Teaching Philosophy
Online First: May 4, 2023
DOI: 10.5840/teachphil202351181

Teaching and Learning Indigenous Philosophy in Viral Times: Personal and Pedagogical Reflections on how to Teach "Indigenous Philosophy"

WAYNE WAPEEMUKWA
EDUARDO MENDIETA
JULES WONG
The Pennsylvania State University

Abstract: The authors of this essay challenge the notion that "philosophy" is irredeemably Eurocentric by providing a series of personal, professional, and pedagogical reflections on their experience in a new graduate seminar on "Indigenous philosophy." The authors—a graduate student, professor, and Indigenous course-facilitator—share in the fashion of "Indigenous storywork," as outlined by Stó:lō pedagogue Jo-Ann Archibald. We begin with the instructor and how he was personally challenged to re-evaluate his roots and philosophical praxis in spite of his experience teaching over several decades. The second section describes a student experience and how they measured the exigencies of decolonization against the esteem that their family holds for Canada's brand of multiculturalism. Finally, we turn to the Indigenous seminar facilitator and his skepticism over whether the course truly constituted decolonized, or "landed," pedagogy. Throughout, the authors ask about the demands of decolonization and how philosophical pedagogy may center Indigenous futurity.

Key words: Indigenous philosophy, Indigenous pedagogy, land-based pedagogy, decolonization

Introduction: "On the Basis of Place"

There is a running joke in academia that "philosophy" is actually a White-European area-studies sub-discipline. Even when courses on non-European philosophers are lucky enough to be taught, they usually fall victim to what Quechua pedagogue Sandy Grande (2015) calls a "rhetoric of inclusion," that is, an uncritical fusing of Black,

Indigenous, and Latinx figures that un-critically draws analogies between experiences that are best understood as "incommensurate."[1] *Pace* Thomas Kuhn, who first used the term to characterize the nature of scientific revolutions, Grande understands "incommensurability" as a normative principle that ought to guide settler and Indigenous teachers as they deliver course instruction on topics related to decolonization. In their usage of the term, Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (2012) write that "Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an 'and.' It is an elsewhere" (36). Building upon this, Grande argues that "fusions" between settler and Indigenous ideas "substitute the project of radical, social transformation with a politics of representation."[2] For Grande, the teaching of Indigenous and decolonizing philosophies behoove instructors to make practical and, at times, subversive changes to the ways that they usually deliver and structure curriculum; changes which—especially in the case of the authors of this essay—challenge and contest the very meaning of "philosophy" itself.

The following is a series of personal, practical, and pedagogical reflections on an attempt to teach a graduate-level "Indigenous philosophy" course from the perspectives of a faculty professor (Eduardo Mendieta), student (Jules Wong), and Indigenous (Métis) facilitator (Wayne Wapeemukwa). The syllabus for our course grew out of an Indigenous and Decolonizing Pedagogy seminar that Wayne undertook in Spring 2020, led by Dr. Hollie Kulago (Diné). There, Wayne took a critical stance towards the philosophical project and its historic role in legitimizing colonization. This required him to organize the syllabus neither around "topic" nor "period," as is common in philosophy seminars, but *on the basis of place*. In this way, our course syllabus challenged how "Western knowledge aims towards a universality which can be 'transplanted' across time and space." Instead, our syllabus advanced a subversive, or, *unsettling*, form of pedagogy based on the fact that "Indigenous knowledge is highly particular, time specific, place- and action-based, as well as relational" (Kulago et al. 2021). Rather than drawing on materials from the "greatest hits" of Indigenous philosophy—such as: Vine Deloria Jr., Robert Bunge, Taiaiake Alfred, and others—course materials were, instead, "grounded" in the history and ongoing stories of Indigenous anti-colonial resistance to dispossession in Pennsylvania—which we recognize as the homelands of the Erie, Haudenosaunee (Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Oneida, Mohawk, and Tuscarora), Lenape (Delaware Nation, Delaware Tribe, Stockbridge-Munsee), Shawnee (Absentee, Eastern, and Oklahoma), Susquehannock, and Wahzhazhe (Osage) Nations.[3] What we did not anticipate, however, was the further complication of teaching such a

"decolonized" course within the context of a historic land-grant institution—namely, the Pennsylvania State University (PSU).

As we experienced it, our seminar became an exercise in doing philosophy *through* grounding our positions as mutually engaged and reciprocal learners in relationship with land. Thus, we found it necessary to foreground our participation in an institution that cannot be thought apart from its historic—and ongoing—complicity with settler-colonialism. As students and educators at PSU, we all sustain ourselves on the proceeds of our school's sale of public domain land that was originally granted by the U.S. government in the 1862 *Morrill Act*.[4] The 780,000-acre grant covers stolen and cheaply bought land which secured PSU a chiefly endowment—approximately $7.8 million when adjusted for inflation—to support the agricultural, industrial, and military education of settlers. This context could not go unnoticed in our class; it profoundly challenged the fullness with which we experienced and understood our relationships as learners and practitioners of Indigenous philosophy. Our seminar was further imperiled by the exacerbating COVID-19 pandemic, which forced us to meet in a disembodied, online format. Instead of joining on the land and forging personal relationships, we were forced to meet as disparate and scattered "talking heads" from across Turtle Island; and, yet, without leaving our homes, we all learned about the extent to which we had participated in the colonization of more than 112 nations and tribes across what we now know now as California, Nebraska, and Kansas. Such land was sold by PSU to prospectors in a double-faceted transaction to simultaneously grab land and fund the settlers who could work it, extract from it, sustain themselves from it, and guard it. Dispossession masked itself as a gift from the new U.S. government to schools that would be charged with successfully industrializing the farming and emergent working class. We realized that, by learning and teaching Indigenous philosophy at PSU, we were also complicit in the university land-grab legacy.

In what follows, we each reflect on our experience teaching and learning Indigenous philosophy at PSU by sharing personal stories in the fashion of "Indigenous storywork," as outlined by Stó:lō pedagogue Jo-Ann Archibald (2008). For Archibald, the sustaining of cultural teachings and principles through "storytelling" marks a way to make meaning from and with Indigenous traditional and lived experiences. However, such storytelling is far from even and uniform. What this means is that, at times, our dialogue will be synergistic and, at others, cacophonous. In the end, though, we hope that our polyphony culminates in practical takeaways for philosophers interested in engaging with Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogies.

We begin with the seminar's instructor—Eduardo—and the philosophical and emotional challenges he faced while reconciling his previ-

ous experience teaching decolonial philosophy with this new seminar's Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogical stance. Even though Eduardo is a highly experienced educator, our seminar nonetheless pushed him outside of his comfort zone, bringing him into closer contact with his experience as a teacher as well as his mother and existential questions regarding his own roots. Next, we turn to Jules—a graduate student—and their reflections on their family history through the social and political realities of settler-colonialism. As a Canadian-born person of Italian and Cantonese heritage, Jules found it difficult to measure the exigencies of decolonization against the high esteem that their family holds for Canada's welcoming brand of multiculturalism. Finally, we turn to the challenges Wayne encountered as the only Indigenous person in class and how translating the seminar online disrupted his emerging land-based pedagogy and growth as an Indigenous philosopher. Initially, Wayne planned the course to center relationship-building with invited guests, speakers, and field-trips. Such plans were stymied by the COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, Wayne found himself in the peculiar position of having to learn, teach, and facilitate Indigenous philosophy under structural conditions that made the dissemination of such knowledge nearly impossible.

In sum, we hope that the stories which follow speak to the wholly interrelated processes by which instructor (Eduardo Mendieta), student (Jules Wong), and facilitator (Wayne Wapeemukwa), sought to decolonize philosophy as well as ourselves. It is not enough to bring diverse practitioners into the same exclusive spaces: larger structural changes to the culture of academic inclusion are necessary. As you read our stories we invite you to consider the practical, personal, and political ways by which you may not only advance, but radically change the academy and, indeed, the meaning of philosophy itself.

Eduardo Mendieta: Mothers, Margins, and Teaching to Transform

My teaching career has always been motivated by the following question: What does it mean to critique from the margins, from the underside, and from the darkness and oblivion of epistemic, material, historical, and hermeneutical dispossession?

Teaching, for me, is not a job, but a calling—a calling to remain accountable to those who have been historically marginalized. Thus, teaching is also a responsibility. On my view, this means making sure that my students receive a better education than I did; an education that imparts the skills of critical and generous reading, lucid and vigorous writing, as well as epistemic orientations that disclose new ways of thinking, reading, and writing. This means that I must continuously

re-educate and disabuse myself of the mis-education that I inherited. This is why, over my now more than two decades of teaching, I have always aimed to teach from the periphery, from what liberation theologian Gustavo Gutierrez called the "underside of history." My graduate seminars, for instance, have always sought to contest that which appears perennial, natural, and justified. I have taught seminars on "Postcolonial Marx," "Genealogy and Race," "Left-Nietzscheanism," and "Ethics and Temporality," just to mention some. More recently I taught courses entitled "Decolonizing Philosophy: Topologies of Reason" and "Critique of the Critique: Decolonizing Philosophy." These were the precursors behind the seminar "On Indigeneity," which is the immediate subject of my following pedagogical reflections. Unlike those other seminars, however, I soon realized that this "Indigenous Philosophy" seminar would unearth an even deeper existential motivation of mine.

Unlike other philosophy courses, which usually operate at the level of abstract theory, this seminar asked us to undertake important emotional labor towards investigating our ancestors and family relations. Soon after undertaking this seminar I realized that I did not know a lot about my mother and her side of the family. After interviewing her I found out, in greater detail, that her side of the family has Indigenous roots to what is now known as Colombia. I discovered that my grandfather—who was of Spanish decent—had married the daughter of a Cacique, an Indigenous leader, in the southwest of Colombia, in what is called the basin of the Cauca River. This partly explained why my grandfather managed to inherit and own a very large piece of land. Unfortunately, he was killed during "La Violencia" —a very violent ten-year civil war in the history of Colombia (1948-1968)— whereupon the hacienda was partitioned and distributed among his numerous daughters and their husbands. Because of "La Violencia," the history of my mother's family is one of diaspora, displacement, and, indeed, dispossession. I began to reckon this personal-emotional epiphany with other, theoretical, questions that came up in class, such as: What does it means to have Indigenous ancestry? What is the history of Indigenous peoples in Colombia and what is their history in Latin American today? My personal journey, then, led me to much larger, more expansive philosophical concerns.

In my work on Latin American philosophy, I had already researched differences between Indigenous experience in North, Central, and South "America." For example, when the Spanish invaded the so-called "New World," they faced one of the most storied Indigenous cultures of the world—namely, the Aztecs (Mexica). Eventually, the Spanish would also encounter the Incas (Quechua). Eventually, in Colombia, which emerged from the Grand Colombia and the Viceroyalty of the Nueva Granada after the nineteenth century emancipation struggle, they met

the Chibcha (Muisca and Tairona), Quimbaya, and Kalina (or Caribs). The Muisca, in particular, practiced sophisticated metallurgy, mining, and farming (Martinón-Torres et al. 2017). They also used gold and emeralds in ritual, which, unfortunately, gave rise to the pernicious legend of the "El Dorado." Some of their artifacts and sacred objects can be seen today at the *Museo del Oro* [Museum of Gold] in Bogotá. One of the main regions in which Indigenous people lived throughout the settlement of Colombia was the northern peninsula (now known as the Guajira), the Valle Cauca, and of course, the Amazonian southeast. My grandmother and her ancestors most likely descended from the Chibcha (Muisca and Tairona), who moved southward towards the valley of the Cauca River, bringing their advanced farming techniques. Though they have a rich and incredibly history, today, Indigenous peoples in Colombia have been relegated to the marginalized area of Choco, a state on the Pacific coast where Indigenous and former enslaved persons intermixed. As important as this larger history is to my scholarship, I soon became reticent with regards to my own family's part.

After more than two decades of being outside Colombia, I finally returned to visit my mother and was soon shocked by misrecognition. As I interviewed my mother, she reminded me about how I hated being called an "Indio" (i.e., "Indian") when I was a child. I often got called that because of my tan complexion and long, jet dark straight hair. I was also called "Chinito" (a pejorative term meaning, "little Chinese boy"). To my embarrassment, my mother also reminded me about how she would endearingly call me "negrito" (i.e., "my little black boy") because of my darker complexion when compared to my brother and her own light complexion. In fact, my mother is the most Euro-American looking of her siblings. All of my aunts and cousins looked much darker. This was when I first asked mother about my grandparents. She told me about her mother, the daughter of the Cacique, who married a Spaniard who walked across the Cordilleras to the valley of the River Cauca—the place where my history above started and my own philosophical journey began.

This family context gave me time to revise my own approach to the history of philosophy. Elsewhere, I have argued that we ought to think of philosophy as a "chronotopological dispositif,"[5] that is, as a mechanism for temporalizing reason, thinking, and tradition. Usually, when we teach "Western" philosophy, we generally follow the same temporal sequence: Ancient, Late Antiquity, Medieval, Renaissance, Early Modern, Modern, and so on. But, when we teach non-Western philosophies, we follow an altogether different sequence—for example: Hinduism, Confucianism, Bantu, etc. Often, we teach such texts and traditions as if they belonged exclusively to an ancient past. In so doing, we unwittingly engage a "de-temporalizing" processes that ossifies

non-European traditions into the past in detrimental ways. For example, anyone minimally interested in Indigenous thought must have read Miguel León-Portilla's *La filosofía náhuatl estudiada en sus fuentes*, originally submitted as his doctoral dissertation in 1956, and tellingly translated as *Aztec Culture and Thought* (1963). This exemplary text asks the following question: Did the Nahuas have a philosophy, i.e. a cosmic vision, a theogony, an ethics, and a systematic politics? The title answers that question in the affirmative. Generally, this text is not taught in "Introductions to Philosophy" classes, or when it is taught, is framed as a "historicizing" text that casts Nahua thought irrevocably in the past. Of course, the Nahuas remain a proud people today. This contemporary Indigenous reality is, however, overshadowed by the historicizing sequencing we often take for granted in philosophy. In truth, León-Portilla's text is a profound meta-philosophical meditation on what is, or what we take to be, philosophy, as understood from the margins of Indigenous culture.[6] What philosophy's problematic "chronotopological dispositif" misses is that Nahua is a living language; a language in which many people speak, philosophize, and poeticize *today*. Again, the point is that philosophy, or a certain way of doing philosophy, as I have understood it, remains complicit in relegating Indigenous peoples to the marginal past.

Here I must ask: What calls us to do "Indigenous philosophy" today?[7] This question has been on my mind for a long time—at least since I first read Luis Villoro's paradigm shifting *Los grandes momentos del indigenismo en* México [Great Stages in Mexican Indigeneity] from 1950. This is a text that has, unfortunately, not been translated in its entirety. For me, this text has always been decisive because of its basic, yet no less compelling, thesis: What is considered "Indigenous" has a history and genealogy that is entangled with the history of Mexico and Latin America, in general. This is a text that I always read in tandem with Octavio Paz's *The Labyrinth of Solitude*, also from 1950, and in particular, the chapter titled "The Sons of La Malinche." These texts reflect on how Indigenous culture is both the thorn and germ, of Mexican culture. Villoro's text, however, has always been key for my engagement with what I would call the "geology of indigeneity" but also the "agency of Indigeneity" today.

I cannot emphasize enough how excited I was to co-teach a seminar on Indigenous philosophy with Wayne—especially given his new training in Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogy. This excitement, however, soon gave rise to other, more serious concerns. As he and Jules Wong explain in their subsequent sections, our seminar did not recycle the problematic temporal sequence I outlined above. In putting our course together, I had to also resist another tendency. In my excitement, I thought that we could read some of the aforementioned materi-

als on Indigenous peoples from Latin America, such as León-Portilla, Eduardo Castro de Viveiros, or Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui. This did not come to pass. Instead, our seminar took on a territorial, geographical, land-based approach that focused on the "where" and "why" we found ourselves and how our location was entangled with the displacement and dispossession of Indigenous peoples. I had to come to terms with the fact that we would not read any of the materials on Indigenous thought which had inspired me throughout my career. While I was, at first, reluctant towards this approach, Wayne eventually persuaded me to think through the following pedagogical question: *What does it mean to be a student and teacher at a land-grant university located on land that was stolen from Indigenous peoples?* What could we do, today, to remain accountable to these perennial stewards? With these prompts in mind, I soon realized how our seminar could become something more than a "survey course"; it could be, instead, an archeological, genealogical, and geological investigation, making each of us aware of our participation in the history of the "denial of coevalness" of Indigenous peoples. This seminar would not be a study of the past. It would be a present act of resistance, speaking the names of today's Indigenous stewards.

I will conclude with the following: this seminar has been one of the most enlightening, rewarding, educational, and personally gratifying experiences I have had as a teacher over my career. Only one experience comes close to it, and that was when I finished my "Introduction to Political Philosophy" course at Stony Brook University; a course with over one hundred and seventy students! On the last day of class, before the final exam, I overviewed what we had learned. Upon finishing, the students spontaneously rose and clapped for five minutes. This memory brings me much joy. But, upon the conclusion of my Indigenous philosophy seminar, things had changed. This time, it was *me* who rose and clapped for my students, whose work was so confessional, intense, moving, and inspiring. I learned that philosophy teachers also teach so that they, *themselves*, can be transformed.

Jules Wong: Unsettling Contracts and Stories of Arrival

I've learned to carry humble knowledge of flashpoint moments in the colonial history of Turtle Island since taking Indigenous Studies courses in my undergraduate program; but this seminar pushed me to critically examine my own, personal, position with respect to settler-colonialism.[8] My previous training helped me to understand and respond to the great privilege that comes along with my social position as a mixed-race settler, a child of non-Anglo immigrants to so-called Canada. The seminar

facilitated by Eduardo and Wayne, however, challenged me in new ways by pushing me to critique the multiculturalist immigrant ethic that I inherited by being from a family of newcomers to Turtle Island.

Wayne and Eduardo centered Indigenous theory and examples of political action, and so this seminar demanded that I unsettle my own story. The result was a convergence of my personal interests—as a person concerned with attending to the responsibilities that come with being a settler—and my philosophical interests—the topic of land in political philosophy, especially in social contractarian models of political thought. Never before have I been asked, in a philosophy class, to attend to my own story. As I understand it, this radical pedagogical move was premised on a few ideas. First, personal history is an avenue to understand social and political history. Second, we can examine our personal histories through place and space, a shift in perspective that materializes our social and political positionalities in personal ways: through experiential and identity-determining concepts of *home*. Grounding history in personal places takes purchase away from Eurocentric temporal discourses. Third, there is no decolonizing the classroom without also challenging European hegemony in both content and, more importantly, method of instruction. As I see it, this innovative approach to philosophy runs parallel to the Indigenous politics of resurgence: where the commitment to liberation is alive "in the cultural form and content of our struggle itself," and "the methods of decolonization prefigure its aims," as Dene philosopher Glen Coulthard says.[9]

When I set my mind to pursuing academia as a profession, I automatically accepted that I would have to move across countries or even continents to access new professional horizons—inadvertently paralleling my ancestors, who came to Canada to provide security and a better future for my parents. I had not considered at length, nor problematized, my family's immigration—certainly not without scrutinizing the personal and political significance of each kilometre traveled by foot, boat, train, plane, or car. I unpacked my unquestioned assumption of Toronto being my "home," and how this involved understanding my story as an immigrant and settler. Settler colonialism pervades my experience of Toronto as home when I consider the movement of my ancestors, my own movement within the city, and the material comfort I have because my family can afford to live in a city with exorbitant costs of living. I examined the paths that my Italian and Cantonese ancestors travelled, the infrastructure that got them there, and the political framework that enabled their immigration—pre-colonial contact, settler-Indigenous treaties and land purchases, and Canadian immigration policy. I unearthed the promises, kept or broken, that covered the land my family travelled and settled, invisible to their eyes because

it is a settler-colonial mandate to keep colonial history firmly in the past.[10] I even complicated the esteem my family holds for Canada's multiculturalism by measuring my family against the state's avowed immigrant ideal.[11] As immigrants, my ancestors exchanged service and agricultural and industrial labour for protection under Canadian laws and social support. Today, it seems that my family is satisfied with its exchange of labour for a life free from sustenance agriculture. They are largely unaware that they sustain Canada as a *settler* state: that their life, which is full of conveniences, is only made possible by dispossession. The high incidence of cancer in my mom's family was the only thing that stoked some suspicion of the good immigrant life. Sometimes I have heard rumblings about the unjust health risks they undertook living and working in unsafe manufacturing environments: "*Is the air toxic? Is the land poisoned?*," they would ask. Infrequently did they ask about who they had displaced in order to come here and found what would, eventually, become my "home."

This occlusion led me to frame my family's settler immigrant story in terms of a sort of "contract" between my ancestors and the Canadian settler-state. I use "contract" without imputing a sterility to the loving relationships that constitute Toronto-as-home. What I mean when I say "contract," then, is an agreement, either implicit or explicit, and in all its varieties of promising and giving, for the obligations that we did and did not choose to undertake. In a strict legal sense, I am not responsible for the contracts I did not sign; nor, the historic migration that turned Toronto into a place for me. Yet, this was a legacy that I nonetheless inherited. The "contract" was something I thought about more and more as soon as I started critically thinking through my life in Toronto. I concluded that contracts and stories mutually inform each other, and that this exchange could only be rendered more legible by returning to the stories of the land.

Let me illustrate the connection between contracts and stories by sharing my research on an infamous, and fraudulent, Pennsylvania land "purchase" that I wrote about in the context of our Indigenous Philosophy seminar. The 1737 "Walking Purchase," as it is called, was a transaction between Thomas Penn and the Delaware/Lenape that allowed the Penn family—the eponymous founding fathers of Pennsylvania—to dispossess the latter of 1200 square miles of land west of the Delaware river.[12] In short, the Penn family transformed a never-ratified and tentative agreement into a completed contract for which they were owed land, and then took more land than was originally discussed.[13] After finding themselves in £7000 of debt in 1735, the Penn family devised a plan to steal land from the Lenape. They falsely presented a "draft" sale agreement as "ratified" in order to claim that the Lenape had sold the land in 1682 to William Penn. Of course, this was a

fabrication. The Lenape Elders only confirmed that a *draft* agreement had been drawn up (after a one and a half day walk with William Penn in 1682). The Penn family exploited that memory, attempting to pass off a half-completed draft of a 1686 agreement as ratified. When that did not work, they presented a map that distorted the land planned to be covered by the agreement by purposefully mislabelling boundaries. As a result, when the Lenape chiefs fatefully agreed to the purchase, they did so under the pretension that they were honouring the original 1686 agreement of their former chiefs. This is just one example of how colonial legal contracts, such as land purchases, rely on the stories we pass on from generation to generation, and, also, how such stories can even "write themselves" by invoking fraud. Under the pretence of following the letter of the agreement, the Penn family maintained a veneer of legality necessary to assuage Quaker Pennsylvanians that their title was legitimate. Indeed, this is a pernicious belief which thrives today as "settler common-sense."[14]

To end the story of the Penn family here would suggest that dispossession was simple, assured, and complete. But, as philosophers seeking to critique contract-making and colonization-as-dispossession, we must also learn to critique the very story we tell in that critique. We perpetuate colonial injustice if we tell the story of dispossession without the story of *survivance* that punctured and ruptured land-theft. "Survivance" is, as Gerald Vizenor explains, "an active resistance and repudiation of dominance, obtrusive themes of tragedy, nihilism and victimry." Vizenor understands "survivance" as an articulation of *survival* and *resistance* that is central to Indigenous rhetoric—or, what Scott Richard Lyons has called, "rhetorical sovereignty." In my usage, "survivance" means that we tell stories as a way to regenerate and heal past injustices. By uplifting Indigenous narratives of survival and resistance, I seek to combat the deeply entrenched colonial archive that continues to ossify Indigenous Peoples, and their struggles, in the past. Against this, I look to stories that depict Indigenous political, cultural and aesthetic action; stories that "create an active presence, more than the instincts of survival, function, or subsistence."[15] I locate one such story in the Lenape resistance to colonialism in "Pennsylvania." My research on this topic unearthed how the Lenape resisted the Penn's fraudulent takeover of their lands, interfered with their plans for settlement, and eventually forced them to recruit the Iroquois Confederacy in order to drive the Lenape off the land.[16] The Lenape chiefs were—and remain—a powerful political presence and force. Threatening military response, Chief Tammany forced the elder Penn's hand to slow settler encroachment. Chief Nutimus dealt sharply with the Penn son, remembering all the details of their previously discussed contract and never ratifying the 1680 purchase. He refused to be intimidated and in

the records we see him raising attention to the sovereign practices of the Lenape and their understanding of the land and land rights. This story's ink is far from dry.

But in 2006, the United States Supreme Court refused to repair this fraud when the Delaware Nation/Lenni Lenape sought Indigenous and fee title to 315 acres of land located in Northampton County, Pennsylvania (now known as "Tatamy's Place"), in land covered by the Walking Purchase. The District Court "ruled that Thomas Penn's method of acquisition, i.e. fraud, was legally irrelevant."[17] The Supreme Court ratified settlement by refusing to hear the case and deeming the fraudulent circumstances of the purchase "political, not justiciable, issues." It was clear that the law of the land remained "the tentative proposition called the doctrine of discovery which allows the European settlers/discoverers/invaders the right to claim for themselves land already occupied by the Indigenous people."[18] Under this justification, the "discovering nation" takes fee title to the land, subject to the Indigenous population's right of occupancy and use. The European sovereign alone—in this case Thomas Penn—had the right to extinguish aboriginal title. Regardless of the fraudulence of the purchase itself, Thomas Penn's intentions to extinguish Lenape rights to the land covered by the Walking Purchase successfully extinguished said rights. So, it seemed that settlers could pick and choose when contracts were valid or not—a caprice not afforded to the land's Indigenous stewards.

To do political philosophy as if the doctrine of discovery were not legally active today disavows the transformation of land and its basis of relationship to property as an exploitable commodity. Political theories often miss, ignore, or outright disavow this transformation—from land as a social relationship to a private commodity—by focusing on redistribution and access to material resources. Few consider how the demand for "Land Back"[19] may not be identical to securing the right to land as a primary social primary good—to invoke Rawls's term. Does decolonization, if not justice, in other words, demand rethinking not only of *who has the land*, but *how we stand in relationship to it*? The land itself can give an answer, if we heed Leanne Betasamosake Simpson's teaching that Indigenous pedagogy requires re-creating the conditions of learning *from* the land. Recounting the story of Kwezens learning to make maple syrup, Simpson draws out that the "radical thinking and action of this story is not so much in the mechanics of reducing maple sap to sugar, it lies in the reproduction of a loving web of Nishnaabeg networks within which learning takes place."[20] The implication, for myself, as a settler philosopher, is that I must seek the guidance of Indigenous thinkers to re-territorialize principles of justice. In line with that aim, I am grateful to Wayne and Eduardo for centering Glen Coulthard's *grounded normativity* in our seminar.[21]

Appreciating the sovereignty involved in protecting knowledge and ethics is itself an invaluable lesson for a student in a discipline which, under the guise of truth, usually adopts an extractive stance towards "non-Western" epistemes. Grounded normativity may not be a normative framework for *my* particular usage, as a settler; but, I nevertheless see great value in situating ourselves and our work in relation to and with land insofar as it grounds collaborations that unsettle the continuum of settler-colonial pedagogy. Such work is already being done in what Wayne termed the "parallaxes of Black/Native studies": for example, the "contingent" collaboration between the Black/Land Project and Eve Tuck sparked by "the imbrication of settler colonialism and antiblackness."[22] As a settler philosopher compelled by the demands of decolonization *and* anti-racism, I will move forward in my own research and teaching with my own grounding in mind, as well as a respect for the land that I look forward to sharing with future coalitions on common ground.

Wayne Wapeemukwa: "Landed Pedagogy," Online?

Though I have always been drawn to philosophy, I have also felt that my own identity as a working-class person of Indigenous (Métis) heritage was systematically excluded from its canon. Over my career, I learned that, while my affinity for the audacity of questioning remained, my identity made the content and directionality of my inquiries distinct and, at times, foreign to what I have been taught to ostensibly recognize as "philosophical." As an underrepresented philosopher, I soon became aware of the harms of exclusion as well as the remarkable possibilities of ethical inclusion.

I philosophize from the position of a white-passing citizen of the Métis Nation, whose maternal relations are Indigenous (Métis) and paternal ones are settler (Canadian). As a child, I was ashamed of my culture because I grew up in a racist household. My father looked down on my mother's Indigenous heritage. As an adolescent, I avoided home by spending hours in my barn. One year I was tasked with training a lamb so that I could show her off at the local Agro-Fair. It took months! On one occasion I lost my temper and took it out on her (as had been done to me many times before). Luckily, I did not hurt her. This memory refuses to fade away even though it happened years ago—a vivid reminder of how men in my family repeat the violence that they have been subject to as a means of making up for their lack of self-esteem. These childhood experiences of self-inferiorization and exclusion are my most staying confrontations with colonialism—in-

deed, they are the emotional bedrock of my current pedagogical stance towards inclusion in the academy.

My experience as a graduate student and activist at PSU made me even more aware of the dire need for real diversification in the academy. Working with other like-minded activists throughout 2018-2020, I participated in the Indigenous Peoples Student Association (IPSA) at PSU. Our spirited group of Indigenous students and faculty met weekly to check-in and provide mentorship. Mentorship and advising are deeply important to me because my father was either largely absent or violently present during my upbringing. I didn't have a parent to look up to. My time in school was marked by a sequence of surrogate teachers who stepped into the important role that he left vacant. For these reasons, mentoring students, especially those with underrepresented identities, will always be a locus of commitment, activism, and service I enthusiastically partake in. Yet, besides mentorship, IPSA also undertook important work towards an Indigenous "Land Acknowledgement" for PSU. My contribution to this endeavour took place over Spring 2021 when I co-facilitated a seminar on "Indigenous Philosophy." Under my guidance, students researched the various treaties that dispossessed the original stewards of this land: the Erie, Haudenosaunee, Lenni-Lenape, Shawnee, Susquehannock, and Osage Peoples. At the end of the semester, I packaged this research into a dossier that I then presented to IPSA; research which is currently being used to make diplomatic connections with representatives, elders, and stewards from the appropriate nations. Beyond my academic achievements, this experience particularly stands out to me because, even though I believe that "Western" philosophy has been historically complicit in colonizing projects, there always remains the potential for scholarly and academic anticolonial intervention under its aegis.

I realized this while taking a course on Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogy led by Hollie Kulago (Diné). For this seminar I wrote an "Indigenous philosophy" syllabus that sought to overwrite settler-narratives of erasure while centering Indigenous resistance. While arranging my syllabus, though, I soon became challenged by how such a course may actually embolden what Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang call "settler-nativist moves to innocence."[23] According to Tuck and Yang, "settler-nativism" is when settlers exculpate themselves from complicity in settler-colonialism by claiming a "long lost Indian ancestor" or aspect of Indigenous culture, thereby marking themselves as blameless in the attempted eradication of Indigenous peoples. I feared that my course may imbue settler-students with such an exculpatory sense of "home." Thus, my task was to facilitate a course which "see-sawed" from providing students with Indigenous place-based intimacies to using such intimacies to "up-root" their settler-consciousness. I have

spoken to this process in a previous essay I co-wrote with Dr. Kulago and my colleagues Matthew Black and Paul J. Guernsey, which I encourage the reader to review.[24]

In that previous article (Kulago et al. 2021), I describe my attempt to "ground" philosophy in a relationship with land. Instead of organizing readings by topic or period, I looked to the land as a teacher and, paradoxically, my university—Pennsylvania State—as a land-grant institution that was (and remains) complicit in settler-colonial dispossession. To provide students new to Native Studies with some signposts, we began by reading Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang's seminal "Decolonization Is Not A Metaphor" (2012) as well as Patrick Wolfe's "Settler Colonialism and The Elimination of The Native" (2006) alongside contemporary news articles on the widespread prejudice held by many local settlers that "there are no Indians in Pennsylvania" (Minderhout and Frantz 2008). Following this, my fifteen-week course surveyed the history of settler-colonialism in (so-called) "Pennsylvania" by examining primary Indigenous-authored documents as well as the storied treaties which dispossessed the Erie, Haudenosaunee, Lenape, Shawnee, Tuscarora, and Susquehannock. After historically situating ourselves in the colonial cacophonies and "transits of empire" (Byrd 2011) militated by William Penn and his sinister scions, we confronted the infamous Carlisle Industrial Indian School (CIS)—mere miles away—and its macabre fusion of genocide and education. In order to emotionally equip students who may feel triggered by the violence thematized by our unit on the CIS, I first had students read theoretical essays on the biopolitics of "Indian Boarding Schools" as well as Two-Spirit resistance from within such institutions (Driskill 2004; Lomawaima 1993).[25] The unit, however, did not end on death: enacting my Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogy, I instead concluded it on a note of futurity, resurgence, and *survivance* (Vizenor 1999).[26] From its inception I knew that a course on Indigenous philosophy must, above all, index the future.

To this end and, in consultation with IPSA, our class thoroughly researched the university's complicity in settler-colonialism, producing a research dossier with our findings. Our research covered most of the pivotal events, treaties, and conflicts involved in Pennsylvania's colonization—including: the storied Treaty of Shackamaxon of 1682, the Walking Purchase of 1737, and The Morrill Act of 1862. Our main objective was to help provide IPSA with the information they would need to help initiate the lengthy process involved in authoring a university Land Acknowledgement. By doing research we made sure that "mainstage" space was secured for IPSA's Indigenous participants and that we, as a class predominately composed of settlers, stood "behind the scenes" of their voices, so to speak. Thus, the intent behind our research dossier was to not only to empower Indigenous students on

campus but to also enact a degree of healing through political action by equipping IPSA's Land Acknowledgement taskforce. In so doing, our seminar "overflowed" the boundaries of the classroom.

While I was very grateful to have the opportunity to co-teach an Indigenous Philosophy graduate seminar last Spring, I was also challenged by how a COVID-19 online-migration posed unique obstacles for a course originally designed to foster and nurture decolonized place-based relationships. Although I am relatively new to Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogy, I do grasp how enacting such a methodology necessitates significant institutional and structural changes to course instruction. As others more experienced than I observe (Burkhart 2019; Corntassel and Hardbarger 2019; Kulago 2019), Indigenous knowledge can only truly be grasped in *relationship* with land; or, as Leanne Betasamosake Simpson aptly puts it: "in the context of family, community, and relations" (7). Personally, I think that educators seeking to teach Indigenous philosophy should do more than merely read and interpret texts or invite and listen to guest speakers—tasks which are actually, in my opinion, easier online than in-person! Sharing Indigenous philosophy requires, above all, forging *relationships*; an exigency which, this Spring, confronted me with the following problem: How could I, as an educator of Indigenous (Métis) and settler heritage, nurture relationships between students, land, and the Indigenous stewards of (so-called) "Pennsylvania," when the closest thing we could grasp of one another was a computer screen? Indeed, this connects with one of the first real "lightbulbs" I had while honing my nascent Indigenous pedagogy. Learning more about the fusion of colonialism and education pushed me see how the "classroom" has been positioned as the presumed and default site of learning. In the aforementioned article I co-wrote with my colleagues, we speak about how we worked together to center land within our discussions and curricula and how this pushed us to also recognize how the classroom *itself* became an impediment to relationship building: "*We needed to get out of the classroom and onto the land*" (Kulago et al. 2021). But once the true severity of the COVID-19 pandemic hit, my co-instructor, Eduardo, and I decided that we ought to migrate our course online. In so doing I encountered a new problem to overcome: How could I turn an online class into a sacred site of healing in spite of our distance from one other?

For pointers as to how I might make this the case I looked to how Jeremy Garcia and Valerie Shirley (2012) conducted classes with Diné students on sacred landscapes since they were the true "*sources of knowledge*" (80). Bridging Tribal Critical Race Theory (TribalCrit) and Red Pedagogy, Garcia and Shirley suggest "that schools serving Indigenous children and youth begin to problematize the ways in which curriculum and pedagogy can become a blending of landscapes between

our schools and communities" (78). The aim here is to unite a critical Indigenized pedagogy with a Freireian component of "praxis" in the learning process. In sum, learning cannot be a purely "cognitive" process where one authorial teacher dispenses knowledge into the mind. Rather, learning—or, knowledge creation, as I think of it—requires an essential component of action (which can take the shape of reciprocity, for example). The schooling experience, by Garcia and Shirley's lights, is a *spiritual* and *sacred* process of *engagement* which requires us, I argue, to reconceive of "the site" of the school (89). Nicholas Claxton and Carmen de France (2019) describe a similar process to Garcia and Shirley whereby decolonized praxis deeply shifted the learning process of students (and educators). By trans-positioning the "site of learning" outside of the (classical Western) classroom, Indigenous and non-Indigenous students alike were able to "relate" to the learning material. Working on the west coast of the Salish Sea, Claxton and de France speak to how their classroom's relocation allowed Indigenous students to emotionally and spiritually identified with important cultural practices and tools such as the Saanich Reef Net in a deeper and more impactful way. By moving the site of education, Claxton and de France claim, "one is more disposed to learning about oneself and to reorganize knowledge in meaningful ways" (217). As Garcia and Shirley also observed, this change in learning location resulted in students building strong relationships with each other as well as land.

There is, of course, one large difference between my classroom experience and the one outlined by Garcia and Shirley: I did not have the option of choosing whether to hold class "on the land" or at "Penn State"; my options were strictly limited to what time I wanted our class to meet online. In other words, I was faced with the challenge of reconciling my Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogy with an online environment.

In her powerful 2017 monograph, *As We Have Always Done*, Leanne Simpson tells us a story about the difference between online and grounded networks. Following the birth of her child, Simpson looked to the stars, seeking guidance from her ancestral elders. "Constellations are not just physical doorways to other worlds," she writes, "they also act as conceptual doorways that return us to our core essence within Nishnaabeg thought" (212). Simpson tells us that the constellations are moving windows of the spirit world and conceptual pathways for ancestors and their wisdoms. They provide clues as to the paths that her recently born child may walk. The timeless, ancestral knowledge activated by starry constellations stands in contrast to the gamut of available information provided by today's internet cyber-networks. Simpson advances skepticism regarding the emancipatory potential of such online networks even though the internet has played a key role in

mobilizing today's social movements for land defense as a way of life. "As much as it pains me to admit," she avers, "grounded normativity does not structurally exist in the cyber world, because it is predicated on *deep*, spiritual, emotional, reciprocal, real-world relationships between living beings" (221). We should heed Simpson's conclusion: *if Indigenous resurgence is to be effective is must be grounded*. And the internet, according to Simpson, is not grounded.

I believe that my experience teaching "Indigenous philosophy" online evidences Simpson's caution. While our course culminated in a practical and political takeaway (i.e., our land acknowledgement research), it also failed in other respects (i.e., relationship building with land). I also admit that, since the majority of my course took place within the context of a classroom, it could not truly be considered "landed pedagogy." This flaw was further complicated by other obstacles trenchant to history as well as my syllabus design. By the time I was able to teach my course I had already been living in Pennsylvania for a couple of years and attempted to make inroads with local Indigenous peoples. There were, unfortunately, no remaining stewards local to the area in which I was living. (Pennsylvania remains one of the only states in the USA with no federal or state recognized tribes.) As a result of not being able to invite local guest speakers, I took recourse to primary documents and texts as my main course materials. Though it did not dawn on me at the start of the course, by its end I realized that the majority of my assigned readings were from the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. While these epochs are certainly essential for understanding how settlement took place in Pennsylvania, they also threatened to give students the impression that settlement was a "done fact," "fossilizing" Indigenous Peoples into the past and obscuring the presence of contemporary Indigenous resistors. Elsewhere, Jean O'Brien (2010) calls this form of symbolic erasure "lasting," which she describes as "a rhetorical strategy that asserts as a fact the claim that Indian can never be modern" (107). Aware of this potential flaw, I hoped to try and make up for this with a series of activities to be undertaken outside the class such as a nature walk where students could interact with Indigenous plants and species, a concluding in-class sharing circle where we could reflect upon our learning and growth, frequent use of narratives as teaching devices, volunteer participation in the local powwow, and a field trip to the CIS. Ultimately these big plans were foiled by the COVID-19 pandemic. Relegating the course online put me in the awkward and seemingly un-navigable position of trying to teach a place-based and relationship-centered course online and in a virtual format. The living and breathing circle of the class was replaced by a vertiginous online grid.

In the final analysis I am ultimately skeptical as to whether the course could be considered a "success." Perhaps my standards are too high but, then again, I don't think that's necessarily a bad thing when engaging with Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogies—especially on land as contested as "Pennsylvania." What I do know is that, in spite of our distance from one another, my Indigenous Philosophy seminar was able to deepen the relationships that students have with one another.

Conclusion: The Challenges of "Incommensurability" and Centering Indigenous Futurity

We have suggested that teaching Indigenous philosophy, *inter alia*, behooves instructors to make fundamental, if not essential, changes to conventional philosophical pedagogy. We proposed that such teaching challenges and contests the very meaning of "philosophy" itself. This is because we believe that conventional "philosophy" curriculum presupposes colonizing classroom dynamics and structures (e.g., authoritarian instruction, term-paper evaluation, a focus on individual achievement, etc.) as well as epistemological dualisms (e.g., mind/body, human/animal, and spirit/matter) that have been integral to settler-colonialism and western schooling. Indeed, as Kulago et al. (2021) report, these philosophical divisions have been mobilized to sever grounded peoples from their lands, creatures, selves, and spirits. Generally speaking, Indigenous thought does not recycle such dualisms. By enacting Indigenous pedagogy, instructors can do important work to not only repair the relationships that settler-colonialism has historically levelled but, indeed, change the received meaning of what counts as "philosophical." This does not mean that "Indigenous philosophy" is less rigorous than "Western philosophy." The work that we do as Indigenous philosophers is very different and challenging in other ways. For example, Indigenous philosophy requires students to radically question their sense of home, identity, and belonging. This requires students to cultivate a rich emotional lexicon and learning experience that is scaffolded around personal-emotional growth. The conventional and unquestioned pedagogical approach that philosophy instructors uncritically adopt abrogates the extent to which such meaningful *relationships* can form in and outside the classroom. Instead of allowing this approach to subsume our Indigenous philosophy seminar, we drew from the deep-well of Grande's "Red Pedagogy" (2015) in order to establish an ameliorative approach to education that heals relationships through learning. To that end, we see tremendous difference between the conventional understanding of philosophy and our, putatively "grounded" approach: the former entrenches division while the latter seeks repair, regrowth, and resurgence.

As newcomers to Indigenous philosophy and landed pedagogy, we all strive to do our individual parts in transforming the academy into a more inclusive, representative space. We do not merely want to see different faces within the space of the academy but to decolonize the frameworks and ideas within it such that multiple sites of knowledge can be seen, honoured, and perpetuated. Through scrutinizing our "Westernized" pedagogy, we seek to create different spaces that may accommodate, respect, honour, and nourish the range of insight and brilliance that all students and scholars bring—regardless of background. It is our hope that, through the work we described above, that others will take on the task of decolonizing the academy. To that effect, we would like to leave the reader with several concrete recommendations for instructors wishing to learn from our experience.

We believe that a good starting point for those who, like us, are new to Indigenous and decolonizing pedagogy is Sandy Grande's (2015) *Red Pedagogy*. That text contains many insightful dialogues, recommendations, and reflections that continue to remain highly valuable for emerging scholars as well as seasoned philosophers who are seeking relationship with Indigenous knowledges. We would also like to recommend two other pivotal texts for their practical advice on how to approach Indigenous issues: Leilani Sabzalian's *Indigenous Children's Survivance in Public Schools* (2019) and *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education*—an incredibly rich collection of essays edited by Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Eve Tuck, and K. Wayne Yang (2019).

Even though we are not by any means experts in this field, we would still like to express our firmly held view that teachers of "Indigenous philosophy" have one obligation that rises above all others: Teachers of Indigenous philosophy must seek to repair Indigenous relationships by fiercely advocating for Indigenous self-determination and decolonization—which we understand literally vis-à-vis Tuck and Yang (2012). Teachers of Indigenous philosophy must approach such knowledges with respect and reciprocity. In concrete terms, this means reading and listening to Indigenous peoples on their terms and without the expectation that they should make themselves legible *for* you. Philosophers seeking relationship with Indigenous knowledge holders should defer to the protocols of those nations on whose land they are a guest. In turn, this means that such scholars should do extensive research on *whose* land they are teaching and learning. Indeed, this should be the first step for any philosopher seeking counsel with Indigenous knowledge: Learn, know, and respect whose land you are on. Each nation is different but this principle of respect and relationship remains universal.

Another challenge that instructors will encounter is what Tuck and Yang call a "settler move to innocence." Tuck and Yang (2012) use the term "settler nativism" to mark how settlers seek to exculpate

themselves from complicity in settler-colonialism by claiming a "long lost Indian ancestor" or aspect of Indigenous culture, thereby marking themselves as "blameless in the attempted eradication of Indigenous peoples" (10). As Wayne has elaborated elsewhere (Kulago et al. 2021), the teaching of "Indigenous" topics may ironically imbue settler-students (and instructors!) with a false sense of home—or, as scholar Paul Guernsey (Kulago et al. 2021) has aptly written, "fuzzy feelings of knowing their place and knowing the "history" of Native knowledge" that "echo the juridical foundations of genocide and removal. . . . In this moment our pedagogy latches on to the idea that settlers can learn more or better about a place than Native people" (352). In addition to the materials listed above, we would like to include a series of practical recommendations here for instructors seeking to adopt the "ethics of incommensurability" we advocate. To avoid imbuing students with a "false sense of place," teachers of Indigenous and decolonizing topics should carefully select resources, materials, and activities that amplify Indigenous voices and "survivance" narratives. In selecting these Indigenous-authored materials, instructors should also consider how to engage themselves *with* their students in self-reflective practices that nurture critical consciousness, such as journaling and story-sharing. By paying more attention to course material and story-work, instructors should, above all, center *relationships* and *healing* between human and non-human relatives, lands, waters, and the course content. The point is not to "give up" because the interests of settlers and Indigenous Peoples are "incommensurate" but to foreground it for new and generative dialogues that may lead to a more ethical relation to land.

Though we could not be on or in relationship with the land together with as peers, we nonetheless deepened our relationship with the land on which we live and work at PSU. In fact, as a class in relationship, we honed tools to *resist* teaching colonization as an abstract and historical "fact." Through our discussion of Pennsylvania's many colonizing machinations—the "Walking Purchase," Treaty of Shackamaxon, and The Morrill Act—we attained clearer vision of colonization's metaphors—giving new meaning to Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang's call to resist metaphorical conceptualizations of decolonization.[27] Our return to land as a pedagogical stance "de-metaphorized" the colonial history and present of our philosophical "edification" and professionalization. Upon learning to (fore)ground our mutual dependence on land grabbing and, thus, our inherent connection to the dispossession of Indigenous tribes/nations and passive support for a system that reproduces this dispossession, we further attempted to actuate in what Tuck and Yang call an "ethic of incommensurability."[28] To meet this challenge, we encouraged students to engage relevant sources and texts in the western and/or other POC traditions, focusing particularly on traditions of critical

thought and practice such as: critical theories in the western canon, the Black radical tradition, Marxist political economy, critical race theory, cultural studies, queer theory, and feminism, among others. It should be noted, however, that fostering intellectual incommensurability in the classroom does not mean that all perspectives necessarily be treated as equal in value. Because Indigenous students often experience the university as a culturally alienating, racially stratified, and gender asymmetrical institution, we strove to ensure that the classroom remained a safe space—especially for under-represented Indigenous, Black, female, and queer students. Adhering to this ethics required us to also adopt a pro-feminist, anti-racist and decolonial approach to teaching and insist that these ethics continue to structure our communications and relationships in the classroom. But this challenge can also be met with much more practical implementations, like sharing snacks, laughs, and stories about personal happenings and "aha!" moments. Indeed, sharing stories is an *essential* part of learning in Indigenous epistemologies; and it has been our pleasure to share our story with you, Reader. We hope that instructors of "Indigenous philosophy" adopt the ethical orientation of "incommensurability" that we formulated here and resist calls to organize a political future based on the mere equalization of relations between Indigenous Peoples and settlers. Moving forward, we will ask ourselves instead about the demands of decolonization first and foremost, rather than premising a political future on settler futurity. This is the challenge we would like to leave our readers with as well.

Notes

1. Also see Tuck and Yang 2012.

2. Grande 2015: 27.

3. It should be noted, however, that our "land-based" pedagogy adopts a particular understanding of land. "Relationship with the land" played an essential role in shaping the content and structure of our course yet our interpretation of what that relationship constitutes is, admittedly, overly-focussed on political systems of colonialism—such as: treaties, lawsuits, land-grabs, etc. A broader view of Indigenous philosophy would see land in much more capacious terms, that is, as a sort of "relation." Importantly, relationships to the environment are also at the heart of what it means to be in relation to the land. This more capacious understanding of "land as a relation" is largely missing from our course instruction and, indeed, another area for future improvement. We would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing this very important point of critique to our attention.

4. Proceeds from the Morrill Act sales fund the institutions in perpetuity.

5. Here is an illustration of the performance of this "chronotopological dispositif": When I was growing up in central New Jersey, I remember watching commercials of an "Indian," now known as "Iron Eyes Cody," shedding tears over the ecological devastation of the world. On my view, I understood this ad as saying something about how settlers

were destroying and polluting land which was originally stewarded by Indigenous peoples. We had taken the land—which was once sacred—and turned it into a mere "commodity." The "Indian" played the role of "ecological conscience," but only as a phantasmagoric apparition from the past.

6. Furthermore, León-Portilla has edited and written a whole set of other texts that remain indispensable for understanding how the Nahuas remain present in our time. Here I would mention *Broken Spears: The Aztec Account of the Conquest of Mexico* (1962), and above all, his anthology, *In the Language of Kings: An Anthology of Mesoamerican Literature, Pre-Columbian to the Present* (2001), which gathers poems, narratives, and histories written in Nahua, including texts from the twentieth century.

7. Another way I could put this question is: "Was heißt Indigenetät?"—which I write in German not out of pedantry, but because I love the multivalent "Was heißt . . . ?" which can be translated as: what is named, what is called, what calls, i.e. what evokes and interpellates, what does it mean . . . ? and so on. One way to translate my German question would be: what calls us to indigeneity? Or what invokes the Indigenous today?

8. With respect to my previous training, I should especially thank Brenda Wastasecoot (Cree, Ininu) who helped me understand contemporary political Indigenous struggles by teaching the social determinants of health and the women-led movements to protect land and relationships. Brenda"s arts based autoethnography through a memory map of her Nikis (home) intersects with Wayne and Eduardo's approach in this seminar. See Wastasecoot 2015.

9. Coulthard 2014: 159.

10. On the contrary, settler colonialism is a continual *process* that uses the state inclusion of non-Indigenous and non-White people to resist Indigenous collectivity and hold Indigenous people in pre-modern conditions, literally and conceptually. See Wolfe (2006).

11. All my close ancestors benefited from the 1960s transformation of Canadian immigration policy. In 1962, skill replaced Anglo/Franco ethnic origin as the main criteria for determining admissibility for non-sponsored immigrants. My Chinese family made it through because Uncle Pak Sum came for engineering education, opening the door for his family to immigrate. Yet, officially the policy discriminated against people from Asian nations, who, unlike Canadians from preferred nations in Europe, the Americas and select countries in the Middle East, could not sponsor children over the age of 21, married children, siblings and their siblings' families and unmarried orphaned nieces and nephews under the age of 21. See "Immigration Regulations, Order-in-Council PC 1962-86, 1962 | Pier 21." https://pier21.ca/research/immigration-history/immigration-regulations-order-in-council-pc-1962-86-1962. Despite being of European origin, my Italian family was farther from the immigrant ideal, but they arrived in a chain of sponsorships. All the Italians in the community worked in agriculture or manufacturing. Though officially less valuable for the Canadian state, my Italian family surely helped satisfy Canadian needs for chemical products, cars, and salt.

12. Steven C. Harper (2012) offers a good critical-settler account of the Walking Purchase, detailing the construction of its mythology by using Delaware historical sources to foreground their active role in the negotiation. With careful attention to the language evoked in Delaware accounts of the negotiation, it highlights the Penns' deceit, namely: a forged deed, secret land surveying, selling that surveyed land before having purchased it from the Delawares, and drafting and using an illusory map in negotiations. The official Delaware Tribe account of the Walking Purchase situates it within the tribe's 130 year-

long displacement from what we now know as the Pennsylvania area to their present-day Oklahoma reservation. It quotes Chief Lappawinsoe's criticism of the Penns' deceit: *[the white runners] should have walkt along by the River Delaware or the next Indian path to it . . . should have walkt for a few Miles and then have sat down and smoakt a Pipe, and now and then have shot a Squirrel, and not have kept up the Run, Run all day.* The author puts emphasis on the sense of honour that the tribe felt bound them to fulfilling their ancestors' agreement. See the Official Site of the Delaware Tribe of Indians for "The Walking Purchase," http://delawaretribe.org/blog/2013/06/27/the-walking-purchase/.

13. They seized land north of Tohickon Creek, notably Lehigh Valley, selling it to settlers and thereby speeding up an already rapid encroachment on and settlement of Lenape land.

14. Rifkin 2014.

15. Vizenor 2009.

16. In other words, the Penns got their return on their alliance with the Iroquois, created in 1736 by compensation for a quitclaim to the targeted land.

17. *Delaware Nation v. Pennsylvania*, 446 F.3d 410 (3d Cir. 2006).

18. Love, Feathers, and Koprowski 2008.

19. Land Back is a slogan used by many anticolonial movements globally, and refers to the praxis of giving land back to Indigenous nations and groups in an effort to restore Indigenous relations and traditional self-sustenance.

20. Simpson 2014: 9.

21. For Coulthard, grounded normativity arises from the reciprocal relationship given by the land and with the land, to ground place-based practices and associated forms of knowledge that aim at nondominative and nonexploitative relationships (Coultharrd 2014: 60).

22. Tuck, Guess, and Sultan 2014.

23. Tuck and Yang 2012: 20.

24. Kulago, Wapeemukwa, Guernsey, and Black 2021.

25. It deeply pains me to admit that, as I write this, a legion of mass graves is being brought to the attention of settler-Canadians across "my" country. The legacy of the Indian Boarding School is not in any way unique to the United States: north of the 49th parallel such "schools" were called Residential Schools and served the exact same strategy of cultural and literal genocide. Indeed, the last "school" was not closed until the late 1990s.

26. White Earth Objibwe scholar Gerald Vizenor describes survivance as an "active sense of presence" (Vizenor, Tuck, and Yang 2014: vii) in which creative negotiations are made amid colonial dispossession as a means of renouncing settler-state hegemonic scripts. "Survivance is an intergenerational connection to an individual and collective sense of presence and resistance in personal experience and the word, or language, made particularly through stories" (Vizenor, Tuck, and Yang 2014: 107).

27. Tuck and Yang 2012.

28. Tuck and Yang 2012: 36.

Bibliography

Archibald, J. 2008. *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Brayboy, B. M. J. 2005. "Toward a Tribal Critical Race Theory in Education," *The Urban Review* 37(5): 425–46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-005-0018-y

Burkhart, B. 2019. *Indigenizing Philosophy through the Land: A Trickster Methodology for Decolonizing Environmental Ethics and Indigenous Futures*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press. https://doi.org/10.14321/j.ctvkjb3xp

Byrd, J. 2011. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816676408.001.0001

Claxton, Nicholas XEMŦOLTW, and Carmen de France. 2019. "With Roots in the Water: Revitalizing Straits Salish Reef Net Fishing as Education for Well-Being and Sustainability," in *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education*, ed. Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang. New York: Routledge.

Corntassel, J., and T. Hardbarger. 2019. "Educate to Perpetuate: Land-Based Pedagogies and Community Resurgence," *International Review of Education* 65(1): 87–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11159-018-9759-1

Coulthard, Glen Sean. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816679645.001.0001

Driskill, Qwo-Li. 2004. "Stolen from Our Bodies: First Nations Two-Spirits/Queers and the Journey to a Sovereign Erotic," *Studies in American Indian Literature* 16(2): 50–64. https://doi.org/10.1353/ail.2004.0020

Freire, P. 1993. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 30th Anniversary edition. New York: Continuum.

Garcia, J., and V. Shirley. 2012. "Performing Decolonization Lessons Learned from Indigenous Youth, Teachers and Leaders' Engagement with Critical Indigenous Pedagogy," *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 28(2): 76–91.

Grande, S. 2015. *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought*, 10th Anniversary edition. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Harper, Steven C. 2012. "The Map that Reveals the Deception of the 1737 Walking Purchase," *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 136(4): 457–60. https://doi.org/10.5215/pennmaghistbio.136.4.0457

Kulago, Hollie A. 2019. "In the Business of Futurity: Indigenous Teacher Education and Settler Colonialism," *Equity and Excellence in Education* 52(2–3): 239–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/10665684.2019.1672592

Kulago, Hollie A., Wayne Wapeemukwa, Paul J. Guernsey, and Matthew Black. 2021. "Land, Water, Mathematics, and Relationships: What Does Creating Decolonizing and Indigenous Curricula Ask of Us?," *Educational Studies* 57(3): 345–63. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131946.2021.1892690

León-Portilla, Miguel. 1990 (1963). *Aztec Thought and Culture: A Study of the Ancient Nahuatal Mind*, trans. Jack Emory Davis. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. 1993. "Domesticity in the Federal Indian Schools: The Power of Authority over Mind and Body," *American Ethnologist* 20(2): 227–40. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1993.20.2.02a00010

Love, Angus, Susan Feathers, and Agatha Koprowski. 2008. "The Supreme Court, Tribal Land Claims, and the Doctrine of Discovery: Trampling on the Walking Purchase," *Guild Practitioner* 65(2): 104–19.

Martinón-Torres, Marcos, María Alicia Uribe-Villegas, Juanita Sáenz-Samper, and Jimena Lobo-Guerrero. 2017. "Archaeometallurgy in Colombia: Recent Developments," *Archaeology International* 20(1): 80–84. https://doi.org/10.5334/ai-354

Minderhout, D., and A. Frantz. 2008. "Invisible Indians: Native Americans in Pennsylvania," *Human Organization* 67(1): 61–67. https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.67.1.541863381578288t

O'Brien, Jean M. 2010. *Fisting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence in New England*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816665778.001.0001

Rifkin, M. 2014. *Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. https://doi.org/10.5749/minnesota/9780816690572.001.0001

Sabzalian, Leilani. 2019. *Indigenous Children's Survivance in Public Schools. New York:* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429427503

Simpson, L. B. 2014. "Land as Pedagogy: Nishnaabeg Intelligence And Rebellious Transformation," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 3(3): 1–25.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai, Eve Tuck, and K. Wayne Yang. 2019. *Indigenous and Decolonizing Studies in Education: Mapping the Long View*. New York: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429505010

Tuck, Eve, Allison Guess, and Hannah Sultan. 2014. "Not Nowhere: Collaborating on Selfsame Land," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* (June 26). http://decolonization.wordpress.com/2014/06/26/not-nowhere-collaborating-on-selfsame-land/.

Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 1(1): 1–40.

Villoro, Luis. 2017 (1950). "The Major Moments of Indigenism in Mexico," trans. Kim Díaz, in *Mexican Philosophy in the 20th Century: Essential Readings*, ed. Carlos Alberto Sanchez and Robert Eli Sanchez, Jr. Oxford: Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190601294.003.0012

Vizenor, Gerald. 1999. *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Vizenor, Gerald. 2009. "Aesthetics of Survivance," in *Native Liberty: Natural Reason and Cultural Survivance*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1dgn41k.8

Vizenor, Gerald, Eve Tuck, and K. Wayne Yang. 2014. "Resistance in the Blood," in *Youth Resistance and Theories of Change*, ed. E. Tuck and K. W. Yang, 107–17. New York: Routledge.

Wastasecoot, Brenda. 2015. "Nikis Memory Map: A Cree Girl Speaks from the Past," *Ars Medica Online Journal* 11(1). http://www.arsmedica.ca/index.php/journal/issue/view/21/showToc.

Wolfe, Patrick. 2006. "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4): 387–409. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520601056240

Wayne Wapeemukwa is a Mellon Fellow and doctoral candidate in the department of philosophy at the Pennsylvania State University. He is Michif and a citizen of the Métis Nation of British Columbia. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0380-6117; wrw37@psu.edu.

Eduardo Mendieta is professor of Philosophy and Latina/o studies at Penn State University. https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0903-885X; ezm5325@psu.edu.

Jules Wong is a Graduate Fellow at Penn State University and a SSHRC Doctoral Fellowship holder beginning Fall 2023. They research the ethics and politics of need with a focus on gender. jmw7546@psu.edu.