, spiritual, and relational connections to those homelands such that, as Patrick Wolfe suggests “where they are *is* who they are.”¹⁰ Decolonization, in this context, is a means of resistance to settler colonialism focused on not only rejecting colonial structures and settler futurities but also envisioning Indigenous futurities. While they share some assumptions with theories of postcoloniality and decoloniality, settler colonialism and decolonization also diverge in important ways.¹¹

Postcolonial theory emerged as an intervention in critical theory as late-twentieth-century thinkers grappled with tensions between the meta-narratives of Marxist theory and the theorizations of difference forwarded by poststructural thought.¹² Foundational postcolonial theorists drew heavily from continental philosophy while illuminating and challenging the colonial roots of Western thought.¹³ Their work tackles important questions about the role of colonial domination in subject formation and thought production in the academy. As NAIS scholars have argued, the “post” in postcolonial is problematic in its implication that colonization is over.¹⁴

Decolonial theories call for a move away from Western Eurocentric thought as a starting point for forms of scholarship that actively support anticolonial ends.¹⁵ They posit that colonialism is central to the production of modernity itself and argue that scholars must turn toward decoloniality, or decentering Western epistemologies as the starting point for scholarship. This “delinking” is central to theories of decoloniality.¹⁶

Studies of settler colonialism and decolonization are focused more on relationality, land, and labor.¹⁷ Although internal colonialism (bio- and geopolitical control from within a colonized nation’s borders) and external colonialism (extraction from Indigenous territories for the benefit of colonizers)—those structures most frequently studied through a postcolonial lens—necessitate the maintenance of the Indigenous population to further the aims of the colonizing power, settler colonialism requires the removal, erasure, and genocide of Indigenous peoples to make way for settlers to claim belonging to land and nation.¹⁸ Thus, in addition to the violent extractive processes of external colonialism and the biopolitical control of internal colonialism, settler colonialism is an “inherently eliminatory” system that “destroys to replace” as nonindigenous people (settlers) arrive for the purpose of making themselves at home.¹⁹ Decolonization in a settler

nation, then, is the project of unsettling colonialism by restoring Indigenous authority over stolen and occupied territory and lifeways.²⁰ Decolonization in a settler context may include the sort of critique of colonial structures and epistemologies common in postcolonialism and decoloniality but importantly focuses on the repatriation of land and life to Indigenous peoples.

This perspective on decolonization offers valuable contributions to rhetorical studies. Rhetoric itself functions as a tool of settler colonialism, providing logics of justification for elimination and replacement. Discourses of proper land use, appropriate familial relations, and civility have all undergirded genocidal policies of removing Indigenous people from their lands, removing Indigenous children from their families, and forcing Indigenous people to assimilate to settler society.²¹ Further, as Na'puti argues, while some rhetorical studies have begun tracing genealogies that challenge rhetoric's Whiteness by attuning to race as a central feature of rhetorical history, these genealogies do not center Indigeneity and rarely distinguish colonization from race.²² This distinction is necessary to avoid the ways that Indigenous people's unique claims to territory, sovereignty, and a distinct political identity are obfuscated by understandings that attend only to race without considering the specific histories of settler colonization. Na'puti argues for "Indigeneity as analytic" as a way of opening up rhetorical studies to different insights that center settler colonialism and Indigenous epistemologies.²³ This will require rhetoricians to question the legitimacy of the settler nation-state as a rights-granting institution, the value of engaging in deliberative rhetorics invested in "settler futurities," and the reliance of our scholarship on centering settler logics.²⁴

DECOLONIZATION IS NOT A METAPHOR

As noted above, Tuck and Yang's article begins with a premise that decolonization is not a metaphor, primarily to make their point that decolonization as a term should not stand in for all forms of struggle against oppression and to maintain a specificity about decolonization within settler colonial structures. While we wholeheartedly agree with Tuck and Yang's caution about turning decolonization into a metaphor and making decolonization meaningless through endless analogy, we do want to highlight how decolonization, while not metaphor, is still in part a rhetorical project.

Metaphor, of course, is not synonymous with rhetoric in Tuck and Yang's essay, yet there is a risk that in following Tuck and Yang's admonition, decolonization is taken by readers to be divided into material versus symbolic forms. Tuck and Yang note: "in our view, decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically."²⁵ This call for a nonsymbolic repatriation of land, or what might be termed "decolonization as material, not metaphor," risks eliding the crucial role of symbolism, or rhetoric, in decolonization efforts.²⁶ To be clear, we do not think that Tuck and Yang are arguing that rhetoric and symbolism do not play a role in decolonization. Yet, we want to make sure that the analysis of rhetorics of settler colonialism and decolonization are included in a material/symbolic project of decolonization. As rhetorical scholars frequently argue, material change generally does not happen in the absence of rhetoric. Decolonization must navigate the tension between outright refusal of rhetoric as a tool of settler colonialism and engaging in "decolonizing appropriation" by developing rhetorical tactics that contribute to the repatriation of land and life.²⁷

One key contribution that rhetoricians can bring to NAIS is a deep and detailed attention to how language and other symbol systems reflect dominant ideologies, can support a radical revisioning of the present and futures, and importantly have material consequences. Rhetorical work engaged with settler colonialism and Indigeneity can come in numerous forms, such as Na'puti's call for both/neither thinking, Qwo-Li Driskill's use of Cherokee doubleweaving to theorize two-spirit rhetorics, and Scott Lyons's assertion of the importance of rhetorical sovereignty, or self-representation.²⁸ The field's historic and contemporary engagement with Indigenous rhetorics and rhetorical colonialism provides examples of rhetorical analysis that focus on decolonization and demonstrate the survival and resilience of Indigenous peoples.²⁹ Yet, as Na'puti argues, the field can do much more to center Indigeneity and address erasures. She argues that a key part of the rhetorical work of decolonization entails rhetorical scholars listening to and learning from Indigenous scholars and NAIS conversations on decolonization and settler colonialism.³⁰ Rhetoricians should embrace and enact forms of scholarship, relationality, and engagement in the field that actively confront settler colonialism and center Indigeneity.

Settler scholars can seek to be accomplices with Indigenous people, standing in solidarity with their inherent rights to sovereignty, land, and life while also appreciating and celebrating the rhetorical tactics that underlie those rights.³¹ Settler scholars must also be willing to act against the institutions that support settler futurities.

SETTLER ACCOUNTABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

As settler scholars, it is our responsibility to understand that our work is a direct result of settler colonialism. Our universities, living spaces, and property—conditions that make our research possible—are produced and sustained through Indigenous dispossession, exist on stolen land, and are thoroughly invested in settler futurities. Metaphors that settlers use and study are embedded in settler imaginaries that structure relationships with territory and people.³² The images and names with which some institutions of higher education represent themselves draw on depictions of the Indigenous people on whose territory they reside, such as our own university's use of the "Utes" nickname.³³ Na'puti argues: "We cannot deny the colonial legacies and white influences that have anchored our discipline, and we all have a responsibility to address our field's embedded Whiteness."³⁴ We are particularly interested in the responsibilities of settlers.

The field of rhetoric is predominantly White (recognizing that Whiteness can extend beyond phenotype) in the norms, assumptions, and cultural practices of the field. As two White women settlers that do research on Indigenous rhetorics, we often ask ourselves what role we can play in decolonization and how we can work toward supporting Indigenous peoples and decolonization without "playing Indian" or enacting settler moves to innocence, which Tuck and Yang define as "those strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege, without having to change much at all."³⁵ To better address settler colonialism and support decolonization, rhetoricians must engage in forms of settler accountability, responsibility, and action toward the goal of being accomplices in decolonization.³⁶

Before laying out some possibilities for enacting settler accountability and responsibility, we want to pause on an example of how our

positionalities as White settler women, particularly when unchecked, can harm our ability to act in support of decolonization. It is nothing new to argue that White women often work against the interests of People of Color.³⁷ White women's role within settler society has always centered the production of settler colonial home.³⁸ As such, White women's rhetoric and advocacy can function to support Indigenous replacement, White settler homemaking, replacement of Indigenous territory as settler colonial home, and forms of civility that work against Indigenous futurities.³⁹ When called to account for Women of Color's experiences, White women often turn to an extractive model that fails to deeply listen to and account for the theories of Women of Color.⁴⁰ This points to the ways in which our particular positions as White women need to be interrogated and subject to self-reflexivity and accountability in our research about Indigenous and settler colonial rhetorics. Likewise, settler researchers in rhetoric coming from other positionalities should account for their relationality to settler colonialism.

In what follows, we reflect on some ways to embody and enact settler accountability and responsibility that we have learned from reading Indigenous scholars and NAIS research. Importantly, these actions should be accomplished *in collaboration with* Indigenous faculty, students, and staff based on *listening to* the specific concerns about particular departments, campuses, and disciplines. Simply acting on our own as settler scholars risks replicating settler colonial patterns of paternalism and knowing what is best for Indigenous people.

INTERVENTIONS IN SCHOLARSHIP

- Settlers can and should engage with Indigenous rhetorics, settler colonialism, and decolonization scholarship in their research, teaching, and engagement in the field. This does not mean that all public address research needs to study the rhetorics of Indigenous people or the rhetorics of settler colonialism, though we do hope for more widespread work in this area. Rather, analogous to what Lisa Flores argues in relation to racial rhetorical criticism, settler scholars must recognize that all rhetorical work—whether or not it is explicitly focused on Indigenous rhetoric—is embedded within settler colonialism.⁴¹ As Na'puti argues: “Beyond shallow and intermittent dips, rhetorical scholars

must take deep dives that center and rethink *Indigeneity*—and how Indigeneity has always been *in relation with* our work, even though the field rarely speaks of it.”⁴² No matter the topic of research, settler rhetoricians should always interrogate its relationship with settler colonialism.

- At risk of belaboring the point Na’puti has already made, settler scholars must read, listen to, and learn from Indigenous scholars and NAIS. Yet, scholars cannot stop with listening, reading, and learning. It is settlers’ responsibility to actively incorporate Indigenous analytics in research, teaching, and thinking processes.
- Settlers should be reflexive about the use of metaphors and resist using ones that further entrench settler colonialism, including frontier, discovery, exploration, Manifest Destiny, and pioneering. Ashley Cordes, for example, has called on communication scholars to question the “last frontier” metaphor in describing cyberspace.⁴³ Rhetoricians are uniquely qualified to understand why metaphors matter, turn critical focus toward metaphors, re-valence problematic metaphors, or invent new metaphors.
- Settler rhetoricians should avoid the settler moves to innocence that Tuck and Yang detail.⁴⁴ These moves to innocence function to assuage guilt about complicity within settler colonialism but do not lead to tangible moves toward decolonization and repatriation of land and life. They do more harm than good.
- Those who do research about Indigenous rhetorics should, in line with Indigenous research methodologies protocols, ask for permission to analyze Indigenous texts before starting projects. This may look different depending on the project; in some cases, particularly rhetorical fieldwork, it may involve working with both university institutional review boards and Indigenous government research boards; in other cases, it may involve communicating with Indigenous leaders, authors/rhetors, and non-profits about projects and seeking approval to analyze their publicly available texts.⁴⁵ In rhetorical analyses, scholars should consider the forms of refusal that Audra Simpson describes, including recognizing participants’ right to engage in refusal to reveal and refusing to reveal things from our research that do not align with the needs of the communities and that do not support their sovereignty and decolonization goals.⁴⁶ Finally, settler scholars should also work with Indigenous

nations and organizations to meet their goals through publicly engaged work or participatory action research.⁴⁷

INTERVENTIONS ON CAMPUSES

- Settlers must call on institutions to not only make land acknowledgements, given that all universities and colleges are on stolen and occupied Indigenous land, but also develop meaningful relationships with local Indigenous governments.⁴⁸ In addition to its [referencing University of Utah] recently released land acknowledgment statement, the University of Utah has a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Ute Tribe of the Uintah and Ourey Reservation that not only codifies the Ute nation's permission for the university to use the "Utes" nickname but also lays out a series of tangible educational outcomes.⁴⁹ While not perfect, the MOU importantly recognizes Ute sovereignty and lays out mechanisms of influence and participation in the university. Depending on the specific goals of the Indigenous nations involved, MOUs could also offer free tuition to Indigenous students, provide space for Indigenous students and scholars, codify monetary and institutional support for Indigenous research, affirm sovereignty, and give land back to Indigenous peoples.
- All campuses should provide a dedicated place, ideally a building, for Indigenous faculty, students, and staff to gather, work, relax, and engage in ceremony. Although not repatriation of land, creating this sort of space is a step in the right direction.⁵⁰ It is important, however, that these places are carefully chosen. For example, the American Indian Resource Center at the University of Utah is located in the repurposed Ft. Douglas military outpost (established in 1862), which is not only on the outskirts of campus but also stands as a symbol of U.S. military contributions to colonization of Indigenous peoples. In addition to creating places, we should also encourage campuses to assess and redress the ways that campuses physically and spatially celebrate settler colonialism through building names, statues, and imagery.

INTERVENTIONS IN THE FIELD

- As noted above, the field needs to encourage and celebrate research that accounts for settler colonialism and Indigenous analytics. The

tradition of American public address is a tradition of settler public address. Settler scholars need to rethink the field of study to better account for structures of settler colonialism, not just including more Indigenous theory and scholarship but using that theory and scholarship to change approaches to research and teaching.⁵¹ For example, on the first day of each rhetoric course we teach, we have displaced a lecture on the classical origins of rhetorical theory with a discussion of settler colonialism and rhetorical sovereignty, the Indigenous peoples on whose land we are holding class, and the responsibilities of settlers on a campus with a “Utes” nickname.

- Beyond acting on Indigenous scholars’ and NAIS research, the field should also work to recruit, retain, and celebrate Indigenous scholars in the field of rhetoric. This necessitates careful consideration of how White norms; position announcements; retention, promotion, and tenure standards; and scholarly climates often exclude or alienate Indigenous scholars.
- Settler scholars should call on disciplinary organizations and conferences to call attention to settler colonialism through land acknowledgment statements and other tangible actions. The most recent Public Address Conference at the University of Colorado Boulder, for example, was the first rhetorical conference we attended in which every session included a land acknowledgment. The field of rhetoric can create institutionalized spaces, such as caucuses or interest groups, that are dedicated to Indigenous and settler colonialism research, such as the newly formed Indigenous Caucus in the National Communication Association.

This is not an exhaustive list of the possible actions that settler scholars can take to support decolonization in settler nations and act to support what Gerald Vizenor has called Indigenous survivance.⁵² We recognize that our advocacy does not sufficiently address intersectionalities of oppression and the ways that rhetoric and public address are also founded on enduring structures of racism, patriarchy, heteronormativity, class, anthropocentrism, and other relations of power. We do not encourage erasure of these relations of power, nor do we assert that settler colonialism is worse than any of them. While our suggestions are specific to settler colonialism, we hope the field will engage in productive conversation across the many

relations and structures of power that undergird the foundations of rhetorical studies and public address. As the field does so, we should consider Tuck and Yang's argument "that the opportunities for solidarity [across social justice and human rights] lie in what is incommensurable rather than what is common across these efforts."⁵³ Recognizing the specificity of settler colonialism and Indigeneity is one step toward such work.

CONCLUSION

We wrote this statement as a way to take Na'puti's call seriously and think about our own responsibilities as settlers. We have reflected on how settler scholars can make moves toward supporting decolonization. Eva Mackey argues that, "how we might decolonize is not prescribed," meaning there is room for a robust conversation about how the field of rhetoric can contribute to these efforts.⁵⁴ We invite further conversation, including critiques and challenges to the arguments we have made in this essay. In doing so, we hope that everyone will take this advice from Tuck and Yang to "be more impatient with each other, less likely to accept gestures and half-steps, and more willing to press for acts which unsettle innocence."⁵⁵

NOTES

1. Personal communication, Dr. Hokulani Aikau.
2. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1 (2012): 1–40.
3. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization," 1.
4. Josue David Cisneros, *The Border Crossed Us: Rhetorics of Borders, Citizenship, and Latina/o Identity* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2014); Raka Shome, "Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An 'Other' View," *Communication Theory* 6 (1996): 40–59; Darrel Allan Wanzer, "Delinking Rhetoric, or Revisiting McGee's Fragmentation Thesis through Decoloniality," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 15 (2012): 647–57.
5. Tiara R. Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity: Navigating Genealogies against Erasure and #RhetoricSoWhite," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 105 (2019): 495–501.
6. Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity," 496–97.
7. For example, Devon Abbott Mihesuah, *So You Want to Write about American Indians? A Guide for Writers, Students, and Scholars* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press,

- 2005); Tiara R. Na'Puti, "From Guåhan and Back: Navigating a Both/Neither Analytic for Rhetorical Field Methods," in *Text + Field: Innovations in Rhetorical Method*, ed. Sara L. McKinnon et al. (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2016), 56–71; Audra Simpson, "On Ethnographic Refusal: Indigeneity, 'Voice' and Colonial Citizenship," *Junctures: The Journal for Thematic Dialogue* 9 (2007): 67–80; Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (London, UK: Zed Books, 2006); Gregory Younging, *Elements of Indigenous Style: A Guide for Writing by and about Indigenous Peoples* (Alberta, Edmonton, Canada: Brush Education, 2018).
8. For example, J. Kehaulani Kauanui, *Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty: Land, Sex, and the Colonial Politics of State Nationalism* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2018).
 9. Eve Tuck and Rubén A. Gaztambide-Fernández, "Curriculum, Replacement, and Settler Futurity," *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 29 (2013): 72–89; Patrick Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8 (2006): 387–409.
 10. Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism," 388.
 11. While our focus will be on settler colonialism, we do not contend that it is the only colonialism worthy of study. There are many ways to engage with colonialism and resistances to it, including postcolonialism, internal colonialism, external colonialism, settler colonialism, neocolonialism, and decoloniality. We will not review all of these threads but do want to note the plurality of many distinct and overlapping colonialisms and anticolonialisms in theory and practice.
 12. Gurminder K. Bhambra, "Postcolonial and Decolonial Dialogues," *Postcolonial Studies* 17 (2014): 115–121; Leela Gandhi, *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019).
 13. Homi Bhabha, "The Commitment to Theory," *New Formations* 5 (1988): 5–23; Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979); Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).
 14. Jodi A. Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*.
 15. Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (New York: Grove Press, 1963); Walter D. Mignolo, "Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom," *Theory, Culture and Society* 26 (2009): 159–81; Aníbal Quijano, "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality," *Cultural Studies* 21 (2007): 168–78.

16. Walter D. Mignolo, "Delinking: The Rhetoric of Modernity, the Logic of Coloniality and the Grammar of De-Coloniality," *Cultural Studies* 21 (2007): 449–514. See also Wanzer, "Delinking Rhetoric."
17. Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015); Scott Lauria Morgensen, *Spaces between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011); Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017); Haunani-Kay Trask, *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawaii?* (Manoa: University of Hawaii Press, 1999); Patrick Wolfe, "Land, Labor, and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race," *American Historical Review* 106 (2001): 866–905.
18. Byrd, *The Transit*; Morgensen, *Spaces Between*.
19. Note: some settlers did not arrive to make a home but were trafficked through the slave trade. Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism," 387–88.
20. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization"; Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies*.
21. Jason Edward Black, *American Indians and the Rhetoric of Removal and Allotment* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2015); Mishuana Goeman, *Mark My Words: Native Women Mapping Our Nations* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013); Margaret D. Jacobs, *White Mother to a Dark Race: Settler Colonialism, Maternalism, and the Removal of Indigenous Children in the American West and Australia, 1880–1940* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *Talkin' Up to the White Woman: Aboriginal Women and Feminism* (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 2000).
22. Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity."
23. Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity," 496.
24. Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández, "Curriculum."
25. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization," 7.
26. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization," 28.
27. Black, *American Indians*; Scott Richard Lyons, "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?" *College Composition and Communication* 51 (2000): 447–68.
28. Na'Puti, "From Guáhan"; Qwo-Li Driskill, "Doubleweaving Two-Spirit Critiques: Building Alliances between Native and Queer Studies," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16 (2010): 69–92.
29. Scholars who address these questions include Patrick Belanger, Jason Edward Black, Danielle Endres, Taylor N. Johnson, Casey Ryan Kelly, Randall A. Lake, Richard

- Morris, John M. Murphy, Catherine Helen Palczewski, Ernest Stromberg, and Mary E. Stuckey.
30. Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity."
 31. See "Accomplices Not Allies: Abolishing the Ally Industrial Complex," *Indigenous Action Media* (blog), May 4, 2014, <http://www.indigenousaction.org/accomplices-not-allies-abolishing-the-ally-industrial-complex/>.
 32. Ashley Cordes, "Meeting Place: Bringing Native Feminisms to Bear on Borders of Cyberspace," *Feminist Media Studies* 20 (2020): 285–89.
 33. Danielle Endres, "American Indian Permission for Mascots: Resistance or Complicity within Rhetorical Colonialism?" *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 18 (2015): 649–89.
 34. Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity," 498.
 35. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization," 10. See also Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1998).
 36. Note that one cannot claim oneself to be an accomplice; rather seeking to be an accomplice is an ongoing goal to make choices that support Indigenous decolonization.
 37. Sandy Grande, "Whitestream Feminism and the Colonialist Project: Toward a Theory of Indigenista," in *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought* (Washington, D.C.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2004), 123–57; Moreton-Robinson, *Talkin' Up*; Peggy Pascoe, *Relations of Rescue: The Search for Female Moral Authority in the American West, 1874–1939* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1990).
 38. Jacobs, *White Mother*; Raka Shome, *Diana and Beyond: White Femininity, National Identity, and Contemporary Media Culture* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2014).
 39. Moreton-Robinson, *Talkin' Up*; Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández, "Curriculum."
 40. Maile Arvin, Eve Tuck, and Angie Morrill, "Decolonizing Feminism: Challenging Connections between Settler Colonialism and Heteropatriarchy," *Feminist Formations* 25 (2013) 8–34; Andrea Smith and J. Kehaulani Kauanui, "Native Feminisms Engage American Studies," *American Quarterly* 60 (2008): 241–49.
 41. Lisa A. Flores, "Between Abundance and Marginalization: The Imperative of Racial Rhetorical Criticism," *Review of Communication* 16 (2016): 4–24.
 42. Na'puti, "Speaking of Indigeneity," 497.
 43. Cordes, "Meeting Place."
 44. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization."
 45. Younging, *Indigenous Style*; Mihesuah, *So You Want*; Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, eds., *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies* (Newbury Park, CA: SAGE, 2008).

46. Simpson specifically writes about ethnographic refusals, which we argue can be adapted to both rhetorical fieldwork and conventional textual analysis. Simpson, "On Ethnographic Refusal."
47. Michelle Fine, Eve Tuck, and Sarah Zeller-Berkman, "Do You Believe in Geneva: Methods and Ethics at the Global-Local Nexus," in *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, ed. Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith (Newbury Park, CA: SAGE, 2008), 157–80.
48. Native Governance Center, "A Guide to Indigenous Land Acknowledgment," *Native Governance Center* (blog), October 22, 2019, <https://nativegov.org/a-guide-to-indigenous-land-acknowledgment/>.
49. "Indigenous Land Acknowledgement Statement," 2020, <https://president.utah.edu/indigenous-land-acknowledgement/>; "Memorandum of Understanding between the Ute Indian Tribe and the University of Utah," 2020, <https://admin.utah.edu/ute-mou/>.
50. This came up as a topic of conversation in the Q&A portion of Dr. Jacob's talk. Michelle M. Jacob, "Indigenous Education Is for Everyone" (University of Utah, January 23, 2020).
51. Karma R. Chávez, "Beyond Inclusion: Rethinking Rhetoric's Historical Narrative," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 101 (2015): 162–72.
52. Gerald Robert Vizenor, *Survivance: Narratives of Native Presence* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2008).
53. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization," 28.
54. Eva Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land and Settler Decolonization* (Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing, 2016), 191.
55. Tuck and Yang, "Decolonization," 10.