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ABSTRACT

The dissertation focuses on the Lakota Sioux and begins with exploring puzzles at the intersections of colonialism, (in)security, and militarization. It focuses how the engagement of traditional cultural practices acts as a means of transforming and navigating the settler colonial social order — for the Lakota, individual transformation is closely related to social transformation. Certain relational Lakota ways of being inform decolonial action and act as an ontological challenges to Descartes-oriented Western philosophical thought. This work represents an exploration of multiple ways the Lakota have come to understand security. Interviews and experiences with Lakota men and women reveal different conceptualizations of security and insecurity, conceptualizations that resist the traditional security framework. The intersection(s) of security, military, and colonialism creates tensions, paradoxes, and ruptures, that, when given attention, can significantly further the study of security. It is within intersecting and overlapping spaces that interesting puzzles emerge. As Indigenous people who have had a long history of military engagement, while still living inside of the US (one of the most, if not the most, militarized state in the world), Lakota experiences and understandings have the potential to greatly enrich the International Relations (IR) study of security. In spite of this, they maintain a distinct sense of self — both culturally and politically. Foregrounding Lakota experiences provides a critical possibility, the opening of space for engagement and transformation of the phenomenal social order, while also providing a path to interrogate Western philosophical thought.

An important aspect to how the Lakota were able to survive was their foundation in traditional ways of life. These traditional ways not only influenced Lakota social arrangement (such as gender roles, guidelines of how to be good
relatives, and socially organizing societies or institutions), but they also emphasized the need for spiritual perception that is lacking in much of modern life. These Lakota social, cultural, and spiritual practices provided a foundation that permitted the Lakota to persevere through the most extreme hardships and oppressions. Lakota traditional ways of life allowed the Lakota to make it through genocide, warfare, and violence—all key themes thoroughly examined within the traditional security studies paradigm. As a result, the loss (or potential loss) of traditional ways of life evokes a greater sense of insecurity than physical security threats. The Lakota recognize the importance of traditional practices within their communities and that, through self- and community-affirmative cultural practices, they are engage and transform the phenomenal social order.

This dissertation also offers a remapping (or reorientation) of IR through the engagement of French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan and his work on the science of the subject and phenomenology. Lacan acts as a means of interpreting Lakota experiences and worldviews for an IR audience by putting forward a framework of understanding the dialect relationship between self- and community-affirmative cultural practices and transformation of the colonial social order. Transformation of the social order comes from intervening upon the master signifier of settler colonialism.
Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Field Note: Those who have a foundation have security

There is a unique remoteness about the Great Plains that simultaneously embodies expansive isolation and bustling life: an enigma difficult to fully appreciate by a person who has spent his life in suburban and urban areas of the East Coast.¹ The ability to drive hours and only run into a single car or to start a trip with half a gas tank and yet still have to stop at a rancher’s home to borrow gas from their lawn mower to make it to the nearest gas station is completely foreign to me.

Driving the Great Plains, I am surrounded by rolling hills, prairies that rise up enough to give a sense of vertical variation but not too much to take away the 360 degrees of horizon. Visibility carries on for miles and there are no cars or pedestrians I have to be aware of. Instead, it is the occasional cow that has gotten out of a fenced area, grazing horses, deer, antelope, or the street-darting pheasants that are the greatest cause for concern. It is already towards the end of summer and the spring thunderstorms ensure there are plenty of green fields that linger and sprinkle the landscape. The rolling hills are broken only by the occasional gully, ravine, or butte.² Single trees, here and there, dot the hills.
Going down a dirt road for about twenty minutes, I finally arrive where the ceremony is going to be conducted. There is not one other building or car for as far as my eyes can see. I look all around me to the horizon and I see nothing but green hills. This area of the reservation is remote, with very few buildings and homes and is the area of the highest concentration of Lakota first-language speakers. The Great Plains are still very open, with large stretches of nature and very little development. In this area of the reservation there are high concentrations of Lakota first-language speakers and, unfortunately, extremely high rates of poverty — the area is in a county that ranks regularly in the lowest income per capita in the country with only sixteen percent of employable bodies are employed. When I found out the other day there are only twenty officers policing the whole reservation, a land mass roughly the size of Connecticut, I was shocked — by comparison there are nearly seven thousand police officers in Connecticut.³

It is late afternoon and in the distance beyond the thatched sunshade in front of me is a rainstorm rolling on the horizon. The deep blues mix with black clouds and contrast with the rich greens of the Plains. Behind me, the sun shines bright, further bringing out the richness of the landscape. There is a single story home is to my right just up a slight hill and a small, nondescript yellow mobile home to my left. Behind me, beyond the parked cars and mud, is a small cook shack where people have already begun making the after-ceremony dinner. Aside from these buildings of the host family, the only object I see is a single tree about four hundred yards away, just off to the left of the thatched sunshade.⁴
“Make sure you put blankets down under the buffalo hides,” Tracy tells the young girls as they are setting up underneath a thatched sunshade. Tracy walks around arranging the grounds. As a respected elder, Tracy, along with her sister, revived a nearly lost Lakota traditional girls’ coming-of-age ceremony. People hurry about getting chairs and blankets set up. The twenty-two girls, ranging from age ten to sixteen, begin to sit down, while others continue laying blankets and buffalo hides. Friends and family begin to sit in metal and camping folding chairs directly across from the thatched awning, about ten feet away.

The unseasonably wet spring has carried over to the summer, and so even though it’s the end of June, the Plains are still green and rains are roll in daily. A handful of families are seated, bunched together talking. I quietly make sure that I am not taking anyone’s seat and stand towards the back. More of the girls are now sitting on the buffalo skins and I make my way to an open seat, third row from the front. The ground is soft, the back legs sinks into the ground. I place my raincoat underneath the chair.

When I first arrived, about forty-five minutes ago, the space I’m now sitting was roped off with metal stakes. Together with about forty friends, family, and other community members, the area we are all in is tucked between the main home, the mobile home, and the cook shack. A muddy rope that delineated the “women and girls only” area for the last four days of the ceremony lays on the muddy ground loosely rolled up. The metal stakes stand marking off the perimeter. Since it’s the last moments of the ceremony, men are now allowed into the space for the final
“presenting to the community” portion. All the girls are wearing long red dresses down to their ankles, with some having colorful ribbons attached horizontally near their shoulders — red is a sacred Lakota color. The various hues of red are easily noticed as Tracy and her sister organize the young girls on the blankets and buffalo hides shoulder-to-shoulder in line before their families. A few other female elders sit amongst the girls. They are not dressed in red but have long skirts and one is wearing a shawl.

Tall and slender, Marshall emerges in front of the assembled families. “Some Lakota are performing umblecha [a traditional ceremony typically conducted on a hill or mountain] in the basement instead of the hills like our ancestors did or performing sweat in the bathtub,” he asserts, “Times are changing for the worse and we need to get back to our traditions.” Marshall wears moccasins and a blue shirt and, as a respected and trusted traditional elder, he is the Master of Ceremonies (MC) of this portion of the ceremony. The land and house where this is all taking place belongs to Marshall. Throughout the ceremony, he tells stories about the importance of women in training children for the future and the significance of traditional Lakota ways.

As the afternoon progresses, we begin to eat and other traditional ceremonies take place — a few honorings and giveaways and multiple naming ceremonies. A large pot of buffalo soup and a 25-gallon plastic storage container full of fry bread is carried out by a group of girls and women and placed upon a fold-up table near the chairs. We all begin to eat. While I am eating I begin to speak to Jennifer, a lady in her forties who is there with two daughters, one of whom was participating in the
ceremony over the last four days. “Those who have a foundation, a spiritual foundation, have security,” She tells me, “When you don’t have that base, a foundation or base, it really leads to a lot of insecurities.” She continues about the importance of the ceremony for her daughters. Christianity is often refused by many Lakota, primarily due to its role in the eradication of Native communities. Traditional spiritual and cultural ways were outlawed until the 1978 American Indian Religious Freedom Act and, even today, many of the ceremonies and traditions of the past have not been fully revived. Jennifer tells me she struggled with this firsthand, eventually taking advantage of an opportunity to attend college through an arrangement with one of the many religious groups on reservation. “You have grown up without those Lakota traditional teachings and are so far removed from your native relatives that you no longer instill that into your children,” Jennifer explains, continuing, “Later on in life you see them really struggling, if you don’t have a foundation, what can you build on? There has to be something that gives you an inner peace.”

I continue eating and speaking with various families at the ceremony. The sun starts to set and families begin to heading back to homes and villages nearby. Instead of heading back to the house that I am staying, I decide to visit a nearby family a few miles down the road. “Our Lakota religion, or they always call it the Red Road, I saw Dad do this in secret,” Juliette tells me, “That is what they tried to kill, but they didn’t succeed and now our ways are coming back.” Juliette and her husband participate in traditional ceremonies and still work with horses. They’re in their fifties and have lived most of their lives in this part of the reservation. “That’s what I would like to
see, our children today to know our religion, regaining our Lakota culture, our traditions, that would change a lot of our ways in a positive way. Our future generations would have something to look forward to, something to fall back on, so when they get into a predicament and they don’t know what to do, they can rely back on their upbringing or what they were taught, our Lakota ways.”
“The distinctive worldview and ways of knowing of Lakota traditionalism, for example do not lend well to any of our existing discourses on notions like security or, more broadly, of the international” - J. Marshall Beier (2009: 221)

This dissertation explores how the lived experiences of the Lakota Sioux complicate and reconceptualize the International Relations (IR) understandings of security. Specifically, it examines the lived experience of the Lakota and the emergent puzzles at the intersections of security, military and militarization, and colonialism.5 This work draws upon six months of immersive ethnographic field research that includes over 600 hours of participant observation and forty-five semi-structured interviews, conducted on a Lakota reservation with one of the nine Federally recognized tribes in South Dakota. It adopts a multidisciplinary approach, building off contributions from IR, Native American Studies (NAS), philosophy, history, and religious and language studies and is informed by feminist, post-colonial, and critical theory.

The United States (US) spends more money on military than any other country in the international community — in 2014, the US spent the same amount as the next seven countries combined and nearly as much as the regions of Asia, Europe, and the Middle East combined (Pizzi 2015, Heeley 2013). The US has been engaged in "perpetual war" since the end of World War II (Bacevich 2010) and is currently in the midst of the longest war in US history. This American foreign policy interest constitutes and influences much of the study of IR and security in the US, bringing to the fore such themes as warfare, military might, balance of power, diplomacy, and international institutions to name a few.6
This is the space in which the Lakota exist: a dependent nation within a military-oriented nation state. The arrangement of “sovereignty produced by colonization” is the continued legacy of a people that exist within a settler colonial state (Lyons 2011). Settler colonialism is a relationship marked by “a particular form of domination; that is, it is a relationship where power … has been structured into a relatively secure or sedimented set of hierarchical social relations that continue to facilitate the dispossession of Indigenous peoples of their lands and self-determining authority” (Coulthard 2014: 6-7). Settler colonies are premised on ongoing domination and dispossession of Native people, thereby establishing settler colonialism as a "structure not an event" (Wolfe 1999: 2). In the Great Plains, the Lakota never acquiesced to domination and dispossession; instead, they struggled for the preservation of their way of life through a long and storied history of military engagements with the US government [See Appendix A for historical timeline]. The Lakota posed a significant threat to the US during the Indian Wars and, now, they constitute the highest contributors of military service per ethnic group in the country.7

This dissertation aims at understanding how the Lakota experience and make sense of security. Specifically, this work suggests that Lakota understandings of security are not primarily that of physical insecurity — in terms of military and policing issues — but, rather, security that comes from having a strong identity associated with traditional values and Lakota spirituality (or spiritual foundation). The absence of individual and communal foundations within traditional Lakota ways posed more uncertainty, hardship, and insecurity than physical security conditions — insecurity is experienced as a separation from traditional ways of being and knowing.
The Lakota have seen periods of displacement, eradication, forced separation of families, relocation of children to abusive boarding schools, and the outlawing of ceremonies and Native religion. A stepping into, or back into, Lakota traditions through self-affirmative cultural practices, therefore, acts as a way to ensure security and provides a foundation in which to engage and transform the dominant social order. Engagement premised on traditional foundations have a politically, economically, and spiritually transformative effect on both Lakota and non-Lakota communities.

The study of security within IR has been dominated by state- and military-oriented research paradigms. Lakota lived experiences of security, however, challenge these trends. The Lakota — a historically marginalized Indigenous group in the US who have been a longstanding enemy of the state — have faced grave physical, cultural, and spiritual repression, as well as physical genocide, and yet, they have never fully given into American colonization. The bloody and traumatic history of genocide and colonization affords the Lakota a complex and distinctive understanding of security.

The study of Indigenous experiences of security provides a unique vantage point (see Crawford 1994, Ross 1998, Deer 2004, Stern 2005, Incite! Women of Color Against Violence 2006, Agtucha 2008), not only because of their historical experiences, but also because Indigenous worldviews and ways of being differ significantly from dominant structures of Euro-American society (Cordova 2007). In this manner, their mere presence inherently challenges the hegemonic social order. As a result, insights generated through taking Indigenous experiences seriously provide an important opening for critical scholars to reimagine the dominant social order and to challenge oppressive social forces.
This dissertation draws upon Lakota lived experience of security and puts forward a framework in which to understand these experiences through the practice of self-affirmative cultural practices and engagement with the dominant social orders. This chapter provides an outline of major themes and provides a roadmap of where the dissertation will be heading. It first provides a brief exploration of the significance of lived experiences, the importance of focusing on Native American and Indigenous experiences and worldviews, and a brief fieldwork and methodology overview, including explorations of language and objectivity. After this, the chapter is segmented into four main sections: (1) an introduction, (2) Lakota lived experiences of security, (3) a theoretical framework for security through a Lacanian conceptualization of self and social, and (4) the structure of the dissertation. This work presents the importance of self-affirmative cultural practices as a means of engaging and transforming dominant social orders.

Section 1: Introduction

Lived experiences

The following focuses on lived experience, or what Steinar Kvale (1983, 1996) refers to as one’s “life world.” As I describe in greater detail in Chapter 3, a feminist methodology that takes seriously the experiences of those at the margins, motivates this research to foreground how people experience theories and contributes to the study of security by placing the referent of security as the individual and not the state. Lived experience as a life world is a “phenomenological methodology concerned with
human experience and the meanings people attach to what happens to them” (Hodge 2008: 30, also see Ashworth 2003). A focus on lived experiences requires an awareness of what Lee Ann Fujii (2010) refers to as “meta-data,” or the verbal and nonverbal expressions about one’s feelings and inner thoughts — within the “presentation of self in everyday life” there exists “sign-vehicles” that convey the unspoken information about the one’s experiences (Goffman 1959: 1). This information provides the context, depth, and meaning to the subject’s experience. This work aims at providing a bridge and dialectic between concepts (and the theories they comprise) and the practical realities of the social world.

It is also focused on the so-called “margins” of society. Recognizing a direct relationship between center and margin allows the researcher to explore the limitations and reach of the otherwise unproblematised center. Studying the margins allows for the interrogation of the dominant social order through the identification and exploration of paradoxes and ruptures. It emphasizes not just how power is wielded, but also how that power is experienced and felt. This focus is what Dian Million (2009) refers to as “felt theory,” or “the inclusion of our lived experience, rich with emotional knowledges, of what pain and grief and hope meant or mean now in our pasts and futures” (54). This translates to being attentive to how the individual (being theorized about) experiences and feels. This approach brings to light the limitations of the colonial order and allows space for the imagining of new ways of being.

Why focus on Native Americans and Indigenous peoples?

Indigenous peoples have been largely left out of the Western study of security (Shaw 2008, Beier 2013). In spite of the many scholars outside of the discipline who
have studied violence within Indigenous communities (see Bamforth 1994, Blick 1988, Ferguson and Whitehead 1992, Ferguson 1992, Chagnon 1988, McGinnis 1990, Keegan 1996), IR has largely ignored Indigenous peoples. This “invisibility” is generated by a colonial system that is unable to recognize entities that fall outside of the state system (Beier 2013: 85). This invisibility of Indigenous peoples in the contemporary study of the international order delimits imagining new possibilities. It is important to focus on the Lakota because of their long history of military engagements and treaty making with the US, as well as their unique worldview.

The discipline of IR is an important space where political arrangements and order can be made and remade. In a broader sense, Indigenous people have already been engaging international relations, though in a manner not visible by the discipline. The Lakota have been making treaties with the US for the last two centuries and if treaties are seen as merely negotiated relationships between two parties, they have been establishing treaties well before the Euro-American system of governance (see Crawford 1994).

Making visible the international relations practices of Indigenous people has multiple benefits for IR.11 (1) One advantage is that Indigenous peoples are a microcosm for complex and emergent struggles people are facing around the world (Shaw 2008). Their situation is particularly revealing of the nature of modern politics for multiple reasons: they exist in the borders and space defined by “our” world system, they constitute our modern identities, the economic and political systems today are built from resources extracted from them, and their situations make known the still-present excesses of colonialism in the form of violences, dehumanization, and exclusion. Karena Shaw (2008) asserts, “Indigenous peoples provide a microcosm in
which one can see elements of struggles faced by a large percentage of the world’s population, struggles that tend to appear very marginally in discourse and practices of contemporary political theory” (5). Indigenous peoples can also offer IR differing understandings of cosmolgy and ontology. The study of Indigenous peoples offers new spaces of imagination premised on collectivity and collective futures — desiring to create new social orders that resist the binaries of modernity and, thereby, resisting the imposition of either being traditional or modern (Shaw 2008). Indigenous communities are uniquely located as to challenge and offer new ways of understanding the international and the study thereof.

Many scholars have attempted to characterize how and why the study of Natives issues should be undertaken. The discipline of NAS is still very much shaping and crafting its disciplinary identity. Sebastian Braun (2016), Chair of American Indian Studies at Iowa State, suggests there are multiple ways that the discipline can be characterized — NAS can be about Natives, for Natives, or by Natives. I would suggest, however, that NAS can also be through Native worldviews and experiences. Though Native experiences are multiple and varied, there are some key similarities in terms of worldviews — this includes Native commitments to cosmology, ontology, and epistemology that inherently challenge and move Western academia in new ways. Viola F. Cordova (2007), the first Native women to receive a Ph.D. in philosophy, explains,

The experience of the world that my daughter and her friend introduced to their sons is a means of providing a world-picture that will constitute the ‘inherited background’ that grants reality to all subsequent experiences of and in the world. The existence of these two unalike ‘world-pictures’ is the basis upon which I make my claim that the
Native American child confronts not only new physical surroundings when he enters the formal school system but a different philosophical space (76, author’s emphasis).

(2) Natives inhabit a different philosophical space with key ontological and cosmological differences. The Native child, when confronted with the dominant White culture, has to ask themselves: “1. What is the world? 2. What is it to be human in that world? 3. What is the role of a human in that world” (Cordova 2007: 83)? The Lakota have multiple key social and cultural principles that both shape the Lakota worldview(s) and challenge hegemonic Western conventions of science. Three of these principles that will be explored throughout this work are the inseparability of spiritual and material reality, Mitakuye Oyasin, the spiritual reality that all are related or all my relations, and a seven generations view of long-term continuity and change. All three of these principles challenges the foundations of Western thought. This is explored later in this chapter.

IR and Indigenous politics scholars highlight the importance of this dissertation. In International Relations in Uncommon Places, J. Marshall Beier (2013) asserts the usefulness in studying Lakota cosmology in the study of IR and, more specifically, the study of security. Jenny Edkins (2003), in her article “Security, Cosmology, Copenhagen,” suggests the usefulness for studying security through a framework founded upon French psychoanalyst and philosopher Jacques Lacan. Edkins, however, does not take into account any empirical cases nor is she attentive to the plight of Indigenous peoples. Another significant work this dissertation speaks to is Glen Coulthard’s (2014) Red Skin, White Masks. Coulthard illustrates the importance of IR involvement with Indigenous peoples and this dissertation empirically reinforces his assertions and places them in a security studies context.
This research also foregrounds indigenous experiences and privileges indigenous experiences, stories (Kunnie and Goduka 2006), voices, and knowledges (Rigney 1999) and making it a feminist and indigenous project that intentionally adopts a counterhegemonic and emancipatory posture (LT Smith 1999, Tickner 2005). For indigenous people, the term “research” is filled with memories, pain, and silence — as actions done in the name of “research” have been implicated in some of the worst excesses of colonialism. “It is a history that still offends the deepest sense of our humanity,” suggests Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), continuing, “Just knowing that someone measured our 'faculties' by filling the skulls of our ancestors with millet seeds and compared the amount of millet seed to the capacity for mental thought offends our sense of who and what we are” (1). Research is approached with caution, recognizing the many promises broken, values negated, and key people ignored. It is characterized by a recognition that research and knowledge are embedded in colonial practices, thereby making research an important site of struggle.

This struggle recognizes a sharing of knowledge that requires a long-term commitment (LT Smith 1999; Silvey 2000). This commitment presents histories and evidence from different views and acts as a “correction to oversights resulting from inaccurate or incomplete vision” (Scott 1991: 776). An indigenous approach to research includes humility, respect, the desire to conduct research face to face, looking and listening, sharing and generosity, caution, and a respect and honoring of one’s spirit (LT Smith 1999: 120).
Fieldwork and methodology overview

As I will go into further detail in Chapter 3, this dissertation is a multisite, interpretive political ethnography premised on a feminist methodology and an abductive logic of research (see Tickner 2005 and Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012). As opposed to inductive and deductive reasoning, abductive reasoning begins with a puzzle, tension, or surprise and works to develop a deeper understanding by “identifying the conditions that would make that puzzle less perplexing and more of a ‘normal’ or ‘natural’ event” (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012: 27). A distinctive characteristic of this research that supplements an abductive logic of research is what Cynthia Enloe (2004) refers to as a feminist curiosity. A feminist curiosity urges scholars to refuse to believe tradition and nature-based explanations, urging an analysis on how things have come into being — taking things for granted makes scholars lazy and accepting of things as natural and normal without questioning the premises that allow these power structures to remain unchanged. Tickner (2005) outlines four key aspects to a feminist methodology that motivate this dissertation. They are: asking feminist questions (about military and oppression), designed to be useful to the communities in which they operate, committed to reflexivity, and aware of the importance of knowledge as an emancipatory force (further explained in Chapter 3).

Drawing upon fieldwork conducted over a three-year span (with the longest period being three months), the accumulated data comprises over 600 hours of participant observation, forty-five semi-structured interviews, and multiple repeat interviews of Lakota men and women from aged 18 to 75. It also includes archival research conducted at various locations and undertaken with an ethnographic sensibility — a committed focus on operations of power (Schatz 2009, Wedeen 2010, Pachirat 2011). The ethnographic evidence I draw from includes participant
observation, immersion, and ethnographic interviews, as well as autoethnographic narrative accounts, or Natives’ own texts about themselves. Ethnography, as a writing style, is reflected in the field notes found throughout the dissertation.

Regarding terminology, I utilize the term Native (or Indigenous) as a noun, referring to the original inhabitants of the Americas. Conversely, I utilize indigenous (or aboriginal) as an adjective, describing the pre-Columbian past. I am aware the term Native has carried pejorative connotations within colonial discourse (see Beier 2005: 9), though I use it because this is how the Lakota refer to themselves. A key principle to this work is trust, impacting the way the research was carried out and resulting in the use of pseudonyms (unless specified otherwise) throughout this chapter. This work attempts not to act as an authoritative voice — as if my work was attempting to validate the numerous Native voices exploring these themes, which need no external validation in the first place. The responses and actions I come to understand represent a distinct snapshot of a shared time and location — these observations emerged from a specific historical, social, and cultural lens and metadata of both myself and those with whom I interacted. As a result, I resist the disciplinary tendency and desire to extrapolate to grand theory or to generalize a particular experience as representing all experiences.

This work only speaks to my experiences with one reservation and does not aim to speak on behalf of all Lakota or certainly not all Natives; rather, it humbly aims to explore and understand how the Lakota experience and make sense of security and their continued role in the evolution of American society. This work also introduces and places Lakota experiences and perspectives into new disciplinary spaces. The intent and hope of this work is to contribute to the thinking and actions of individuals
already working within Indigenous communities and to contribute to understandings of how Indigenous contributions can impact the study of the political. A more thorough account of methodology and methods will be explored in chapter two.

**Normative and positive language**

The analytical and theoretical claims of this work require an understanding of Lakota and Native history. Presenting contextualizing history, however, is not free from political choice. There are various accounts of history that often relied upon the same historical moments though vary significantly in tone or perspective. I would characterize these differences to be loosely correlated to normative versus positive arguments — the study of research methods suggests that positive arguments provide objectivity, while normative arguments are explicitly value laden. Positive accounts of Native history often feature one-sided descriptions that were favorable to the American perspective, while normative accounts featured more passion and empathy towards the Native perspective.

Critical and feminist scholars have long dismissed the notion of so-called objective (positivist) arguments, as these claims often reinforce dominant structures and institutions (Harding and Hintikka 1983, Haraway 1988, Harding 1991, Tickner 2005). In this particular case, Euro-American understandings and accounts of early American history are recounted with the appearance of objectivity. Tickner (2005) explains “Under the guise of 'objectivity,' statistical procedures can serve to legitimize and universalize certain power relations because they give a 'stamp of truth' to the definitions upon which they are based” (16). Objectivity allows the eschewing of responsibility and gives the illusion of innocence and ahistoricism. “Feminists don't
need a doctrine of objectivity that promises transcendence, a story that loses track of its mediations just where someone might be held responsible for something,” asserts Donna Haraway (1988), continuing, “we don't want a theory of innocent powers to represent the world” (579).

This work draws upon various accounts of history, including historical texts written by non-Natives, texts from NAS, Lakota autoethnographic accounts (Native’s own texts about themselves), as well as firsthand Lakota accounts gathered from fieldwork. Overwhelmingly, the historical texts outside of NAS were firmly placed into the category of positive accounts of history (rather than normative). One might be tempted to suggest that these positive, so-called objective accounts are a result of more “scholarly” or “academic” rigor, though that would be misleading because the discipline of NAS and First Nations and Indigenous Studies in Canada is firmly entrenched within the Western Academy and put forward distinctly normative accounts of history. Historical accounts found in Lakota autoethnographies, as well as the firsthand accounts presented to me on the reservation would fall into the normative category of history. What this results in was various usage of language, ranging from scathing to sanitized.

Within this context, political decisions of language use had to be made — do I use the term “battle” or “massacre” or “Custer’s Last Stand” or “The Battle of Greasy Grass?” The answers to these questions depend on who I envision my audience is, who am I writing for. For practical purposes, I am writing this IR dissertation to scholars who, themselves, are trained in IR. No doubt a primary task is to be intelligible to my disciplinary colleagues, but a second, yet no less important task, is to create research that honors and serves the communities in which I work with — the
Lakota communities themselves, without which this dissertation would not be possible. I strive, therefore, to strike a balance between seemingly normative and positive historical accounts as a way to speak to multiple audiences (within the Academy and within Native communities)

Going Native and strong objectivity

I do this while recognizing the idiom of “going native” and the closely related trope of the “noble savage” (see Huhndorf 2001 and Ellingson 2001). Going native represents the phenomena of non-Natives adopting Native ways and sympathies, probably most easily exemplified through the 1990, Oscar-Award winning film *Dances with Wolves*. This enculturation by adopting Native ways and sympathies allows for the forging of new identities. Philip J. Deloria (1998) explains, “Wearing a mask also makes one self-conscious of a real ‘me’ underneath. This simultaneous experience is both precarious and creative, and it can play a critical role in the way people construct new identities” (7). Going native, however, is not merely about escape, it also reinforces white colonial logics. Shari Huhndorf (2001) explains,

Escape is not his ultimate goal, however. By adopting Indian ways, the socially alienated character uncovers his own ‘true’ identity and redeems European American society. Similarly, throughout the twentieth century, going native has served as an essential means of defining and regenerating racial whiteness and a racially inflected vision of Americanness. It also reflects on the national history by providing self-justifying fantasies that conceal the violence marking European America’s origins (5).
This going Native impulse was born from the Euro-American desire to “distance themselves from the conquest of Native American” (Huhndorf 2001: 5).

Intimately tied to going native is the trope of the noble savage. Linda T. Smith (1999) explains, “Rousseau has a particular influence over the way indigenous peoples … because of his highly romanticized and idealized view of human nature… This view linked the natural world to an idea of innocence and purity, and the developed world to corruption and decay” (49). Rousseau portrays the indigenous people of South Pacific as living in blissful, idyllic conditions, closer to nature and who “possess 'noble' qualities from which the West could relearn and rediscover what had been lost” (LT Smith 1999: 49). To suggest that the Lakota have qualities that need to be relearned and rediscovered by American society, would act to delimit Lakota history as a “necessary” function to a linear Western colonial timeline of so-called progress. It would fix Lakota culture to a pre-modern society and further the subsumption of Indigenous cultures in the colonial process. Additionally, not all my field experiences were positive. This includes having to end an interview because of alcohol consumption, witnessing backbiting and division, as well as having audio and video recording equipment stolen by an interviewee. I experienced various aspects of Lakota daily life, representing both what the Lakota refer to as the Red Road and the Black Road — the former representing a balanced life of honesty and integrity, while the latter a path of materialism, anger, and abuse.

In order to navigate this these concerns, I recognize that I write from a particular settler colonial space. As I describe in greater detail in Chapter 3, I write as a Filipino American who comes from a family history of resisting colonialism, while at the same time benefiting from the settler colonial state. There has been a tradition
within NAS for well-published and prominent academics making fraudulent claims of Native identity, attracting squatters and poachers (Weaver 2010). An exploration of the personal convictions that animate this work is an attempt at “strong objectivity,” or an “awareness of one's personal position in the research process acts,” acts as a correction to “pseudo-objectivity” and the negative idioms and tropes (Tickner 2005: 9).

Section 2: Lakota Lived Experiences of Security

This second section starts with a brief historical context and then moves to an exploration of contemporary Lakota experiences of security. It continues with the spiritual metaphor of the Lakota hoop broken, the impact of reestablishing the balance of the hoop through traditional and self-affirming cultural practices, and engaging the past.

Historical context

The Lakota Sioux provide a distinctive and unique space to focus on the intersections of colonialism, security, and militarization. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Native American communities were decimated and nearly heading for extinction (Snipp 2004). War, disease, starvation, relocation, and downright genocide moved their numbers from millions to less than a quarter of a million in 1890. The once thriving and self-sufficient tribes of America were forced to give up their lands, homes, and traditions, forced to assimilate to an unknown (and violent)
culture. The colonial history of the Lakota is long and bloody. The conquest of Native Americans and the US expansion westward was the first colonial venture of the US. This started with being driven off their lands and pushed into reservations, forced into abusive boarding schools, stripped of their traditions and cultural values, and placed into “sovereignty produced by colonization” (Lyons 2011: 302). The legacy of this can be seen throughout Lakota reservations stripped of their financial and natural resources, individuals facing rampant poverty, limited opportunities, and high suicide rates. From once being a vibrant and flourishing people, the Lakota have been battered down by generations of colonial violence.

The Lakota face many material challenges. Natives living on reservations are the poorest minority group in the US (US Department of Justice National Institute for Justice 2001) and the two counties the fieldwork takes place are both in the top eleven poorest counties in the US. The challenges that come with poverty are all found on Lakota reservations — this includes high rates of crime and violence, rampant health issues, and high rates of substance abuse. Complexities of jurisdiction and governance have also added to Lakota vulnerability. These overlapping jurisdictions have made it difficult for courts and police to apprehend and prosecute perpetrators on reservations. In particular, who holds jurisdiction over crimes committed on reservations, what policies cover specific crimes, and which courts are responsible for prosecution (Bubar and Thurman 2004; Deer 2005; Peacock et al. 2002; Valencia-Weber and Zuni 1995).

The Lakota Sioux have a unique modern and historical relationship with the US military. Today, Natives have the highest rate of military service of any ethnic group in the US (Williams 1998). Historically, the Lakota Sioux have also had
significant involvement with the US military — not only did they resist colonization the longest of all Native tribes (Brown 1972), but they also have a storied (and bloody) history of military conflict with the US government. Three significant engagements stand out: the Minnesota Uprising, the Battle of Little Bighorn, and the Wounded Knee Massacre. The Minnesota Uprising in 1862 led to the largest mass execution in US history. It started with a series of broken treaties with the US government and reached its apex when Santee Dakota bands (part of the larger Oceti Sakowin nation, see Appendix B) resisted white settlers along farmlands of the Minnesota River. As a means of resisting, they raided white settlements and killed 490. The US military responded through the battle at Wood Lake, MN, causing many Santee warriors to flee while others to surrendered. Of those who surrendered, 303 were sentenced to execution by hanging. This was eventually lowered and 38 Dakota were hanged.

The Battle of Little Bighorn in 1876 stands as the largest US military defeat was at the hands of the Lakota. General George Custer came upon the camp of Lakota leader Sitting Bull who was gathering for the largest spiritual ceremony of the year, the four-day summer solstice. Custer and his 7th Calvary decided to attack, unaware that Sitting Bull was anticipating and preparing for their advancement — 4,000 Lakota warriors battled 600 US soldiers. US casualties were estimated at 300, including Custer, his brother, nephew, and brother-in-law (NY Times 1876). The Battle of Little Bighorn was the worst US military defeat of the Indian War and is often referred to as one of the military defeat ever (Wilkinson 2007, Rose 2014).

The Wounded Knee Massacre of 1890 marked the end of the Indian Wars and involved the Lakota. A group of Lakota heard of the death of Sitting Bull and were fleeing towards the protection of Oglala Lakota leader Red Cloud. The group was
captured by the US 7th Calvary near the Wounded Knee Creek, SD. Initially known as a battle, it is now widely known as a massacre, with 300 of the roughly 350 Lakota men, women, and children were killed.

These three events are important milestones within US military history. Much of US military history has been premised Natives as enemies. For example, nearly 15% of Congressional Medals of Honor, the highest award for valor, have been awarded for the killing of Natives, including twenty from the Wounded Knee and twenty-five at the Battle of Little Bighorn. More recently, the seventy-one day Wounded Knee standoff with US Marshals and the FBI in 1973 and many of the AIM actions (AIM leader Russell Means is Lakota) involved the Lakota.

Contemporary findings

The intention throughout this dissertation was to get a sense of how the Lakota understand security. These understandings are necessarily constituted by historical experience, Indigenous worldviews, and the contemporary social order — of both myself and of those I interacted with. Every interview began with a question of what security means for them and what are the security issues faced on the reservation. Half the time this solicited a conversation about a topic or two that the Lakota face on the reservation and the other half elicited a conversation of what do I mean when I say security. Overwhelmingly, the conceptions of security discussed were not the same as the typical issues security studies concerns itself with — such as warfare, nuclear weaponry, diplomacy, or international institutions.

The importance of the need for knowledge of traditional practices and ways of being was an ever-present theme with many of those I encountered. “It fills in the
gaps,” Maryanne, a Lakota elder, tells me, “The jar where a person puts rocks in and then thinks its full and then puts sand in, that’s how it is — there are those spots inside of everyone and when you begin to understand where you come from then you can go anywhere in the world because you know who you are.”

Traditions provide a foundation in which to engage the world — “I can still go out in the world…go out and live in New York City or Hong Kong, … but I would go as who I am, not as who I try to be and that’s what I wanted for my children and my grandchildren, [for them to know] who they are.” “There is still a need to hang on to these traditional teachings,” Clinton, a respected elder who works for the tribe, tells me, “I met with some people yesterday and they have casinos, they have revenue flow, they have oil production, they have natural resources, they have royalties. But with that they have more problems … [they now have] a lot more responsibility in educating their people so that they learn.”

Insecurity and challenges come from the disconnection to the traditional Lakota practices and worldviews — resources and material security, alone, does not guarantee security for the Lakota. Whereas I anticipated discussions around sovereignty, policing, poverty, etc. (and certainly these themes were mentioned), what I experienced were conversations around tradition – Who are our ancestors? Who are our relatives? Being a good relative was more than merely just being a good family member, it indicated an awareness of social roles and responsibilities. A good relative is a good community member.
Spiritual metaphor of the Lakota hoop broken

“The hoop was broken,” a grandmother named Veronica tells me, “[My husband’s] Great Grandmother tells a story of her dad and brother being killed … After this, they ran back to [the village] … When they got back, so much had changed so fast, this was the last resistance in the Indian Wars and now the children were being taken to schools, families were being torn apart, and those keeping traditions were ridiculed.”

Veronica is a daughter of one of the original AIM members and her husband is a descendent of those who survived massacre by the US military. They both tell me about the importance of the hoop.

The hoop, or the circle, is a sacred figure for the Lakota and represents harmony, balance, and unity. Many of the ceremonies feature some aspect of the circle and even the sacred construction of the tipi is circular. “In the pre-reservation days, they had their own system of governance and organization. They were quite dependent on individuals rising and performing altruistic and self-abnegating acts of service for the people,” Ian, a well-respected spiritual and cultural leader and traditional dancer, tells me. “For all peoples on the planet, that shape represents unity, harmony, beauty, balance, perfection. There are no corners, there is no dark place, there is no back row, there is no third or second row … it represents well-being.”

Ian is one of the few traditional hoop dancers and relates security to cultural well being, “[Traditional dances and practices are] all about restoring well-being, restoring physical well-being, restoring emotional and mental and of course spiritual well-being — not just individually but collectively. It’s about restoring collective well-being.”

The hoop dance involves twenty-eight hoops, similar to small hula-hoops, representing the days in the lunar cycle. Ian tells me that Lakota and many Indigenous people believe in a cycle of decay and renewal — balance being represented in the
hoop. “You know a couple of months ago when it was still pretty frozen out here, then there was a certain lunar cycle in which the seasons dramatically switched over from the cold, dark, dormant, and lifeless colorless stage of winter into the awakening, the light, the warm, the color, the movement, sound, fragrance of this renewal of life.” This is balance he tells me. When the hoop is broken, the cycle of decay and renewal is also broken.

Reestablishing the hoop through self-affirmative cultural practices

Throughout my interactions with individuals on the reservation, I sought to explore how the Lakota understand security. Consistently, their responses and actions were not related to the traditional study of security. This is in spite of the Lakota having been on the bloody side of genocide and military warfare, seen the failure of treaties and diplomacy, and having had international institutions fail them. The Lakota have experienced firsthand many of the key issues examined by traditional security studies, and yet, when asked about how they understood security, many of the main elements of traditional security studies do not first come to mind.

The Lakota have been through attempted extermination and have come out alive. Out of the necessity to survive, they have become accustomed to hardships and genocidal practices and carry a healthy mistrust of the dominant culture and of US policy. It is within this environment that security is being able to individually and collectively have their traditions and way of life. This is the foundation that has allowed them to persevere through difficult times — difficult times characterized by issues commonly associated with security studies.
What has kept the Lakota safe (and able to persevere through extreme hardships) is an inner foundation premised on traditional ways of being. Insecurity is not the threat of physical harm — containment, war fighting, physical genocide, sexual abuse, etc., which the Lakota have faced more than their fair share — but the idea of not having an inner foundation. This inner foundation has allowed for the Lakota to survive and persevere through the most grievous situations imaginable and is premised on the cultural and spiritual practices of their traditional ways and worldviews. Imbalances, whether through physical repression or the psychological impacts that come from generations of cultural genocide, threaten the security and vibrancy of individuals and the community. Balance becomes achieved through self- and community-affirmative cultural practices that reestablish the hoop.


> It is time for our people to live again. This book is a journey on the path made for us by those who have found a way to live as *Onkwehonwe*, original people. This journey is a living commitment to meaningful change in our lives and to transforming society by creating our existences, regenerating our cultures, and surging against the forces that keep us bound to our colonial past. It is the path of struggle laid out by those who have come before us; now it is our turn, we who choose to turn away from the legacies of colonialism and take on the challenge of creating a new reality for ourselves and for our people (19).

is redirect our attention to the host of self-affirmative cultural practices that colonized peoples often critically engage in to empower themselves, as opposed to relying too heavily on the subjectifying apparatus of the state” (Coulthard 2014: 23). Both Fanon and Coulthard call for colonized peoples to abandon the fantasy that the state apparatus can produce liberatory outcomes by renewing and emphasizing self-affirmative cultural practices.

Engaging the past

When I suggest the use of self-affirmative cultural practices, there is an implied looking to the past, or a connection to the past through the re-finding and rejuvenating of traditions and practices. This illusion to the past, however, is not to gesture towards romanticizing a bygone era, to do so would not only be reductive, misleading, and irresponsible. Not only would it attempt to fix the Lakota, but it would also imply that there was a singular Lakota tradition that can be defined and harkened back to; rather than the multiplicity inherent within any cultural dynamics.

Caribbean writer and postcolonialist Edouard Glissant describes the limits of referring to a fixed and singularly defined past, one that is in opposition to the so-called modern. Glissant (1997) explains,

The conquered or visited peoples are thus forced into a long and painful quest after an identity whose first task will be opposition to the denaturing process introduced by the conqueror. A tragic variation of a search for identity. For more than two centuries whole populations have had to assert their identity in opposition to the processes of identification or annihilation triggered by these invaders. Whereas the Western nation is first and foremost an “opposite,” the identity of colonized peoples is primarily an “opposed to”—which means a
limitation from the very beginning. The real work of decolonization will have been accomplished when it goes beyond this limit (16).

The binary of traditional versus modern, limits understanding of the relationship between Lakota traditions and modernity.

This can also be understood through Hegelian triad dialectic where the tension between thesis and antithesis is resolved through the sublimation. US assimilation policy was motivated by the notion that the Lakota (and Native Americans in general) live within the US borders and should adopt American (read: modern) ways. The negation of this thesis would be that the Lakota are governed by differing values and cultural orientation and, therefore, do not have to adopt American (modern) ways and can remain (or regain) living in traditional ways. Sublimation would be the rejection of the opposition between the thesis and antithesis: I am neither only modern or only traditional, but a whole person who could consist of a mixture of modernity and tradition. Sublimation implies a multiplicity and complexity that rejects the simplicity of the notion of a romanticized past. It produces a third outcome that is constitutively different and of a higher nature than either of the first two parts.

To romanticize or suggest there is a singular, fixed past would also confine one’s self to constrictive Western conceptualizations of time. The Lakota, as well as many Indigenous cultures, have traditionally viewed time as cyclical in nature rather than linear. Much like the seasons spoken about with the Lakota hoop, each season comes and goes and replicates itself in a cycle. Each season of the cycle has many of the same qualities from years past that arise by the same forces (sunshine, rain, temperature), yet the details of each season are not the same. The leaves and flowers of the spring are not the exact same flowers from the year before. On top of this, the
strength of previous each season changes and inclement weather of one season can indelibly change the physical landscape and material reality for the following seasons. Material realities may change but the animating forces of each season remain the same.

When referring to the past, or self-affirmative cultural practices, this dissertation does not suggest a linear moving back to a point in time, a rolling back of the clock so to speak. It is not suggesting the benefits of moving society to the moment of first Lakota contact with the Lewis and Clark expedition in 1804 — a time when people in the US were dying of Yellow Fever, dysentery, and Cholera. Instead, a looking to the past suggests the reinvigoration and engagement of those same animating forces of previous seasons. These animating forces of generosity and simplicity, communal living, unity, responsibility, and a recognition of the spiritual aspects of existence stand in opposition to the prevailing forces of greed, individualism, division, genocide, and materialism.

Section 3: Lacanian Conceptualization of Self and Social

This third section puts forward a theoretical framework of this dissertation and is separated into six parts: the science of the subject, surveillance and confinement as the look of the subject, phenomenology, a framework for understanding Lakota security, Lacan for an Indigenous context, and foregrounding Lakota experiences and worldviews. As I will describe in greater detail later in this chapter, a Lacanian framework can provide a means to interpret Lakota experiences to an IR audience. In doing this, it allows for an Indigenous-inspired remapping and reorienting the way
security is studied. This section explores a primary Lacanian dialectic between the science of the subject and phenomenology and provides a means for IR scholars to locate the Lakota’s way of understanding security as a need for self-affirmative cultural practices. The theoretical contributions of French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan provide a useful framework for this inquiry. Though Lacan’s commitment to psychoanalysis orients him to focus on subjectivity and the unconscious (primarily on the individual level), the framework that he creates has social and political applications. The following focuses on why Lacan is appropriate to use within an Indigenous context and then it turns to his contributions of the science of the subject and phenomenology.

Science of the Subject

In his exploration of the science of the subject, Lacan separates the gaze into two parts: the look of the subject and the gaze of the other. The science of the subject simply represents the science of subjectivity. Lacan uses this phrase, in spite of highlighting the oxymoronic logic of a “science” of subjectivity. In his 1966 Écrits, Lacan (2006) explains, “To say that the subject upon which we operate in psychoanalysis can only be the subject of science may seem paradoxical. It is nevertheless here that a demarcation must be made, failing which everything gets mixed up and a type of dishonesty sets in that is elsewhere called objective; but it is people’s lack of audacity and failure to locate the object that backfires. One is always responsible for one’s position as a subject” (729). Lacan’s contributions to understanding subjectivity, the science of the subject, allows for the theorizing of
resistance. He does this through interrogating René Descartes’ philosophical proposition *cogito ergo sum*, or “I think, therefore I am.”

In Descartes’ (1641/1996) *Meditations on First Philosophy* he asks how do we know that we exist, that we’re not dreaming? Descartes concludes that the proof lies in the fact that we think, “I think, therefore I am.” Lacan revisits this notion but distinguishes between thinking and being, suggesting more complexity to the *cogito*. Lacan challenges the collapsing of these two distinct concepts of thinking and being, which he attributes to not only Descartes but also to the project of modern science born from the Enlightenment. Lacan (1964) suggests, “It seems something of a new departure — and it is — that I should have referred to the subject when speaking of the unconscious. I thought I had succeeded in making you feel that all this happens in the same place, in the place of the subject, which — from the Cartesian experience reducing to a single point the ground of inaugural certainty — has taken on an Archimedec value, if indeed that reality was the point of application that made possible the quite different direction science has taken, namely, that initiated by Newton” (Lacan 1964: 43). Lacan challenges the notion that the unconscious, the science of the subject, can be understood as originating from a single point of subjectivity.

Whereas Descartes pairs thinking and being into a single point, Lacan highlights the dialectic of thinking from being. This split positions the other as an integral aspect to subjectivity: no longer is the subject the primary entity thinking/being, but while the subject is being, the other is thinking. Lacan makes this distinction by focusing on the “look” of the subject’s eye and the “gaze” of the other. The subject is only able to look from a singular point, yet they can be seen from multiple points. This is what he refers to as *speculum mundi*. Lacan (1964) explains,
“We are beings who are looked at, in the spectacle of the world … that gaze that circumscribes us, and which in the first instance makes us beings who are looked at” (75). The dialectic relationship between the subject and the object is not merely one-directional; rather, it is a co-constituent relationship. The subject is constituted by the thinking other — the subject looks, while the other gazes.

Lacan uses an analogy of a tin sardine can floating in the ocean. In Lacan’s earlier days as an intellectual, he would often like to get away and he would do so by spending time at a small, impoverished fishing village. Often, he would go out with the fisherman and, on one occasion, a fisherman named Petit-Jean pointed out a floating tin sardine can. “You see that can? Do you see it? Well, it doesn’t see you!” Petit-Jean told Lacan, laughing and taking great amusement (Lacan 1964: 95-96). What made an impression on the young Jacques was not merely the physical and material reality of the can seeing him (as an exchange of light wavelengths from subject to object), but what Petit-Jean’s laughter meant to him. Lacan was a young academic from a fairly well to do family from Paris spending time with a poor fishing village plagued with disease and poverty — Petit-Jean’s name came from his slight stature, he soon died from tuberculosis like many in his village. Even if the can could see Lacan, it would not recognize him. Lacan (1964) explains, “I, at that moment — as I appeared to those fellows who were earning their livings with great difficulty, in the struggle with what for them was a pitiless nature — looked like nothing on earth. In short, I was rather out of place in the picture” (96). Not only are others seeing the subject, in the material and physical sense, but the other is going through processes of thinking and recognizing, placing the subject within their worldview and conceptual framework.
The other will always see the subject from a point unknown by the subject. Lacan uses the notion of “I see myself seeing myself” to capture this idea, explaining, “The privilege of the subject seems to be established here from that bipolar reflexive relation by which, as soon as I perceive, my representations belong to me” (Lacan 1964: 80-81). Simply, the subject will never be able to understand how the other comprehends them — “that which is produced by a signifying system can never be determinate” (Copjec 1989: 56). This is due to the inherent limitations of the subject that can only comprehend through the understandings of the subject itself. When the subject looks upon the other, the subject’s look and the gaze of the other are necessarily from a differing locations (Evans 1996: 73). Physically, both sets of eyes cannot inhabit the same physical space and, metaphorically, the differences that make the other distinct can never be fully comprehensible by the subject. “You never look at me from the place at which I see you,” asserts Lacan (1964: 103). The subject’s look will necessarily be incomplete.

This focus on the constitution of subjectivity through the splitting apart of Descartes cogito marks a distinctive Lacanian contribution with significant implications. It implies a dialectic relationship between the subject and the other — not merely a one-way street but a relationship of mutuality and co-constitution. The subject’s look is not totalizing or all-knowing; rather, the subject’s look provides only partial visibility. An imbalance of power, therefore, is not to equate two contradicting positions; but rather, as an “incompleteness of every meaning and position” (Copjec 1989: 56).

Lacan’s science of the subject allows for the theorizing of the subject-object relationship in a manner that ascribes thinking (and agency) to the other and allows
space for the imagining new ways of being. This emphasis on a dialectic logic (in terms of subjectivity and the social order) is similar to Hegel’s master-slave dialectic premised on negation. Placing this into a colonial context, Lacan’s science of the subject allows for new ways of thinking about the subject and the colonized Other — the other moves from a mere inanimate (knowable) object to a thinking (unknowable) Other. This shift allows for recasting historical relations in ways not premised on one-way relationships of colonial domination, but in ways distinguished by mutuality and co-constitution. The physical, material, and psychological realities of continued colonial subjugation and white supremacy, however, impede the realization of this co-constitutive relationship. Self-affirmative cultural practices, or the realization of a Jenny Edkins (2003) refers to as a “coherent self” (both on the individual and communal levels and through the means of cultural revival, renewal, and resurgence), therefore, would be the fulfillment of the balanced subject-Other dialectic relationship motioned to by Lacan.28

Surveillance and confinement as the look of the subject

To better understand how the look of the subject operates, this dissertation looks to the work of French Philosopher Michel Foucault and his genealogy of surveillance as a mode of state control. The look of the subject is what is often understood within feminist, postcolonial, and visual media scholarship as the colonial gaze. One of the most important figures in study of the gaze is Michel Foucault. In his important works *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (1995/1975) and *Madness and Civilization: A History of Insanity in the Age of Reason* (1964/1961), Foucault shows how material and psychological mechanisms of social control take on
spatial and institutional manifestations — namely, the confinement and surveillance of the panopticon. Foucault developed a theory of observation and control based on a series of letters in 1787 by Jeremy Bentham. Bentham described an architectural design for a structure he referred to as the *panopticon*.

Foucault expands upon this architectural design and fashions a theoretical framework for understanding the operations of technologies of surveillance and control. Social discipline is ensured by an all-seeing observation guard tower able to view all the prison cells lining the outer circumference and capable of carrying out punishment at any time. This panoptic gaze results in individuals self-regulating their behavior in fear of observation (and punishment). Mistakenly, Lacan’s gaze is often merged into Foucault’s panoptic logic (see Copjec 1989). Foucault’s gaze is defined by total visibility, Joan Copjec (1989) suggests, “The panoptic gaze defines, then, the *perfect*, i.e., the total, visibility of the woman under patriarchy, of any subject under any social order, which to say, of any subject at all … According to the logic of the panoptic apparatus, these last do not and (in an important sense) cannot exist (55). Within a panoptic logic, there is no possibility of nonvisibility or nonknowledge. All is seen and all is known. This differs significantly from Lacan who foregrounds indeterminacy, separating the gaze into two parts — the look of the subject and the gaze of the other — both of which can never fully conceive the perspective of the other. Foucault's gaze is similar to Lacan's look of the subject. Panopticism describes an authoritarian organization of the space through the function of the gaze, a visual order and authority enforced by punishment and state power. The look of the subject comes to represent total visibility, exploitation, and domination.
Foucault explores surveillance and confinement through a genealogy of the Hôpital Général (as a house of confinement) and an interrogation of its mechanisms of control. Houses of confinement, developed in sixteenth and seventeenth century France, provided an alternative to the untenable policies of expulsion. The creation of the "undesirable" category justified initial expulsions and later confinement under the guise of attending to state-defined social order. These tactics took individual sovereignty and placed so-called undesirables into a system of state dominion (Foucault 1964, Rabinow 1984: 130).

Confinement required perpetual surveillance, with the ever-present fear of punishment — “He must know that he is watched, judged, and condemned” (Foucault 1964, found in Rabinow 1984: 156). The shock of punishment served multiple functions: it instilled fear of sustained and escalated punishment, it created a lack of control of one’s situation, and it provided punishment carried out by an unidentifiable punisher and with no means of appeal or adjudication. One such punishment was to use forced cold-water showers to shock and control inmates, showers that could be administered at any point onto the inmates’ head (Sémelaigne 1912: 205, found in Rabinow 1984: 156). Punishment is anonymous and out of the control of the inmate and can be carried out at any moment. It also involved benevolent, moralizing intentions — in the case of using cold water, “Care is taken to avoid the hard tone and the shocking terms that would cause rebellion; on the contrary, the madman is made to understand that it is for his sake and reluctantly that we resort to such violence measures” (Sémelaigne 1912: 205, found in Rabinow 1984: 156).

Houses of confinement had full power to define deviance and productivity and create and enforce social norms. These norms were greatly influenced by the Church’s
moral presuppositions — confinement was motivated by a Manichean tension of the good working to transformation evil. Foucault (1964) explains, “In the shadows of the bourgeois city is born this strange republic of the good which is imposed by force on all those suspected of belonging to evil” (Rabinow 1984: 138-139). The technologies of surveillance and confinement constitute the look of the subject. The creation of houses of confinement as a means of control and surveillance represented a new stage in history where moral principles were applied in a physical manner. Spaces of confinement and surveillance were systems of absolute power and control.

Phenomenology

Ascribing thinking (agency) to the Other, however, does not address the material and psychological realities of colonialism. How, then, can one understand the impact of Indigenous self-affirmative cultural practices on society? This is where Lacan’s focus on phenomenology provides a link between the science of the subject and the body’s social reality.29 Lacan combines psychoanalysis and phenomenology, suggesting that the “production of a coherent self relies on the production at the same time of a coherent social framework” (Edkins 2003: 366). The science of the subject and phenomenology, Lacan suggests, not only rely on each other, but they are inseparable (Edkins 2003).

Phenomenology acts as a spatial orientation. Phenomenology is “a philosophy that places essences back within existence and thinks that the only way to understand man and the world is by beginning from their ‘facticity’” (Merleau-Ponty 2012: xx). Placing psychoanalysis in conversation with phenomenology, Lacan explores how the science of the subject is experienced in the phenomenal — or the “‘lived’ space,
‘lived’ time, and the ‘lived’ world” (Merleau-Ponty 2012: xx). Lacan engages questions of habit, orientation, and forms of experiences. Phenomenology links action, movement, and regulatory technologies with the science of the subject. Lacan (1964) explains, “[Phenomenology] brings us back, then, to the regulation of form, which is governed, not only by the subject's eye, but by his expectations, his movement, his grip, his muscular and visceral emotion — in short, his constitutive presence, directed in what is called his total intentionality” (71). Maurice Merleau-Ponty, in his 1945 work *Phenomenology of Perception*, gives an example illustrative of how Lacan views phenomenology. When a person is sleeping in the middle of the night and wants to get a glass of water, their body knows how to move and orient itself. The phenomenal space of the room and its contents enables or delimits mobility. Even though the lights are off and it's dark, the body is still able to navigate. Phenomenology takes the form of bodily orientation, the body needs to know where and how to find things and navigate the world.

The phenomenal social order is also incomplete. The phenomenal is premised on the science of the subject, which, as mentioned previously, is necessarily incomplete — the subject will never be able to fully comprehend from where they are being gazed upon. These so-called gaps are filled in by what Lacan refers to the master signifier, or an organizing social principle. An important aspect to this is that the master signifier is fluid and able to be changed.30 Edkins (2003) explains, “There is always some lack or excess around which that order is constituted, a lack which is concealed by the presence of a master signifier. It has to be concealed for what we call social reality — or what Slavoj Žižek calls social fantasy — to work” (366-67). This is particularly relevant for those falling outside the current social order since there is no
way to subject position from outside of the organizing order. To find equal space amongst the dominant order, the colonial subject must “challenge the very foundation of our social and cultural order” (Irigaray 1985: 165). Luce Irigaray (1985) suggests the socially organizing principle is patriarchy. In the case of the Lakota, the organizing principle is colonialism.

Lacan, however, does not place his understanding of phenomenology and the master signifier within a colonial context. This is where I supplement Lacan’s framework with the contributions of psychiatrist and revolutionary Frantz Fanon and his Black Skin, White Masks. Fanon speaks directly about phenomenology for the colonized individual, referring to what he calls “schemas.” These schemas are means in which the colonized bodies are socially oriented, acting as the “definitive structuring of the self and of the world” (Fanon 1967: 111). The colonized exist in a spatiality of “certain uncertainty,” having to know where and how to move and act lest risk certain death (Fanon 1967: 110-111). This “corporal” schema, however, is only part of the schemas enacting upon the colonized body. Underneath the corporal schema is the “historico-racial” schema. This schema is comprised of the structural and institutional aspects of historical oppression and bred through generations of prejudice and marginalization.

The historico-racial schema is not defined by sensations or perceptions, but by the “white man, who had woven me [the colonized object] out of a thousand details, anecdotes, stories” (Fanon 1967: 111). These schemas are imposed and not negotiated, they are inscribed within the racialized body — “The evidence was there, unalterable. My blackness was there, dark and unarguable. And it tormented me, pursued me, disturbed me, angered me” (Fanon 1967: 117). These two schemas — the corporal and
the historico-racial — constitute the markings of phenomenology with in a colonial context and comprising the colonial master schema.

The phenomenal colonial social order outlined above is similar to what Sara Ahmed (2007) refers to as “whiteness as an orientation” and Mark Rifkin (2014) “settler common sense.” Ahmed (2007) assesses the contributions of Fanon and speaks about an orientation that is inherited, passed down from one generation to the next. Ahmed (2007) explains, “Such an inheritance can be re-thought in terms of orientations: we inherit the reachability of some objects, those that are ‘given’ to us, or at least made available to us, within the ‘what’ that is around. I am not suggesting here that ‘whiteness’ is one such ‘reachable object,’ but that whiteness is an orientation that puts certain things within reach” (Ahmed 2007: 154). It is an orientation that defines the “‘here’ of the body, and the ‘where’ of it’s dwelling” (Ahmed 2007: 151).

Rifkin (2013) explores the canonical works of Hawthorne, Melville, and Thoreau and suggests that Native phenomenal existence is distinguished by a settler common sense, or a way to “conceptualize the mundane dynamics of settler colonialism, the quotidian feelings and tendencies through which it is continually reconstituted and experienced as the horizon of everyday potentiality” (2013: 323). Rifkin (2014) relates this to a colonial phenomenological corporeal schema, asserting, “My felt sense of possession of my property, such that my sense seem to extend over it as if it were contained within my individual body schema, can be conceptualized as coming at the expense of Indigenous claims to that same space, the former emerging through the phenomenological translation of the setter-state’s jurisdiction and property law as the material from which my experience of selfhood and inhabitation arises” (xvi). In this way, settler colonialism is best understood as an imposition of a structure,
not as an event (Wolfe 1999). Settler colonialism acts as a phenomenal structure that orients social space and constitutes prevailing “common sense.”

A framework for understanding Lakota security

How does the science of the subject and phenomenology interact? The science of the subject puts forward a subject-Object relationship that ascribes thinking (and agency) to the Other, not just the colonizing subject. The realization of this within a colonial context, however, has been resisted and is yet fully realized. Self-affirmative cultural practices, or the realization of a “coherent self,” occurs on both the individual and community level and allows a means for this equally thinking, co-constitutive relationship to come to fruition. As self-affirmative cultural practices increases, or what Coulthard (2014) refers to as “resurgent politics of recognition,” so will the ability for the Other to impact the “orienting” social order (phenomenology). Put simply, this framework suggests the more Native communities emphasize self-affirmative cultural practices (through recapturing, reviving, and reclaiming repressed cultural traditions and values), the more they will impact and shape the phenomenal social order. Self-affirmative cultural practices represent a resurgence of traditional and spiritual ways of being. It is an acceptance and adoption of practices in an ongoing, sustained, and long-term fashion that aims to preserve important ancestral knowledge.
Lacan for an Indigenous context

Is the Lacanian framework laid out above appropriate to be used within an Indigenous context? On the one hand, Lacan comes from the French psychoanalytic tradition of the early twentieth century — a tradition premised on narrow Euro-American experiences that never concerned itself with the plight of Indigenous peoples around the world. In this manner, Lacan can represent hegemonic Western thought. On the other hand, a Lacanian dialectic framework emphasizes a relational approach and challenges key aspects of Western thought. As a result, a Lacanian approach in an Indigenous context is not only useful, but also provides a means for decolonizing interventions of Western thought. A Lacanian framework is useful for Indigenous communities for the following reasons.

It is premised on relational presuppositions. The dialectic nature of the Lacanian framework is congruent with the relational orientation of Lakota ways of being. This relational aspect can be seen in the central Lakota principle of *Mitakuye Oyasin*. The sacred connection to all things is at the heart of the Lakota's relational orientation. This emphasis on a relational framework corresponds with Lacan’s relational dialectic — the presence of the other, allows for subjectivity. That is, how we view who and how we are is dependent upon others. IR scholar Karina Shaw (2002) affirmed this when she observed the importance of Indigenous peoples in the creation of present-day social structures, suggesting, "Their situation is a condition of
possibility of our own, historically as well as in present times" (59). Relations are of supreme importance for the Lakota, acting to inform their past, present, and future and encompassing relations that define Native cosmology and ontology. They provide the foundation in which the Lakota exist.

It places emphasis on engaging and transforming the phenomenal social order — in particular, the master signifier of colonialism. Lacan’s focus on phenomenology is relevant to Native communities ensconced in oppressive settler colonial structures. The science of the subject is inherently connected to the social order, providing a relationship between individual and social level action. By Lacan focusing on the connection between subjectivity and the phenomenal, it provides the theoretical space to challenge and transform organizing social principles and structure, a social order cohered settler colonial logics.

It foregrounds the importance of individual practice. A Lacanian framework foregrounds the importance of self- and community-affirming cultural practices as a means of transforming the phenomenal social order. Because it is a framework that connects individual with social level action, it is particularly significant within an Indigenous context because it provides added importance to decolonizing practices premised on revitalization and reclamation of traditional ways. A Lacanian framework connects individual efforts to the transformation of oppressive, colonial social orders.

In addition, engaging a Lacan dialectic framework also contributes to two larger decolonizing projects. The first provides a means of decolonizing action and the other as a means of intervening on the foundations of Western thought. By decolonizing projects, I am referring to what bell hooks (2016) characterizes as "work that pushes against imperialist, white supremacist, capitalist patriarchy." Using a
dialectic framework within an Indigenous context contributes to decolonizing projects in the following ways.

Acting from a relational worldview is decolonizing act. The recognition that reality is inherently connected differs from the dominant Western academic philosophical framework. The practices that come from seeing reality in a relational, dialectic manner are decolonizing modes of action. In exploring non-statist forms of Indigenous sovereignty, J. Kēhaulani Kauanui (2016) describes the Indigenous Hawaiian Kanaka Maoli term *Aya* as “the power and life force and interconnectedness between deities, ancestral forces, humans and other animals and all elements of the natural world.” Acts that are premised on *Aya* must recognize the multiple and complex relations that it impacts — it forces the individual to recognize that their actions impact the environment, their family and community, and society. The concept of *Aya* expands the understanding of sovereignty to include genealogical relationships with ancestors, to all living things, and to elements of the natural world. *Aya* pushes decolonial modalities to address all these relationships (Kauanui 2016). Acts that are premised on *Aya*, therefore, necessarily consider the relations they are ensconced within.

A similar Lakota concept is one of the four aspects of the soul called *Nagila* (pronounced naghela). The *Nagila* is the fourth aspect of the soul and is the “embodiment of the cosmic energy, or Taku Sakan Skan, which infuses the entire universe… it is the original source of all things, the divine essence of life” (Brown and Cousins 2001: 90). Along with the *Niya, Nagi,* and *Sicum,* these multiple dimensions of the soul inform how the Lakota constitute relations with people, their environment, and reality. The *Niya,* or life breath, infuses all living beings with life and leaves this
world upon death and visits the spirit world. The second, the *Nagi*, is most like the idea of a ghost. It is “an individualized, mirror image of the physical form that maintains the idiosyncrasies and personality of its possessor” (Brown and Cousins 2001: 89). All *Nagi* are familiar with a universal language that allows the spirit to communicate with animal spirits. The third aspect, the *Sicum*, is the spirit power of all living things, the essence of that particular being or item — for plants it could be the healing qualities it possesses; for animals the characteristics it represents such as wisdom, courage, or cunning; or for loved ones it could be the characteristics and virtues they possess. For example, a human's *Nagi* can communicate with an eagle's *Nagi*. If that eagle is ritually killed, "its *Niya*, or life-breath, is taken away, though its *Sicum* may still reside in its feathers" (Brown and Cousins 2001: 90). The eagle's origin, as well as its existence after death, is defined by the *Nagila*, or the cosmic energy that binds all reality. "These four souls are the basis for the unity of all things … Western culture often categorizes things by the appearance of their outer form. The Lakota, however, perceive categories on the basis of inner qualities" (Brown and Cousins 2001: 90).

A recognition of the *Nagila* directs how the Lakota interact with the environment, their family and community, and society. Lucas explains,

> If you cut any plant off a tree, it may feel rigid but its still supple because moisture is coursing through it to feed the very top of it. Any kind of plant when you cut it off from the earth and you leave it, it dries hard and brittle. When you take people who just simply don’t believe in the soul then they take on that characteristic [of the dried branch] because they don’t allow their *Nagila* to function properly with their body and soul.33
The *Nagila* connects the individual to the earth, to all living creatures, and to all reality.

Likewise, a Lacanian framework that foregrounds a dialectic, relational orientation to the construction of self and society, can also provide a new means of fashioning relationships with the environment, family and community, and society. This also impacts cosmological, ontological, epistemological considerations — all reality comes from a cosmic energy that binds all, the interrelated nature of reality is the operating force of society, and, as a result, knowledge comes from all forms of life in ways that transcend material reality. *Nagila* acts as an ontological (and cosmological) conviction that, when engaged, is the foundation for decolonizing practice.

The relational framework of Lacan disrupts Cartesian dualism, a key tenet of Western philosophical thought. René Descartes was one the prominent European philosophers of the Age of Enlightenment during the seventeenth century.\(^{34}\) Enlightenment philosophers "wrestled with the relationship between the knower and the known in ways that generally privileged some blend of reason and observation" (Jackson 2010: 41). Jerome Bruner (1991) explains,

Since the Enlightenment, if not before, the study of mind has centered principally on how man achieves a ‘true’ knowledge of the world. Emphasis in this pursuit has varied, of course: empiricists have concentrated on the mind's interplay with an external world of nature, hoping to find the key in the association of sensations and ideas, while rationalists have looked inward to the powers of mind itself for the principles of right reason. The objective, in either case, has been to discover how we achieve ‘reality,’ that is to say, how we get a reliable fix on the world, a world that is, as it were, assumed to be immutable and, as it were, ‘there to be observed’ (1).
This foregrounding of reason and the mind, causes what Patrick Thaddeus Jackson (2011) refers to as mind-world dualism, or the mind operates separately from the material world. Though Descartes was not the first to break from the natural philosophy tradition, he was one of the most prominent philosophers to do so. Jackson (2011) explains, "Descartes upended all of this [natural philosophy], beginning with the assumption that grounding arguments about the world … in the authority of a text was insufficient … Hence a different ground for arguments must be sought, a ground that did not presuppose assent to the authority of traditional texts but rested purely on natural reason" (42-43). This led to Descartes' *cogito ergo sum* — "I think therefore I am" — and the conclusion that the essence of being was the ability to think. Descartes (1993) asserted, "I am therefore precisely nothing but a thinking thing; that is a mind, or intellect, or understanding, or reason — words of whose meanings I was previously ignorant. Yet I am a true thing and am truly existing; but what kind of thing? I have said it already: a thinking thing" (31). Descartes emphasizes the independence of the mind to explore, understand, and control the universe, a universe that is empirically testable and separate from the mind. Because the world is separate from the mind, it can be observed, measured, tested, and, ultimately, controlled.

Lacan challenges Descartes' *cogito* by placing the individual into a complex web of relationships that constitute one's subjectivity and social phenomenal order — both of which are shaped by relational forces outside of the subject. Once an individual enters the world they are birthed into a social order of laws and conventions. Lacan (1977) refers to this birthing act as the Name of the Father, or *le nom du père* (and the desire of the mother) — parents name their child premised on a
set of meanings and symbolic order that operates separately from the reality of the
child. Lacan (1977) explains, "It is the name of the father that we must recognize the
support of the symbolic function which, from the dawn of history, has identified his
person with the figure of the law" (67). Human beings are birthed into this world when
they are named, or rather, when they are positioned into a set of relationships with a
symbolic order, a social order of conventions and laws outside of their own making.
An individual’s goal then is to reconcile these differences. In this light, the
constitution of subjectivity is premised on relationships with the Other and the
phenomenal social order. Lacan revises Descartes cogito to “I think where I am not”
(Sarup 1993: 10). For Lacan, the mind is not independent from an empirically
measurable universe; but rather, the mind is constituted through a series of
relationships.

What does this mean? The philosophical premise established by Descartes is
the framework that allowed for the extermination of Indigenous peoples, the
dispossession of their lands, and the exploitation of natural resources. Treatment of
Natives was not carried out in a relational manner; rather, it was “rational.” That is, it
was premised on a desire to civilize, order, and control nature — Natives were seen as
part of that wild nature. Lacan revises the cogito to place it within a relational
framework, a relational framework of the science of the subject and the phenomenal
social order. Foregrounding this relationality rejects Cartesian dualism. Kauanui
(2016) explains, "The idea of Aya is recognizing that we do not have to participate in
the Cartesian split, that we understand there are other ways of doing things, so
decolonial modes have to be able to recognize [relations]."
Foregrounding Lakota experiences and worldviews

A particular challenge that I wish to foreground is the theoretical placing of Lacan in relationship to the observed Lakota experiences. I wish to foreground Lakota experiences and background a Lacanian framework. Though I believe a framework built from Lakota experiences can stand alone as an intellectual contribution by itself, without the need to reinforce it with a European theorist to mediate or be a surrogate; this, however, may not be the disciplinary reality in the US where Indigenous voices, and in particular the Lakota, are significantly omitted from the IR (Beier 2009).

The use of Lacan acts as a tool to interpret Lakota experiences to an IR/academic audience, thereby allowing for a remapping or reorienting the way security is studied, the study of the international, and how research is carried out more broadly. The use of Lacan is not intended as an intervention or a framework informing the Lakota – the Lakota are already engaging self-affirmative cultural practices as a means of transforming the phenomenal social order. Rather, a Lakota-inspired Lacanian framework is intended on being an intervention for the discipline of IR.

A Lacanian framework allows the non-Native scholar to better understand the relationship between self-affirmative cultural practices and the phenomenal social order. Lakota experiences and worldviews expand upon the framework laid out by Lacan. Most significantly, it extends the dialectic aspect of Lacan’s framework by placing it into a relational orientation. Subjectivity and the social order is not premised on merely a dialectic association; but rather, it is premised on an interrelated relationship of mutuality. Interdependent based on the spiritual principle of unity is much more profound and its implications broader than merely a dialectic relationship. In this manner, a Lacanian framework can only go so far. A Lakota framework, derived from both experiences and worldviews, significantly advances a Lacanian
understanding because the Lakota explicitly link spiritual principles to the understanding of subjectivity and social order.

This dissertation challenges the IR reader to engage Lakota experiences and worldviews through Lacanian dialectic framework. It challenges the IR reader to recognize that foregrounding Lakota experiences benefits the study of security and the study of the political more broadly. In doing so, it offers a disruption and remapping of the foundations of hegemonic Western thought.

Section 4: Structure of the Dissertation

This dissertation is divided into three parts. Part I: Foundations for Inquiry provides the basis for understanding how this work contributes to various IR and NAS conversations, how it approaches research and use of methods, and how the Lakota experience security. These three initial chapters provide context to the framework outlined in this introductory chapter. Throughout this work, particular chapters are proceeded by ethnographic field notes. These field notes act as a way to combine an ethnographic writing style with more traditional IR writing, while illuminating salient themes covered in various chapters.

Chapter 2, State of the Discipline, explores the contributions of this dissertation to the two disciplines and multiple literatures it engages. Falling at the intersection of two disciplines — IR and NAS — this chapter speaks to how this work fits into literature in critical security studies, Indigenous politics, and political theory. Chapter 3, Methodology and Analytic Strategies, explores the methodology and analytical strategies that animate this dissertation. It provides more detail about the
motivating commitments of ontology, epistemology, research logic, and other key elements of this work's methodology such as ethnographic sensibility, methods, analytical tools, and fieldwork. The chapter foregrounds an exploration of the author's position and motivations for the research.

Chapter 4, *Lakota Lived Experience and Security*, explores Lakota lived experience through exploring interviews and experiences collected while conducting fieldwork. It provides greater detail to the fieldwork process, Lakota understandings of security, and fieldwork observations. This chapter provides empirical data to support the theoretical and analytical claims of this dissertation.

The next two parts represent the Lacanian dialectic relationship between the science of the subject and the phenomenal social order. *Part II: Science of the Subject* and *Part III: Phenomenology and Social Order* are composed of a total of four empirical chapters that explore various aspects of Lakota experiences of security.

*Part II: Science of the Subject* consists of two chapters. Chapter 5, *The Look of the Subject: Surveillance and Confinement*, explores the look of the subject and the logics of power revealed through Lakota lived experiences of surveillance, control, and punishment. It turns to the work of French Philosopher Michel Foucault and his writing on panopticism for a deeper understanding of the look of the subject through technologies of containment and surveillance. Chapter 6, *Powwow, Militarization, and Self-Affirmative Practices*, explores the transformation of self-affirmative cultural practices. Particularly, it explores the important Lakota cultural space of the powwow and how it has been influenced by the process of militarization. It illustrates how self-affirmative cultural practices have been preserved through adaptations that have allow the Lakota to explore, express, and celebrate their own traditions and subjectivities.
Part III: Phenomenology and Social Order consists of two chapters. Chapter 7, Fighting for Recognition, Engaging Social Order, explores the strategy of military service adopted by minority groups to engage the phenomenal social order. It examines Lakota military service and African and Latino American experiences in making rights claims based on service. It suggests that engaging in military service is a problematic means of engaging and transforming the dominant social order, particularly within an Indigenous context.

Chapter 8, Lakota Seven Generations Vision and Phenomenal Order, places the Lakota Seven Generations Vision into dialogue with the Lacanian dialect relational framework. It describes the Vision and then creates a conceptual scaffolding to better understand its significant implications. The Vision charts a course for the evolving role of Natives in modern American society and the emergent role of Indigenous experiences and worldviews within the Western academic project. Both a Lacanian framework and the Lakota Seven Generations Vision place great significance on the role of self-affirmative cultural practices in the engagement and transformation of the phenomenal social order. The Vision provides a productive way to address negative consequences of US policy and its implications are far reaching — affecting Lakota society and beyond.

Chapter 9, Concluding Thoughts, discusses the salient themes present throughout this dissertation and highlights its major theoretical, analytical, and empirical contributions. It ends with implications of this work moving into the future as well as areas of further research.
ENDNOTES

1 All names and identifying features have been removed as to ensure anonymity. Pseudonyms are used throughout this work. The research conducted and my presence on the reservation was permitted through the Tribal Council and the elders who served as my primary contacts.

2 The uniqueness of the gullies and ravines — giving the appearance of sandy cliffs — provided a landscape for the 1998 Bruce Willis film “Armageddon.” Filmed in the nearby Badlands National Park, the location was chosen because of its terrain similar to that of an intergalactic meteor.

3 These numbers come from an internal Tribal report about the rates of employment and conversations with a former member of the reservation’s police force. The number of police officers in Connecticut are taken from a 2011 “Connecticut Police Department Statistics” Report by Veronica Rose. The actual number of police officers in Connecticut is 6,656.

4 Date of Isnati ceremony, June 28, 2014.

5 When I use the term colonialism, I am referring specifically to settler colonialism, which I use interchangeably. Additionally, I wish to avoid the impression that there is a singular expression of Lakota (or Native, more generally) culture — there is no singular Native American experience. There is a great diversity of Native experiences and expressions.

6 This is a reductionist statement, as there is quite a variation within the hegemonic approaches to IR. A more nuanced assessment will be explored later in this chapter.

7 Native Americans represent the highest rates of military service, per ethnic group, in the US (see Williams 1998, Lemay 2012).

8 I would like to make a distinction between marginalized peoples and Native Americans. The Lakota are politically, economically, and culturally marginalized, though they differ in significant ways from other minority populations in the US (such as African Americans or Latino Americans). The Lakota have established land bases through nation-to-nation treaties that have established an arrangement of overlapping
sovereignties. Series of violated treaties diminished the Lakota land base to a fraction of what it once was, though the US-Lakota relationship is still a treaty arrangement.

9 The call to bring Indigenous experiences and frameworks into IR, however, can be seen as problematic — prioritizing a responsibility for rather than to Native communities. Beier (2009) explains, “The former stance suggests that we think their knowledges our wards, with little value independent of our own interventions; the latter we think them the equals of our own. Thus, appropriation of Indigenous knowledges in ways that make them fit harmoniously with the dominating society’s predetermined concepts and categories is also an exercise in their devaluation … Such appropriations may thus be counted among the practices of advanced colonialism” (91-92).

10 This work foregrounds the experiences of the Lakota for multiple reasons that will be explored in the methodology chapter. Most primary, however, is that the purpose of this dissertation is to offer an intervention on the process of militarization and colonialism in the US itself. A focus on an Indigenous group within US boarders, who, themselves, have had a long history of colonial encounters provides an important space for this intervention.

11 Benefits for the Lakota for engaging a Lacanian dialectic framework are explored later in this chapter.

12 Mitakuye Oyasin refers to not only all human beings, but also to all animals, trees, all earth and water. Interconnectedness and unity permeates all reality. There are differing accounts of the meaning of Mitakuye Oyasin. Francis White Bird (2008) suggests a more narrow definition of “everything is related to the existence of all MY Lakota relatives.” As I will provide more detail about later in the chapter, I interpret its meaning in combination with the Lakota understanding of the four aspects of the soul, particularly the fourth aspect the Nagila. Throughout this work, I italicize Lakota words not to point them out as something different from the commonly used English words, but to indicate that there are a set of meanings associated with these words that English descriptions cannot fully describe.

13 When using the term political ethnography, I am referring to an ethnographic sensibility that informs how research is conceived and carried out. Political ethnography can also be seen as a method. Because an ethnographic sensibility influences how the study was carried out, I refer to it as an aspect of the guiding methodology.

14 Of the 567 Federally recognized tribes (and over 550 non-recognized), nine of them reside in the state of South Dakota (Schilling 2015).
To ensure academic rigor, conclusions are verified through the method of strategic member checking and triangulation — conclusions and drafts shared with select informants for feedback. Where I could, I also attempt to provide more full excerpts from interviews within footnotes to supply the reader greater context. That said, this ethnographic work does not attempt to represent a singular Lakota experience or voice, let alone a singular Native experience. It represents a contingent moment that yields analytic and theoretical insight.

For a detailed conversation on terminology, see Shaw 2008, pg. 13-14.

Of the 3,510 Medal of Honors given out (as of Nov 11, 2014), 19 of which were for repeat occurrences, making it a total of 3,491 Medals awarded, 425 given for killing Indians - calculating to 12% of all Medals awarded. Additionally, 28 have been given to Natives, making a total of 453 Medals involving Natives in some way. For more on Wounded Knee Massacre in relation to Medal of Honors, see Lone Hill (2015).

Interview with Maryanne on August 7 and 10, 2014.

Interview with Clinton on August 18, 2014.

One of the many interviews with Veronica, dated June 29, 2014 and August 4, 2014.

Interview with Ian on July 5, 2015.

To be clear, this is not to suggest the Lakota, and Indigenous people in general, should not benefit from increased knowledge generated by the study of dominant forms of security that would (presumably) lead to increased protections and physical security. It is meant to provide an important insight into the intersections of colonialism, military, and security and suggest that security for Indigenous people is experienced in unique and complicated ways.

Lacan is one of the most prominent poststructuralists. Poststructuralists focus on language use and communication, particularly the process of transferring ideas through the through iterations. Known as the “Gang of Four,” the most prominent poststructuralists were Lacan, Levi-Strauss, Foucault, and Barthes. Because ideas cannot be “perfectly” transferred from one mind to another, language use to convey ideas are always understood in various ways, depending on audience. Though the speaker’s intentions impact the use of any particular iteration, they are separate from the indisputable and real impact it has on its audiences. Poststructuralism, therefore, emphasizes the importance of context and the potential for various readings of a particular iteration. As such, it emphasizes the historical and changing meanings that
take place over time and in various contexts as a way to understand how things can be understood contemporarily. Poststructuralists reject the notion of the self as being singular or coherent. Lacan brings these poststructuralist presuppositions into psychoanalysis. Lacan problematizes the collapsing of the look of the subject and the gaze of the other by separating these two concepts and showing how the science of subjectivity is co-constitutive, dynamic, and contextual. Other well-known poststructuralists are Derrida, Deleuze, Butler, Baudrillard, and Drsteva (New World Encyclopedia 2015).

24 Hegel uses the term *aufhebung* which is very often translated to *synthesis*. This, however, implies that the third dialectic is merely a combination of the first two. A more appropriate translation can be sublimation, defined by OED as “something which has been transformed into a higher, nobler, or more refined state.”

25 Reading Jacques Lacan is notoriously challenging. In conversation with a colleague who studied under well known Lacan specialist Helen Sheehan, he recalled a moment when she asserted that it is beneficial to read Lacan not to fully understand what he says, but rather, to expand consciousness. Shoshana Felman (1987) asserts, “Lacan is difficult to understand. His style, although intriguing, is disconcerting and ambiguous. But this difficulty we all share in reading Lacan should not discourage us, but because it is an integral part of what he talks about: we all have difficulty with the unconscious” (164, footnote 2).

26 Because this work is premised on a feminist methodology, an important aspect of Lacan’s work must be mentioned. Lacan has been shown to draw upon a problematic understanding of gender which renders the female as voiceless, tongueless, function of phallic desire. Anne McClintock (1995) explains, “There is no room in Lacan’s narrow house for women as social agents, nor for mothers and children to gradually recognize each other as both like and unlinked, both desired and desiring (identity throughout difference) in ways that are not reducible to a single, grim, castrating phallic logic (identity through negation)” (196). Lacan has also resisted the feminization of psychoanalysis and has stood to reinforce the patriarchal order. How can Lacan properly theorize the look of the colonizer and the gaze of the Other if he cannot recognize females as having a distinct voice and perspective? Is his perspective inherently flawed and incomplete if he holds this (almost hostile) perspective? This is where I understand Freud, Sartre, and Lacan putting forward a psychoanalytic perspective of the co-constitutive nature of human identity - the male drive is dependent upon the female and visa versa. In this manner, human identity is singular. I do view Lacan’s body of work as paternalistic and omitting the voice of women, though when viewed through the lens of co-constitution, one can better understand how Lacan can theorize the gaze of the Other without recognizing the woman as the
Other. McClintock suggests, “women are the bearers and custodians of distance and difference but are never the agents and inventors of social possibility” (McClintock 1995: 193). Though the gaze of the Other can function as an impetus for possibility and change, Lacan does not place women in the category of the Other.

27 Psychoanalysis can be applied in social and political contexts. Take for example GW Hegel’s work (1977/1807) *Phenomenology of Spirit* has had significant political and social application because of his exploration of the master-slave dialectic.

28 The notion that there is such a thing as a “coherent self,” however, is problematic when used within a Lacanian poststructuralist context. The poststructural framework would reject the notion of the “self” as being singular or coherent. Lacan problematizes the collapsing of the look of the subject and the gaze of the other by separating these two concepts and showing how the science of subjectivity is co-constitutive, dynamic, and contextual. Where ever possible, this work avoids the use of a coherent self; opting instead for the importance of self-affirmative cultural practices.

29 I want to draw the distinction between phenomenology, which is also referred to experimentalism, and the phenomenological tradition of Edmund Husserl that foregrounds “the adoption of a first-person point of view, so that specific experiences can be foregrounded and analyzed” (Jackson 2011: 61). This later tradition has been expanded upon by philosophers, psychoanalysts, psychologists, and anthropologists and is what is focused on throughout this work.

30 The way master signifier is used here stems from Edkins (2003). Looking into Lacan’s treatment of the term, the use of master signifier as a stand in for the organizing social principle is not as straightforward. Another way to view this could be through COPJect’s (2015) examination of the discourses on law by both Lacan and Foucault.

31 For a feminist take on oppression and phenomenology see Sandra L. Bartky (1990).

32 Fanon also refers to this as the “racial epidermal” schema “Then, assailed at various points, the corporeal schema crumbled, its place taken by a racial epidermal schema” (Fanon 1967: 112).

33 Phone conversation with Lucas on April 29, 2016.

34 Winona LaDuke (1994) makes a similar distinction between the practice of *mino bimaatisiwin* in Ojibwe and industrial society or “settler society.” The former refers to a “continuous inhabiting of place, an intimate understanding of the relationship
between humans and the ecosystem, and the need to maintain balance,” while the latter is characterized by “‘man’s dominion over nature’ has preempted the perception of Natural Law as central … From this perception of ‘progress’ as an essential societal development (defined as economic growth and technological advancement) comes the perception of the natural world as a wilderness in need of ‘cultivation’ or ‘taming,’ and of some peoples as being ‘primitive’ while others are ‘civilized.’ This, of course, is the philosophical underpinning of colonialism and ‘conquest’” (LaDuke 1994: xi).

35 Matthew Sharpe writes in the Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy, “This law is what Lacan famously dubs the name (nom) of the father, trading on a felicitous homonymy in French between nom (name) and non (the "no!" to incestuous union). When the father intervenes, (at least when he is what Lacan calls the symbolic father) Lacan's argument is that he does so less as a living enjoying individual than as the delegate and spokesperson of a body of social Law and convention that is also recognised by the mother, as a socialised being, to be decisive.” Also see Lacan and Mehlman (1987).
Chapter 2

STATE OF THE DISCIPLINE

This chapter explores the contributions of this dissertation to the two disciplines and multiple literatures it engages. Falling at the intersection of IR and NAS, this chapter speaks to how this work fits into literature in critical security studies, Indigenous politics, and international politics. The following is segmented into four parts: (1) critical security studies and ontological security, (2) the benefits to IR and NAS interdisciplinarity, (3) contributions to IR, and (4) contributions to NAS. It begins with a brief examination of critical security studies and the emergence of ontological security and then moves to an overview of IR and NAS and potential areas of overlap and mutual contribution. The third section explores the contributions of this work to IR. Specifically, it examines the essay of Jenny Edkins (2003) “Security, Cosmology, Copenhagen” and J. Marshall Beier’s (2005) International Relations in Uncommon Places. The fourth section provides an exploration of the contributions to NAS by focusing on Glen Coulthard’s (2014) Red Skin, White Masks and Don Fixico's (2013) Indian Resilience and Rebuilding. It ends with concluding thoughts. This chapter begins with an exploration of critical security studies and ontological security and then it places this work into conversation with scholarship that looks to combine Indigenous experiences and worldviews and IR.
Section 1: Critical Security Studies and Ontological Security

Security, understood primarily in terms of interstate warfare, has been a primary focus of the discipline of IR (Walt 1991: 212). As a subfield of IR, security studies has traditionally defined itself in terms of “the study of the threat, use, and control of military force,” and focuses on the “conditions that make the use of force more likely … and the specific policies that states adopt in order to prepare for, prevent, or engage in war” (Walt 1991: 212). Yet even at the height of the Cold War, a time during which increased government and private funding for traditional security studies drew ever more scholars to the field, there were those who questioned the utility of such a restricted understanding of security (e.g., Galtung 1971).

By the end of the Cold War, growing numbers of IR scholars began to challenge traditional conceptualizations of security under the mantles of critical security studies (CSS) and feminist security studies (FSS). As compared to traditional security studies, critical and feminist approaches frequently incorporate normative and emancipatory perspectives. Perhaps most importantly, these scholars seek to theorize and investigate security as experienced not by states as a whole, but of the individuals within them. In this section, I look at a particular variant of CSS, the Copenhagen School, and address its strengths and limitations in understanding Lakota experiences of security.

Critical Security Studies and the Copenhagen School

Critical security studies emerged from the intersection of critical social theory and security studies; its perspective encapsulated in Ken Booth’s (2001) assertion that
“Emancipation, not power or order, produces true security” (319). CSS rejects the traditional, realist paradigm of security that holds “international politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power” (Morgenthau 1954, cited in Vasquez 1996: 24). It focuses on how the system (and its accompanying assumptions) came into being in the first place, as opposed to a realist security paradigm that unproblematically assumes the existence of unequal power relations. The broader tradition of critical theory connects knowledge to operations of power, assumes a process of change, rejects current power relations, and looks to reorder and change the current system (George 1993). As a result, critical security studies holds a different set of core assumptions about what constitutes power and security, focusing more on individual and marginalized group experiences of security (Pettiford and Curley 1999). It focuses on the restructuring of global power relations.

Significant among the critical approaches was scholarship being conducted at the Center for Peace and Conflict Research (now Conflict and Peace Research Institute) in Copenhagen. The Copenhagen School of security studies, as it eventually came to be known, focused on non-military aspects of European security. The Copenhagen School and its most prominent scholar Barry Buzan (1991), held that greater attention must be placed on social identity — threatened identity leads to various forms of insecurity. Bill McSweeney (1996) explains, “Another factor that will contribute to its appeal and influence is its focus on societal identity as the core value vulnerable to threats and in need of security … Identity is a good thing, with a human face and ephemeral character which make it at once appealing and difficult to grasp” (82). By decentering state security, the Copenhagen School introduced innovative and useful concepts such as societal security, securitization, and regional
security complex (see Huysman 1998, McSweeney 1996). Securitization requires attention to “discourse and political constellations,” or, “When does an argument with this particular rhetorical and semiotic structure achieve sufficient effect to make an audience tolerate violations of rules that would otherwise have to be obeyed” (Buzan et al. 1998: 25)? Societal security was made distinct from state security, thereby shifting focus from state to societal security, thereby allowing it to develop a research agenda that deals with identity, migration, security sectors, various interpretations of security, regional security dynamics, and the relationship between politics and security, as well as the ability to ask ‘who speaks for society’ and ‘whose identity is to be secured’ (Huysman 1998: 486, Waever et al. 1993: 6, Buzan 1991)?

The Copenhagen School emphasizes collective survival, concerned with not merely threats in society, but threats to society. A threat to society must threaten group survival. Lene Hansen (2000) explains,

‘Security’, as defined by the Copenhagen School, is not only about survival, it is, as a general rule, about collective survival, and to argue that something threatens a group’s survival is to engage in a political process: one has to convincingly state that this particular threat is of such a magnitude that action needs to be initiated and ‘normal rules’ suspended. By its very nature, even in the rare cases where the threat to a particular individual is securitized, one has to engage in a collective process where the relevant audience needs to be convinced — or coerced — into recognising the ‘threat’ in question (290).

As such, the Copenhagen School does not focus on merely individual security, it deals with individual security so long as it can be understood as a collective threat (Waever 1995, Buzan et al. 1998).
In spite of having “possibly the most thorough and continuous exploration of the significance and the implications of a widening security agenda for security studies,” the Copenhagen School overlooks key aspects of the analysis of security studies (Huysman 1998: 480). Among these “blank spots,” as Hansen (2000) refers to them as, include the inabilities to analyze gender-based insecurity. Hansen (2000) suggests that scholars “shift our analytical attention from identifying instances of securitizations and towards the question of how security discourses are produced” (300). Though it focuses on societal security, speech, and identity, the Copenhagen school does not significantly address how speech is defined and produced. Speech is central in understanding securitization — securitizing actors’ speech acts link these actors to referent objects, or the objects that need to be secured. As such, speech and discourse constitute the referent objects. Referent objects “do not exist independently of discursive articulation” (Hansen 2000: 288). Hansen (2000) interrogates how speech is defined, “is it a relatively narrow definition equating speech with oral or written words, or is it a broader definition encompassing non-verbal forms of speech/communication” (300)?

Copenhagen School has difficulty theorizing intersecting phenomena occurring within the blurred lines of individual and collective security. This is particularly the case in regards to defining homogenous communities who are in need of security. For instance, Hansen (2000) explores honor killings in Pakistan as an example of the difficulty the Copenhagen School to theorize gender insecurity when it falls at the intersections of individual and collective security. Hansen (2000) explains that “‘international security’ requires threats to a larger collectivity, [and] ‘social security’ only to individuals” (294). Honor killings operate on both levels. This creates
particular silences where individuals may have limited ability to speak their security issues. Hansen (2000) refers to this as “security as silence.” Honor killings refuse to be securitized through the Copenhagen School framework. Another black spot of the Copenhagen school comes from the need for the referent object of security to be clearly defined. Buzan et al. (1998) define the referent object as, “Whatever larger groups carry the loyalties and devotion of subjects in a form and to a degree that can create a socially powerful argument that this ‘we’ is threatened. Since we are talking about the societal sector, this ‘we’ has to be threatened as to its identity” (123, author’s emphasis). What this means is that indigeneity, much like gender, must be a distinct identity separate from other distinctions such as national or religious referent objects. Injustice operates at the intersections of identities in ways that are often overlapping and interlaced, this is particularly the case with Indigenous peoples. The worldview of the Lakota influences every aspect of their identity – their Indigeneity cannot be separated from their tribal affiliation, religious practice, etc.

Though the Copenhagen School of security studies has greatly moved the study of security in new directions by focusing on how speech and societal factors impact the conceptualization of security, there are still significant areas of omission. This includes vulnerabilities that can be categorized as both individual and societal security and identities that cannot be separated from other identity-based phenomena, such as gender or Indigeneity. A precise genealogy of critical security studies is challenging to ascertain because of its many influences, including feminist and post-colonial theory (Said 1978, Haraway 1988, Butler 1990), political geography (Dalby 1991, Gregory 1995), and cultural studies and ethnography (Gusterson 1996, Sluka 1999). Critical security studies carries a transdisciplinary orientation that engages
various literatures, methods, areas of inquiry, spaces of analysis, and transnational locations (for example Ferguson and Turnbull 1999, Der Derian 2001, Weizman 2007, Debrix 2008). Flowing from these critical traditions, the notion of ontological security emerged.

**Ontological security**

Closely related to how this dissertation conceptualizes security is the notion of ontological security (see Giddens 1991; Wendt 1994; Mitzen 2006, 2006b; Huysman 1998; Kinnvall 2004; Zaretsky 2002; Steele 2005; Manners 2001; McSweeney 1999). Anthony Giddens (1991) defines ontological security as an individual’s basic need for “a sense of continuity and order in events, including those not directly within the perceptual environment of the individual” (243). Ontological security stems from uncertainty inherent to the security dilemma — the dilemma that arises within a realist understanding of anarchy where “actions taken for one’s own security can threaten the security of others, leading to arms races, conflict and war” (Mitzen 2006: 341). The security dilemma is founded upon the assumption that individual (and extrapolated to state) actors seek physical security.

There are, however, other types of security aside from physical security, particularly a desire for the security of self, achieved by routinized relationships of trust with others (Mitzen 2006). Ontological security, therefore, refers to individual desire to exist and experience themselves as a whole person (Laing 1969). It is security not of the material body, but security of a subjective perception of who one is. This, in turn, is intimately related to agency. “Individuals need to feel secure in who they are, as identities or selves … agency requires a stable cognitive environment,”
explains Jennifer Mitzen (2006), continuing, “Where an actor has no idea what to expect, she cannot systematically relate ends to means, and it becomes unclear how to pursue her ends” (342). Ontological insecurity derives from an “incapacitating state of not knowing which dangers to confront and which to ignore, i.e. how to get by in the world” (Mitzen 2006: 345). When an individual cannot establish a sense of wholeness and identity, they are consumed with tending to immediate needs and are therefore are unable to plan and prepare for the future. In contrast, ontological security “is the condition that obtains when an individual has confident expectations, even if probabilistic, about the means–ends relationships that govern her social life” (Mitzen 2006: 345). Ontological security provides the individual the ability to “know how to act and therefore how to be herself” (Mitzen 2006: 345).

A key premise of ontological security is that identity is established and sustained through relationships with other people (Wendt 1994, Mitzen 2006). Individuals attain ontological security by “routinizing their relations with significant others…since continued agency requires the cognitive certainty these routines provide, actors get attached to these social relationships” (Mitzen 2006: 342). Individuals long for “predictability in relationships to the world, which creates a desire for stable identities” (Wendt 1994: 385). As such, ontological security can account for the desire for Lakota individuals to seek out and establish relations with others within their community as a means of navigating uncertainty. It does not, however, capture the whole nature of Lakota relationships.

The notion of ontological security is limited in understanding Lakota routinized relationships. Ontological security emphasizes the role of relationships with other people. The Lakota move beyond the notion of relationships with other people to
establishing relations with all sentient and non-sentient beings. The Lakota are not only establishing and routinizing relationships with other people, but also with ancestors, the land, animals, and to all beings. Traditions and ceremonies play a role in routinizing relations with other community members, but, more importantly, they act as a means of communing with their ancestors. Lakota worldviews and experience complicate ontological security by moving beyond limited relations with merely individuals and states to a much broader and more profound set of relations (with ancestors, animals and nature, and land) and constituting a distinct ontological reality. This dissertation contributes to the understanding of ontological security and critical security studies by focusing on Indigenous experiences and worldviews.

Section 2: The Benefits of Interdisciplinarity: IR and NAS

This dissertation engages two different disciplines, both of which would benefit from mutual engagement with the other. Indigenous voices have been largely omitted by the discipline of IR, leaving significant gaps in theorizing, while the study of security and power has not been well developed within NAS. A reason for this is that it has been asserted that Indigenous frameworks occupy a different philosophical and ontological space. Native philosopher V.F. Cordova (2007) explains, “The experience of the world that my daughter and her friend introduced to their sons is a means of providing a world-picture … I make my claim that the Native American child confronts not only new physical surroundings when he enters the formal school system but a different philosophical space” (76). These philosophical and ontological
differences provide a critical opening that could greatly impact both IR and NAS, as well as the way research is conducted.

Engaging Indigenous experiences in IR

Indigenous voices have overwhelmingly been muted and overlooked by the discipline of IR. This is particularly the case for Indigenous peoples within North American, who, while “ensconced within advanced colonial states, have been accorded almost no attention” (Beier 2013: 82). What can explain this? One refuted possibility is that Indigenous peoples have never engaged the Westphalian state model. Ironically, however, the Ancient Greeks were not engaged in the Westphalian state model and yet the study of the Peloponnesian War is a foundation of security studies. Additionally, stateless peoples, such as the Kurds or Palestinians, have been object of study in IR in spite of not being nation-states. The fact that North American Natives tribes are nations within nation-states should not be an exclusionary factor since they have had a history of engaging international law and treaties, including the 2007 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. How then can this omission from IR be explained?

J. Marshall Beier (2013) suggests that this treatment parallels the “invisibility” of the non-European world to settler colonizers. “Owing to their subsumption of the colonies into the various European empires,” Beier (2013) suggests, “their external relations were not understood to be international” (85). Only after direct colonization ended did these entities become intelligible to the study of the international. The same status of invisibility and unintelligibility, however, still hangs over those people where decolonization has not occurred. Just as hegemonic conceptualizations of what was
considered international during the time of direct colonialism delimited the contents of what could be studied, the invisibility of Indigenous peoples in the contemporary study of the international order delimits imagining new possibilities.

There are a small but growing number of scholars incorporating Indigenous experiences and frameworks into the study of the international and pushing the discipline in new directions (Geeta and Nair 2004: 111). For instance, scholars have recognized the need to integrate Indigenous perspectives in IR (Wilmer 1993, Epp 2000, Beier 2005), the impact of Indigenous cases on democracy (Bedford and Workman 1997), indigenous pluralistic security communities (Crawford 1994), Indigenous contributions to diplomacy (Beier 2009, de Costa 2009, Parisi and Corntassell 2009, Stewart-Harawira 2009), and Indigenous contributions to self-determination (Kuokkanen 2009).

The study of Indigenous peoples has urged the imagining and creation of new social ordering in ways that differ from dominant political theorizing. For instance, Indigenous peoples seek to fashion multi-layered arrangements of sovereignty and political arrangements (Deloria and Lytle 1984; Jaimes 1992; Boldt and Long 1985; Boldt 1993; and political theorists engaging indigenous sovereignty claims including Kymlicka 1989, 1995; Tully 1995; Ivison et al. 2000), Indigenous engagements with international institutions (Lightfoot 2008), and the establishment of post-colonial sovereignties (Chatterjee 1993, 1986; Nandy 1983).

There has also been scholarship on the rise of self-determination and normative approaches. Wilmer (1993) puts forward two arguments about the history of the study of the international during the late 80s and early 90s: IR has moved away from theorizing conquest towards a focus on self-determination (and therefore becoming
more in tune with normative issues more generally) and that IR needs to parallel this
shift to take into account and understand the normative nature of the field (24). The
normative approach she identifies functions to support claims for the rise (and the
need) of indigenous politics. Shaw (2002) characterizes Wilmer’s argument as, “If one
reads the international system through Realism, there is no way to explain the rise of
indigenous politics, as these movements lack the ‘currencies of power’ that are
recognised by Realism” (67). Wilmer (1993) puts forward a strong normative claim
for the need of the integration of indigenous perspectives and experiences within the
field of IR.

Crawford (1994) engages IR, security, and Native Americans. Crawford (1994,
2006) examines the extended period of peace between the five Iroquois nations that
took place prior to colonial American rule from 1450 to 1777, over 325 years. The five
(which was later six) nations formed an international organization that was referred to
as the Iroquois League; prior to which, violence conflict between nations was
commonplace. The language spoke by the nations were distinct but related and they
totaled about a hundred thousand inhabitants. Crawford (1994) finds two things: (1)
the Iroquois League functioned as a security-regime with its own norms and rules that
prevented the nations from going to war with each other and (2) because the League
was composed of democratic nations it was an embodiment of Immanuel Kant’s
notion of perpetual peace. She also suggests that a non-European IR can act as a
corrective from biased perspectives and theories that arose from IR theories based on
League can only begin to open the door to analysis of international relations in other
cultures, this small extension of the historical and cultural domain of international
relations scholarship shows that international systems based on different premises (belief systems) do not necessarily conform to realist predictions about state behavior” (347).

Political theorists also have explored the linkage of indigeneity and IR. Karena Shaw (2002) asks the question under what conditions might the field of IR be a meaningful political site of struggle for indigenous peoples? Suggesting that the manner in which indigenous perspectives have been integrated into IR have only acted to reinscribe colonial relationships, Shaw (2002) puts forward a notion that IR theorizing premised on a narrow conceptual framework — such as the state-centric conceptualization of sovereignty — limits the contributions of indigenous frameworks. She outlines a few implications: that IR will continue to express and constitute the political environment in which indigenous peoples are theorized and made intelligible, a continued narrow conceptualization of sovereignty will significantly constrict the field’s ability to speak coherently and to imagine new collective futures (thereby leaving itself vulnerable to loosing its theoretical and explanatory relevance to world politics), and it can open up new research communities. Shaw (2002) suggests that IR can drive itself to obsolescence as a result to its persistent defense of its scientific ontology — as in, what constitutes sovereignty. Building off this work, Shaw (2008) explores how the integration of indigeneity into the study of politics can provide a more responsive and adaptive framework for dealing with changing contemporary issues. She draws on feminism, globalization, and post-colonialism and suggests, “Indigenous peoples provide a microcosm in which one can see elements of struggles faced by a large percentage of the world’s population, struggles that tend to appear very marginally in discourse and
practices of contemporary political theory” (Shaw 2008: 5). The situations of Natives in the US are revealing of the nature of modern politics for multiple reasons: they exist in the borders of the space defined by “our” world system; the political systems today are built from resources extracted from them; and they illustrate the still-present excesses of colonialism in the form of violence, dehumanization, and exclusion.

Shaw’s work (2002, 2008) suggests Indigenous peoples can create new conditions of possibility for the field of IR that diverge from the political grounds established by Thomas Hobbes. As a result, indigenous perspectives and frameworks must be integrated into the study of modern politics. In summary, there are a handful of scholars examining indigeneity and world politics and even fewer that are investigating its relevance within an IR framework. Though these scholars illustrate the usefulness and the necessity of expanding the scientific ontology of IR, they are still very clearly located on the margins of the field.

Section 3: Contributions to International Relations

This dissertation engages IR in multiple ways and contributes to disciplinary scholarship on Lacan, cosmology, and security. Two pieces this work directly contributes to and builds off of are explored further.

Lacan, IR, and security — Jenny Edkins

In 2003, Jenny Edkins wrote an article in Contemporary Politics entitled “Security, Cosmology, Copenhagen,” where she posed the question whether or not the
engagement of Lacan could be helpful in the study of international security. She asked, “In what way, and with what result, ideas of security and notions of subjectivity and sovereignty would be changed if a cosmology that recognized the ‘final core of uncertainty at the heart of things’ were taken seriously, and it examines why the disjunction persists” (Edkins 2003: 361). In this manner, Edkins (2003) asserts that an incoherent social order depends upon the non-achievement of what she calls the "coherence self" — once the coherent self is achieved, then so to can a coherent social order be achieved (366). She then turns to the indeterminate nature of Lacan’s “production of self and society,” which this essay refers to as the science of the subject and the phenomenal social order, and its implication for the construction of the symbolic or social order. A Lacanian framework that foregrounds indeterminacy denies a fixed worldview and it forces scholars to be attune to disjunction and uncertainty.

Edkins asserts the usefulness of the use of Lacan for the study of security and puts forward an argument that security can never be achieved since the social order is necessarily incomplete. This incompleteness is filled in by Lacan’s master signifier, or an ordering social principle. Edkins (2003) explains,

[The] important thing to note about the production of self and society in the Lacanian view — and this is where the approach is particularly helpful in the analysis of security. Neither the subject nor the social order is complete or closed. There is always a lack or excess that is produced by the very process of the production of these entities … However, this lack or gap is concealed, hidden by what Lacan calls the master signifier (366).
Security, therefore, is an “impossible fiction” due to a Lacanian structural impossibility of lack (Edkins 2003: 368). This assertion disrupts binaries of secure or insecure and foregrounds the importance for scholars to be attune with uncertainty.

This dissertation furthers the work of Edkins in various ways. For starters, though Edkins recognize the presence of the master signifier as the organizing principle of society, this dissertation suggests the master signifier holds particular significance for Indigenous peoples grappling with the vestiges of colonialism. To be clear, Edkins does not place her framework in the context of the struggles of Indigenous peoples and marginalized communities. Whereas Edkins identifies an irreconcilable incompleteness and lack (a gap filled by the master signifier) — identifying the gap and not going much further beyond that —, I suggest the gap (filled by the master signifier) is the socially organizing principle in need of intervention and transformation. The organizing social principle in the US is settler colonialism.

Secondly, Edkins suggests there is no preexisting social order prior to the creation of subjectivity. “It is crucial to mention that this is not in any sense a question of an interaction between a pre-existing subject and a society or social order outside the subject which is always already there,” She asserts, “The symbolic order does not exist before the subject. It comes into being only when it is posited by the subject as already existing” (Edkins 2003: 366). Edkins’ interpretation suggest that the social order becomes as such only once the subject is ‘born’ into it. This dissertation, however, suggests that there is a preexisting social order, a colonial phenomenology that has detrimentally impacted previous Indigenous generations. To say that the social order only comes into being once a subject is born into the social order makes
sense when seen through the lens of the individual, though in an Indigenous context that emphasizes mutuality, nonlinearity of time, and a relational worldview, the realities of ancestors has significant material and spiritual implications on the social order and practices of today. To better situate this, this work pulls from Frantz Fanon’s *Black Skin, White Masks* which suggests the social order is constituted by preexisting corporal and historico-racial schemas.

Edkins’ message is clear and supports the contributions of this dissertation: it is important for critical security studies to draw upon new cosmologies in the study of security, while the use of Lacan provides unique possibilities in understanding security. Edkins provides an in-depth treatment of Lacan and, though our readings and frameworks differ in important ways, she clearly articulates the analytical significance of the use of Lacan and the importance of foregrounding various cosmologies.

**Cosmology, IR, and security – J. Marshall Beier**

Another important work this dissertation builds on is J. Marshall Beier’s (political science, IR, critical IR, politics of representation) 2005, *International Relations in Uncommon Places*. *Uncommon Places* examines how efforts to bring Indigenous peoples into IR discourse can be unwittingly fraught with colonial practices, or what he refers to as advanced colonial practices. This is a result of (and has contributed to) IR’s inability to “develop a truly counter-hegemonic theory in International Relations” (Beier 2005: 215, author’s emphasis). As a part of the inability of the discipline to create a counter-hegemonic theory, Beier critically examines how ethnography in IR acts as a re-inscription of colonial authoritative relations between the researcher and the so-called subjects. He critiques the method of
participant observation as being the antithesis of conversation, suggesting it rises a “surrogate voice to speak in place of the Other, the Other’s perpetual outsider status is reconfirmed” (Beier 2005: 216). Instead, Beier describes the character in which the Other should be "brought in" to IR,

In the end, though, it might be that the most important things we can learn about international relations are actually things we have yet to learn about ourselves. It might also turn out that this promise is conditional upon the extent to which we are able to engage disciplinary International Relations' Others — and the historical contexts of disciplinarity are such that they are International Relations' Others as surely as they are Europe's Others — in a conversation between authoritative equals. This is why it is not enough that other voices simply be 'brought in' to the discipline — the inevitable outcome of such a strategy is that they will languish in a position of lower hierarchical order in much the same way that extradisciplinary conceptual borrowings do. A conversation, on the other hand, is about speaking with others as opposed to speaking about or even to them. It presumes not only that others have something to say that is worth hearing, but also that they deserve a response. In short, conversation, involving both reciprocity and a mutual authority to speak, presumes relative equals (Beier 2005: 92, author’s emphasis).

This dissertation continues the work of Beier (2005) in so far that it builds a framework of mutual authority and reciprocity. *Uncommon Places* calls for an exploration of IR theory that aims at decolonizing the discipline and focusing on the interests of the Other.

Beier also highlights the importance of Lakota cosmology, suggesting that the disciplinary understanding of emancipation would be better served if derived from Lakota cosmology. Beier establishes these claims on the engagement of Lakota cosmology, ways of being, and experiences. Beier (2005) explains,
The problem we face is that International Relations must also be recovered from colonial practice … That is, conversation is not advocated in the interest of the Other alone. The academic pursuit of knowledge stands to reap tangible rewards of its own if recovered from colonial practice. Not only does the possibility of broadly counter-hegemonic theory and practice depending on it, but as postcolonial subjects ourselves we also stand to learn something of it” (217).

This dissertation continues the work of Beier (2005) in the following ways. Beier refers to the notion of a hegemonic IR. Viewed through the framework of Lacanian phenomenology, as described in the introductory chapter, the constitution of hegemonic IR is made possible by the socially organizing principle — or master signifier — that fills in the gaps of the incomplete social order. In this case, colonialism, as expressed through disciplinary hegemony, is the socially ordering principle and the focus of Lakota intervention. This intervention occurs through the self- and community-affirming cultural practices. This work also provides empirical evidence for the influence of Lakota cosmology in the understanding and experience of security. That is, the ways the Lakota have come to understand insecurity — as the separation from traditional ways of being and an individual foundation — are premised on distinctly differing cosmologies than Western society.

*Uncommon Places* identifies a gap in IR literature that this dissertation attempts to fill. Beier suggests significant implications for the study of security from Lakota cosmologies rather than a hegemonic Western cosmology. The continued omission of Lakota experiences with security is an example of “violences of advanced colonialism.” These violences are actively “denying the legitimacy — even plausibility — of the self-defining security concerns of Lakota traditionalists” (Beier
He also speaks about the character in which IR should engagement Indigenous peoples: adopting an orientation of speaking with (rather than about or even to) and the development of relations of mutuality and reciprocity. Taking seriously Lakota cosmology is not only significant in the study of security, but also in imagining and constructing new social order. Beier (2005) asserts,

Taking Lakota cosmology as constitutive of authentic international theory begs the question of what its distinctive contribution might be. Surely, the answer must lie in its ability to treat alterity without constructing hierarchy — it is a discourse that allows us to find hope for peace in difference rather than in spite of it” (221, author’s emphasis).

Beier puts forward a call for IR engagement of Lakota cosmology and its potential impact on the study of security and the practice of ethnography in ways that create counter-hegemonic theory and foreground the interests of the Other. This dissertation takes on the challenge put forward by Uncommon Places by adding empirical and theoretical contributions to security and IR in a manner that challenges hegemonic IR and conceptions of the Other. Outside of these contributions to IR, there are also contributions to NAS.

**Section 4: Contributions to Native American Studies**

In addition to the handful of IR scholars who are engaging Indigenous experiences and worldviews, the newly emergent discipline of NAS (and First Nations / Aboriginal Studies in Canada) has also been exploring the importance of Indigenous
experiences in the study of the political. Having its beginnings in the Native intellectual movement of the late 1960’s and early 1970’s, NAS (now known as Native American and Indigenous Studies Association or NAISA) formed as its own disciplinary association beginning in 2005 and officially in 2009.\textsuperscript{1} Though there is limited cross-pollination between NAS and IR, both disciplines are interested in social order and disorder, colonial arrangements, and the operations of power. How this dissertation specifically engages particular NAS literature is explored below.

Politics of recognition, Indigenous politics, and IR – Glen Coulthard

Glen Coulthard’s (2014) important book \textit{Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the colonial politics of recognition} suggests that the dominant state-recognition model reproduces colonial power structures. Since the late 1960s and early 1970s, efforts around Indigenous self-determination have been increasingly engaging and cast in the liberal recognition-based approach. Not only has this approach failed, but “now serves to reproduce the very forms of colonial power which our original demands for recognition sought to transcend” (Coulthard 2014: 23-24). A major shortcoming of the state-recognition model is rather than being premised on mutuality and reciprocity, these arrangements are premised on colonial, patriarchal, and racist forms of state power. As a result, self-recognition must turn away from statist presumptions and should instead be focused on “our own on-the-ground struggles for freedom” (Coulthard 2014: 48).

\textit{Red Skin, White Masks} calls for a resurgent politics of recognition premised on turning to traditions and self-affirmative cultural practices. Coulthard (2014) explains, “I suggest that this conclusion demands that we begin to collectively redirect our
struggles away from a politics that seeks to attain a conciliatory form of settler-state recognition for Indigenous nations toward a *resurgent politics of recognition* premised on self-actualization, direct action, and the resurgence of cultural practices that are attentive to the subjective and structural composition of settler-colonial power” (Coulthard 2014: 24, author’s emphasis). The resurgent politics of recognition must not only draw upon cultural and traditional strengths, but it also must be attentive to settler colonial structures.

Emphasizing self-affirmative cultural practices is not to valorize or envy the past. On the contrary, to do so undermines attempts to draw from Indigenous experiences and knowledge. Coulthard (2014) explains that the “decolonial potential of Indigenous cultural politics as fundamentally undercut by its *ressentiment*-directed orientation toward the past” (Coulthard 2014: 153, author’s emphasis). Coulthard points to Fanon’s assertion, “We should not therefore be content to delve into the people’s past to find *concrete examples* to counter colonialism's endeavour to distort or depreciate … colonialism will never be put to shame by exhibiting unknown cultural treasures under its nose” (Coulthard 2014: 153, author’s emphasis). Coulthard deviates from Fanon and his linear treatment of social transformation — thereby reifying the binary relationship between “old” and “new” — and suggests that it is at odds with the “cultural foundations upon which Indigenous noncolonial alternatives might be constructed” (Coulthard 2014: 153-153). Here, Coulthard both avoids valorizing or fixing the past and eschews the linear dialectic of social transition. Lacan’s science of the subject within the phenomenal also adopts this orientation.

The framework developed in this dissertation contributes to *Red Skin, White Masks* in three ways: it brings Coulthard (2014) into the study of security, it provides
empirical evidence affirming his resurgent politics of recognition thesis, and it places his contribution in a larger framework that allows for the engagement of traditional ways of being and the challenging of colonial structures. First off, Coulthard suggests resurgent politics of recognition allows for a new mold of representation not premised on settler-state structures. These practices of resurgent politics of recognition can also be useful in a security context. Coulthard’s work is a significant piece in the discussion on recognition and sovereignty achieved through self-affirmative cultural practices. This dissertation connects self-affirmative cultural practices to a means of ensuring security. Secondly, this dissertation shows that this particular Indigenous community does, in fact, connect the need for self-affirmative cultural practices to a path for securing their future. It provides empirical evidence of the recognition of importance of self-affirmative cultural practices within Indigenous communities.

Lastly, it places Coulthard’s work in a larger dialectic/relational framework of individual and structural transformation. On an individual level, the Lacanian perspective put forward in this dissertation, suggests self-affirmative cultural practices reestablishes the balance within the co-constitutive relationship of the looking subject and the gazing Other. This relationship of the science of the subject is inherently connected to phenomenology, or corporal and social order/orientation. Edkins (2003: 366) holds that a "coherent self" is necessary for a coherent social order — the individual and the social are intimately tied together. The master signifier, the ordering social principle, functions to keep the system in place. The master signifier is not fixed, however, it is fluid and can be changed. As a result, engaging political institutions based on state-recognition is not inherently reinforcing a racist, colonial
system. The system is not the object of intervention; rather, the master signifier that orders the system is the location for intervention.

This dissertation further contextualizes the work of Coulthard and provides a more robust theoretical understanding for the dialectic connection between individual transformation and its impact on the hegemonic social order. Coulthard connects self-affirmative cultural practices to the politics of engaging the social order in groundbreaking and innovative ways and is strengthened by the empirical and theoretical contributions of this dissertation.

Engaging the phenomenal order, resilience, and rebuilding – Don Fixico

This dissertation also speaks directly to Don Fixico’s (2013) *Indian Resilience and Rebuilding: Indigenous Nations in the Modern American West*. Fixico (2013) puts forward a narrative description of the role of Natives in modern society and suggests there has been a prolonged period of resilience which has now given way to rebuilding. This contemporary moment of self-determination has been brought upon by the ability for Natives to have “resiliently survived” (2013: 6). This, he suggests, is particular to Natives in the US, suggesting that in the US “something drastic has happened: the vanishing race of the late nineteenth century chose not to disappear” (Fixico 2013: 7).

In his analysis, Fixico identifies two distinct periods that characterize Native-US relations: resilience and rebuilding. These two themes corresponds with the two concepts explored within Chapter 8 *Lakota Seven Generations Vision and Phenomenal Social Order*. Fixico suggests that a Native period of rebuilding started at the end of the 1960’s and has culminated in the current epoch of self-determination.
Fieldwork experiences and critical NAS scholarship, however, bring doubt to Fixico’s assertion that a period of full rebuilding has taking place. This dissertation places Fixico (2013) within the larger framework of the Lakota Seven Generations Vision and suggests that what rebuilding has been described is merely a moment of renaissance that will continue through a process of multi-generational (re)building, thereby providing more context for the relationship of resilience and rebuilding put forward by Fixico.

**Section 5: Concluding Thoughts**

This dissertation contributes to critical security studies and furthers the notion of ontological security. This chapter began with an exploration of critical security studies and ontological security and then placed this dissertation into conversation with IR and NAS scholarship. Indigenous experiences and worldviews have been largely ignored by the discipline of IR, while both IR and NAS have been slow to recognize the mutual benefits from cross-disciplinarity. This work speaks to both IR and NAS by carrying out and furthering the contributions of important scholars (such as Edkins 2003, Beier 2005, Coulthard 2014, and Fixico 2013). In addition to this, and as described in the introductory chapter, by engaging a Lakota-inspired dialectic/relational framework, this dissertation also acts to inform decolonizing praxis.
ENDNOTES

1 Conversations began in 2005 with a group that included Tsianina Lomawaima (University of Arizona), Kehaulani Kauanui (Wesleyan University), Ines Hernandez-Avila (University of California, Davis), Jeanne O'Brien (University of Minnesota), Robert Warrior (then of the University of Oklahoma), and Jace Weaver (Weaver 2010: 14-15). The first NAS conference was held in 2007 and NAISA was officially created in 2009. The discipline now has three journals (American Indian Quarterly, Wicazo Sa Review, American Indian Culture and Research Journal) which publish scholarship attentive to Indigenous experiences and the political. In Canada, the
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYTIC STRATEGIES

This chapter explores the methodology and analytical strategies that animate this dissertation. It provides more detail about the motivating commitments of ontology, epistemology, research logic, and other key elements of this work's methodology such as ethnographic sensibility, methods, analytical tools, and fieldwork. The chapter foregrounds an exploration of the author's position and motivations for the research.

The nexus of colonialism, security, and militarization creates troubling paradoxes and associations not easily understood at first take. This work attempts not to act as an authoritative voice, attempting to validate the numerous Native voices exploring these themes (which need no external validation to begin with); but rather, it humbly aims to explore the critical role of Native American in the progression of an ever-evolving American society. In order to do so, it adopts a reflexive orientation and recognizes the importance of foregrounding methodological and analytical approaches.

The distinction between methodology, as a theory of how to conduct research, and method, as a technique to collect and analyzed evidence, is an important one and is motivated by philosophical and theoretical convictions (Harding 1987: 2-3). This chapter provides an overview of the methodological and analytical strategies that frame and animate this research. It is segmented into five sections: (1) my place in the
academic project, (2) philosophical foundations, (3) methodological considerations and theoretical perspectives, (4) methods, and (5) concluding thoughts

Section 1: My Place in the Academic Project

Who I am

Paulene Regan's (2010) highlights the importance of lifelong self-exploration in the decolonizing process, suggesting, "We must begin from where we are, not from where we want to be, remembering that decolonization is a lifelong struggle filled with uncertainty and risk taking. As we have seen, confronting this reality can lead to paralysis fueled by the settler guilt and denial that breed frustration, cynicism, or apathy” (217). I am not Native American. My background is Filipino and American, for which I hold two passports. My family comes from the area of the Aeta in Northern Luzon and I have had a long interest in poverty and conflict, eventually moving to exploring these themes within its context of colonialism. From an early age, I dealt with a sense of being “home”-less, that is, “too American” to be Filipino and “too Asian” to be American. The same has held true for finding an academic disciplinary home — working with themes and frameworks that place me in and around Native American studies, media studies, international relations, political science, women and gender studies, political psychology, and anthropology. This is the unique vantage point from which I write: not fully comfortable with my American identity, while also possessing a distinctive “Third World” identity.¹ I also have a difficult time staying within the imaginary disciplinary boundaries that delineate one
area of intellectual “property” from the another. As Jace Weaver (2010), drawing upon the work of Jiying Huang (2001), suggests, the Asian American is a perennial “guest in somebody else’s house” (Weaver 2010: 363). This relates to not only my ethnic and national identity, but also my academic identity.

Getting told off

“I don’t like what you’re doing here, your research makes me nervous and you should not be on the reservation.”

“Excuse me,” more surprised than puzzled or shocked, “I am just trying to follow up on the minutes from last [Tribal] Council meeting.”

“I don’t think you should be here, thank you and have a nice day,” she responded curtly, about to hang up.

“Please wait, I’m sorry, did I miss something? Can you explain where you’re coming from?” I say before she can hung up.

There is a bit of a silence, then she says, “You people come in here all the time and don’t care about what happens to us,” she asserts, “Academics come in and tell us to get over the fact that we’ve been annihilated!

“That’s exactly why I am trying to avoid,” I say before she cuts me off.

“White people come in here all the time and all they want is money and fame and they don’t care about us! I’m suspicious of you, you didn’t tell me your research was for a dissertation and that it was about security and that you’re seeking council’s approval is also suspicious. I don't think you should be here.”

Over the weeks leading up to this call I had been in contact with tribal officials to ensure that I had permission and approval for my work on the reservation. The day
prior to this exchange I had spoken before the council and presented my work and my interest in long-term commitment to the community. At this point, the council had already granted me permission to be on the reservation and to conduct my research. This morning, I had called the tribal office to follow up on the documentation of the previous Tribal Council meeting. Her reaction caught me off guard and I was filled with frustration, confusion, and indignation. It caused me to further reflect on my presence and intention on the reservation, something that I have done for multiple months leading up to the beginning of my fieldwork.

My brownness

As the day progressed I continued to make sense of all that had happened that morning. Later that evening I spoke to a few of my main contacts with whom I’ve known and consulted with for over the last year. These were the friends who invited me onto their reservation and had helped me find housing and get my feet on the ground. As I was sharing with them the frustration, confusion, and (frankly) sadness that the morning events had evoked, I was, yet again, shocked by their reaction and response. Though they did say things like “Don’t worry about it, there are always some unfriendly people out there” and “we think you’re here for the right reasons so don’t let it get you down,” those were not their first responses. Instead, they asked if the person I spoke to on the phone had met me in person? Had they seen me before this happened? At this point I was still not sure where there were going with this questions. “The fact that you're brown matters, and once they see that you’ve come out here multiple times, they’ll start trusting you,” Grant told me.
I am not Native American, though I have always been acutely aware of my brownness. I really had no choice growing up in a Filipino family relocated in predominantly white suburbs of Ohio. When my parents first moved into town just a few years before I was born, little white children would follow them when they would go grocery shopping, having never seen someone looking like my parents. My parents dealt with prejudice as they struggled to survive in our new environment. These struggles, however, were welcomed — we had relocated to the US, we had “made it.” At that time, during the 1970s, the Philippines approach to address growing unemployment and a stagnating economy was to “export” some of its richest resources, people. My grandparents on both sides were in the medical field, doctors and running pharmacies. My family represented the brain drain that was supposed to send remittances and eventually return to the Philippines. This never happened — we had made it just by being in the US.

Brownness acts as a marker for authenticity. The fact that I look different from the typically envisioned “American” is something I cannot mask or ever hope to shed. I cannot pass as white and I certainly do not need anyone reminding me about my brownness. This, however, was not the first thing I thought of when I was being told that I shouldn’t be on the reservation. I wanted to think that this reaction had to do with something in my control, that it had to do with something I was either doing or not doing which led to this undesirable situation. At least this way I could then address my shortcomings and avoid them in the future. Instead, race and brownness became clear, unmistakable, and inescapable marker of intent and belonging. It became a marker of authenticity.
Separating identities: station and person

The young lady on the phone that morning was not speaking to the brown Justin de Leon who, for the last ten years prior to graduate school, had been working with marginalized women and children in urban slums around the world for the last ten years; rather, she was speaking to Justin de Leon the representative of Western research and academic institutions (read: the white exploiter). After processing the experience and gaining insight from others on the reservation, I was able to understand the need to separate these various identities — not to ignore these realities, but to evaluate them on the terms in which they arise.

As a researcher of color, working with a population that has been historically wronged by the Western academic project, my brownness puts me in an emotionally challenging and hurtful space, one which I cannot avoid. I understand, live, and feel the repercussions of colonialism while at the same time represent the same Western academy which filled my ancestors' skulls with millet seed to measure skull size and reinforce white supremacy. For people of color, the presence of a researcher has not always been a positive one. Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) explains: “The word itself, 'research,' is probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world's vocabulary. When mentioned in many indigenous contexts, it stirs up silence, it conjures up bad memories, it raises a smile that is knowing and distrustful” (1). Research has been part of some of the worst excesses of colonialism and ethnographers have always been on the forefront of colonial technologies.

I end up being a stand in for exploitative Western researchers. The morning of the phone conversation, I quietly held my tongue, quite literally holding back tears, all the while focusing on how my research could provide a platform in which to intervene and disrupt those very same oppressive hegemonic forces the young lady was
speaking about. To be clear, in spite of my brownness, I am still an active participant in the American settler colonial project. That is, my family and I have and continue to benefit from the seizure and occupation of Indigenous lands. Other scholars (Thobani 2007, Fujikane and Okamura 2008, Regan 2010, Byrd 2011, Tuck and Yang 2012) have explored how complicit, non-Indigenous activists and scholars can participate in the reconciliation and decolonial processes — something this dissertation hopes to be doing.  

Identities are multiple and dynamic. Just as all Natives do not share a single space or even offer unified understanding of the most important issues which face Natives today, identity in always in flux and overlapping — space and location can change how one is perceived and enacted upon.  

“Multiple, fluid structures of domination that intersect to locate women differently at particular historical conjunctures,” asserts transnational feminist Chandra Mohanty (2003), continuing, “In other words, systems of racial, class, and gender, domination do not have identical effects on women in Third World contexts” (55). What this gets at is that there are multiple positions which one can hold at any given time. She advocates for use of the language “One-Third World” and “Two-Thirds World” as introduced by postcolonial scholars Gustavo Esteva and Madhu Suri Prakash (1998). This move disrupts colonial binaries and allows for a more nuanced understanding of the differences that exist in the lives of minorities. What this looks like in practice is that people of color’s experiences are never the same — in one stroke Mohanty can be seen as a minority subject to patronizing attitudes and racist assumptions and on the other she is seen as part of the privileged class when visiting her homeland of India. In this manner, this
change in linguistic distinction highlights the “continuities as well as the discontinuities between the haves and have-nots” (Mohanty 2002: 506).

This is to say that there are multiple stations and spaces which one can simultaneous hold. As a Western academic, I am subject to derision and chastisement, while as a person of color engaging in subversive intellectual inquiry, I have been at times subject to praise and encouragement.

Who do I come from?

My family comes from the barrios outside of Philippine capital Manila, in the land historically occupied by the Aeta, Igorot, and Negrito of Luzon. Tellingly, I am not able to trace my lineage back to the indigenous peoples of the Philippine Islands even if I wanted to. Identifying indigenous lineage within the most recent generations is difficult enough, let alone attempting to go back multiple generations. This is because Filipinos have an acute sense of hierarchy and stratification (see Carroll et al. 1970), causing families to orient themselves towards moving “forward” and not “backwards” on the social ladder. For instance, a Filipina friend of mine in her late 20’s, recently recounted a story about her friend who has an Aeta grandmother. Her friend takes care of her two younger siblings, a ten-year old boy and a twelve-year old girl. The first time my friend met the two younger siblings she noticed their curly hair and dark features and told them that their beauty must come from their Aeta grandmother. To her surprise, the two had no idea they had indigenous blood. “I just didn’t think it was important to tell them,” her friend explained, suggesting that there would be little or no benefit from them knowing about their indigenous roots. Such is
the way of not only the colonized Filipino, but also many other people’s who faced long periods of colonization.

In my own family, the only documentation we have of our family is to a Spaniard named Francisco-Mariano Zalamea in the early 1800s. This is the earliest documentation of our family lineage. At this level of my family ancestry, there were dozens of ancestors that I would eventually inherit genetic traits from. From my appearance, I can safely deduce that the vast large majority of my ancestors were not Spanish. And yet, my family has chosen to anchor its narrative history around a European. Why is this? One of the lasting legacies of Spanish colonization is an acute sense of hierarchy and social stratification amongst Filipinos (Carroll 1970). When the Spaniards first took over they intentionally exploited preexisting social differences through granting in the local principalía, or the local upper class, with control over state resources. As a result, in order to gain or maintain any semblance of social standing during the nearly three hundred and fifty years occupation, Filipinos had to align themselves with the European colonizers. Intermixing and aligning oneself with the Spanish meant survival for you and your family, while maintaining and acknowledging indigenous roots meant continued isolation from the colonial political and social structures. The difficulty of linking Philippine heritage to indigenous blood is not by mistake or happenstance; rather, it is a historical outcome of three-hundred and eighty-one years of colonial rule — Spanish from 1565 to 1898, US from 1898 to 1942, and Japanese from 1942-1946 — which marginalized indigenous Filipinos and favored the mestizo.
Asian in America

Though I hold two passports, I’ve spent a majority of my life in the US, minus a handful of years living in the Philippines and parts of Asia. I am not Native American nor do I have the desire to “become Indian” as Circe Sturm (2011) refers to it. Those I met on the reservation told me plenty of stories of White visitors coming into their communities and finding their “Native spirit” and then claiming Native lineage or hoping to be adopted into Native families. I have always found it a bit unsettling when I see throngs of White people donning “Lakota” garb (typically shirts with Native symbols that you can purchase at the gift stores in all the major towns in the state) and carrying sacred pipes (which is a serious and huge responsibility for the Lakota) (see Philip Deloria 1998 and Huhndorf 2001). The line between appreciation and appropriation is very thin and quite complex — as illustrated by controversies regarding NAACP leader Rachel Dolezal and self-proclaimed Cherokee scholars Ward Churchill and Andrea Smith. This chapter will not deeply explore the relationship between appreciation and appropriation. It bears mentioning, however, on multiple occasions when speaking to non-Natives, there is an assumption that because of my interest in Native issues, my obvious brownness, and my long hair (I’m a soccer player), that I am Native. With those who make this mistake, a majority of them are non-Native, though there is not always the rule. That said, what I want to emphasize and highlight an important point: I am not Native American, I am Filipino American. This distinction is not merely an eschewing of the logics of possession, which Aileen Moreton-Robinson (2015) masterfully explains in her discussion of the “White possessive,” but rather it is the primary spatial position in which I write (see Fujikane and Okamura 2008 for discussion on Asian settler colonialism).
Answering the question “Where are you from?” with “Ohio,” where I was born and raised, never seemed to be a fully sufficient answer. The inference of these types of questions are that “Asians cannot possibly be real Americans and do not belong in the United States,” asserts Erika Lee (2015), “Instead, they are perpetual foreigners at worst, or probationary Americans at best” (9). Having been described as a “guest in somebody else’s house” (Huang 2001), a “homeless stranger among us” (Riis 1971), and “probationary Americans” (Park and Park 2004), the Asian American is truly an outsider in America.

From an early age I dealt with a sense of being an outsider, without a “home.” Through racist remarks on the sports fields, kids fingers pulling the outside corners of their eyes back, and crude language impersonations — "ching, chow, chong" — of a language I did not speak but knew exactly who they were referring to, there were too many times I was reminded I was “too Asian” to be an American. Conversely, when back in the Philippines, people would always tell me that I was “too American” to be Filipino, even after I lived there for a time and became fluent in the language. This has left me not fully comfortable with my American identity, while at the same time possessing a distinctive third world identity. The feeling of being a perennial outsider is something I know intimately and provides a uniquely different viewpoint from both the insider and the outsider.

This also extends to my experience in academia, having never quite been able to fit into a disciplinary home. Holding a disregard for the suffocating disciplinary boundaries which cordon off one area of intellectual inquiry from the other has been extremely challenging for me and has left me, on multiple occasions, having to struggle against people in my department, as well as contemplating leaving academia.
all together. The silver lining, however, is I now find myself being able to teach courses in a multiple of areas, including political science, international relations, political psychology, peace and conflict resolution, women’s studies, Native American Studies, Asian American studies, African studies, and media studies.

This is to say that the space from which I write is a unique. The feeling of being a stranger or guest in someone else’s house, combined with the struggle of not fitting into a disciplinary home, is the inherited and claimed space in which I theorize. It should not come to a surprise to the reader, therefore, that this dissertation deals with issues of being seen, being recognized, and being present — all themes that have been a common thread throughout my life experiences as an Asian in America.

Role of gender

I am a heterosexual male in a heterosexual marriage. My wife came to visit and meet with the community in which I was living multiple times throughout the three years of my fieldwork. This position of privilege revealed itself in multiple ways. Throughout the fieldwork experience, I encountered a few conservative individuals who shared with me their concerns with the outside world being premised on loose morals, this included homosexuality and marriage. In these circumstances my heterosexuality and athletic build provided me with a safe space and caused me to be seen as a potential “safe ally.” The opposite side of this were the multiple people who told me about berdaches, or Two-Spirit people who contain multiple spirits and perform multiple social roles. Qwo-Li Driskill (2010) explains that this term was chosen as an intertribal term that captures “a way to communicate numerous tribal traditions and social categories of gender outside dominant European binaries” (72). In
both of these circumstances, being told about conservative gender practices and Two-Spirit people, it was accepted that my sexual and gender identity was not threatening or foreign, allowing people to speak openly to me.

Another way gender affected this study concerns community and individual access. Traditional Lakota ways divide men from women in manner that I was not fully aware of going into fieldwork. Male and female siblings begin to limit their contact with each other when they reach the age of maturity. The avoidance of incest, not just of brother and sister but also of cousins, is an important theme throughout Lakota culture — this showed up at multiple ceremonies with MC’s voicing the importance of making sure young Lakota do not take interest in cousins. This also results in individuals being keenly aware of who are in their sphere of relations. Once a couple does marry, the opposite sexes from both sides, though merged together as one family, do not directly associate. For instance, if I had an issue with my mother-in-law, as a Lakota I would never directly bring it up with her, I would go through my wife who would then take care of the issue or even use the intermediary of an aunt. Likewise, my wife would never directly address my father, she would have to go through either myself or a brother-in-law. Men would generally not stay in the house of a woman — even though I was married and young and my host was a female elder, I had to be seen as one of the family.5

Gender significantly impacted levels of access. Initially, while in the pre-fieldwork stages of this dissertation, I intended to focus on experiences of Lakota women and their understandings of security. This is directly in line with the feminist methodology in which this study is structured. The intent to focus on women’s experiences was not fully realized — I had much more access to males than females.
Many of my experiences that would be indicative of friendship were with men — this included horseback riding, picking chokecherries, helping someone at work, visiting museums, castrating colts, and branding bucks. I was also able to see how this impacted the level of comfort people felt around me. For instance, there was one female elder who helped me stay safe and guide me while on the reservation. To me, she was always short, direct, and to the point, though of course in a loving and congenial manner. To my surprise, the first time my wife came to visit, this elder was much more warm and welcoming to my spouse. Immediately they were bonding over the grandchildren and spending time together in happy and open ways. In the span of just a few days, my wife was able to gain access to spaces that I never was able to achieve in the months in which I stayed there. Reading this reality moved me to evolve in my understandings and revisit the way I approached my inquiry.

Indigenous of North America and the Bahá’í faith

The Bahá’í faith is relevant to this dissertation in two ways: it provided access into Lakota communities and it also informs the concept of constructive resilience discussed in more detail in Chapter 8 Lakota Seven Generations Vision and Phenomenal Social Order.

The Bahá’í faith in North America has greatly been influenced by Indigenous peoples, and in particular, the Lakota. As a Bahá’í, myself, I was able to develop a handful of relationships with various Lakota families. Not only did this provide for me an invitation to come onto the reservation before conducting fieldwork, but it also contributed to a relatively quick amount of trust to be built up between myself and various Lakota communities. My main contacts were Lakota Bahá’ís who were able to
house me and pointed me towards the resources that made it possible for the carrying out of this research. I was also able to confide in a few of these contacts and carried out regular conversations, interviews, and member checks. Though the number of Lakota Bahá’ís is relatively small, as is the number of Bahá’ís globally (estimated near 9 million), this point of mutuality was critical in gaining access to communities.

Constructive resilience, a nonadversarial approach to social change, is derived from the contributions of the Bahá’í faith. This concept comes up in Chapter 8 as a means of offering one particular tool to address a foretold Lakota prophesy of a multi-generational phase of rebuilding and cultural rejuvenation. More detail about this concept and its application within a Lakota community context will be explored later in this dissertation.

Section 2: Philosophical Foundations

Ontology: Interpretivism/reflexivism

It is important to foreground philosophical foundations and methodological considerations prior to delving into the themes and issues encountered throughout this research. To explore ontology and philosophical commitments is to recognize that it is “the nature of objects that determines their cognitive possibilities” (Bhaskar 1998: 25, found in Jackson 2011: 27). Clarifying a researcher’s ontological commitments is done through a concerted examination of the philosophy of science. Patrick Thaddeus Jackson (2011) suggests there are two related but distinct parts to ontology: a concern “with what exists, or what the general principles on which such existence might be
determined,” or “the conceptual and philosophical basis on which claims about the world are formulated in the first place: ontology as our ‘hook-up’ to the world, so to speak, concerned with how we as researchers are able to produce knowledge in the first place” (Jackson 2011: 28). Ontological commitments premised on philosophical foundations determine what type of knowledge is able to be produced. These foundations animate the researcher's epistemological and methodological commitments.

This work is premised on an interpretivism/reflexivism ontological wager. A wager consists of the "provisional commitments" on "positions on the character and conduct of science" (Jackson 2011: 35). This position combines mind-world monism and transnaturalism and calls for “reflexivity of knowledge” — where the tools of knowledge production are turned onto the researcher themselves (Jackson 2011: 157). The reflexivist wager includes viewing knowledge as a means of increasing self-awareness, viewing causation as dialectal, approaching causal explanation through the addressing of unresolved tensions, comparing to de-naturalize, and with an aim to provoke social change (Jackson 2011: 197-201). Jackson (2011) explains,

For reflexivists, knowledge itself causes and is caused by the operation of broader social forces, and part of the point of theorizing one’s own social location is to call attention to the ways in which knowledge is implicated in the social order … [reflexivists compare] to ethnologically ‘de-naturalize’ a set of taken-for-granted assumptions about social order by delineating an empirical alternative or to ‘incorporate’ multiple cases into a more holistic view…The point of either of these exercises, as with every concrete research practice utilized by reflexivists, is to promote and provoke social change, by unsettling supposedly firms notions and freeing up the possibility of their dialectical transformation” (200-201).
This stands in contrast to other philosophical wagers such as neopositivism (limiting knowledge to objects we can see), critical realism (dualism allows to go beyond the limitations of phenomenological knowledge), and analyticism (monism reinforces phenomenalism).

The dialectic, puzzle oriented nature of this work is premised on the assumption that human beings operate in and create dynamic social, political, and cultural contexts. The social world has cultures, volition, and identities, humans that resist being studied like rocks or plants; rather, in the social world self-awareness is needed to recognize how own research practices are embedded in a broader social and organizational context. In practice, this equates to viewing human beings “not as objects, but as agents” who are actively engaged in constructing (and deconstructing) cultures and societies “along with the institutions, organizations, practices, physical artifacts, and language and concepts that populate these” (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012: 46). This commitment reflects an interpretive approach that recognizes social phenomena resist conceptual articulation and refuse to accept systematic modes of assessment. It recognizes that hierarchies are multiple and interconnected. As a result, researchers must pose questions from the ground-up to understand the workings and operations of (in)security. Cynthia Enloe (2004) asserts: “Hierarchies are multiple, because forms of political power are diverse. But the several hierarchies do not sit on the social landscape like tuna, egg, and cheese sandwiches sitting on an icy cafeteria counter, diversely multiple but unconnected. They relate to each other, sometimes in ways that subvert one another, sometimes in ways that provide each with its respective resiliency ... The questions to pose, then, are: When and how exactly are these hierarchies connected” (31)?
This informs a unique approach to knowledge. Scientific knowledge fulfills a specific function and is “not simply an expression of one's class or race or gender or any other categorical or positional attribute” (Jackson 2011: 159). Researchers should continually analyze their own role in that production and to “locate themselves with reference to their broader social contexts” (Jackson 2011: 159). Knowing and studying the world and changing the world are intimately tied and inseparable — generated knowledge, therefore, “either reinforces or challenges such social distinctions” (Jackson 2011: 159).

Abductive reasoning

This research is premised on an abductive logic of research. Advantages of abductive reasoning are an attentiveness to puzzlement and surprise; researcher’s prior knowledge and expectations; the ability to generate new relations, concepts, and theories; and the methodological necessity and space for reflexivity and positionality (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012: 33). A common understanding of abduction — the forceful taking away of a person against their will — shines some light on the abductive reasoning process: the researcher is faced with a puzzle or tension they don’t understand and through welcoming and exploring this surprise they become swept away “against their will.” Surprise and curiosity motivate the direction of the research, making these elements critical to the process and marking its departure from other types of reasoning (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012:27). Abductive reasoning is not so much a step-by-step linear tacking back and forth between puzzle and explanation. It often takes form of a spiral — circular reasoning going back and forth fluidly between puzzle and explanation as it moves to deeper levels of understanding.
and meaning (Bentz et al. 1998: 170). Abduction requires dynamism — being able to engage multiple pieces at once — and is ideal for interpretive ethnographic exploration of intersecting identities, oppressions, and forces. It is well suited to analyzing complex social relations and structures.

Abductive, interpretive research insists on contextuality and situatedness. This distinguishes abductive reasoning from positivist research — an interest in a particular puzzle, generated through a particular experience, as well as the generative role of the embodied researcher and researched. Situated lived experience, therefore, becomes a key aspect of abductive reasoning. Pre-developed concepts and hypotheses generated by theoretical literature often fail the researcher as they become more and more ensconced in the “life world” (Kvale 1983) of those she wishes to understand (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012: 28). The twists and turns that weave the multilayered tapestry of lived experience resist the neatly organized logic of both deduction and induction. Abductive reasoning allows for the exploration of puzzles that come from the field (ones that could not have been anticipated through encounters with theoretical literature alone), it allows for flexibility and dynamism, it adopts an unfolding nature of inquiry (rather than a “front-loading” hypothesis-testing model), it allows for continual learning throughout the entire span of the research, and it allows for a productive combination of empirics and theory.

Section 3: Methodological Considerations and Theoretical Perspectives
Constructivism

This dissertation is guided by a constructivist theoretical framework, in that it recognizes the importance of agency and structure and the role ideas, agency, language, rules, and norms play in the making and remaking of social reality. The agent-structure tension is examined throughout this work through the Lacanian dialectic between the science of subject and the phenomenal and is revisited in the concluding chapter. Constructivism allows the scholar to explore and show how ideas create, define, and transform international affairs; shape and constitute state identity and interests; and define and shape legitimate international action.

Feminist methodology

There are four feminist convictions that animate this dissertation: asking feminist questions, designed to be useful to the communities in which it operates, commitment to reflexivity, and an understanding of knowledge as emancipatory (see Tickner 2005). These convictions constitute a feminist responsibility premised on the desire to generate research useful to marginalized communities. These commitments undergird and frame this dissertation and allow for certain questions to be asked and taken-for-granted conventions to be examined. Throughout the history of politics, women's voice and experiences (similar to Indigenous experiences) have been trivialized and marginalized — deemed important only in relationship to men or the colonizer (see Tickner 2005 and Fanon 1961). Tickner (2005) suggests a Kuhnian paradigm shift where formerly marginalized groups (particularly she speaks of women) become the creators of knowledge will reveal “anomalies or observations that do not fit received theory” (7).
Data collected at margins

Focusing on the lived experiences of those at the margins is critical to understanding the operation of power through the security discourse. In order to have margins, there must be a center — a functioning center that is functional and seemingly unproblematic. Moving further away from the center, however, reveals ruptures and paradoxes that point to the deficiencies of the otherwise unproblematic center. No social group or individual can be located at the margins of any web of relations without there being another group or individual that has accumulated enough power to constitute and maintain a center. The unidirectional understanding of power tends to focus primarily on how power operates at the center. As a result, “scores of analysts have produced a naïve portrait of how international politics really (there's that tricky concept again) works” (Enloe 2004: 19). This is part of what Carol Cohn (2006) refers to as “studying up” (103).

The majority of interviews conducted on the reservation consisted of a particular group of Lakota living on the reservation, an area that consists of the most Lakota first language speakers on the reservation. It is also an area of high poverty and low employment. Similar to any population, there develops socially defined subcategories. Among the Lakota, three emerged: Wacisus (whites), Iyeskas (half-bloods who display "non-Indian behavior"), and fullblood/traditionals (or what was expressed to me as "Lakota"). This third category is the group most politically and economically isolated of the three on the reservation. Previously, the Reservation Agency (of the Bureau of Indian Affairs) was located on the edge of the reservation. This was where the government Wacisus were located — Wacisu translates to "taking
the fat' or the person who takes the good part of the meat. Lakota who commingled and interbred with previous European fur traders and *Wacisus* tended to be geographically closer to the Agency, causing many to associate the half of the reservation closest to the old Agency as being dominated by *Iyeskas*. The corner on the reservation farthest from the old Agency is where the communities I operated in are located. It was at the Agency where the US government would distribute resources (including food and health provisions). In line with an emphasis on studying at the "margins," it is important to focus on the fullblood/traditionals not only because of their historical disenfranchisement, but because of their unique experiences with the US settler colonial project (with many being direct descendants from survivors of the Wounded Knee Massacre), their ability to speak Lakota, and their familiarity with ancestral practices. They constitute a portion of the Lakota that many Lakota living outside of this area are attempting to preserve and learn from.

Selection for interviews developed and evolved throughout the fieldwork process. Throughout the fieldwork process, I had an intention on focusing on Lakota experiences and having a balance in terms of gender and age, though I did not specific individuals in mind to speak to beforehand. These contacts developed as my experiences evolved and my network expanded. I began with a very limited amount of interviews, primarily with my initial contacts, which then increased as my time on the reservation went on. My first points of contact were developed through the Bahá’í community who invited me to a few initial community events and meetings — this included a Keystone XL Pipeline community resistance/organizing meeting, an honoring ceremony, and a spiritual coming-of-age ceremony for girls. These events involved dozens of community members that I was able to speak to and arrange for
further conversations, visits, and eventually interviews. Many of those initial contacts were interviews multiple times as my relationships and understanding developed. In this manner, those interviewed were in many ways a reflection of my expressed desire to my initial contacts to learn from “the Lakota,” and my contact’s interpretations of that request. I also made contacts whom I interviewed through attending Tribal Council Meetings, visiting local vendors, and attending powwows. Because of the promises of anonymity I made to my respondents, I did not share the names of those I interviewed.11

Ethnographic sensibility and political ethnography

Ethnography poses challenges for the discipline of IR. The tension between a desire for parsimony and the “thick and rich” description of ethnography makes ethnography as disruptive and foreign to IR. Timothy Pachirat (2013) suggests,

Ethnography is the method that comes home to family reunions, with the new mermaid tattoo, with the purple hair, with yet another belly button ring, and with a moody melancholic artist for a girlfriend, at the dinner table she is method that interrupts her old brother’s descriptions of his stock portfolio, with tales of the last full moon party on Phi Island, in Thailand. Given that kind of unruliness, it's no wonder that the older siblings and father figures, and yes they are father figures of our discipline, revert to the language of discipline and harnessing ethnography, of bringing her wild and unruly impulses under control, by making her abide by the rules of the dinner table.

Ethnography can be founded upon interpretivist or positivist convictions. A positivist approach downplays or attempts to obscure the role of the ethnographer,
while an interpretivist approach sees the ethnographer as a productive and generative aspect of research. An interpretivist ethnography provides a bridge and dialectic between concepts (and the theories they comprise) and the practical realities of the social world. This requires the ethnographic researcher to be constantly aware of what Lee Ann Fujii (2010) refers to as “meta-data” — or verbal and nonverbal expressions about one’s feelings and inner thoughts, which they may not always articulate in interviews and responses.

It allows demands the researcher to be interested in a subject’s life world. It is the scholar’s responsibility to understand the “institutional context that shapes and distorts what happens in the lifeworld” (Burawoy 1991: 6). The “presentation of self in everyday life” presents “sign-vehicles” that convey the unspoken information about subjects and their environment (Goffman 1959). How sign-vehicles are expressed and interpreted take place within a social order, demanding the ethnographer to be attentive to the complexities of power. This requires the need for a multisite ethnography that adopts a composite methodology appropriate for each site.

Examining various spaces of analysis allow ethnographers to "follow the metaphor" in a manner that both flexible and insightful (Cohn 2006: 93).

Political ethnography pays particular attention to how individuals make sense of experiences with power and the political and emphasizes lived-experience, insider perspectives, and multiple, complex interpretations (Schatz 2009, Wedeen 2010, Pachirat 2011). It provides the ability to challenge boundaries and explore productive grey areas of the political and the operations of power — making it an ideal tool to explore and research marginalized populations (Scott 1985). A hallmark of political ethnography is its attention to power (both external and internal to the researcher-
subject relationship). Ethnography offers radical promise particularly suited for critical theorizing (Vrasti 2008).

An important aspect to this dissertation is a recognition of the “embodied nature of ethnographic research” (Pachirat 2009: 144). The ethnographer is a “conduit of research and a primary vehicle of knowledge production” (Shehata 2006: 246). An interpretive orientation towards knowledge is premised on meaning making and contextuality — in contrast to a priori theorizing and model specification and generalizability/universality (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow 2012: 48). This adherence to contextuality translates to the methodological dependency on “thick description” (Geertz 1973), thereby embedding meaning within a situated context. Being physically present in the communities of research combined with an interrogation and acknowledgement of the motivating forces of the researcher is of critical importance.

Ethnography in IR

With the change in the international structure with the ending of the Cold War, many IR projects looked to move beyond a state-centric focus to examine other sites of inquiry. Beier (2001) explains,

More recently, fieldwork has become more ethnographical in character and informants themselves have come to be of central interest to researchers. Activists, Indigenous people, migrant workers, and a host of others have been approached not only for reasons of what they know but also out of an interest in/appreciation for their often radically different ways of knowing. Critically inclined International Relations scholars, in particular, have sought by these investigations to unsettle many of the ontological and epistemological commitments of the orthodoxy of the discipline and, frequently, to advance some emancipatory project in the process. These investigations have thus
underwritten the epistemic enlargement of the field, making way, in turn, for ever more ethnographically-based projects (1).


Ethnography has had a much longer presence in Native American studies. Ethnography, as a primary tool for the cultural anthropologist, brought Indigenous communities around the world to European and American audiences and acted as a lead tool for cultural genocide (see Asad 1995, Wolfe 1999, Pratt 1992). As part of the global colonial moment, ethnography was anthropology’s favored tool and paved the way for global imperialism. Native scholars have engaged the practice of “writing back” as a means of challenging imperial, racist assumptions (Miller 2009). Susan A. Miller (2009) explains writing back,

Before a community can plan an effective decolonizing project, it must understand its situation, and a good way to understand a situation is to understand its origin. One purpose of writing back, therefore, is to provide Indigenous communities with historical narratives to explain their experiences of colonization (36).

Native scholars who engaged in this tradition of writing back particularly in the case of anthropology and ethnography (see Deloria 1969, Simpson 2007).

This dissertation takes inspiration from feminist scholars who emerged in the 1980s and 1990s who challenged scholars to “abandon the sterile and politically ignorant goals of the scientific method and, instead, turn to the study of real-life
experiences,” to focus on “grounded research rooted in situated knowledge, experience and immanent critique” (Vrasti 2008: 284). The work of Carol Cohn (1987) and Cynthia Enloe (1989, 2000) also significantly influence this dissertation by bringing into focus the importance of exploring meaning making within the everyday security arrangements. They both illustrated for me the potential and need for scholarship that “read[s] up the ladder of privilege,” to borrow from the phrase of Chandra T. Mohanty (2002: 511).

Stylistically, this dissertation models the writing of Ann A. Ferguson’s 2001 *Bad Boys*. Ferguson (2001) combines theory and ethnographic writing by pairing chapters with relevant field notes that describe particular scenarios from her fieldwork. These experiences are then explored through an examination of broader contexts and outside theoretical contributions, tacking back and forth to explicate seemingly banal occurrences. Ferguson (2001) does this to show how young African American students make meaning of punishment in their schools. This work is also inspired by Timothy Pachirat’s (2013) *Every Twelve Seconds*. *Every Twelve Seconds* explores the operations of power and the politics of sight by looking at the workings of an industrial slaughterhouse. Specifically, he explores how mass killing becomes normalized through bureaucracy, sanitation, and procedure and he does with the methodological choice of basing his inquiry within the US. By focusing on occurrences within the borders, Pachirat (2013) is able to create a critical opening to evaluate not only phenomena within the US, but also the larger hegemonic international order.
Section 4: Methods

The methodological and theoretical commitments explained above motivate the methods used to gather data. The methods of this dissertation include (1) participant observation, (2) ethnographic interviews, and (3) archival research. Before describing each of these, this section will discuss ethical considerations. It then concludes with a method table detailing the specifics of each method of data collection.

Ethical Considerations

A discussion of the ethical considerations takes on heightened importance when working with Indigenous peoples (see LT Smith 1999). Premised on the feminist convictions described above, the importance of evaluating the impact of this research among the population interviewed and written about is of utmost importance. As such, this dissertation went through two separate Institutional Review Boards (IRB’s), one formal (University of Delaware) and one informal (the Lakota Reservation’s Tribal Council approval).

The University of Delaware (UD) IRB required Human Subjects in Research training, as well as full disclosure of the benefits to the researcher and the potential harms that respondents could potentially face. These considerations were explicitly detailed out in the Informed Consent Form (See Appendix C). Each respondent was given a hard copy of the Informed Consent Form, which I then reviewed it with them and answered any additional questions. In the case of a few phone interviews, I emailed the consent forms in advance and then received verbal consent to conduct the
interview. The UD IRB was then updated on two separate occasions covering the span of this research.

A unique feature of my Informed Consent Form is an attached Media Consent Form that described the authorization of the use of media collected from the participant. This Media Consent Form was not used in a majority of the interviews and I told the respondents to not fill out this portion of the Form. The collection of media was limited to two Lakota individuals who consented to the capture and use of video. These individuals consented to their identities to be used and were already prominent figures within their communities. The media collected has been used at academic conferences and the consent of those individuals featured was obtained before presented. The media aspect featured in the Consent Form package represents a media portion of the dissertation that was ultimately omitted from the final dissertation and moved into a separate and ongoing media collaboration with various communities.

Prior to arriving in the reservation, I obtained an invitation to conduct the research and to speak to the Tribal Council by an enrolled member of the Tribe. Within the first week of the fieldwork, I sought permission to conduct this research and presented my proposal in front of the Tribal Council and the Lakota community present. This included submitting my full research proposal to the Council beforehand via email and hard copy given directly to the Tribal Chairman. While speaking in front of Tribal Council it had surfaced that the documents shared beforehand were not distributed to the Council Members, making the presentation and question and answer session lasting much longer and going into a fair amount of detail. In the proceedings, Council Members voiced their support and concerns for the proposed research. In support, a few members of Council spoke about how I had been in contact with them
and had already interacted with them and their respective communities over the week prior. They also mentioned that some had already interacted with me months earlier when I first visited the reservation for a brief weekend trip – this visit was the main bulk of the fieldwork, lasting three and a half months. Concerns were also voiced, including one Council Member sharing her concerns with my research theme of security and how the Tribe must be protective of information that could be seen as sensitive or leave the Tribe vulnerable in any manner. She was addressing any potential data security threats. Another Council Member voiced her concern with why I was seeking Tribal Consent in the first place, asserting only researchers conducting medical experiments have sought Council permission – I was the first social scientist conducting research on the reservation to seek Council permission. In response to this, I shared with and affirmed my research convictions and the importance of shared consent and, in so doing, other Council Members suggested my very presence in front of Tribal Council illustrated my commitment and respect for the Tribe. My request to conduct research was ultimately approve with no Council Members objecting (See Appendix D for Approval Memorandum). Tribal Council permission took place in spite of the fact that the Tribe had not yet been able to set up a Tribal IRB.

Participant observation and fieldwork

Fieldwork was conducted over a span of three years and includes five trips to a Lakota Sioux reservation in the western portion of South Dakota. The longest visit lasted a span of three months (with the others lasting one to two weeks), totaling over 600 hours of participant observation and forty-five semi-structured interviews, yielding nearly 70 hours of recorded interviews. The corpus of interviews is composed
of twenty-three women and twenty-two men, with a bell-curve-like age distribution from 18 to 75. All but four are enrolled members of the tribe — of the four, two held administrative positions within tribal governance and two were multi-year reservation residents. This work also relies on strategic member checking (conclusions and analysis are shared in draft form to select Lakota informants for feedback) and triangulation (the ensuring that empirical evidence is not repeated and confirmed by other informants).

Participant observation “is the study of people in their own time and space, in their own everyday lives” (Burawoy 1991: 2). It involves the studying of so-called subjects in their natural environments, rather than in laboratories or formalized interview settings. This method allows for insight into how people act and how they understand those actions. It allows for capturing of meta-data of experiences, aspects that may not always come out through direct conversation or interview. Additionally, it can also reveal dichotomies, enabling researchers to “juxtapose what people say they are up to against what they actually do” (Burawoy 1991: 2). At the heart of this method is the difference between understanding and explanation. Understanding is achieved through the immersive participation and through interaction and dialogue between communities and researchers within a social context. Explanation, in contrast, focuses on creating a connection between theory and data. Michael Burawoy et al. (1991) refer to this as the “hermeneutic dimension” versus the “scientific dimension” of social science (3). This included a structure of rigorous documentation and analysis protocols.
Taking field notes

Over the last four years I have spent many months on a Lakota reservation with one of the nine tribes in the state of South Dakota. My daily routine was time consuming and intellectually, emotionally, and spiritually challenging. Because the ethnographic researcher is generative of the data and analysis produced, I was forced to be ever-aware of emotional experiences and to foreground past life-experiences. Bringing my “full self,” while critical in writing jottings, field notes, and memos, was an exhausting and laborious task. Field notes involved daily writing about fieldwork experiences. This consisted of jottings, field notes, commentaries, and memos. In practice this translated to the daily writing of field notes, commentaries, and memos every evening, as well as, morning writing sessions reflecting further upon experiences and was motivated by a deep concern “about the quality of the relationships they develop with the people they seek to know and understand” (Emerson et al. 2011: 23). The following is more detail concerning the practices employed:

Jottings – Jottings are quick shorthand notes in field to document specific details. These happened throughout the day.

Field notes – Field notes are detailed paragraph-form written notes drawn from jottings and are more specific and full accounts of experiences. They were written immediately after leaving site and occurred daily or even multiple times a day. These also relied upon recorded audio taken during interviews and events.

Commentaries – Commentaries are more elaborate writings on a specific themes or end-of-the-day reflections and were, at times, within the field notes or comprising parts of the field notes. They took place either when writing or reviewing field notes and were aimed bring up other relevant experiences and themes found in outside literature and/or experiences. These provided the basis of memos and more polished writing.
Memos – Memos are polished writings on particular themes and draw from all items previously mentioned practices. They allow for the insertion and analysis of theoretical and empirical life and literature contributions. This served as the infield analysis to the field experiences and took place every few days or after particularly generative experiences.

These practices required a significant dedication and discipline, as every evening included hours of intellectual and emotional engagement with daily experiences. They required the vigilant taking of jottings in the field and to be in a constant state of keen observation and deep reflection.

Ethnographic interviews

Ethnographic interviews are interviews that draw from an ethnographic framework and foregrounding a subject’s experience and meaning making. Two ethnographic interview methods utilized throughout this dissertation are immersive interviews and Ordinary Language Interviews (OLI). Interviews are immersive when they recognize the importance of building familiarity over a period of time — when possible, repeating interviews as a relationship between the researcher and subject develops. An intimate familiarization with subjects over an extended period of time yields data that can only come from an ongoing relationship. Immersion based on genuine, long-term relationships requires recognition of the interdependence between researcher and subject. OLI allows the researcher to focus in on how subjects understand and utilize particular concepts and terminology. This occurs through utilizing open-ended questions about the definition and use of particular key concepts — in this case, security. This technique allows for alternative (and at times, contradictory) meanings to emerge.
OLI focuses on figuring out how people conceptualize, categorize, understands, and assume things about how they create their world. It allows for attention to language in use and reveal various meanings and deployment of concepts. This took the form of an intentionally open-ended first question to many of interviews: what are some of the security issues that are faced on the reservation? Attempting not to influence the respondent’s response, discussion would often move towards the asking what I meant by security and me allowing for them the space to answer that question. As informants became more and more familiar with me on the reservation and some of the themes I was focusing on, this became more and more difficult. At this point, insightful conversations came about when I informed repeat respondents about the OLI technique and my interest in understanding localized, community conceptualizations of security. Ultimately, ethnographic interviews are focused on the elucidation of meaning, aiming to understanding how subjects make sense of and interpret their experiences. In the field, this took the form of repeat interviews with many of the same questions over an extended period of time and with particular attention to how security is understood and employed. Ongoing conversations allowed space for emergent and nuanced readings of language use. My analysis throughout this dissertation was dependent on genuine relationships of trust built over time. OLI allowed this dissertation to focus on how Lakota individuals understand and utilize the concept of security by using open-ended questions to see how alternative and sometimes contradictory meanings emerged. These interviews allowed people to conceptualize, categorize, and describe how they have come to understand security.
Archival research

This work also involved archival research at various locations around the US, including the American Philosophical Society (Philadelphia, PA), the Oglala Lakota College Woksape Tipi Library (Kyle, SD), the Wounded Knee Museum (Wall, SD), and the National Museum of American Indian (Washington, D.C.). These archives provided diverse resources ranging from unpublished manuscripts, graduate theses/dissertations, and family photographs. This archival research was carried out with an ethnographic sensibility that focused on how people make meaning and construct their life-world.
Table 2  Methods Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Data Yielded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Community gatherings, community meetings, powwows, Tribal Council meetings, spiritual ceremonies (four various types), Keystone XL resistance groups, Carlisle Industrial Indian School, Pie Ospaye Spiritual Camps, daily routines, Angel Valley Retreat Center (location of 2010 sweat lodge deaths) conversations, Bigfoot Wounded Knee Memorial Ride, President Barack Obama Standing Rock visit, Smithsonian National Museum of American Indian (NMAI), family colt branding and horse training</td>
<td>Talk, social and communal understandings, attitudes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing</td>
<td>Lakota Sioux spiritual leaders, elders, community members, Tribal administrators, cultural specialist officers, young adults</td>
<td>Talk, attitudes, specific usage of language, specific understandings of concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archival, documents</td>
<td>Woksape Tipi Library at the Oglala Lakota College, SD; American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, PA; Eagle Butte Cultural Center; Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe Cultural Preservation Center; Pierre State Library; Wounded Knee Memorial, Wall, SD; Rapid City Public Library; Pierre Public Library; NMAI; the Holocaust Museum; Dakota Club Public Library</td>
<td>Written words, historical description, unpublished essays, photographs, family histories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 5: Concluding Thoughts

The various convictions and methods outlined throughout this chapter constitute a strong commitment to a researcher’s positionality and reflexivity. Being responsible to the community in which I work, as well as an awareness of the historical and presence forces of colonialism motivates the foregrounding of my
normative commitments. Ethical and moral concerns and convictions animate this work. As a result, this dissertation went through a Human Subject Research Protocol with the University of Delaware’s Institutional Review Board. In addition to this, I secured invitation by Lakota tribal members before beginning fieldwork and, immediately upon arrival, presented the proposed research to Tribal Council, receiving official permission to conduct the dissertation research on the reservation. Standing before the Tribal Council, it was noted by two Tribal Council members that no one has ever approached the Council for non-statistical or non-health related research purposes. Many outside researchers come onto the reservation without acknowledging the tribal authoritative structures and because I immediately sought this approval, I was permitted to conduct the research in spite of the fact that they had not yet established a defined social science institutional review board protocol.

Foregrounding philosophical convictions and methodological considerations is essential to the feminist and indigenous commitments that animate this dissertation. The intersections of colonialism, security, and militarization create troubling paradoxes that are layered and complex. A multi-methods approach premised on how subjects make meaning, therefore, is essential in this works conclusions and findings. This chapter looked at four motivating aspects to this dissertation. This included my place in the academic project, philosophical foundations, methodological considerations and theoretical perspectives, and methods.
ENDNOTES

1 I use “Third World” to gesture to difference created within a colonial context. Chandra Mohanty (2003) refers to this as “Third World Difference.”

2 There are similar experiences with Natives and Filipinos. Rosier (2010) explains, “The United States has practiced imperialism since its founding, that America as a particular geography was constructed by force rather than conceived by ideological notions such as manifest destiny, an that its imperial expansion in what became the American West shaped U.S. soldiers’ and officials’ subsequent engagement with new peoples on new global frontiers – ‘Indian country’ migrating westward to the Philippines and beyond” (3).

3 For a detailed overview of decolonial alliances see Scott Morgensen’s (2014) essay in Decolonization entitled “White Settlers and Indigenous Solidarity.”

4 Salo (2010) explores the importance of foregrounding difference within critical ethnography traditions in Africa, arguing for detailed ethnographic work and feminist positionality. Salo (2010) asserts the need for “a more complex, transdisciplinary methodological approach in order to excavate the complex multi-contextual aspects of debates about diversity that inform the debate on human rights” (102).

5 I say this figuratively, I was not officially adopted into the family through ceremony and am not claiming adoption, but was told through conversation this convention by the elder I was staying with. She then told me that I’m an uncle to her grandkids and that’s why I can stay at the home.

6 It is difficult to get an exact number of Bahá’ís of Indigenous background in the US, though in the 1960’s and 1970’s in Canada, First Nations Canadians constituted between one-quarter and one-third (and even estimates of up to half) of Canadian Bahá’í membership (Horton 2005: 91 and conversation with Roshan Danesh April 5, 2016). Indigenous people have influenced American Bahá’í communities. For example, the US the governing body of the Bahá’í faith is the US National Spiritual Assembly. Being comprised of nine democratically elected members, this body has included Natives, specifically Lakota Sioux women, for over two decades: first Patricia Locke (1993-2001) and Jacqueline Left Hand Bull (2002-present). Additionally, one of the current members of the Canadian National Spiritual Assembly
is also Sioux, Chairperson Deloria Bighorn. As of early March 2016, there listed roughly 2,000 enrolled members who signified themselves as American Indian or Alaskan Native on the membership rolls of the continental 48 states (Conversation with Membership and Records at US Baha’i National Center). This, however, is vastly incomplete, with nearly half of the records not having filled out a race designation, though it is fair to say that there are thousands of Native American Baha’is.

7 Closely associated with ontology, and of particular relevance to Indigenous peoples, is cosmology. Ontology is the focus on what the world is made of, where as cosmology is on how the world came into existence. Cosmology also influences what type of knowledge can be produced.

8 To clarify the distinction between mind-world dualism and mind-world monism, the former "maintains a separation between researcher and world such that research has to be directed toward properly crossing that gap, and valid knowledge must in the end be related to some sort of accurate correspondence between empirical and theoretical propositions on the one hand and the actual character of a min-independent world on the other," while the latter suggests "the researcher is a part of the world in such a way that speaking of ‘the world’ as divorced from the activities of making sense of the world is literally nonsensical: ‘world’ is endogenous to social practices of knowledge-production is in no sense a simple description or recording of already-existing stable worldly objects” (Jackson 2011: 35-36).

9 One important aspect about IR feminism is that there is no singular feminism or feminist theory; rather, by design, it is multiple and complex (Grant 1993). To get a sense of this complexity, its important to describe the multiple waves of feminism and how each have theorized the military and military service. An early first wave of feminism starting in the nineteenth century primarily focused on woman’s equality, primarily through suffrage and obtaining a “seat at the table.” This also included feminist theorists who explored the notion of civic virtue and military service (Wollstonecraft 1792). A second wave started in the 1960’s with feminist theorists focusing on inequality and injustice. It was premised on the claim that women have distinct experiences that have been left out of theorizing the political. Particular standpoints produced through unique identities are necessary, therefore, for the basis of new and useful theorizing. This was the time right wing, radical, and Marxist feminism emerged, all offering various critiques of military service and citizenship. Feminist theorists began to question the roles of masculinity and warfare (Elshtain 1987, Enloe 1983). A third wave of feminism emerged in the 1990’s from feminist scholars who realized that a “seat at the table” did not mean a seat for everyone. Scholars from diverse backgrounds identified the limitations of previous feminist scholarship, stemming from the experiences of women from white upper class
backgrounds. Feminist scholarship pushed at the structural inequalities and interrogated the long-standing systemic imbalances throughout both the academy and the larger society. Feminism is “neither just about women, nor the addition of women to male-stream constructions; it is about transforming ways of being and knowing” (Peterson 1992: 205).

10 This is derived from an interview with Lucas on May 1, 2016. Iyeska is often used in a pejorative manner, though the notion of half-blood is not inherently derogatory — one can be a half-blood and not be an Iyeska. An Iyeska is a person who acts non-Indian or favors non-Indians.

11 This also compelled me to be very conscious of my social media presence, particularly Facebook. Much of the community communicates on Facebook, this includes elders as well as youth. As a result, I did not allow for any messages and pictures to show up on my public profile feed and I also changed my profile settings prevent users to view non-mutual friends. Similar to any small community, news about who is associating with whom travels quickly. This made it necessary to be hyper-aware of who I was associating with and how I was potentially being perceived. Practically, this took the form of avoiding locations where individuals were consuming alcohol or visiting bars, associating primarily (in public) with men, and being very conscious of my interactions with young women. Wearing a wedding ring and having my wife visit on multiple occasions also helped. Simply, I had to be constantly aware of how my conduct and person was being perceived. Towards the end of my first long fieldwork period, a female elder had told me that she had been watching me and observing how I conduct myself – certainly she was not the only one.
Chapter 4
LAKOTA LIVED EXPERIENCES AND SECURITY

Field Note: Healing Through Traditions

The powwow is being held in a small community consisting of roughly thirty houses and one general-item corner store. The federally created houses possess little uniqueness, as all are similar in appearance — single story, rectangular homes with no garages surrounded by a small yard. The houses are in a moderate state of disrepair with visible peeling paint, rusted chain-link fences, a few boarded windows, and cracked cement streets. Most are in a small cluster on three streets, while a handful of others are spread out over multiple acres. The three streets branch off perpendicularly from the main road coming into town, two on the left and one on the right. This little village is similar to many communities on the reservation — consisting of drab cluster housing, a few connecting streets, no sidewalks, a community center, and a nearby powwow grounds. For months, the powwow grounds lays relatively unused and overgrown (or snow-covered), with the exception of the one weekend a year where it fills with drumming, colorful dancers, and visitors from far and wide. "Cluster homes are a form of genocide, that’s America's way of doing it," a Lakota man tells me as we stand watching horse races in the fields next to the powwow grounds.¹ He continues,
"Cluster housing isolated us Indians into places with no businesses or stores… they turned us into a lazy man, unable to take care of ourselves."

Most of the villages are located on or near riverbeds, where the land dips to more arable flat land. The environment down here differs significantly from what is faced on the open prairies where the wind, unhampered by trees, bushes, or cliffs, is relentless. The cliffs that give way to the riverbed gives the village protection from the wind and oftentimes tornados that torment the region during the spring. Entering into the community, the landscape drops to the grassy tree-filled riverbed.

The powwow grounds immediately stand out — a ring of parked cars surrounds its white wooden structure, donned with twenty-plus American flags fluttering in the breeze. The parking area is not roped off (nor formally organized) and is sprinkled with tents, horse trailers, and RV homes. Emanating from the center is drumming, singing, and the general roar of celebration. I feel like I am approaching an anachronistic medieval arena — a wooden circular stadium draped with an extraordinary number of flags rippling in the wind, filled with the sound of celebratory roars and chest penetrating beating of drumming. As I get closer, the surrounding hills, the increasing beat of the drum, and the sounds of celebration envelop me.

In the center of the grassy area is an island of flags and staffs. The overall diameter of the structure is roughly twenty yards and four flags and three staffs surround the middle tall veteran’s flag. Each staff represents something different: the American Indian Movement (AIM) staff, a ‘home’ Wacipi family staff of the hosting village, and an American Legion staff. Made from wood, they raise about six feet high
then curl forward and downward, similar to a candy cane or curled walking cane. The upper portion of the AIM staff, which is nearest to me, is wrapped in leather and from it hangs a small fur tail, feathers, and leather straps. Joining the staffs in the middle are a Prisoner of War (POW) / Missing in Action (MIA) flag; an American Legion Post flag; a black and red “American Fallen Heroes, Killed in Action, Freedom is Not Free” flag; and a US Marines flag. Flags are raised in the morning and then taken down at the end of the afternoon session. Nearly two hundred people are in and around the stands, most of whom are standing with their hats in their hands. A few stand at attention, saluting. Elder men and women, as well as a handful of children, remain seated in their portable folding chairs and on the wooden benches. The playing drummers are also seated and are singing in Lakota.

The wooden stadium seating consists of benches with clearings about every thirty feet. These are areas where the benches end and small clearing are cordoned off for various drum groups. Drumming groups typically consist of at least four men (sometimes up to a dozen) who sit around a large circular drum, each utilizing a single drumstick while chanting and singing. Their role is critical to the celebration because they provide music and motivation for the dancers and keep the atmosphere both celebratory and reverent.

The powwow offers a present-day representation and expression of Lakota traditions and culture. The term powwow originates from the Algonquin word pauau or pauwau, referring to gathering spiritual leaders and medicine men. A powwow, or wacipi in Lakota, generally involves cultural and religious ceremonies, traditional
dance and song, community honorings and announcements, and large shared feasts. Powwows and spiritual gatherings traditionally played a critical social and cultural function. The *Oceti Sakowin*, or the seven council fires (or bands/tribes) of the Lakota Sioux, are historically nomadic peoples that would use spiritual gatherings as a way to communicate and coordinate amongst bands. Large family structures, known as the *tiospaye*, would coordinate times throughout the summer to gather, pray, and celebrate.² Spiritual gatherings were outlawed by the US government when the Lakota were forced onto reservations in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Traditionally, winter camps would bring *tiospayes* together and when they would break up for the summer hunting seasons, spiritual gatherings would be arranged throughout the season to bring everyone back together in the same space. Many things would happen at these spiritual gatherings, including marriages, honoring ceremonies, healings, shows of gratitude for bountiful hunts or harvests, and forgiveness ceremonies.³

It was within this context that powwows emerged, carrying on many of the same practices and functions of spiritual gatherings. The powwow is a self- and community-affirming cultural practice that can last for multiple days. Powwows originally served as community celebrations and eventually broadened and opened up for multi-tribe participation in the early twentieth century. Community dancing takes the form of prayer, allowing the powwow to function as a means of unity, prayer, ceremony, and celebration.⁴ These celebrations are multi-generational affairs involving the entire community. The powwow played a significant role in cultural
preservation, continuance, self-affirmation, and resistance and still holds this function today.

Looking around the audience I see many families of various ages — ranging from little kids who are running around the outer walking area playing with plastic guns to elders who have strategically placed their fold-up chairs in front of the stands, ensuring optimal viewing. Sprinkled among the crowd are dancers in various stages of dance-readiness. A few sit wearing full regalia, ready to take center stage at any moment, while others share snacks with family members, donning lower body regalia and t-shirts. “We have a code talker’s flag in the middle today,” comes over the loud speaker — the MC is an older Lakota male. “It’s important we honor our warriors from the bottom of our hearts, that we recognize their sacrifice.” The kids continue to run around near the fry bread and hotdog stands, carrying plastic handguns and rifles.

The environment is very welcoming and, in contrast to other festivals I have attended, there is no entrance fee. In further contrast, powwow attendees are actually fed breakfast, lunch, and dinner free of charge. “You will never go hungry during powwow season,” I remember a Lakota friend telling me after I asked if I should be packing food for the weekend event. To get to the main grounds, I navigate the narrow passages of parked cars and vendor stands that create a ring closest to the wooden structure.

The drumming comes to an end and the dancers move out of the center circle. One family begins to gather at one end of the grounds, near the MC booth. An elder male comes forward and addresses the crowd, “With the conflict of 1877, as will all
our histories of conflicts that our people went through, because our history is spoken and oral in nature, it feels like it happened yesterday.” The group of people are from the Nez Perce tribe from the Northwest and Canada. “One hundred and thirty-seven years ago our people, the Nez Perce, were in a time of need and your people, the Lakota, came to our aid,” the elder, who turned out to be the Tribal Chairman and descendent of those original people who fled to the Lakota.

In 1877, the US Army sought to enforce the removal of the Nez Perce from their ancestral homeland in the Pacific northwest to reservations in Idaho. The Nez Perce resisted and battled the Army for months. “My great-grandmother was carrying my grandmother on her side and when they got to an Assiniboine village where they were received,” the elder spoke through the loud mic, “They said we will feed you and hide you here and they took our weapons… We thought that we finally found some allies.” He paused for a moment, and then continued, “In the morning, we were told to come out and eat and when we did our men were slaughtered, murdered at point blank range. My great grandfather fell, one of the first ones, some of the women were captured and others escaped.” Decimated by the US Army and narrowly escaping the Assiniboine, the Nez Perce fled north to seek assistance. When they came upon Sitting Bull’s band of the Lakota, they were taken in and provided safety. This was one year after the Battle of Little Bighorn and Sitting Bull was in Canada avoiding the US Army. “The story goes to say that when spring broke, they helped them to get back to their country and now today we have come here to bring gifts and say thank you, to you, to each and every one of you,” the Chairman explains and everyone sits quietly
listening. “You are the people of Sitting Bull, you are the ones that helped us,” cries of “LeLeLeLe” come from women in the crowd. “Your grandfathers and great grandfathers and grandmothers, we come here today to honor your people, to say thank you.”

The Nez Perce were here to honor the Lakota with a giveaway of blankets and handmade items. “Our people have tried to survive, to keep our land,” says the man, “We had to flee, but we’re still here.” They then ask for a male and female elder to come forward from the crowd so they can bestow upon them a quilted blanket. Two elders move towards the center and the Chairman, along with two women, meet them and shake their hands. The two women wrap a blanket over the elders’ shoulders. The audience around the circle sit attentively watching the honoring. At this point, the MC from the booth calls for everyone to come into the circle and shake the hands of the Nez Perce. People get up and one of the drum groups begins to play. Those in the audience move into the circle and create a line that wraps all the way around the circle. Those in line begin to march, a slight two-step bouncing to the beats of the drums. Every minute or so, the drums move to a crescendo and everyone in line faces the center and raise both hands in the air. A handful of dancers in line have tears in their eyes. I feel my heart racing and goose bumps rising on my arms — the emotion is palpable and the atmosphere is electric.

The drums die down and people begin to sit back down. The Nez Perce elders sit down on chairs near the MC booth while other family members sit and stand near those elders. A young lady in her late 20’s moves forward with the microphone and
begins telling a story. Her voice is low and shaky recount a battle with the US Army where many Nez Perce were killed, including one of her family members. Her voice begins to crack as she’s recounting the event. As she is fighting through the tears falling down her cheeks, she tells of a nine-year-old girl in her family that was lost during the battle. As they fled, they came to the Lakota to take shelter and were taken in.

Wiping tears from her eyes, the young lady takes a deep breath. “This took place August 9th, 1877 and now to honor our lost family member, we will give a shawl to a nine-year-old here,” she says. She asks for a nine-year-old girl to come forward. A few little girls start moving forward towards the family and a handful of Nez Perce female elders meet them. The young lady, along with the elders wrap a shawl around the little girl. They all wipe back tears.

The Tribal Chairman holds the mic while the wrapping of the shawl is taking place, “I was fortunate to be able to visit with my grandparents who were able to be a part of the conflict and the aftermath, but also to recount the things that happened and how we came to be today that resulted in our people still being separated — this requires healing, today to yesterday, yesterday to today, and we started the healing process again.” A silence settles over the grounds and then the MC in the booth speaks over the speakers. “We cannot forget the things that occurred among us at the hand of the white people and how it has made you and I, it’s an honor today to welcome today our relatives from the mountains.”
The little girl returns back to her family and the Nez Perce stand facing the crowd. “Their stories teach us who we are… they teach us that we have a history of compassion and respect… You are the people of Sitting Bull, you are the ones that help them.” A few cries of Le-Le-Le-Le come out of the crowd. “They come here today to honor our people, to say thank you…. We have a ceremony over here today to let them know that we’re no different from our grandfathers and grandmothers — our doors will always be open, our hearts will always be filled with compassion.”
This chapter explores the Lakota lived experience through exploring interviews and experiences collected while conducting fieldwork. It provides greater detail to the fieldwork process, Lakota understandings of security, and fieldwork observations. This chapter provides empirical data to support the theoretical and analytical claims of this dissertation.

The Lakota interviewed understand security in ways that do not fit neatly into widely accepted conceptualizations of security within IR. Interviews and conversations often turned to the importance of traditions, lost and regained, and responses did not cite material security (issues such as policing, military might, and border protection). This is particularly surprising when understood within the context of a long historical engagement with the US military (including numerous hostilities with the US military, the FBI, and CIA), limited political representation, and reservation-wide high rates of poverty, unemployment, suicide, domestic violence, and substance abuse. Given these historical realities of the Lakota of having gone through the worst excesses of colonialism and genocide, viewing security as being intimately tied to traditions is surprising, yet understandable.

Linking security to traditions is understandable when seen through a different: the Lakota have made it through the most horrific events imaginable and have come out alive, not because of military supremacy, diplomatic prowess, or unlimited material resources, but because of strong traditional values. There was something that not only gave them strength to persevere but was also worth surviving for and protecting. Lakota traditional ways of being were and are so dramatically different from the dominating Euro-American philosophical framework — in terms of cosmology, ontology, epistemology, etc. — that its preservation and protection was,
and continues to be, ever-more-so significant to the study of security and the engagement of ongoing colonial structures.

This chapter explores and cites direct fieldwork experiences that act as the foundation for this dissertation’s analysis and theoretical contributions. Drawing upon interviews and participant observation, it is separated into five sections: fieldwork process, asking questions, Lakota responses, a review of particular observations and experiences that reinforced analytical findings, and concluding thoughts.

**Section 1: Fieldwork process**

Half of the time in the field was spent sleeping in a tent in one of the villages on the reservation or at a powwow or ceremony grounds, while the other half I stayed in a home in the largest town on the reservation. The main town has a population of 1,300 people. Every morning started with a writing and reflection session, re-combing over my notes and experiences and writing down all my thoughts that came through a night’s sleep. This typically allowed for more insight following an evening writing session. After morning writing, I would then send out text messages and make phone calls to confirm and make plans to visit with folks throughout the reservation. This was the beginning of a full day of visiting with people and taking part in community activities. All the while, this involved constantly writing jottings — short hand notes — throughout the day. These jottings were then read over and written down every night in full sentence form through field notes and more elaborate commentaries and memos.
Evening writing would last, at times, while other nights just enough to convert the jottings to field notes. This required diligence and commitment — not allowing myself to go to sleep after long days without writing field notes. The outcome was over a total of three hundred, single-spaced pages notes and over sixty interviews with forty-five people. This was the beginning of the process of pouring over these notes and interviews, writing, connecting fieldwork experiences to pre-existing theoretical contributions (from both NAS and IR) and then placing them back into the context of experience, and then checking back in with select informants with the sharing of drafts.

Section 2: Asking questions

The main question that I would ask during an interview was about individual understandings of security. Because they were semi-structured and, taking place within developed and ongoing relationships, the wordings of questions would differ slightly. The main question though would stay the same:

What does security mean to you?

After just two or three interviews, it became clear that this wording of the main question was met with confusion, sparking lengthy conversations about what I meant by security and how broad that concept is. I decided to alter my initial question slightly to reflect this reality. Variations included:
What do you think of when I ask you about security and insecurity?

When I say security or insecurity, what first comes to your mind?

If I were to ask you about security on the reservation, what comes to your mind first?

Other attempts to avoid confusion were to inform interviewees a bit more about the OLI technique and then ask the question. Such as:

I am interested in how people on the reservation understand particular concepts, which has led me to asking others about how they understand security. It's been interesting to see how security can come to mean so many things. What do you think of when I ask you about security?

My follow-up questions would be looking at examples of what their initial responses were. Questions such as:

What are some of the security concerns on the reservation or with the Lakota community?

Do you see some of these security issues on the reservation?

After getting initial responses to these questions, I would then either ask them further questions about themes they brought up or experiences or puzzles I have encountered. Over time, many of these interviews turned into ongoing conversations taking place at home visits, while driving from one location to another in the car, at powwows, at community events, or ceremonies. Many of these later conversations were not structured interviews and were much more specific to experiences or insights that particular person could provide.
At one point, a respected female Lakota elder told me that I should change the wording of my questions from asking people about security to asking people about safety. She explained, “That kind of security, with the police and things like that was not what you were talking about, you were talking more about how safe I feel and there’s a big difference.” Taking her feedback into account, I added an extra question which I asked after my first few questions:

What are some of the safety concerns on the reservation?

The terms safety and security overlap each other in some ways and can differ in others. This ultimately did not effect significantly the information gathered from the interviews, as each interview guided and informed my daily participant observation and would lead me to new areas of theoretical insight. Interviews would guide daily inquiries and follow-up interviews.

This research was conducted with an ethnographic sensibility that refused partitioning interviews from participant observation. Aside from audio recording the semi-structured interviews, which I later transcribed, I also wrote up field notes concerning each interview experience — the ethnographic sensibility that animated participant observation was never suspended. This approach to field research illuminates the process of conducting ethnographic field research defined by an abductive research logic.

Section 3: Lakota responses
There were a wide range of answers to initial questions trying to get at how security is understood. Answers ranged from individuals speaking about treaties and land, prejudice faced off the reservation, a lack of employment and other opportunities, the rampant nature of sexual violence, poor education, limited policing, to the danger of marauding dogs. The most recurrent answer, however, dealt with the loss or moving away from a traditional or spiritual foundation. For instance, one middle-aged mother who has lived on and off the reservation tells me,

My first thought, my first reaction is, those who have a foundation, a spiritual foundation have security. Or understand it, feel it, seek it out, but when you don’t have that base, a spiritual foundation or base, it really leads to a lot of insecurities … a spiritual foundation needed to have security or to understand it, but without a base then it leads to many issues.7

A spiritual or traditional foundation provides a base which leads to security. She went on discussing traditions in terms of the development of a child,

It is kind of like that lost child syndrome. Mistrust, they don’t trust people. That’s just my observation [having lived on and off the reservation]. Then I come home and interact with the different relatives and friends and stuff… those who have the Christian foundation or a Lakota tradition base, or the Baha’i faith, there is some kind of faith as a foundation, they seem to be less insecure or more secure.8

Another young mother also immediately moves towards traditional understandings of security through community. She answers,
Safety from what? I feel more safe here than the cities. Are you talking about medically? I have people here that I can trust, that makes me secure.\textsuperscript{9}

Strong family ties and the tight nature of Lakota communities (direct families and adopted extended families) provide a sense of security. She goes on to describe her perception of insecurity found outside the reservation — particularly a commercial society that emphasizes materialism, money, and greed. She continues,

I get sad when I think of the impact America has had globally. I live in America and I'm scared, I couldn't imagine how other people would feel in different countries…. I don’t want a world of judgment. I don’t want a world based on money, of paying bills. I want a world of love, compassion and care.\textsuperscript{10}

Another example is when I spoke to a man in his 50’s after a community ceremony. He had overheard a conversation I had between me and another respondent and he approached and told me,

There would be no need for security if the world was living in a spiritual way… If everyone were prayerful there would be no need for protecting yourself in terms of that security.\textsuperscript{11}

On another occasion, a female elder when asked about what she thinks about security on the reservation, responded,

You must be looking only at men then, if you want to learn about insecurity you must study men. You see, we're a matriarchal culture, outside there, they are patriarchal. Here, we’re traditionally [a place
where] women are in charge … it’s much like racism, it is not our problem, it is the dominant culture’s [problem]. Our traditional ways are very different.¹²

Reclaiming and reviving the traditional roles of women play a significant role in creating a balanced society. She then told me about the importance of traditions,

If you have the opportunity to go back to where your grandparents and great grandparents grew up and you had the opportunity to learn how they lived, what they did, what they ate, and what their way of life was like, how they prayed. Then you’d know … It [tradition] fills in the gaps, its like the jar where a person puts rocks in and then thinks its full and then puts sand in [and realizes there more space], that’s how it is, there are those spots inside of everyone.¹³

Not only do traditions “fill in the gaps” and provide individuals with a foundation, but she continues and tells me that there is a physical aspect to this as well,

And when you begin to understand where you come from, then you can go anywhere in the world because you know who you are … to know who you are, who I am, is to fill those spaces … I can still go out in the world, if I wanted to go out and live in New York City or Hong Kong I could go. But I would go as who I am, not as who I try to be and that’s what I wanted for my children and my grandchildren, who they are — that’s what it [security] means to me.¹⁴

Responses to further questions

As interviews continued, more was revealed about the importance of traditions in relation to security. Two different elders responded,
When you don’t know who you are and, worse, when you don’t care, then you won’t have responsibility toward the future.\footnote{15}

If we enforced our culture and our tradition into our children, a lot of the gang related activities, the drug activities and the alcohol activities, I think will diminish. They call each other niggas and all that, we’re not no [sic] other nationality, we’re Native Americans — we’re Lakota. There were [traditional] societies, like the Kit Fox society, there were women’s society like the Dog Soldier society… men had a role to play and the women had roles. There’s a ceremony when you’re going into womanhood, there’s a ceremony to wear feathers and to wear their wasere… they are taught at a young age how to take care of themselves, how to take care of the things around a home.\footnote{16}

Traditions gave an orientation for the future, as well as creating a sense of self through the establishing of family and social roles.

Traditions are seen as a way to create resiliency and fortitude, providing people the tools to make it through challenging times. Two Lakota women told me,

Our Lakota religion, or they always call it the Red Road, dad prayed with a pipe and he would Umblecha — you know, fast on a hill and put tobacco ties out … They had to do it in secret, it was outlawed for them to practice our religion … That is what they tried to kill, but didn’t success and now it’s coming back … To know that we have the pipe [the covenant brought forth by the Sacred White Buffalo Calf Lady], that you know what the meaning of a pipe is … I think that would really help us to regain our Lakota culture, tradition, that would change a lot of our ways, in a positive way. That way, our future generation would have something to look forward to, something to fall back on — say they get into a predicament and they don’t know what to do, they can rely back on their upbringing or what they were taught, our Lakota ways.\footnote{17}

If you are going to be angry at the Christian people once you figure out that they wanted to eradicate our culture … Then you are going to be angry about that and maybe not bring up your children in the Christian way … so then you have grown up without those Lakota traditional teachings and are so far removed from your Native relatives that you no
longer instill those [Lakota traditions] into your children. I’m talking about those children, [children] without a foundation — later on in life, you see them really struggling. If you don’t have a foundation, what can you build on? There has to be something, something that gives you an inner peace, I don’t care what it is.  

Traditions also provide a means for healing, for finding balance through tumultuous times. Two respected elders, one female and the other male, explain,

I think about how I was brought up and the situation I'm in now [sister going through hardships] , I'm praying a lot and I had my sister with me and I was telling her lets do this [ceremony] and do this [traditional practice], trying to get her to come back into the circle. To come back into that life, that circle of life … Yes, lets pray she’d say. On our drive in … I would pray with her and I’d say, remember what mom and dad used to say? … Just reflecting and having her remember things I think is going to help her, I told her we was going to the Sun Dance.  

There is still a need to hang on to these traditional teachings. I met with some people yesterday and they have casinos, they have revenue flow. They have oil production, they have natural resources. They have royalties. But with that they have more problems. They have to have some kind of way to control that and to prevent losing their ways … so they have more resources and benefits but a lot more responsibility in educating their people so that they learn, make a stand, make a statement.  

This was also connected to balance and reconnecting the hoop. Three separate elders, a woman and two men, told me,

[My husband’s] Great Grandmother tells a story of her dad and brother being killed at Wounded Knee. After, they ran back to [the village] and when they got back so much had changed so fast. This was the last resistance in the Indian Wars and now the children were being taken to
schools, families were being torn apart, and those keeping traditions were ridiculed — this was when the hoop was broken.21

Out there we’re just existing, chasing dollars — Big cities, east and west coast. Traditional living is what we are doing here. In this material world we’re existing, we’re not living. The old man and the old lady living over there [in the rural area of the reservation], they are living. They don’t have to chase that clock and that calendar, that dollar. But that’s the system, some people understand it where they don’t want anything to do with it, while others are chasing that and all they are getting is nothing … That’s where I know there is no balance — emotional balance, intellectual balance, the physical balance, spiritual balance.22

A long time ago, in the pre-reservation days, they had their own system of governance and organization. They were quite dependent on individuals rising and performing altruistic and self-abnegating acts of service for the people. These different groups would organize and form societies … and have other functions as well. They have the custom of periodically hosting feasts, they consider it a privilege to be able to perform these acts of service so then in gratitude of privilege they will invite people and have a feast and have their own unique presentation and music … the hoop, which you know is the ubiquitous and pervasive archetype, it’s a global archetype — for all peoples on the planet that shape represents unity, harmony, beauty, balance, perfection, all of these things. In other words, it is a sign of God on earth, the sign of the circle. In Paris Talks, Ábdu’l-Bahá says that Baha’u’llah has drawn the circle of unity, he has made a design for the well-being of mankind … It is a shape in which there is no corners, there is no dark place, there is no back row, there is no third or second row, its all front row. In a way it represents everything included, totality, it has no beginning and no end. In many ways it’s the most mystical and spiritual of all the shapes, it invokes the sacred. This is what the hoop is all about, it represents well-being … it is all about restoring well-being, restoring physical well-being, restoring emotional, mental, and, of course spiritual, well-being. And it is not just individually but collectively, it’s about restoring collective well-being.23

The importance of balance not only has an individual and collective aspect to it, but it also engages the larger society — it is not for the Lakota alone, but for all
those cultures that interact and can learn from the Lakota. The same male elder cited in the previous quotation, a well respected Lakota who others inform me is the most traveled Lakota (and not hyperbolically), explains,

All these different designs, they are symbolic of the change of seasons but then again if they are only to represent that they are meaningless, the real meaning of springtime is it’s a metaphor for the spiritual awakening of mankind, of course individually but now collectively. The designs represent the power that we can create when we work together, we create patterns of unity. Now we are building new shapes of human society, in the past the people here they only knew each other, it was all just Lakota people. But now we realize that we have to all begin to work together.24

Understanding why there has been a separation from traditional ways and how those self-affirming cultural practices are coming back were also spoken about. A young mother and a female elder explain,

You just never know at what point people get their growth stunted…what happened to cause them to deny their native identity. It could be that when they grew up … they were never taught about their way, they were told their ways were evil, the ways of the devil. That was part of the whole appropriation and assimilation process — the ways of the Red Man were bad. I never bought into that and never agreed because I looked at my relatives and they were the best, most kindest people I know. Yes, maybe they are struggling with alcoholism, but when they are sober and when they are of a clean and clear mind, they are the kindest, most generous people I know, I didn’t buy into that. Then people that are very traditional, like full bloods, who have come from ancestors that have held strong and they might be descendants from Sitting Bull or the Oglala people, they have this amazing family connection with Crazy Horse or American Horse, all these really famous chiefs, that’s the spirit of these war chiefs and it still runs strong in their families. You have those traditional full blood
people who really are fighting and watching to preserve their culture and those who recognize the importance of traditions, which is awesome.\textsuperscript{25}

There has been [a cultural renaissance]. I think what I told you was that when I was growing up there wasn’t anything culture … The ceremonies were underground, we didn’t hear about them, or at least where I grew up I didn’t hear about them. It wasn’t until the American Indian Movement, because the black movement had started before that and then the American Indian Movement started and all of a sudden there was an awakening. The things that were underground started coming up again. Even the beadwork was different when things started back up, it was very, quillwork, simple designs, no meaning behind them. [So even the beadwork was suppressed?] Everything thing was suppressed and then as people started researching, talking to their old people, things started coming out of trunks. Things that were underground that hadn’t been sold or stolen came up, came out and a lot of knowledge started coming back. Then in the 70’s when they passed the Indian Freedom of Religion Act, then legally we could do it, we could do ceremony. Since then, the last forty-five years there has been a huge comeback.\textsuperscript{26}

\textit{Section 4: Observations and experiences}

In addition to sitting down and conducting semi-structured interviews, experiences on the reservation also revealed a connection between security and traditional ways. Most memorable were the handful of relationships I was able to build with elders who had once struggled with substance abuse and self-destructive behavior. These elders, now well-respected members of their community, had recounted their journey of treatment and self-discovery. Invariably, it involved the (re)finding of traditional ways. Every case, this involved an older mentor figure who spent time with them and taught them the traditional ways. Self-affirmative cultural practices (of ceremony, learning traditional ways and language, and gaining deeper
understandings of traditional community and social roles) were all common aspects of getting their life back in balance — back onto what they referred to as the Red Road. The Red Road was the path which involves spirituality and honest living, while the Black Road refers to a path of materialism, greed, anger, and abuse.

On one instance, while cleaning dishes and straightening up after a community event in a small village, Veronica, a grandmother of nine, community leader, and a fairly prominent person in her church, recounted her finding of balance in her life. Veronica explained, “I went through treatment I had the opportunity to look at all the past hurts… then I met an older gentleman who became my mentor and taught me about our old ways of prayer and taught me about things … he taught me to listen… he said, you have to remember no matter where you are, you are always representing all of our tribe — we represent not just your family but you represent the Lakota woman and who she is, so be proud of who you are.” This conversation had taken place after I had already spent a lot of time with Veronica, joining her and her husband in setting up community gatherings and activities. For her, self-worth and security was closely tied to knowledge about the Lakota traditional ways. She continued, “He helped me to find that not pride but self worth within myself… and he didn’t go to boarding schools and he didn’t read English or write English. He signed his name with an X, but he knew all our old ways of prayer. I was very fortunate to have met him and to learn from him and everything that I do today comes from him.”

Another example came over a breakfast with a grandmother who lives in an area of the reservation with a high concentration of Lakota first-language speakers. Juliette shared with me her challenges with substance abuse and how the death of her father moved her to seek out the Lakota traditions and the Red Road. Now, in the
midst of taking care of her sister, Juliette reaffirms the importance of traditions in mending and healing, “I’m mad and then I’m hurt, but the only thing I keep doing is prayer … Dad always says when things get rough and you don’t know what to do, pray, always pray all the time, so that’s what I’ve been doing. I hope that things fall into place, but at least I can get my sister some help, that’s all I want is help for her.” She continues, “She needs to heal from the inside out … I am really anxious about [the Sun Dance ceremony], I was telling her when we go up to the tree you pray, you ask Wakan Tanka to be strong, heal my body, heal my heart. She said, yeah that would help. I think it will.” Juliette went through a tough time in life and was able to find stability in Lakota traditions and now she’s bringing her sister into the circle by introducing her to prayer and ceremony.

Another time I spent an afternoon with a Lakota elder named Marshall. As a well respected elder, Marshall holds a prominent position within the tribe. He, too, had a long journey with drugs and self-destructive behavior. After serving in the military, Marshall moved off reservation in his early 20’s, “I was drinking three quarts of whiskey a day, all the cars I had were all fast cars. I was young, I had every fast car you could want — Mustang, Camaro, Chargers, all the cars I had went about 165 miles per hour.” He had the American dream, along with a thick manila folder containing his arrest records. Soon, however, he found this lifestyle was not making him happy, he was missing something and decided to move back to the reservation. Once there, an elder invited him to stay his undeveloped land. “I had all this stuff and I’m not happy, something is wrong, I missed something. So I lived down here, dug a hole in the ground, cooked, hunted, fished.” He visited the elders and learned from them, finally coming to the realization that he had been going down the wrong road
the entire time. Getting back to traditional ways of living — living close to the land and the outdoors — along with spending time with traditional elders who were teaching him self-affirmative practices, placed him back on the Red Road.

Marshall illustrated that traditional Lakota ways do not only involve the taking part in traditional ceremonies, but also to be able to self-sufficient and happy with modest resources — whether it be with living off the land or a sense of not being driven by materialism. “Give me my horse, my gun and my tipi poles, that’s all I need, I don’t need money, I don’t need cars — I can go and live and be happy.” Efforts to revive Lakota culture over the last few decades included many aspect of living in the same ways of their ancestors, in touch with the land and living with simple means. This has taken the form of traditional wilderness immersion camps and horse riding camps. Living in the traditional manner compliments participation in ceremonies. Marshall explained, “[When I saw you at the ceremony] we were there for a week before for Sun Dance. Four days for Sun Dance and we took care of everyone. After Sun Dance we took care of everyone at [the next ceremony]. Who took care of everything?” When I had seen him at a few weeks earlier ceremony, a group had been on the grounds for nearly two weeks. He continued, “There was other people out there helping — here you can have food, you can stay here … [We were] all taking care of each other, we don’t have to go anywhere, we don’t have to come up here [to the nearest town], we don’t even need the police down here. We had our own traditional setup.” A Lakota traditional life challenges many of the basic premises of material security — “Put them in one area and have tipis and horses, we don’t need anything else, we are no longer poor, we have everything. If we are chasing money we are going to be poor, the rich get richer and the poor stay poor, no matter what.”
These experiences reinforced the emergence of the importance of traditional ways of life and practices throughout the OLI, semi-structured interviews. The tenuous balance between the Red Road and Black Road was seen throughout my fieldwork experiences.

Section 5: Concluding thoughts

There arose many connections between security and Lakota traditions. As much as I continued to try to focus on material security issues — such as military, policing, domestic violence, etc. — the importance of traditional ways of living, achieved through self-affirming cultural practices, continued to be pervasive throughout the fieldwork. The Lakota have been accustomed to hardship, for decades they have lived through abusive boarding schools, high rates of suicide, extreme poverty, and limited economic opportunity — this is not even to mention the long and bloody history of engagements with the US military.

This chapter explores interviews and fieldwork conducted on the reservation and covered the fieldwork process, asking questions, Lakota responses, and a review of participant observation and experiences. Self-affirmative cultural practices saved many of the Lakota elders who had been lost to self-destructive activity and substance abuse for long periods of their lifetime. Those elders are now involved in reclaiming and renewing traditional practices as a means of providing a foundation for younger Lakota — they recognize security comes from being connected to traditional Lakota ways and practices.
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Chapter 5

THE LOOK OF THE SUBJECT: SURVEILLANCE AND CONFINEMENT

Field Note: They can come at any time

The Great Plains holds many paradoxes — the reservation, located in the heart of the Plains, has both an abundance of untapped resources and, at the same time, devoid of resources. It is a land of plenty in terms of wind and solar energy potential, ample farmlands, and there are still many berries and traditional medicines that can be foraged. On the other side, there is a lack of material resources such as commercial development, educational institutions. There are only a few stores and few places to find “luxury” items for the family or even to take your car to get a repair — the only “official” auto repair store and that is 40 miles north, while the only restaurant open for dinner is located 30 miles west. The reservation is remote and it forces the Lakota to be resourceful.

Near the current reservation boarder, there are proposals for the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline, stretching from Canada and purportedly through the Great Plains down into Texas. The pipeline would run just a mile from the borders of the reservation through former treaty reservation boundaries. The Lakota have been overwhelmingly against its construction and have gone so far as interfering with megaload 18-wheeler trucks carrying oil pipeline material on reservation highway. As
a means of resistance, they have set up spiritual camps, or *pteospyes*, to keep prayerful vigilance over the sacred earth.

Grant and the family ask me to join them at the *pteospye* for the weekend and as I'm getting an extra shirt and toiletries together I get notice that before we can make it out there this weekend, it's some 60 miles away, we’ll have to go and tend to their truck that broke down on the way a few days before. I pick up Grant and we head off about three-quarters of the way there to meet up someone who can help tow the truck to get it repaired.¹ “Dalton just lives near the *pteospye* and he’s going to meet us out there, the truck is just outside Buffalo Ranch,” Grant tells me as we drive along the straight but rolling highway. I have a small car so we do our best to make sure to stay on paved roads, otherwise, Grant would have taken a more direct route through dirt roads. Grant is broad man, in his forties, stocky with short brown hair. He wears dark grey jean shorts and work boots. Grant is of Alaskan Native descent and has lived on the Lakota reservation for nearly fifteen years now. He married a Lakota woman and now they live in the reservation city center with many of their family members living near by.

Pulling off down a dirt road we drive for another twenty minutes, traveling up and down the rolling hills of the Plains, until we see two pickup trucks parked at the top of the hill. Both are well used, beat up but working (for the most part). As we approach, Grant explains that the white one is theirs and the blue one is Dalton waiting for us. Dalton is wearing blue jeans and cowboy boots. He is in his sixties and dons a Vietnam Veteran baseball cap. After we exchange pleasantries and talk for some time,
Dalton uses his truck to push the other truck onto the road and then gets out a rope from his truck bed. After it's all set up, I follow them as they tow the troubled truck into the small nearby village. We go through the tiny village towards the community center and playground. Sharing the same dirt parking lot as the community center is a small garage with one bay door open. Next to this is their church, though it looks more like a small warehouse than a church. There are a few discarded tires stacked up near the bay door and a few white men sit inside. Its hot outside and the men, with dirt and grim on their shirts and jeans, sit talking. “This is where the Mennonites are,” Grant tells me, “they’ll help us with the truck.” Grant explains there have been so many religious groups that come and go on the reservation, but one that came and never left was the Mennonites. “They came here to live and asked how they can best serve the communities,” Grant tells me, “they help us with our cars and they really do try to help us, if it weren’t for them, we’d really be in a bind.” Everything out here is much more slow moving than the East coast. Grant and Dalton talk to the guys for a little bit, then we head back out into the parking lot and begin siphoning the gas from the white truck. Unfortunately, the Mennonites are not able to assist with the fix and it looks like we’ll have to tow the truck back to where we came from, the main town center, some forty miles away.

While we are talking about how to get the car back, two Humvees pull up to the community center — really more of a small office room than a community center, similar to a double-wide trailer or two shipping containers attached. Four uniformed
(camouflaged) solders get out and go into the community center. There are three men and one woman.

Standing between our two trucks, Dalton continues siphoning gas out of the truck and into a red gas container. The soldiers come out again, walking to their Humvees and this time come closer to us as they are walking out. “Hello,” Dalton calls out, “do you guys have dentists and can you repair teeth?” Not knowing at all what was going on, I thought he was joking — seeing military people and asking them if they can fix teeth is not what I was expecting. Apparently Dalton knew why they were there, they were there to provide health care, which was a bit more evident as two of the soldiers came closer and you could see that they had medic insignias on their uniforms. The solders pleasantly respond that they’ll see what they can do and see if they can make those arrangements. “Thanks for your service,” Dalton tells the soldiers. They smile and nod graciously and then one of the soldiers says, “Thank you for your service.” They all shake hands and continue on their way. We continue siphoning and planning the tow. Dalton goes inside the garage to clean off the gas from his body and hands.

Sitting with Grant later that day, he tells me that it is not normal to see the US military on the reservation, maybe only once or twice a year. They seem to come in to assist with health needs, as well as during the winter if there is a need for extra wood. They come in and drop a huge mound of wood off at the community center back in the
town center once a winter for elders and those who cannot afford heating. “The National Guard does not have a good relationship with the tribe,” Grant tells me, “they’re the ones who committed the Massacre [at Wounded Knee].” Though he tells me that the health provisions were probably initiated by the tribe, he continues to tell me that they are not here only to give medical assistance, but rather, they are here to show the people on the reservation that they can be mobilized and can infiltrate the reservation borders at any time. “They’re here to show us that they come in whenever they want, if they think that we are doing something they don’t like, they can come in with the military at any time,” Grant says. He tells me that they are here to watch them, they tap their phones and use drones to monitor the Natives.
This chapter explores the look of the subject and the logics of power revealed through Lakota lived experiences of surveillance, control, and punishment. It turns to the work of French Philosopher Michel Foucault and his writing on panopticism for a deeper understanding of the look of the subject through technologies of containment and surveillance.

The look of the subject is present on the Lakota reservation. This look, however, does not go unnoticed — as the subject’s look surveils Lakota activity, the Lakota are also gazing back. This interaction between Lakota on the reservation and the US National Guard is emblematic of this dialectic two-way relationship — on one side the presence of the look, and on the other, a suspicious watchfulness marked by rampant mistrust and fear of attack, punishment, and retribution. At first glance, their interaction seemed pleasant and even cordial, marked by mutual appreciation, gratitude for military service, and information sharing. Underneath this prosaic interaction, however, coexists a different Lakota interpretation: the National Guard is on the reservation to illustrate their ability to employ military force. Their message is clear: beware and, most importantly, behave. This creates an atmosphere (real and perceived) of perpetual surveillance.

Philosopher Michel Foucault examines the creation of the Hôpital Général in seventeenth century France and reveals how the state created and utilized particular technologies of control. Through a process of containment, punishment, surveillance, and spatial control allowed France to extend state power. Wrapped in moralizing terms, Foucault reveals how state and religious powers combined to obfuscate state motivations, veiling them instead with notions of reform and correction. This genealogy of structures of confinement and surveillance provides a convenient
framework to understand the historical occurrences of the Lakota set forth by US policy.

The focus on the gaze, or as Lacan would refer to it as the look of the subject, requires an examination of the relationship between Foucault and Lacan. This is especially the case when dealing with the gaze, since it is often a point of misunderstanding and conceptual confusion (see Copjec 1989: 55 and Copjec 1994: 18-19). Though Foucault and Lacan were both theorizing at the same time, Lacan twenty-five years his elder, the two never directly engaged each other’s work, though subsequent scholars have placed their works into dialogue. A key distinction between the two is its approach to dialectical logic. Whereas Foucault explores subjectivity as constructed historically thought power structures and relations, Lacan emphasizes the relationship between the subject and the Other — more particularly, the look of the subject and the gaze of the Other. This dialectic of subjectivity, premised on negation (and dependence) — similar to Hegel’s master-slave dialectic — is at the heart of Lacan’s understanding of the science of the subject and the phenomenal social order. For Foucault, subjectivity is created by history and operations of power. His conceptualization of the gaze, however, contributes significant understanding to the operations of the look of the subject.

This chapter focuses on the presence of the look of the subject on the Lakota reservation and is segmented into three sections. It starts with (1) a brief overview of the look of the subject and then to (2) surveillance and confinement on the reservation. Finally, it turns to (3) concluding thoughts. The second section, surveillance and confinement on the reservation, is further segmented into four parts: the creation of the
category of undesirable, containment and punishment, moralizing and reforming, and surveillance and control.

Section 1: The Look of the Subject

Apparatuses of confinement, documentation, and control become “an essential part of normalizing technologies” (Foucault 1979: 202). “The power of the state to produce an increasingly totalizing web of control,” suggests Paul Rabinow (1984), “is intertwined with and dependent on its ability to produce an increasing specification of individuality” — those deemed undesirable were responsible for their so-called moral transgressions, rather than it being a function of a structure or society (22). The state and Church established their power to define who was “productive” (and paying taxes) and who was “unproductive” (unemployed, beggars, or not buying into the land-ownership model). This created an environment in which the state “acquired an ethical power of segregation, which permitted it to eject, as into another world, all forms of social uselessness” (Foucault 1964, found in Rabinow 1984: 136).

Perpetual surveillance was not only a means of control, but also self-regulation. A state of constant visibility meant ever-present observation. Anne McClintock (1995) explains, “Unable to see inside the inspection tower, the inhabitants would presume they were under perpetual surveillance, daily routine would be conducted in a state of permanent visibility” (58). Panoptic logic is analog to supervision and scrutiny of an all-seeing authority, a perpetual surveillance. “Inspection functions ceaselessly,” Foucault (1995) asserts, “the gaze is alert
everywhere” (195). This perception causes inmates to self-regulate their behavior, “he becomes his own guardian” (Rabinow 1984: 19).

Spatial control is a critical aspect of panoptic logic. “Discipline proceeds from an organization of individuals in space, and it requires a specific enclosure of space,” describes Rabinow (1984), continuing, “Once established, this grid permits the sure distribution of the individuals who are to be disciplined and supervised” (17). Having relevance beyond prisons and houses of confinement, this also applied to hospitals, schools, factories, and towns. Instilling discipline through surveillance and control intended to promote orderly behavior, productivity, and to limit the impact of so-called undesirable elements.

Section 2: Surveillance and Confinement on the Reservation

Social control is achieved through multiples means or technologies. Foucault shows how surveillance is initially achieved through confinement — a confinement made possible through the creation of social categories category of so-called “undesirables.” This categorization provides justification for the containment and punishment of these particular groups of society. Often crafted through the frame of moralizing and reform, surveillance and control is achieved.

Creation of category of undesirable

Native Americans exemplified the category of undesirable in early America because their worldview and way of life did not fit into American society. Lewis and
Clark encountered a Sioux village for the first time on September 25, 1804, after which, Lewis described the Lakota as the “vilest miscreants of the savage race” (Quaife 1806: 142, found in Ostler 2004: 20-21). For the nascent American republic, land ownership was a critical way to resist and break away from the authoritarianism of its European past — viewed as the highest form of civilization, one that “demanded universal adherence” (Ostler 2004: 15). Natives were seen as ignorant and wasteful, and their social and religious practices barbaric.

This led to what is known as the “Removal Period” where Natives were expelled from their traditional lands in the East. The period has its origins in the early 1800s and extended roughly to the late 1800s and established policies to encourage and ultimately force Eastern tribes to relocate west of the Mississippi River. The early part of the period was motivated by a growth in US population combined with growing US military capabilities and political power. Expulsion was seen as a more humane way, an “alternative to extinction,” of removing Natives from land claimed by US expansion (Thornton 1984: 289-300). This aim, however, was obsolete by the time removal was completed — white settlers were already infringing upon and expanding the US Western frontier, establishing homes and cultivating fields west of the Mississippi. To mitigate this challenge, the US government again changed its strategy. This time it was to contain the Natives.

Contain and punish

Expulsion of Natives quickly shifted to containment. This happened in the 1840s, ushering in what is known as the “Reservation Era” and saw its peak between 1870-1880 when the Lakota were driven into reservations in the Great Plains.
Containment on reservations (and the initial expulsion of many Native traditional lands) was enforced through military force. On more than one occasion, Lakota tribal enrollment numbers were referred to as their prisoner number.

The Great Sioux Reservation was established with promises of government-to-government benefits. The first time boundaries were set around Lakota territory was with the 1851 Fort Laramie Treaty. This allowed for white settlers to travel through the Platte River Valley unimpeded. It was soon followed by the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 that redrew the reservation lines and assured the Lakota of “absolute and undisturbed use” of the Great Sioux Reservation. These agreements were quickly nullified as gold was found in the Black Hills in 1874 – a year later the US ordered the Lakota to abandon the Black Hills and the Powder River hunting area southwest of the Black Hills. White miners moved into the area and soon after, in 1876, the US ordered all Lakota to remain on reservation. All Natives found off the reservation would be treated as “hostile” by the US military. The Black Hills Agreement of 1876 annexed the Black Hills from Lakota control and significantly reduced the size of the Great Sioux Reservation. The 1868 Treaty represented the “largest” bordered territory of the Lakota, with it eventually shrinking in size multiple times over the next few decades. The Agreement of 1889, as a result of the implementation of land allotments called for by the 1887 Dawes Act, separated the Great Sioux Reservation into even smaller reservations — six in number: Pine Ridge, Rosebud, Cheyenne River, Standing Rock, Lower Brule, and Crow Creek.

The confinement of the Lakota took place in a series of treaties and agreements over the course of the nineteenth century. It started from first being confined west of the Mississippi, then to the Platte River Valley and much of the Great Plains. The
finding of gold in the Black Hills in 1874 marked a significant turning point. From then, the US was much more aggressive in confining the Lakota, making it illegal to leave the reservation in 1876 and breaking up the Great Sioux Reservation. By 1889, the Great Sioux Reservation was cut by 11 million acres and the Lakota were confined on reservations (Marshall 2012: 19-21).

Moralizing and reforming

The US policy towards Natives included the creation of “evil” and reformation through moral reform. In 1884, the US Department of the Interior created the Religious Crimes Code. This outlawed the practice of all Native religion and spirituality, banned all ceremonies, and called for the confiscation of sacred objects. Those who were caught in violation faced imprisonment, fines, and the withholding of rations. Native cultural and religious practices were cast as savage and barbaric and various religious groups were relied upon to assist in assimilating Natives through religion.

Christianity played a significant role in the suppression and assimilation of Natives. In 1819, the Indian Civilization Act offered $10,000 per year for religious groups willing to establish schools for Native children. Christianity within the Lakota communities began to take hold during the reservation era, when it became integrated into US policy. In the 1870s, a few decades before the end of the Indian Wars in 1890, many Santee and Teton Lakota had become Congregational and Episcopalian Christians. This eventually spread throughout the Lakota reservations. Religious groups divided up Lakota reservations — on the particular reservation I spent time on, the Mormons, Catholics, Lutherans, Episcopalians, Baptists, and the United Church of
Christ were all present. The Lakota had no choice but to accept these outside religions, especially with their own religious practices banned. Parents were forced to send their children to religious boarding schools, rations were dependent on religious affiliation, and social welfare often took the form of religious-based aid.\textsuperscript{5}

The end of the Indian Wars ushered the period of Assimilation (from late 1800s to 1930) through boarding schools and land allotments. Assimilation efforts aimed at reforming Natives and taking place after the isolation of Native communities. Originally, Indian Agents were housed on reservations and acted as the official liaisons between the US and Native tribes. After the Indian Wars, Indian Agents were replaced by school superintendents. Natives were isolated to reservations and their youth put into Boarding Schools, forced to leave their traditional ways behind and adopt Christianity. Part of this reforming plan was also to instill the values of land ownership into Native communities. The 1887 passing of the Dawes General Allotment Act codified land ownership in a way that forced the Lakota to adopt white culture (Fenelon 1998, Greenwald 2002: 15). Boarding schools and the Dawes Act attempted to reform Natives through the means of education, Christianity, capitalism and private property, and farming (see Brant 1988; Morrisette 1994; Braveheart-Jordan and DeBruyn 1995; and Ross 1998).

The motto of the founder of the Carlisle Indian School, US General Richard H. Pratt, was “Kill the Indian, Save the Man.” This highlighted the moral impulse that animated the assimilation of Native people. Natives were viewed as things that needed to be civilized and reformed. Boarding schools indoctrinating Native children with the belief that traditional ways were inferior to Euro-American culture. The reformation and assimilation of Natives was carried out with strong moralizing principles —
civilizing Natives through Christianity was a significant aspect to US Native policy and was seen to be more humane means to extermination.

Surveillance and control

The perception of surveillance and the look of the subject were ever-present on the reservation. For instance, I was having dinner with a family on the reservation and we began talking about security and surveillance. “It can happen any time, we can be shot by snipers and killed by the National Guard,” Grant tells me.⁶ “Our phones have been tapped and they were flying drones overhead last week, with those AWACS systems,” Grant’s wife Penny asserts, “our cells stopped working right after that.” The months leading to my arrival on the reservation, a group of Lakota, including Penny and Grant, had been resisting the construction of the Keystone XL Pipeline. They did so by established spiritual camps near the projected construction of the pipeline, where they stayed and resisted throughout prayer. They also took it upon themselves to notifying tribal police every time they saw large-haul, pipe-material carrying trucks pass through the reservation — an illegal act by tribal law. “The Fed’s and the state are monitoring the [spiritual] camp,” Penny asserts, “You can see them watching from the top of the ridge from the South.” Other spiritual camps had to build raised hay-bail walls around their perimeters due to shots being fired at them from the road. They believed that it could have been local farmers, they did not rule out other parties or possibilities.

On another occasion, I was told that those Lakota living in the area of the most first-language Lakota speakers were being watched by drones flying overhead. Looking into this further, I found that state and Federal drone use over throughout the
region was well documented from as early as 2010. Many Lakota I interacted with believed the Federal government was monitoring them. A year after my fieldwork, it was revealed that the FBI were, in fact, monitoring (and making house visits) to activists resisting the Keystone XL Pipeline construction in Texas and Oregon (Graef 2014, Valentine 2015). On another afternoon, the sight of a military helicopter flying over the largest town on the reservation stirred many conversations (in person and online). Some suggests (however jokingly) the reservation was being invaded by the US military or that the government was taking video and pictures. A few months after I left the reservation, I spoke to Penny on the phone. Mid-sentence, she paused and asked, “Did you hear that? That clicking? They’re listening to us.”

The history of Federal surveillance is not forgotten by the Lakota. The FBI closely monitored the activities of the American Indian Movement (AIM) in the 1970s (Weyler 1982, La Course 1974). Many of those in the area of high concentration of Lakota first language were descendants from the 1890 Wounded Knee Massacre and the 1973 Wounded Knee Incident. Both of these instances featured military engagements with the US government, the former resulting in the deaths of hundreds of Lakota and the latter a seventy-one day standoff with the CIA and FBI. Not only do the Lakota perceive they’re being watched, but they also know there has been a tradition of US surveillance that effected their parents, grandparents, and great grandparents.

This surveillance and control also take on a spatial dimension. Native reservations are federal enclaves held in trust, or “reserved,” by the US government. Lakota who live on them are dual citizens who hold a “peculiar dual identity as both American and colonial subjects depending on the space they inhabit at a given time”
This duality has its origins in the US Supreme Court decisions known as the Marshall Trilogy of 1823-1832. These decisions established the grounds for tribal sovereignty as a domestic dependent nation through indigenous land claims, tribal sovereignty as nations with the authority to self-govern, and US federal trust responsibilities.

Registration and documentation have been a longstanding tradition between the Lakota and Western society — this includes meticulous documentation of tribe, as well as the collection and classification by ethnographers, anthropologists, and collectors. This documentation has material consequences, represented today through tribal affiliations. Historically nomadic, the Lakota and would travel fluidly through different regions. US census surveys, however, did not take this fluidity into account. As a result, many Lakota ancestors show up on tribal registries different from family claims. Resource allotment depends on tribal classification and resources. Tribal affiliation and blood quantum can make the difference of whether one has access to food commodities, housing assistance, and healthcare. The effect of this classification has proved to be pernicious and divisive, especially in the face of rising casino and business revenues increase individual tribal payouts which are often premised on number of tribally enrolled members. Estimations of disenrollments nationwide are as high as 8,000 in the last two decades (Nogueras 2014).

US spatial control of the Lakota advanced significantly with the 1887 Dawes Act that brought limited citizenship for Natives who accepted land allotments, introducing the “blood quantum” for tribal enrollment. The Dawes Act distributed land to those legally enrolled in a tribe. These lots of land have been subsequently passed down from generation to generation and pooled by family members and today
provide a significant source of income when leased to farmers for cattle grazing. This not only opened the door for Lakota land ownership, but it also created a “legal” path for the dispossession of Native land. Emily Greenwald (2002) explains,

The 1887 General Allotment Act, also known as the Dawes Act, was the final step in this reorganization of Indian space and culture. It mandated allotment in severality — the division of Indian lands into individual, privately owned parcels… The Dawes Act furthered the process of dispossessing Indians, and it created an elaborate new bureaucracy for managing Indian lands. Rather than causing assimilation, its main legacy would be to enhance Euroamerican’s control over spatial dimensions of Indians’ lives (15).

This continued dispossession still poses a threat to the Lakota. As time has passed, individuals have sold land to non-Native farmers and ranchers. This has put the reservation’s land base at risk — if land ownership dips below 50% non-Native, the tribe can lose portions of the reservation to the state, never to gain them back. This places the tribe in a constant struggle to maintain land base with the ever-present possibility of further losing traditional land. The allotment of Native land brought together two significant aspects of spatial control: it created a physical boundary between White Americans and “removed” people (who were granted land tracks) and (for those who were not granted land tracks) it placed them into a system of private property (Greenwald 2002: 17).

Panoptic logic requires surveillance and spatial control. Tribal membership and a system of private property has had a punishing effect on the Lakota. If tribal membership cannot be proven (though this is becoming increasingly politicized, see Nogueras 2014) or if too much land is passed onto non-Lakota owners, vital resources
for communities can be cut. The Lakota feel they are under constant surveillance and exist in a tenuous balance of maintain their already significantly diminished, yet hard-fought rights. These ever-eroding footholds require everyday vigilance and locate the Lakota in a place where fear of loss on punishment is ever-present.

Section 3: Concluding thoughts

In the seventeenth century, France established the Hôpital Général as a way to manage those deemed socially undesirable. Initially expelled, those nonproductive members of society were driven into confinement as a way to moralize and reform. They did this through a process of containment, punishment, surveillance, and spatial control. This panoptic logic allowed France to extend state power and contain “unruly” and “less than ideal” citizens. The perception of being watched and the threat of punishment being administered at any time, led the inmate to adopt a self-policing stance. Likewise, the Lakota have been confined to reservations and live in a state of perpetual surveillance. The US deemed Natives as socially undesirable and started with a strategy of expulsion, then moved to containment and punishment. Christian values and religious institutions were called upon to administer reform schools for Lakota youth. A system of surveillance and spatial control was established, placing the Lakota in a state of perpetual observation and in constant threat of punishment and loss.

To understand the colonial operations of look of the subject, Foucault allows us to see that these historical occurrences are not merely incidental and parallel many of the techniques of power carried out in seventeenth century Europe. Panoptic logics
reveal themselves through Lakota experiences of surveillance, control, and punishment. For the inmate, the perception of observation (enforced with a threat of punishment) is actually a stronger controlling force than punishment alone. The perception of threat (facilitated by perpetual surveillance) is a more pernicious technique of control, since it is inescapable and longer lasting than a mere episode of punishment. Foucault’s contributions allow for a deeper understanding of the look of the subject through the technologies of containment and surveillance, thereby resulting in the internalization of these threats. Foucault panopticism reveals the look of the subject on the reservation.
1 Interaction with Grant and Dalton took place on June 10, 2014.

2 The text of the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868 reads: Article II, “Set apart for the absolute and undisturbed use and occupation of the Indians…United States now solemnly agrees that no persons…shall ever be permitted to pass over, settle upon, or reside in the territory described in this article, or in such territory as may be added to this reservation for the use of said Indians, and henceforth they will and do hereby relinquish all claims or right in and to any portion of the United States or Territories;” Article XII, “No treaty for the cession of any portion or part of the reservation herein described which may be held in common, shall be of any validity or force as against the said Indians unless executed and signed by at least three-fourths of all the adult male Indians.” To see full text of treaty see PBS’ Archives of the West 1856-1868 (http://www.pbs.org/weta/thewest/resources/archives/four/ftlaram.htm).

3 There are nine reservations today in South Dakota.

4 The Religious Crimes Code was strengthened it 1894 and 1904.

5 Parents continue to plan their children’s summer around the various religious group’s summer camps — two weeks with the Mormons, the next week with the Baptists, and so on. This provides their children with summer supervision, day care, and food.

6 I had multiple interviews with Grant and Penny, this particular one happened on June 21, 2014.

are used by the US military to track and carrying out strikes in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Yemen. They can monitor targets for up to twenty hours and have a range of nearly twelve hundred miles (Zakaria 2013). Additional accounts of drone use in South Dakota ranges from monitoring bank erosion of the Missouri River (Hood 2013), launching combat missions (Fox 5 News), monitoring storm patterns (Davis 2015), and includes North Dakota’s legalization of Armed Police Drones (Wagner 2015).

8 An internal FBI memo referring to those resistors as “extremists” revealed that monitoring was taking place between November 2012 to June 2014 – overlapping the last few months of my time on the reservation (Lewis 2015, Sweeney 2015).

9 The three cases that make up the Marshall Trilogy are Johnson v M’Intosh (1823), Cherokee Nation v Georgia (1831), and Worcester v Georgia (1832).

10 This also included the documentation of Lakota physical characteristics. Franz Boas, the father of anthropology, traveled to Lakota communities in 1891 and documented features such as name, age, tribe, parent’s tribe, number of children, hair type and color, eye shape, nose appearance, lip details, ear appearance, color of skin, the color of their palms, shape of forehead, height, hand length, and width of shoulders.
Chapter 6

POWWOW, MILITARIZATION, AND SELF AFFIRMATIVE PRACTICES

Field Note: Ready, Aim, Fire!

“We celebrate the integrity of these heroes” comes over the loudspeakers, “We want to honor our veterans and to say thank you to all the families…without these colors, we couldn’t honor them.” The colors that the Master of Ceremonies (MC) is talking about are veteran’s flags — flags draped over caskets of fallen soldiers then tightly folded into triangles and bestowed upon the surviving families.¹ “Please remove caps and stand.” The celebration is conducted in a circular wooden structure with four openings that lead to the grassy circle. These four openings dissect the wooden stands into equal parts, three of which are stadium-seating style that consist of five basic bench-seating rows and a fourth section that is an enclosed microphone booth. In the center of the circle stands a singular tall flag, flanked by four flags on smaller six-foot poles and three wooden staffs. Throughout the wood structure, affixed veteran’s flags rise twenty feet into the air, while the center veteran’s flag rises about ten feet higher. Each of these flags are placed equidistant from each other and is tied onto the vertical wooden supports (of the audience seating) that hold up the aluminum rain and sun shelter. The flags, when not displayed at celebrations are preciously stored with the families of the fallen veteran and brought to these special gatherings, allowing their ancestor to be honored and remembered by the community. Some of the
flags are bright white, making them seem fairly new, while others are much older in appearance — yellowing and wind torn. Each flag has a small name written on them in a black marker located on the vertical white strip closest to the pole side of the flag. I squint and tilt my head to make out the names.

Four uniformed men carrying assault rifles form a single line at the entrance near the MC booth and walk towards the center flagpole, passing behind it. The four men wear white gloves, maroon short-sleeved collared shirt, and black cargo pants. They all wear blue baseball caps and their maroon shirt has a large yellow Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) insignia on the back. Their blue baseball caps give various indications of branch of the military served and in which war they served: “Native Pride” over the US Marines Eagle, Globe, and Anchor symbol; “POW-MIA, You’re not forgotten”; "Veteran" on top of the distinctive Vietnam green, yellow, and red horizontally stripped flag; and “US Army”. On the side of the hats are etched indications of military conflicts — Korean, Vietnam, etc. All together it is a curious mixture of “Native pride” and military service attire. Carrying the weapons across their torsos, they move to a spot a few steps behind the center flagpole. Marching in unison, they place their assault rifles butt-end down in a tipi-like structure, all four muzzles rest against each other. Once in place, the four form a straight line behind the tipi structure facing the center flag and the microphone booth. Turning in synchronization, they then march out in a single file line back towards the opening they entered. A larger group of veterans, half in the distinctive maroon shirt uniforms and the others in various veteran t-shirts and hats, wait at the opening.
All the veterans form two lines in the opening and then enter the circle, marching clockwise circumambulating the center American flag. As they make their way around the center circle, pairs peel off and move to the base of each of the flags fixed to the wood stands. Upon getting to the flags, the pairs stand at attention, saluting the center flag. “Flag number one, Gilbert Catches the Eagle, World War II combat veteran, United States Army,” comes over the loudspeakers, “Flag number two, Franklin Spotted Dear, Vietnam Veteran, United States Marine Corps.” The MC continues to name flags until the twenty-two flags surrounding the grounds are announced. Once all pairs of veterans arrive at their respective poles, one lowers the flag with the ropes while the other waits attentively to catch the flag so as to ensure it does not touch the ground. They make a great effort to make sure that the flag does not touch the ground, gently gathering each part of the flags as it’s slowly lowered. Once down, the pair works together to fold the flags back to their neat triangle. First, the flag is folded longwise (in direction of the stripes) two times, making it folded into horizontal fourths. Meticulously shaking the flags to ensure sharp creases, they then fold the flags into triangles, folding eight times until it is fully wrapped up. The veterans who were in charge of catching the flag as it was being lowered now hold the triangle closely to their chest with both hands — clenched to their heart.

The MC booth is made of wood, with panels rising to waist-high. There are five men inside the booth, two of them tending to an audio switchboard. The wood panels and all the wood structure is painted white and on the back wall of the interior of the MC booth the paint is cracked and peeled. Underneath the booth the grass is
overgrown and coming up the front of the booth and there is a large wood sign that hangs on the front of the MC booth. The three lines of text on the sign read, “Home of…” and then names a great Lakota warrior, followed by “the Great Sioux Nation,” and then the name of the reservation. Right next to this is a smaller, newer sign that has two lines, “Welcome to…” the community’s name, followed by “Honoring all the Veterans.” The background features a Lakota medicine wheel — a circle divided into four parts, each with a specific direction and color (white, red, yellow, and black).

The two hundred or so, mainly Lakota audience continues to stand with their hats off, with a spattering of people saluting towards the center flag. Two veterans fold up the center veteran’s flag, while a handful of others collect the other center flags and staffs. One of the two in the center yells a command and those who were saluting stop saluting. The drumming stops and the MC announces the singing of the Lakota Flag Song, the Lakota equivalent to the national anthem. “The US have the Star-Spangled Banner, and the Lakota have the ‘wapuchula’ (or Flag Song),” says the MC. The drummers begin to play and sing. The Lakota Flag Song, known as Ñhawápaha Olóway, was created in the 1950s to honor returning Native WWII veterans. It celebrates the warrior’s selfless act of protecting the People - standing strong and acting bravely to protect the People and to ensure safety and prosperity (Red Cloud Indian School 2014).

The two in the middle begin marching towards the MC booth. Just a few feet before they reach the booth they turn in the clockwise direction and begin circumambulating the center grounds again. Each pair that is standing by the
surrounding flagpoles wait for the procession to come their way. As it does, each follow along and join the marching. The procession of veterans continues to clasp the folded triangles closely to their chest with two hands. The march is best described as a two-step — a mixture between a march and a dance, similar to a step with a $\frac{1}{2}$ step/bounce in between. The line — consisting of staff bearers, then flag bearers, and then by 30 or so veterans — circles the empty center flagpole. At the end of the second rotation they form a line facing the MC booth, the line parallel to the front of the announcer’s booth. Behind this line is the center flagpole and, behind that, the tipi of guns. The four gun holders (who were part of the longer procession) step back and move in formation backwards towards their assault riffles, ceremoniously collecting their guns from the gun tipi in synchronization. They stand at attention behind the larger line of veterans and hold their guns on their right side, butts to the ground.

“Huh,” one of the gunners yells. The music and drumming stops. The four men pick up their guns and aim them into the sky at a 45-degree angle. “Aim,” raising them up a slightly bit higher. “Fire.” Shots ring out, echoes ricocheting off the surrounding ridge. I attempt to mask my startle as best as I can, internally trying to recall the last time I was in the proximity of guns being fired off. "Aim…fire," echo. “Aim…fire,” echo. Five times they shoot their assault rifles — at this point, I am slowly scanning my peripherals to see if I can pick up if anyone else is startled. These are not small rifles, they are full assault rifles! All black military-style rifles. I notice nothing that would indicate for others anything out of the ordinary.
The audience remains at attention. “Present arms,” all gun-bearers cradle their guns with one hand while saluting towards the MC booth with the other hand. Outside of the shots being fired and their reverberating echoes, there is complete silence over the grounds. Over two-hundred people and complete silence. “We recognize those veterans… for their bravery and for their protection of the People,” chimes in the MC. “If we don’t have any of them, who would keep our land safe and protect our way of life?” The MC notifies families who brought the veteran’s flags to come up to the MC booth to receive their relative’s flag. Silence fills the gaps between the MC’s announcements.

Then, over the loud speakers, the military bugle song “Taps” begins to play. Quite possibly the saddest song, the grounds remain silent and all 30 veterans salute towards the MC booth. The four gun holders are behind the line, cradling their guns in their left hands and saluting with the right. The military bugle ends. “Huh,” another order is voiced out. The veterans finish their saluting. The gun holders continue to stand behind the line — left hands behind their back, gun butts on the ground near their right foot, and right hands near the muzzles of their guns. After all twenty-two of the flags are delivered, the veterans turn to their right, create a single file line, and walk out of the grounds near the MC booth. As they exit the grounds, each moves to the side, forming a line to give handshakes to the veterans in line behind them.

What stands out to me is how much time is dedicated to the honoring of US military veterans and how patiently the audience stands at attention. The taking the flags down ceremony lasts about an hour. Putting flags up and taking them down
occurs at the beginning and end of the first session on both days. The morning raising
the flag session took two and a half hours to complete.

It is mid-afternoon and I arrive in the middle of a traditional men’s dance.
Though there are over 80 dancers present, this dance consists of primarily young boys
(roughly from the age of 8 to 16) with one older gentleman in his 50’s. There are just
over a dozen in number and a few carry small wooden shields fixed to their left
forearms, others hold small wooden axes, spears, and wooden rifles. The axes and
spears have leather straps and feathers tied to them. The dancing regalia is colorful and
ornate, with some the dancers wearing bustles of feathers on their backs and colorful
arm, leg, and headwear. From top to bottom they are covered with colorful regalia.
“The Germans are coming and they are shooting…,” the MC says through the speaker
system loud enough to be heard over the drumming and singing. “The Germans are
coming and they encounter four Lakota warriors.” Upon hearing this, as if right on
cue, half of the boys take a knee — some using their shields to block imagined enemy
blows, while others aim their guns and spears towards the imagined German soldiers.
The dancers move their weapons back and forth to the drum beat and those not on a
knee hunch over at the waist, as if crouching through tall grass. High-pitched cries of
“Le-Le-Le-Le-Le” from the women in the audience encourage the dancers in their
repellence of the envisioned German threat.

Seated to my right are two men in jungle fatigues (pants, jacket and boots),
while across sits a teenage female dancer wearing an olive green military jacket and a
little boy wearing a large jungle camouflage jacket. An elder sitting in front of me
dons a Vietnam Veteran’s hat specifically designed for the Teton Lakota — a two inch Lakota medicine wheel sewn into the top of the hat, from which a string attachments a six-inch feather. The feather dangles to the side, shifting back and forth from the left to the back of his head. In the front of the MC booth is a six-foot flagpole placed into the ground. It holds up a Lakota Vietnam Veteran’s flag. The typical Vietnam Veteran’s flag is a multi-striped, vertically oriented green, yellow, and red flag with the green portions on the outer edges. The Lakota version is the same but it has a large horizontal eagle feather running through the entire length of the flag. Looking around, I also see a specifically designed Lakota Marines t-shirt. The Marines symbol of an eagle sitting on a globe, with an anchor running through it diagonally was modified with a Lakota medicine wheel in the place of the globe. This unique intermixing of symbols, both of Lakota (and “Native Pride”) and US military stands out — as I never knew there were so military-related shirts, flags, and other paraphernalia designed specifically for a particular ethnic group.

Dancer regalia varies depending on the type of dancer. The most common dancing for men (and the ones that are featured in this powwow) are fancy, grass, and traditional and for females fancy shawl, jingle, and traditional dances. Each wear a specific type of regalia. For instance, grass dancers have long strands of fabric attached to their arms, legs, waist, and shoulders — these dancers would dance before the setting up of camp, pressing the grass flat and warding off snakes (snakes like the shelter of tall grass). Female fancy shawl dancers hold long shawls wrapped around their shoulders and twirl while dancing, constantly moving and opening their shawl
covered arms to emphasize and accentuate their movement. Jingle dancers have small pieces of metal tied to their regalia by string and clang around and create a distinctive noise. The dancers take the top of tobacco tins and roll them in a conical fashion and use string to hang them upside down in a strip on their garb. A few jingle dancers use spent 3-inch bullet shells in the place of tobacco tin tops, jingling together while they walk and dance.

“We would like to honor them for the services they rendered,” chimes the MC over the loudspeakers. The audience is standing at attention as the procession moves clockwise around the center powwow grounds. Some stand saluting. “Eeh Ha Ay!” the MC cries out, "We celebrate the integrity of these veterans. The original homeland security, the Lakota!”
This chapter explores the transformation of self-affirmative cultural practices. Particularly, it explores the important Lakota cultural space of the powwow and how it has been influenced by the process of militarization. It illustrates how self-affirmative cultural practices have been preserved through adaptations that have allow the Lakota to explore, express, and celebrate their own traditions and subjectivities.

Native Americans have faced decimation and suppression at the hands of genocidal US policy. In spite of this, Natives are still here, they have not been exterminated. Natives have done more than merely survive, they have actively endured and resisted. Throughout the globe, indigenous cultures were being wiped out, though Natives in America were quite different. Fixico (2013) explains, “In America, in the modern West, something drastic has happened: the vanishing race of the late nineteenth century chose not to disappear” (7). To understand this further, Anishinaabe scholar Gerald Vizenor refashions the term survivance to capture this trait. Survivance, derived from the French term, is used to indicate something more that just surviving. It is a combination of survival, endurance, and resistance. By adding the suffix -ance — referring to the act of doing, such as reliance or assistance — to the term survive is to indicate a conscious act and choice of surviving. Lakota cultural practices are examined through the framework of survivance, illustrating how these practices have taken on various forms as a way to maintain key aspects of otherwise suppressed traditions. The powwow is an example of the Lakota reading the colonial landscape (the look of the subject) and asserting their own presence (the gaze of the Other).

This chapter explores self-affirmative cultural practices and their ability to transform according to the realities of the colonial landscape. New forms practice,
emerging from the environment of suppression, act as a way for the once-marginalized Other to gaze back at the colonial subject.

The concept of colonial cultural transference — suppressed cultural values being enacted through new forms of cultural practice — is introduced as a way to understand phenomena which occurs at this nexus of colonialism, warrior traditions, and militarization. The following is segmented into three sections: (1) cultural celebration and the military, (2) survivance and colonial cultural transference, and (3) concluding thoughts. The first section is further separated into three parts: the powwow; the nexus of colonialism, security, and militarization; and military enlistment. The second explores Lakota warrior values of bravery and sacrifice through looking into three elements of the powwow: warrior staffs, sacred numbers, and the Lakota Flag Song.

Section 1: Cultural Celebration and the Military

The powwow

The powwow, or wacipi, offers a present-day representation and expression of Lakota culture and provides a means for hegemonic resistance. "When powwow dancers enter the communal arena circles of Indian country," Ann Axtmann (2013) explains, "they affirm Indian identity and resist colonialization and assimilation" (124). The meanings of the powwow have remained fairly constant, while also allowing for dynamism — both keeping alive important cultural values and permitting new practices and meanings to surface. The term “powwow” refers to gathering spiritual leaders and medicine men (Jennings 1976: 241). The Oceti Sakowin, or the
Seven Council Fires (or bands/tribes), are historically nomadic peoples that would use the spiritual gatherings as a way to communicate and coordinate amongst bands. Once these gatherings were outlawed, the powwow emerged as a way to carry on these important practices. Ann Axtmann (2001) suggests that through the powwow, “Power is manifest as physical, social and spiritual, and individual and communal,” continuing, “reciprocity and exchange are especially pertinent as individuals relate with one another, with visitors, with others who have passed on, and with a higher power” (18).

The powwow is a sacred, celebratory space where old and new traditions enter into a complex dialogue, allowing for new traditions to emerge and old traditions adapt. The powwow as a site of cultural tradition and evolution highlights two significant points: (1) Lakota culture today is alive and thriving and (2) the powwow is both a product and productive of Lakota society. “It’s a gathering, its everything all wrapped into one,” a Lakota elder named Martha explained, “It’s the center.”

Nexus of colonialism, security, and militarization

Why is the valorization of the military and acceptance its necessity such a significant aspect of the powwow? This is even more puzzling knowing the Lakota have long been regarded as the archenemy of the US military, possessing a long and bloody history of military engagements with the US government. In spite of this, Native Americans as an ethnic group have the highest rate of military service in the US (Williams 1998). What can explain this? Even with Native military service rates in mind, it is still striking how prominent the valorization of military and military service is throughout Lakota powwows. Militarization can be understood as a “step-by-step
process by which a person or thing gradually comes to be controlled by the military or comes to depend for its well being on militaristic ideas” (Enloe 2000: 3). This process constructs notions of necessity and worth associated with military service and needs. It goes beyond whether one merely enlists in military service and encompasses the subtle normalization process of military demands and militarized suppositions. It is a process in which military service becomes valorized, remembered, and celebrated.

This chapter asks multiple questions concerning militarization, colonialism, and security. These questions include why is military service so highly valued by the Lakota and why are service rates so high, how has military service become acceptable given the long history of military engagements with the US, and why is military service and valorization so central to the Lakota powwow? These questions explore militarization of the Lakota through the important cultural space of the powwow.

Before addressing these questions, however, a more detailed exploration of the history context of Lakota-US military history and what other scholars have found as reasons for military enlistment.

Military enlistment

There are many reasons put forward to explain military enlistment. The majority of the explanations fall under two broad categories: (1) demographics and family background and (2) individual-level factors.

It has been found that demographics and family backgrounds impact military enlistment (Lawrence and Legree 1995, Stone et al. 1993, and Nieva et al. 1996). Particularly, low socio-economic standing, primarily minorities and those living in the South, contributes to higher rates of enlistment (Dale and Gilroy 1984, Phillips et al.
Moreover, African and Hispanics Americans have had historically disproportionate rates of enlistment, though this trend has lessened over the last ten years (Kleykamp 2006). Parental socialization (Bleeker and Jacobs 2004, Bois et al. 2005) and parental education have been found to impact the likelihood of young adults to join the military. The less education obtained by the parents, the greater likelihood of service for their children (Bachman et al. 2000). A strong impact of parents who serve or previously served has also been found to increase rates of enlistment (Paris 1984, Kilburn and Klerman 1999, Segal and Segal 2004).

Additionally, young people coming from single parent households are more likely to enlistment (Bachman et al. 2000). These decisions take place within increasing college tuitions and diminishing student financial aid (Kleykamp 2006). In summary, those who enlist are generally economically poor, rural, and/or from ethnic or minority groups. They are more likely to have grown up in single parent households, with parents without a college education, and/or parents who serve or previously have served in the military.

Individual-level factors also impact the likelihood of military enlistment. Job training and opportunities to further education has been found to impact enlistment (Tarver et al. 1994, Bachman et al. 2001, National Research Council 2003, Kleykamp 2006, Tsinnajinnie 2011). Classroom performance also effects these rates. Students with lower grades have higher rates of enlistment, especially since stronger grades translates to more college opportunities (Bachman et al. 2000). Low high school grades, minimal college aspirations, and the hope service can bring job training and access to education are all motiving individual-level factors that lead to upward social mobility (Kleykamp 2006). Both of these two types of explanations (demographic-
and individual-level) stem from external forces — circumstances of lack or structures of underachievement producing the likelihood of enlistment. Though these factors undoubtedly impact Lakota rates of military service, they do not paint a complete picture.

Section 2: Survivance and Colonial Cultural Transference

Self-affirmative cultural practices had to adapt and transform in ways that allowed for the continuance of important cultural values. The notion of survivance captures the qualities Natives have displayed in the face of genocidal US policy. It denotes the act of doing something and encompasses survival, endurance, and resistance. Survivance is based upon a “belief in life as movement and continual transformation … [an] ongoing process of hybridity and cultural change” (Helstern 2008: 166). It can also represent “earlier forms to produce something not particularly new, but not really old either,” and the ability “to change in order to stay the same” (Silliman 2014: 60). Survivance as continual transformation and change in order to stay the same can only partially explain militarization at powwows.

Transference, defined by Jacques Derrida as “transportation of a meaning from one location to another,” provides important insights to understand militarization at powwows (Bernet 1993: 143). When transference operates within a colonial context it can provides an analytical tool for understanding the impact of warrior traditions, security, and military service. It illustrates how survivance can be carried out through renegotiating self-affirmative cultural practices. The notion of colonial cultural transference attempts to provide a way to understand the impact of colonial forces on
cultural values over time, or the evolution of salient cultural values and practices as they interact with suppression. It is a way to understand how specific self-affirmative cultural practices transform over time and within various contexts. Operating within the framework of survivance, it shows how communities (re)negotiate cultural practice. It is a way to image how the gaze of the Other is materialized. This gazing back, through renegotiating cultural practices, illustrates a reading of the colonial landscape (the look of the subject) and responding through self- and community-affirmative cultural practices. Transference of one traditional meaning to another more “colonially approved” practice can be seen throughout the powwow; in particular, through an examination of Lakota warrior values of bravery and sacrifice.

Warrior values of bravery and sacrifice

The Lakota are a warrior culture and these values were suppressed by US laws that banned possession of arms and hunting by Natives. Hunting and warriorhood taught Lakota men more than merely how to craft a bow or to shoot an arrow, these activities taught young men about their role in society — how to protect and provide for their family. One of the only available (and legal) expressions for these values for was through US military service. For the Lakota, a warrior is more than a just a soldier or mercenary, it is one who sacrifices for good of the People and cares for the vulnerable. Traditionally, being a warrior meant a willingness to sacrifice your life for the protection and betterment of the People. Bravery and sacrifice were at the heart these values and were key to being a good relative, a notion that is of utmost importance in Lakota culture. A good relative recognizes the responsibility each has to
the other, to the community. This ensures the safety and future of the community and traditional ways of life.

Already into her 80’s, Maryanne is a respected elder who, along with a small group of other elders, has taken on efforts to ensure the continuation of traditional Lakota ceremonies. “Our people are warriors,” Maryanne tells me while we’re sipping on our hot drinks, “we’ve always been warriors, always.” On the wall behind her, towards the rear of the kitchen, is a three foot braided string of wild turnips (timpsula) and, to her side, a seashell the size of an ash trey with the burnt remnants of sage. “The military is a way to continue our warrior society,” she says, “We’ve always been warriors, we’ve always been fighters.”

This appreciation and reverence for the values associated with being a warrior is evident throughout the powwow. For instance, I was once approached midway through a powwow by an older Lakota women named Martha. After we spoke for some time, I joined her family and when I sat down I noticed her granddaughter was donning ornate regalia with an old image of a soldier on the back. Martha had created the dancing regalia for her granddaughter and the image was of Martha’s uncle, a code talker from WWII. We sat in her family’s fold-up chairs in the front-row and she began to tell me the importance of her uncle, “They are the ones who protect us, they fought for us to live.” She then takes the tail end of her granddaughter’s regalia, the portion emblazoned with her uncle’s image, “They fight for the right to live and for those who cannot fight for themselves.”

In Lakota, the concept closest to military soldiering is akicita, which loosely translates to warrior. The meaning of akicita, or ogichidaa in Anishinaabe/Ojibwe is closely related to the English word soldier, though they differ in significant ways.
*Akicita* carries a deeper meaning. In 1897, a Lakota man named Thomas Tyon explained the differences, “When I speak of the *akicita* of the white people I mean the soldiers… but *akicita* never means a soldier of the Lakotas, except when a Lakota is in the army of the white people as a soldier” (1992: 28). *Akicita* can be used in multiple ways and has various (but related) meanings. As a verb, it can be seen as hunting for something or searching for the “right way to do something” (Tyon 1992: 28). As a noun, it can refer to a camp officer designated by tribal leadership. This kind of *akicita* is “the highest officer of a camp” and acts as policeman, judge, and jailor all in one (Tyon 1992: 29). It also refers to officers charged with organizing and protecting moving bands, protecting the People during vulnerable transitions of camp. Though *akicita* can be defined as military soldiers, it also holds much deeper meanings.

Bravery and sacrifice are two values that are still central the Lakota way of life, particularly for men coming of age. “In order to continue being warriors, you went to war,” explains Maryanne, “we couldn’t go to war with each other anymore.” At the end of the Indian Wars, guns and hunting became outlawed, and any Lakota who ventured off reservation would be treated as a US enemy. The Lakota way of life was shaken up and warrior practices suppressed — there was no outlet for the Lakota to continue time-honored and enact culturally defining practices. The Lakota, however, refused to lose their ways of life and adapted accordingly.

Lakota manhood depended upon warrior traditions. “[Military service] is similar to going away to learn how to be a warrior,” Andrew tells me, continuing, “there is no place else to test your skills.” Andrew, a Lakota man in his mid-50’s is not a physically large man but his voice is gruff and his demeanor imposing. “There are other ways you can be a warrior, but the quickest way is to go to the military, and that
is what I did — US Marine Corps,” he explains. He then tells me about his family ties to great Lakota warriors of the past and explains the significance of warriorhood to manhood. “When the boys get of age, they usually go to the military… its just part of being a man, manhood.” Military service, and the accompanying valorization of service, provided an avenue for the Lakota to enact and embody cultural values through new and evolving outlets. “I never pushed my children into joining any type of military service,” Andrew continues, then starts naming two, three and four of his kids and nephews who served in the military. “I don’t push them into it, it was always their choice, my parents never pushed me into it either.” Natalie, Andrew’s wife, then asserts, “We don’t push our kids, but they know their dad is a Marine… and they still want to be what their dad was.”

Cultural values passed on through warrior traditions faced a period of suppression. This caused these self- and community-affirmative cultural practices to embody new forms — forms deemed more “acceptable” to the dominating culture. US military service was one means of carrying out warrior traditions. This occurred as a result of, and in spite of, ongoing US efforts to eradicate Lakota ways of being. Serving in the US military for the Lakota, therefore, is much more than merely enlisting to be a soldier, it is a continuation of a cultural traditions associated with manhood, bravery, and sacrifice. Traditions are able to find manifestation through self- and community-affirmative cultural practices that connect young Lakota men of today with great Lakota warriors of old. Transference can be seen through the use of warrior staff and US veteran flags, the duration of military service and Lakota sacred numbers, and the Lakota Flag Song.
Warrior staffs and US veteran flags

US military veteran flags drape the powwow grounds and encircle the circular dancing area, reaching upward on twenty-foot flag poles. Each flag represents a family members of those present who have served in the US military — passing away from either direct conflict or through old age. These are the US flags that cover caskets at funerals.

The veteran flags are so important to the powwow that it even gets publicized in the local newspapers as the “Raising of the Flag Celebration.” This practice, however, derives its origins from pre-Euro-American contact (see Schmittou and Logan 2002). Historically the Lakota did not have flags; instead, they surrounded the celebration grounds with warrior staffs. Flags were first introduced by the Europeans and then Americans. US flags began to be used in powwows after World War I, when Native veterans were returning home with American service experience. This was during a time when practicing traditional Lakota ways was outlawed and seven years before the Lakota became US citizens.

The Lakota utilized staffs to represent a group or society — primarily, but not limited to, warrior societies. Individual warriors also carried staffs and, upon their passing, they were used in celebrations and ceremony as a way to honor their owner and their sacrifices. Historically, these staffs surrounded the celebration grounds as a way to remember fallen warriors and highlight the importance of bravery and sacrifice. With warrior traditions suppressed and US military service an easy and acceptable alternative, traditional practices were altered — Lakota warrior staffs were replaced by US military veteran’s flags. Another way this can be seen is through the duration of military service.
Duration of service and sacred numbers

Durations of military service, four or seven years, coincide with traditional Lakota warriorhood practices. When young Lakota men were coming of age, it would be essential for them to learn the values of bravery and sacrifice through become a warrior. This was a critical aspect to becoming a man and learning how to be a good relative. At the age of thirteen, boys would be sent off to the far boundaries of the Lakota territory, mainly to the North, to help protect against marauding rival tribes. Young men would learn from older warriors and serve to reinforce areas where the Lakota were most vulnerable. They would learn fighting techniques, the tactics of stealth and cunning, hunting and tracking, and how to practice discretion and discernment—when to count coup or when to kill. They learned to herd and protect cattle, as well as other roles of men that carried on the Lakota way of life.

Traditionally boys were sent away to learn the warrior ways for four years. Upon their return, they would full-grown men and formidable warriors, able to take care of the People and be a good relative. Only then would they be able to marry, protect their family, and provide for the larger tiospaye.

“That was normal,” says Neil, “See, you’re gone at thirteen, so when you come home you got the right to choose your wife and protect your family from there forward.” Sitting on the couch in Neil’s home, to my left is a wall of photographs dedicated to family members who served in the military. Photographs varied from soldiers with their arms around each other to more formal headshots in uniform. A picture of a young Neil in his army uniform is surrounded by photographs, some dating back to the early 1900s and others quite modern. “All the Lakotas went to the full max, just to show them that we did it,” Neil tells me as he folds a small blanket and straightens up his living room. “If you’re in the National Guard, you were just a
weekend warrior, that’s what we’d call you.” Neil is in his fifties and is a well-known local artist and fluent Lakota speaker.\textsuperscript{18} He comes from a long line of US military service — a great grandfather in World War I, an uncle a Lakota code talker in World War II, and his nieces currently serve in the Navy. Even his late wife’s great grandfather served in World War I and grandfather in World War II.

“It hit our culture right on the head,” Neil says, “because it’s four years or seven years.” “Those are our numbers and are based around our beliefs.” For the Lakota, military service is a full-time commitment and not just a part time activity — many serving for four or seven years.\textsuperscript{19} This aligned to the Lakota sacred numbers and mirrored traditional practices of warriorhood. The sacred number four represents the four directions, four seasons, four types of balance (spiritual, physical, intellectual, emotional), and four winds. There are Seven Council Fires (or the seven bands of Lakota), seven sacred parts of the body, seven sacred directions (north, east, south, west, up, down, and internal), and seven stars that comprise the Big Dipper — the Big Dipper plays a central role in the Lakota origin story, the Lakota coming from an arrow from the Big Dipper and landing in the Black Hills.

The tradition of sending young men for four years to vulnerable areas of the territory was an important ritual that allowed for young males to learn the warrior way, to be a good relative, and their role in society. They gained the skills needed to protect and to carryout traditional Lakota ways of living throughout their life.\textsuperscript{20} The opportunity to be sent off for four or seven years to learn from other Lakota warriors was interrupted and suppressed. US military service became an alternative and, again, we see traditional ways of life being altered and transferred to new self-affirmative cultural practices. Transference can also be seen through the Lakota Flag Song.
Lakota Flag Song

The powwow grounds are covered with American flags, a few dozen on flag staff surround the central powwow dancing area. In spite of this, it is the Lakota Flag Song and not the US National Anthem is sang. This takes place at the beginning and end of each powwow session — there are two sessions a day and many powwows last multiple days. The Flag Song can be understood in multiple ways that serve distinct purposes — one that reinforces and carries on Lakota traditional ways of life and the other gesturing to the colonial realities faced by the Lakota. The Lakota Flag Song lyrics read:

\[
\text{Tȟuŋkášilayapi, ȟawápaha kiŋháŋ /} \\
\text{oïhanke šni hē nážiŋ kte lō /} \\
\text{Iyóhlateya oyáte kiŋháŋ /} \\
\text{wičhíchaŋiŋ kta čha, /} \\
\text{léčhamuŋ weló.}
\]

This commonly translates to: The flag of the United States / will stand, indestructibly. / Because of the Flag, / the People shall live, / and flourish. Parts of these lyrics, however, can be translated in different manners. Take for instance, the first line “The flag of the United States” — \(\text{Tȟuŋkášilayapi, ȟawápaha kiŋháŋ.}\) 
\(\text{Thawápaha,}\) is commonly translated as “flag.” Though traditionally, as previously mentioned, the Lakota did not use flags. \(\text{Thawápaha,}\) therefore, can also mean staff.
Secondly, Šuŋkášila, translates to “grandfather,” or what the Lakota refer to as the Creator or Great Spirit. As initially translated, it can also come to mean the US. When the Lakota first met white Americans, they were told to see and refer to the US president as their grandfather. As a result, this first line can either come to mean “The flag of the United States” or “The staff of the Creator” — two equally significant, yet serving different ends, translations.

The Flag Song was created just after World War II in a time when practicing Native spirituality and prayer had been outlawed for roughly sixty years (Red Cloud Indian School 2014). Suppression was well underway and had already impacted multiple generations. The Lakota could not pray or express thanks to the Creator in any manner outside of Christian-based expression. Violation of this carried a penalty of up to 30 years imprisonment (Zielske 2010). The Lakota Flag Song, therefore, became a way to carrying on a core Lakota value — prayer to the Creator — while still being understood as demonstrating allegiance to the US government.

The Lakota Flag Song is a central aspect to powwows, as well as many other Lakota ceremonies and events, and is another example of adaptation and transference. The look of the subject trough suppression of native spirituality and prayer led to expressions of these cultural values to take new forms — self- and community-affirmative cultural practices maintained important traditional values. The Lakota Flag Song acts as a substitute to the US National Anthem in a way that appeals to the dominant sensibilities, while at the same time carrying on a major aspect of Lakota life — prayer.
Section 3: Concluding Thoughts

The intersection of colonialism and traditions produces complex and layered puzzles. The important cultural celebration of the powwow reflects the centrality of US military service for Lakota communities. The process of militarization is visually pervasive throughout these celebrations. This chapter explored this puzzle and found that though the common explanations of military service — poverty, lack of education and job opportunities, poor academic performance or college preparation, and desired upward social mobility — are relevant, they did not tell the whole picture. A deeper examination of Lakota military service through the interrogation of the historical Lakota context, as well as placing it within a Lacanian dialectic framework — of the look of the subject and the gaze of the Other — reveals new ways of seeing high rates of military service as expression of self- and community-affirmative cultural practices. Colonial cultural transference allows for a way to understand how the suppressive look of the subject is met through transformed cultural expressions.

This chapter explored how military service and the militarization of powwows are renegotiated expressions of important, yet suppressed, self-affirmative cultural practices. It looked at military enlistment, survivance and colonial cultural transference, and warrior values of bravery and sacrifice. Traditional values of warriorhood have been suppressed, forcing the Lakota to find new expressions of these values. New expressions can be seen through the use of US veteran’s flags, the duration of military service, and the Lakota Flag Song. New forms of self-affirmative cultural practice, emerging from the realities of the suppressive landscape, act as a way for the once-marginalized Other to gaze back at the colonial subject. The look of the colonial subject outlawed Lakota practices and caused them to reimagine self-
affirmative cultural practices. The powwow is an example of how the Lakota have engaged in maintaining, reclaiming, and reviving traditions in a way that provides a sense of purpose and direction.
ENDNOTES

1 Dates of powwow ceremony was July 25-27, 2014.

2 Survivance has had somewhat of a wide usage. For instance, at the first exhibit at the National Museum of the American Indian, on the National Mall in Washington D.C. is the Our Lives: Contemporary Life and Identities exhibit. Immediately as you enter, there is a wall of photographs of various Natives from around North America, showing the diversity of Natives on the continent. The accompanying text panel features prominently the definition and explanation of Vizenor’s term survivance. In terms of scholarly impact, Vizenor’s top five works about survivance have been cited nearly 800 times (per Google Scholar as of Feb. 2, 2015).

3 Vizenor refers to survivance as a practice not as a theory, suggesting, “Survivance is a practice, not an ideology, dissimulation, or a theory” (Vizenor 2008: 11).

4 There is a great diversity of Native American experience and expression. I write specifically of the Lakota powwows I attended over the summer of 2014, July 25-27, 2014.

5 Interview with Martha at a powwow, July 27, 2014.

6 The related but broader term “militarism” arose in the 1860’s in Germany and France to signify political criticism, or to “describe the adoption of war and military behaviors as ideals: the glorification of war and military power as ends in themselves, as dominant or even defining values in a society in which the military establishment has disproportionate social and political influence relative to other elites or institutions” (Kohn 2008: 182); while Alfred Vagts (1959) holds that militarism is “a vast array of customs, interests, prestige, actions, and thought associated with armies and wars and yet transcending true military purposes” (13ff). For more on militarism see Berghahn 1984; Stargardt 1994; Bönker 2002. Turning to militarization, historian Michael Geyer (1989) defines it as “the contradictory and tense social process in which civil society organizes itself for the production of violence” (79); while Michael Sherry (1995) provides a broader definition of militarization as, “the process by which war and national security became consuming anxieties and provided the memories, models and metaphors that shaped broad areas of national life” (xi). Richard Kohn (2008) suggests militarization as “the degree to which a society’s institutions, policies,
behaviors, thought, and values are devoted to military power and shaped by war” (182). Armato et al. (2013) also draws from Cynthia Enloe’s (2000) conceptualization of militarization as “a step-by-step process by which a person or a thing gradually comes to be controlled by the military or comes to depend for its well-being on militaristic ideas” (3). An important aspect of this is the normalization of military symbols and ideals throughout society - toys, TV, music, video games, and fashion (Singer 2009; Stahl 2009; Turse 2008).

7 Most of these studies look at high school age individuals since it was found that this is the age when decisions to enlist occurs (Segal et al. 1998, Bachman et al. 2000).

8 This working definition, however, belies the complexity and of the term. Vizenor, “a lover of verbal jousting and the innate comic potential of language,” has defined survivance in multiple ways and at times in contradictory manners (Carlson 2011: 39, footnote 11). For instance, both relying upon dictionary definitions then asserting that dictionaries “do not provide the national reason or sense of the word” (Purdy and Hausman 2005: 98). As a result, the concept of survivance has come to encompass many things: surviving and resisting, “survival + endurance” (Weaver 2006: 89); “active presence” (Breinig 2008: 39); an “active repudiation of dominance, tragedy, and victimry” (Bernet 1993: 144); something “more than survival, more than endurance or mere response” (Breinig 2008: 39); an “action, condition, quality, and sentiments of the verb survive” (Vizenor 2008: 19); and an “act of being recognized” (Carlson 2011: 17). Two important aspects of survivance that relate to this chapter are Deep Memory and Perfect Memory. Deep Memory focuses on the “development of a profound emotional/psychological connection with the transpersonal traumas of Native history” as a source of strength; it is the project of “rendering the unconscious conscious” (Helstern 2008: 164-165). Perfect Memory, on the other hand, focuses on individual memory and identity as a social creation. Put differently, Deep Memory focuses with the deep workings of the unconscious and Perfect Memory the renegotiating the ever-changing identity. Colonial cultural transformation most closely aligns with the level of Perfect Memory.

9 First introduced by Sigmund Freud (1900), transference refers to the displacement of affect from one thing to another (SE V 562). Transference refers to a subconscious phenomena where emotions are transferred from one relationship (generally from childhood) to another (in adulthood). Transference in psychotherapy is defined as “the neurotic feelings that were displaced or transferred from formative relationships” (Marcus 2002: 851). It later came to refer to a patient’s relationship to the analyst. There are a few other relevant understandings of transference. Freud (1912) asserts transference creates a willingness for the weaker individual (or group of people) to assimilate the cultural apparatus of that of the authority. Framing it in the patient-
therapist relationship, transference causes an “eagerness of the patient to assimilate the conceptual apparatus of psychoanalysis, even to absorb the particular slant or preferences of their own analyst, and to reproduce them fluently in their sessions” (Niezen 2005: 539). Additionally, Ronald Niezen (2005) examines transference in regards to the relationship between international indigenous representation and international institutions and discourse. Indigenous spokespeople are influenced by the institutions and organizations that govern, codify, and frame their concerns, holding that “correspondence of ideas between indigenous representatives and U.N. officials suggests that the concept of indigenous peoples has been collaboratively developed” (Niezen 2005: 544). Lacan’s treatment of transference is another example of his commitment to a dialectic. He is critical of Freud’s term of countertransference — the unconscious feelings of the psychoanalyst to the patient. Instead, he insists that transference is already a dialectic involving both parties, “Transference is a phenomenon in which subject and psycho-analyst are both included. To divide it in terms of transference and counter-transference… is never more than a way of avoiding the essence of the matter” (Lacan 1964: 231).

10 Colonial cultural transference bears some resemblance to the notion of “syncretism” in the field of religious studies, meaning the “Attempted union or reconciliation of diverse or opposite tenets or practices,” and the “process of fusing diverse ideas or sensations into a general (inexact) impression; an instance of this” (Oxford English Dictionary Online).

11 I refer to this as colonial cultural transference. The colonial qualifier refers to a relationship of power imbalance produced by colonialism — present in both the patient-therapist and the colonized-colonizer relationship. Cultural emphasizes the operations of transference at the cultural and social levels, suggesting it occurs not only through individual practices but also through cultural practices. As a result, cultural transference can contribute to understanding how displacements of affect can also impact cultural and social values, celebrations, and meanings. This differs from how “cultural transference” is typically defined within psychotherapy - indicating the “emotional reactions of a client to the therapist based on the client’s sense of who the therapist is culturally with respect to race, ethnicity, religion, gender, age, social class, and other factors” (Jackson and Greene 2000: 20). I intentionally use the term suppression and not repression. Repression generally takes place at a subconscious level, while suppression at the conscious level. The forces of colonialism occur on a conscious level. That is, those who are being impacted are aware that their practices and expressions are being suppressed.

12 Great Lakota chief Sitting Bull describes the notion of a Lakota warrior: “For us, warriors are not what you think of as warriors. The warrior is not someone who
fights, because no one has the right to take another’s life. The warrior, for us, is one who sacrifices himself for the good of others. His task is to take care of the elderly, the defenseless, those who cannot provide for themselves and above all, the children, the future of humanity” (LaDuke 2013: 3). This quote, however, cannot be verified as coming from Sitting Bull in spite of it being widely circulated as such (See Chadwick 2012).

13 The Lakota use the term “the People” to refer to the larger group of the Oceti Sakowin, or the Seven Council Fires that include the Lakota, Nakota, and Dakota (See Appendix B).

14 Interview with Maryanne on August 18, 2014.

15 This is not exclusive to only men, there are many accounts of female warriors and acts of bravery and sacrifice by women.

16 There were multiple interviews with Andrew and Natalie, this one took place on August 5, 2014.

17 Considered the most honorable act carried out by a warrior, counting coup is to touch an enemy warrior without taking their life. Being able to have deliver a death blow and yet leaving them to continue with they life would leave a more significant impact in the life of the opposing warrior and their community than merely killing them. The bravery, cunning, and skill that this required - to touch a hostile enemy warrior with a coup stick - carried with it the respect and honor.

18 There were multiple Interviews with Neil, this particular one was on August 18, 2014.

19 For accuracy’s sake, the majority of first-term enlistments require four year active duty commitments, with two years of inactive duty. Depending on timing, this process no doubt stretches into seven years (Military.com).

20 Becoming a warrior and the responsibility to protect the tiospaye was (and is) a lifelong commitment. In the broader American culture, when it comes to the end of military service, it is viewed that military responsibilities are over and assimilation back into civilian life begins. While Lakota veterans also face the same assimilation process, there is a strong cultural belief that values and responsibilities associated with being a warrior continue well beyond the four-year period of service. The concept of ending service or putting aside warrior identity was not existent; this tradition carries on today - exemplified through Neil’s assertion of Lakota going “full max” and the derision directed towards “weekend warriors.” Upon arriving home, warriors of old
and soldiers of today join akicita societies, making them responsible for security and safety on the reservation. Today, this primarily takes the form of ensuring safety at ceremonies and community events (including powwows).
Chapter 7

FIGHTING FOR RECOGNITION, ENGAGING SOCIAL ORDER

Field Note: From “Savage” to Colonizer – William Jones in the Philippines

The late nineteenth century was a difficult one for Native Americans. Still considered less than human, American policy towards Natives was one of elimination and destruction. Before encountering Euro-American colonizers, Native population was five million, with some estimations as high as ten million. By the close of the nineteenth century, however, population reached its nadir at 238,000, marking a conservatively ninety-five percent decrease (Fixico 2013: 220). This included the gruesome and tragic events of the Trail of Tears and the Wounded Knee Massacre, to name a few. By the turn of the nineteenth century, Natives were still considered savages and were viewed as the principle enemy of the US military, not becoming full citizens until 1924.

Racism and prejudice towards Natives was widespread and reflected throughout the projects of science and research. This is particularly the case with the discipline of anthropology, whose primary aim was to “discover” and explore so-called primitive peoples (Gulbenkian Commission 1996, Beier 2009). Tribes have been killed off, cultures eliminated, and people enslaved in the name of scientific inquiry.
William Jones was born in 1871 in Oklahoma (Fox and Sauk Nations) and in his youth he studied at Hampton Institute and Andover Academy in the Northeast (Boston Evening Transcript 1909). Going on to study at Harvard and then Columbia for graduate school during a time just after the completion of the Indian Wars in 1890 and well before Natives were granted citizenship in the 1920s (Rideout 1912). Jones was only the fourth Ph.D. in linguistic anthropology and the first Native anthropology Ph.D. While at Columbia, Jones studied under the father of anthropology Franz Boas. In spite of having studied in some of the country’s finest institutions, Jones could not find a way to fund his continued studies of northern Algonquian tribes.

Being left without any options, Jones decided to take a field assignment with the Field Museum of Natural History in 1906 to study the Igorot Indigenous tribes of the Philippines. This was just after the 1898 transfer of colonial rule of the Philippines from the Spanish to the US and just years after the completion of the Philippine-American War that claimed the lives of nearly a quarter of a million soldiers and civilians (US Department of State). Having been ruled by the Spaniards for three hundred and seventy-seven years, Filipinos had become accustomed to colonial violence and control.

In his diary, Jones writes, “My work out there will probably be with the pygmy black man called the Negrito. He is the wild man of the islands” (Rideout 1912: 127-128). He started from the North in Aparri in the North and moved down the Cagayan River. He first met the Negritos and then the Igorots, or more specifically the Ilongot ethnic group of the Igorot tribe. These Filipino Indigenous groups were no strangers to
violent colonial rule, facing this type of treatment throughout the Spanish occupation. They did not, however, expect this type of treatment from another Indigenous person. He describes the Ilongot as “little naked brownies, with crinkly russet hair, and often a crinkly russet down of a beard; with broad cheeks but narrow chins, so that their faces had a cat-like, effeminate contour” (Rideout 1912: 139).

During his sixteen months in Northern Luzon, Jones treated the Ilongots with contempt and derision — the same racism and prejudice directed at him in the US. The following is an excerpt from Jones’ personal diary, “Their aspect is most repelling. Hands, faces, and their bodies are smeared with blotches of various kinds of dirt; and their stiff hair is disheveled. As they sit and scratch their lousy [a reference to lice] selves they seem more like beasts than human beings” (1908: 176).

Jones handled himself with the same attitude of superiority presented towards him in the US. After some time on assignment, Jones arranged to have a handful of boats meet him at Dumobato, near the headwaters of Cagayan River in Isabela Province to carry his collected works back to the capital Manila. The Ilongots stumbled in providing arrangements and not only were the boats late in arrival, but they also were a few boats short of what Jones requested. Jones was frustrated by this malfeasance and took his out his anger on the Indigenous Filipinos. Jones cursed and yelled at the locals, leading him to forcefully grab the arm of an Ilongot elder. A few Indigenous warriors took offense and sought out to correct this slight. They attacked Jones and his team, spearing him multiple times and wounding his two assistants. The
three narrowly escaped on one of the boats, though Jones passed before they were able to arrive in Manila.¹

Jones was subject to prejudicial treatment and racism in the US because he was Native. Shut out of work opportunities in the US, he was stationed to work with Indigenous Filipinos in a remote part of the country. While there, he reenacted the same colonial violences he faced at home, upon Indigenous Filipinos. Instead of finding solidarity amongst the Ilongots, Jones reviled the Filipinos with disdain, derision, and a strong sense of superiority. This attitude cost Jones his life.
"My conscious won't let me go shoot my brother, or some darker people, or some poor hungry people in the mud for big powerful America. And shoot them for what? They never called me nigger, they never lynched me, they didn't put no dogs on me, they didn't rob me of my nationality, rape and kill my mother and father… My enemy is the white people, not Viet Cong or Chinese or Japanese. You my opposer when I want freedom. You my opposer when I want justice. You my opposer when I want equality. You won't even stand up for me in America for my religious beliefs — and you want me to go somewhere and fight, but you won't even stand up for me here at home? "

Mohammad Ali

This chapter explores the strategy of military service adopted by minority groups to engage the phenomenal social order. It examines Lakota military service and African and Latino American experiences in making rights claims based on service. It suggests that engaging in military service is a problematic means of engaging and transforming the dominant social order, particularly within an Indigenous context. It explores Lakota military service and draws from the cases of Buffalo Soldiers and Native anthropologist William Jones. Military service has been used as a tactic by minority groups to make gains in equal rights (Parker 2009, Sullivan 2014). Military veterans, throughout US history, have attempted to gain recognition as equal citizens through their service to the US. Returning veterans, however, have not always been received as they had hoped — instead of being seen as equals, many were met with the same prejudice and legal discrimination they faced before their service. As a result from this reality, veterans have used military service to leverage claims for equal rights premised on the claim that if a group is willing to give the ultimate sacrifice for the country, then they should have the same rights as everyone else.³

Military service has been a means adopted by marginalized groups as a way to gain recognition of a dominant class — as is the case with African Americans and
Latino Americans. This tactic, however, often fails short of achieving its desired outcome. Though it is not fully clear that the Lakota have made large-scale attempts to leverage military service to make equal rights claims, as many veterans I spoke to conveyed their desire gain recognition from their own Lakota community rather than the US, this tactic was reflected in some efforts put forward by Natives after World War I and leading to the 1924 Indian Citizenship Act.4

This chapter explores the use of military service as a means for engaging the phenomenal social order — that military service can illustrate the loyalty and service of a minority group and act as a way to obtain equal or increased civil rights. The following is divided into three sections: (1) military service by minority groups, (2) the problems with military service for equal rights claims, and (3) concluding thoughts. The first section is further subdivided into two parts: the origins of the citizen-soldier and minority groups claims. The second section is also divided into two parts: reinscribing colonial violence and controlling Native identity. The last section is subdivided into two parts: what can be learned from struggles of other minority groups and a need for new tools.

Section 1: Military Service by Minority Groups

Minority groups have used military service as a way to make citizenship and equal rights claims. The basis of this connection has its origins in ancient Greece, where the association of the duties of soldiering with citizenship was seen as a necessary aspect to the creation of a national narrative. This tradition has caused minority groups within the US to make citizen and rights claims based on military
service. The origins of this association, as well as how minority groups within the US have engaged this tradition will be explored in this section.

Origins of citizen-soldier

The origins of the association of citizenry and soldiering come from the beginnings of the study of international relations (IR). The dominant narrative of IR begins at the fifth century BC Peloponnesian War between Sparta and Athens. In this narrative, politics and war-fighting went hand-in-hand, they were synonymous. “The story of politics and war in the Western tradition does not unfold as a fall from grace, a tale of sordid descent from a bucolic age when people peacefully went about their business and let their neighbors peacefully go about there. Instead, it is a tale of arms and the men,” explains Jean Bethke Elshtain (1987: 47). Being an active citizen required protecting the state, what Elshtain (1987) refers to an “armed civic virtue.” Citizenship required warfare. The notion of armed civic virtue is further reinforced by many of the most well-known political philosophers such as Aristotle, Plato, Machiavelli, Rousseau, Hegel, Clausewitz, and Marx and Engels.

Armed civic virtue was also tied to the creation and expansion of the nation-state. War-fighting allowed the protection and expansion of the state, providing it with vitality and identity. As people became absorbed into Western political life, they became absorbed in “war and the state” (Elshtain 1987: 75). Maintaining the primacy of the state required domination and expansion. Later, as the nation-state moved away from a sole focus on being a warfare state, it also became a welfare state. Throughout this time, citizenship was predicated upon white, male independence — a standard which was impossible for Natives, women, and other people of color (Pateman 1988).
The creation of the citizen was premised on logics of domination and subordination. Carole Patemen (2008) explains, “Defence [sic] of the state (or the ability to protect your protection, as Hobbes put it), the ultimate test of citizenship, is also a masculine prerogative” (248). Citizenship was a white male endeavor and heavily gendered — the state cast men as “bearers of arms” and women and children as those in need of protection (Pateman 1998, Hawkesworth 2006). At this period, people of color and indigenous people were yet to be considered fully human.

In the US, World War I and military service was used as a way to create new citizens. In spite of not yet being citizens, Natives served in the US military during World War I in great numbers. In the years leading up to the war, then-President Theodore Roosevelt and the Progressives viewed military training as a way to acculturate immigrants coming into the country (Krebs 2004). Soon after, and at the height of the war in 1917, President Woodrow Wilson instituted conscription, or mandatory universal military service. Military service was seen as a means to defend the nation, as well as to craft new citizens among immigrants. Nationalizing liberals viewed conscription as an effective way to homogenize so-called dangerous elements of society (Elshtain 1987: 115).

The viewing of military service as a means of ideal citizenry and national acculturation are still visible today. Today, the military is seen as “a key institution for the labeling and transmission of social values” and exemplary citizenship (Krebs 2004: 85, Janowitz 1976, Sullivan 2014). Military service is even a way that non-citizens can achieve citizenship (Bredbenner 2012). At the start of this decade, thirty-five thousand non-citizens were serving in the US military, with an average of five to eight thousand non-citizen enlistments every year (Garamone 2010).
Minority group claims

Minority groups have used service as a way to make claims for equal rights and engage oppressive social order. There are many reasons why individuals from marginalized groups enlist in military service; this includes, but is not limited to, financial reward (Dale and Gilroy 1984, Segal et al. 1998), access to education (Tarver et al. 1994, Bachman et al. 2001), international travel, and social mobility or job training (Kleykamp 2006). Another significant reason is the hope for better treatment by the government and society (Krebs 2004, Sullivan 2014), including claims to citizenship (Cohen 2013: 77, Ramirez 2009: 27) and equal rights and treatment (Burk 1995). The following is a brief overview of a few minority groups engaging military service as a way to leverage claims for equal rights.5

African Americans

African Americans have had instances of engaging military service as a means for equal rights claims. Take for instance, the Buffalo Soldiers, the African American army units that were created in 1866 through an act of Congress. Freed slaves from the 1863 Emancipation Proclamation joined Union forces in the tens of thousands. Just a few years earlier Africans were barred from serving in the military and now they were being incorporated into their own units — though they did receive substantively lower pay and were placed under the supervision of white officers under the US War Department’s Bureau of Colored Troops. During the US Civil War, 186,000 black troops fought and 38,000 died — more deaths than any individual state (Dunbar-Ortiz
Poor Irish communities from New York also joined the military in large numbers and contributed significantly to the highest death toll of any singular state. After the Civil War, these black and Irish troops then fought for the US in the Indian Wars on the Great Plains. Buffalo Soldiers were present on the Great Plains, as well as being involved in battles in Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines. Though it would be reasonable to assume black soldiers and poor Irish soldiers would have found solidarity with the plight of the Natives they were fighting since both groups had been subject to marginalization by the dominant US society, they did not. Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz (2014) explains,

This is precisely how colonialism in general and colonial warfare in particular work. It is not unique to the United States, but rather a part of the tradition of European colonialism since the Roman legions. The British organized whole armies of ethnic troops in South and Southwestern Asia, the most famous being the Gurkhas from Nepal, who fought as recently as Margaret Thatcher’s war against Argentina in 1983 (147).

Not only did this formation of the modern army serve to protect US territory, but it also served as a tool for imperial expansion. These endeavors were often carried out overseas by marginalized minority groups who were themselves serving in the military to gain more rights back in the US (Dunbar-Ortiz: 149).

The “black republican” movement in the late 1950s and 1960s somewhat successfully utilized military service for equal rights gains (Parker 2009). Towards the 1950s and early 1960s, black communities began to coalesce and band together to resist racial discrimination through the creation of community institutions, such as fraternity groups, churches, and civic groups that were all encouraging further
community solidarity (Hughes and Demo 1990, Litwack 1998, Skocpol et al. 2006, Parker 2009). At this important moment, black veterans were present in great numbers in the Vietnam War (and had already served in World War I, WWII, and the Korean War). Based on this, black veterans believed they were entitled to the same rights of all US citizens and demanded treatment as such. This belief led to firmer and more compelling group claims.

Though these veterans helped African Americans gain civil rights and used service as a way to engage the phenomenal social order and better treatment, military service in itself, however, was not the direct cause of these equal rights gains (Parker 2009). Instead, the best that can be hoped for is the minority group’s claims and resolve become more emboldened. African Americans have, for the most part, achieved legal and institutional equality in the US. Yet, still, black communities face many non-legal forms of discrimination and prejudice. That is, equal rights were gained but the overall structural inequality that blacks face in the US has not been fully addressed.

Latino Americans

Latino Americans have attempted to transform colonial structures by making rights claims based on service. Mexican Americans fought on the US side in World War I and, upon returning to their communities, a handful of veterans began to form US citizen-only civil rights organizations in Texas. These organizations leveraged their military service as a way to make claims for civil rights and equal treatment. After World War II and with even more Mexican American participation in the US military, these organizations grew to have a nationwide political influence. It was not
until the Vietnam War, however, that these organizations began advocating and including Mexican immigrants in their advocacy. This is the foundation of the American GI Forum (AGIF) and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), two contemporary groups who advocate on behalf of Latino communities and who both support legal pathways towards citizenship based on military service. This mentality has been referred to as the civic republican perspective, where “unauthorized immigrants should be given the option to enlist in the military to serve their adopted country and show their preparation for citizenship if they so choose” (Sullivan 2014: 246).

Today, this use of service to gain the rights can be seen most clearly in the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act. First introduced in 2001, the DREAM ACT is still being nationally debated, though has been implemented in the state of California. The Act allows undocumented immigrants who entered the country before the age of sixteen to earn citizenship by either serving in the military or going to college (Sullivan 2014: 246). The DREAM Act will significantly impact transnational Latino communities — 1.4 million children and young adults could benefit from the Act, 70 percent of which are from Mexico (Pew 2012a). The Act has been widely supported by the US military, viewing it as a way to increase military enlistment after a lull in the mid-2000’s, as well as Latino communities who see it as a way to earn the rights of citizenship — upwards 91 percent of Latinos support the DREAM Act (Pew 2012b).

Even though military service has emboldened minority group claims for equal rights and citizenship, such as the case with African Americans, it has not always been able to achieve equal treatment. “The historical legacy of unrequited loyalty, service,
and sacrifice by previous generations of Mexican-American citizens and immigrants alike,” Sullivan (2014) explains, “further underscores why immigrant rights advocates should exercise caution in advocating for a pathway to citizenship for unauthorized immigrants based on military service” (257).

Native Americans

Native Americans have the highest rates of military service per ethnic group in the US (Williams 1998, Lemay 2012). Lakota men and women have fought in every major US military operation since World War I. If you include their involvement in the Indian Wars and their efforts for both sides of the US Revolutionary War, then military service stretches back to a much further date. In spite of this, Natives were only made citizens in 1924. Natives played critical roles in the winning of both World War I and World War II, serving as code talkers in both of these wars — first with the Cherokee and Choctaw in World War I and then with Navajo, Creek, Menominee, Cherokee, Choctaw, Chippewa, and Lakota in World War II. Code talkers have been honored by the French government, presented with Presidential Gold Medals, and had a Hollywood film created about them (Russell 2014). The Lakota and Natives have had a long history of military service and engagement with the US.

There has been claims to Native rights made in the US Senate. These claims based on service have been carried out by non-Native individuals and groups. For instance, on October 7th, 2004, Democratic Senator from South Dakota Tom Daschle spoke to Congress about the “extraordinary history of service and sacrifice” Natives have given to the US. “In every major military conflict in our nation’s history Indians have fought side by side with non-Indians,” Daschle began, “Today, one in four
Native American men is a military veteran, as are nearly have of all tribal leaders.” He then highlighted the long history of Native service — including Korea, Granada, Panama, Persian Gulf, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan. “Given the tragic history between the Indian tribes and the US military, some might regard it as remarkable that Native Americans choose to serve in the military at all,” Daschle continued, “Yet not only do Native Americans serve, they have the highest rate of any ethnic group in America.” He asserted that the US should be honoring their commitments to Natives and, in so doing, “it will strengthen Native American’s long and exceptional tradition of military service to our nation … it would make America even safer and stronger.” By passing provisions to provide Native veterans with more resources and support, “America would better be able to honor the extraordinary patriotism of these heroes and provide them with the respect and benefits they have earned.” These types of claims can also be seen in regard to access to adequate and affordable housing (US Senate Bill S.2960 2013-2014).

In large part, Natives did not make concerted claims based on Native military service. For instance, the most prominent of these groups advocating for equal rights was the American Indian Movement (AIM) advocated for the rights through high-visibility social actions. Formed in part as a result of the civil rights activism taking place in during the time, AIM initiated direct actions, including taking over Alcatraz, the Trail of Broken Treaties March to DC, and the seventy-one day standoff with FBI, CIA and police at the village of Wounded Knee. AIM claims included review and restoration of treaties, a focus on community reconstruction, protection of religious freedoms, land reform, and increased access to the US Senate. Even though AIM consisted of many military veterans — veterans who came back home from Vietnam
and were sorely dissatisfied the conditions their communities faced — AIM did not
directly base their rights claims upon Native military service.

Section 2: Problems with Military Service for Equal Rights Claims

Utilizing military service as a means for engaging the phenomenal social order
can be problematic, especially since this tactic very often leaves the underlying social
prejudice in place. The following section looks specifically how military service can
reinscribe colonial violence, as well as how it can act as a means of influencing and
controlling Native identity.

Reinscribing colonial violence

Colonialism acts as a system of violence, or as Patrick Wolfe (1999) asserts,
“Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies… Invasion
is a structure not an event” (2). Whether it was the mass slaughter of the Incas by the
Spanish (Diamond 1999: 67-74) or the exploitation and slavery of Africans by
European powers, colonialism has been intertwined with military action and violence.
As a result, military service as a “model of equal opportunity,” as Cynthia Enloe
(2000) refers to it, for African Americans, Latino Americans, Natives, and gays and
homosexuals, is problematic since it implies the “highest caliber of American citizens
were those who chose the military as their career” (Enloe 2000: 15-18). Supporting
military endeavors spreads and reenacts many of the same violences that these
marginalized groups have historically faced. It is at the heart of what Winona LaDuke
and Sean A. Cruz (2013) call the “ironic dichotomy” Natives face — to engage and support a military to “defend the people and the land” or to fight to “create or sustain an empire, to impose colonial rule on an unwilling population” (3). To better understand this, the military as a patriarchal structure, the notion of coercive taking and the logics of rape, and military service as reinforcing the state apparatus will be explored.

Military as patriarchal structure

Patriarchy, an ideology and system which rewards and privileges masculinity, pervades social structures and institutions in ways that make masculinity subconsciously accepted and preferred (Enloe 2000). Feminist scholars draw attention to the excluded voices of society as a way to disrupt oppressive structures and transform the patriarchal order of society — military included — into new ways of being and knowing. Patriarchy orders society on masculinity, thereby disfavoring the feminine and anything that falls outside of the scope of masculine and domination. Enloe (2004) explains, “Insofar as any society or group is patriarchal, it is there that it is comfortable — unquestioned — to infantilize, ignore, trivialize, or even actively cast scorn upon what is thought to be feminized” (5). A patriarchal order premised on masculinity and domination, therefore, lies at the foundation of the study of the international (Alexander and Mohanty 1996: xvii-xix). Military and war-fighting are its preferred weapon.

Imagining new ways of being is greatly inhibited by what Kathy E. Ferguson and Phyllis Turnbull (1999) refer to as a “military model of authority” (xiii-xiv). This understanding of (military) order pervades society at the expense of other types of
social order, particularly indigenous or feminist frameworks. Alternatives types of social ordering are viewed as “Disorder, as messy, inefficient, lacking competence” (Ferguson and Turnbull 1999: xiv). A military order uses domination and extermination as its preferred means, giving rise to the process of militarization and the expansion of the nationstate (Paul 1981). It is also is the bedrock of intolerant nationalism — nationalism is the liberal desire for self-determination of peoples, where each would be able to create a state of their own (Elshtain 1987: 108-109). Nationalism belies state claims to expansion — expansion inevitably involves subsuming (dominating) and eliminating smaller or “lesser” nation states (peoples). Military service reifies the necessity of military order premised on domination and expansion and imbues society with the belief that supremacy and authority are not only good but required for a nationstate.

The American society reflects this patriarchal impulse, having been motivated at particular times in history on expansion through military means. Paul C. Rosier (2010) explains,

The United States has practiced imperialism since its founding, that America as a particular geography was constructed by force rather than conceived by ideological notions such as manifest destiny, and that its imperial expansion in what became the American West shaped U.S. soldiers' and officials’ subsequent engagement with new peoples on the new global frontiers — ‘Indian country’ migrating westward to the Philippines and beyond (3).

The military order in the US and the minority groups who have serve to reinforce these institutions are actively taking part in a US military order that is actively “constructing the discourse and dimensions of the American empire” (Rosier 2010: 2).
It is widely accepted, however, that the US is not motivated by imperial motives. This invisibility is a key aspect of the normalization of the military order.

When military order so thoroughly dominates a society it reaches the stage of near invisibility. This is reflected in how the public views the military — public polls have shown that the American public routinely regards the military in a positive light, especially in regard to other government institutions. The US military is polled as the only institution with integrity and is believed to be the most trusted and reliable aspect of the US government (Dunbar-Ortiz 2014). This is in spite of a long historical documentation of the US military blunders and missteps, including wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and their continued military engagements in these countries. Dunbar-Ortiz (2015) explains, “This is a military ruled nation, it is not new … from the beginning this military control has been ever-present, but because it’s wrapped in colonialism and settlement its obscured — it is the most consistent [institution] and it is also the harbinger of progress.” The military order, reinforced by military service, has thoroughly saturated society and continues to perpetuate the patriarchal order of domination and taking. The colonial social order is also closely related to violence towards women. Paula Allen Gunn (1999) explains, “For many people the oppression and abuse of women is indistinguishable from fundamental Western concepts of social order” (66).

Imperial warfare and logics of rape

Coercive power, also known as compulsory power, is when one party forces another party to do something they would otherwise not do. Coercive power aims at changing or altering behavior or conditions of existence through the threat of
destruction and death through direct action. It consists of a “range of relations between actors that allow one to shape directly the circumstances or actions of another” (Barnett and Duvall 2005: 49). By referring to coercive power, I am gesturing to imperialist warfare premised on total annihilation and conquering of land, or what has been referred to as "genocidal warfare" and "total war" (Blick 1988, Keeley 1996). William K. Powers (2001) explains the difference in approaches between Native and Euro-American warfare,

Unlike warfare as we know it today, the Lakotas and other Indians of the Northern Plains did not fight to conquer an enemy or confiscate his land. Of course there were times when a hostile tribe invaded the hunting domain of another, but the invaders did not think of conquest of another territory. Land was not considered a negotiable commodity. Each tribe had more land that it could use, and all land had been bestowed upon them by Wankantanka. No Indian tribe tried to conquer another; one tribe was not interested in ruling another (3).

Many tribes did not practice war fighting and, those that did, did not seek the total annihilation of their enemy (Blick 1988). The utmost act of bravery for the Lakota warrior was to counting coup, or the touching of their enemy with a coup stick and letting them live. Total war, or war “between peoples or whole societies, not just the armed forces who represented them,” was something unseen among Native tribes (Keeley 1996: 175). Instead, battles with rival tribes were undertaken to obtain honor and obtain resources.

The US military and their practice of imperial warfare acted as the “blunt instrument of genocide” (LaDuke and Cruz 2013: xvi). “The explicit purpose of the buffalo soldiers and the army of the West as a whole,” asserts Roxanne Dunbar-Ortiz
(2014), "was to invade Indigenous lands and ethnically cleanse them for Anglo settlement and commerce" (148). These acts of imperial violence robbed Indigenous peoples of their worth and their agency, attempting to destroy their (unperceived) humanity. Coercive taking and imperial warfare is the ultimate act of taking something against another’s will.9

Coercive taking closely parallels the act of rape (Tadiar 1993, Gardam and Charlesworth 2000, Hansen 2001, Baaz and Stern 2009). Rape consists of the act of taking something against another’s will, it is a taking without asking — killing and warfare is the ultimate act of taking action against an individual’s will.10 The same motivating logics of rape motivate imperial warfare. On one hand, there is the desire for imperial expansion (the lustful taking of land and resources) and, on the other, the total evisceration, dehumanization, and domination of the Other. Coercive taking and the logics of rape are particularly relevant within a Native context. Paula Gunn (1999) explains,

It seems to me that the underpinnings of sexual dominance are simply a particular case of the systemic belief that dominance is synonymous with superiority… These beliefs underlie the entire apparatus of Western civilization since its infancy; I can see no easy way to avoid rape and other forms of violence against those excluded from the inner sanctums of power other than by dismantling the entire philosophical and social order (66).

Colonialism and imperialism warfare and coercive taking and rape are closely related. “Rape and sexual violence are deeply embedded in the colonial mindset,” Sarah Deer (2009) explains, continuing, “Rape is more than a metaphor for colonization — it is part and parcel of colonization” (150).
Military service safeguards the state, not necessarily individuals and their communities. Critical security studies has challenged the way security is conceptualized — the dominant approaches to IR, classical political realism and neorealism, conceive the state as a unitary actor in which all human existence and interactions occur. The state, therefore, is the primary unit of analysis — this also means that the state is the primary referent for security and not the individual. First and foremost, military service acts to protect and secure the state, humans and their communities are only secured to the extent that they are a part of a given state (Shepherd 2008: 57). This historical reality — military service secures the state over individuals and communities — provides a challenge for Natives who engage military service as a means of protecting their local communities.

For many minority groups, the state itself is the primary source of communal insecurity. This is particularly the case with Lakota communities who have been decimated by being on the enemy side of the US political and military policy. As a result, military service reifies the state and, therefore, reinforces a primary source of Native insecurity.

Using the military to engage in rights claims and recognition has also been explored by other IR and NAS scholars. For instance, Glen Coulthard (2007, 2014) refers to the problems with recognition — the problems of recognition achieved through means which reinforces the state and are premised on “the assumption that the flourishing of Indigenous peoples as distinct and self-determining entities is dependent on their being afforded cultural recognition and institutional accommodation by the
surrounding state” (2007: 448). Engaging in activities that directly reinforce the state, Natives are seeking recognition through colonizers’ structures. This achieves the opposite of the intended outcome by reinforcing and reifying these oppressive systems. At the heart of this is what Julie Cassidy (1998) refers to as the colonizer’s “false choice” — having to choose between either being granting indigenous sovereignty or a continuation of the denial of indigenous’ claims of sovereignty. Kevin Bruyneel (2007) calls for a third space where “indigenous political actors work across American spatial and temporal boundaries, demanding rights and resources from the liberal democratic settler-state while also challenging the imposition of colonial rule in their lives” (xvii). A third space would call for the evaluation of how the US military has impacted and continues to impact Lakota lives.

Controlling Native identity

Engaging military service for equal rights claims also has an impact on Native identity in multiple ways. This included issues regarding the suppression of local communal identities, instilling differing land values, tribal registry, and tribal enrollment.

Nationalism and war-fighting requires local identities to be suppressed and national identities to be adopted. Elshtain (1987) explains, “To create a grand civic entity, local identities must be shattered or muted; individuals must become entangled with the notion of a homeland not as the local community into which one is born but as a vast entity, symbolized by flags, oaths of allegiance, constitutions (in some cases), and wars against others” (107). The creation of the categories of “us” and “them” is central to this process. The creation of a national identity involves “yanking young
men out of their local identities, disciplining their bodies to armed purposes, scraping off the insignia of their particularity by the visible sign of putting diverse human elements into identical uniforms” (Elshtain 1987: 72). The military soldier has to suppress their local identity, with their uniform masking their origins.

Creating national allegiances and identities is a means to supersede local and particular ethnic, religious, and community identities and reinforces the Euro-American project. For people of color, those who themselves have been impacted by colonial histories, this creates a challenging and often confounding circumstance. LaDuke and Cruz (2013) provide accounts of Lakota soldiers struggling with having to fight in the Vietnam War. “The Native American soldier when confronted with the Viet Cong would actually be looking into more of a mirror than if the Native was looking at a fellow United States Soldier,” recounted Anishinaabe veteran Jim Northrup (LaDuke and Cruz 2013: 17). Upon seeing the bodies of Vietnamese soldiers, Northrup recalls, “It was hard not to notice the similar appearances of these men and Indians. He looked like an Indian, he looked like one of my cousins” (LaDuke and Cruz 2013: 17). US military service challenges the multiple localized identities of Native communities — identities that have long been attacked and suppressed and that are now being to be rejuvenated and preserved.

The US policy has long been involved in attempting to change and control Lakota identity.¹¹ For instance, Natives had viewed and valued land differently than the Euro-Americans, believing that land was sacred and necessary for the survival of life. As a result, land was not able to owned or sold. Not only was it sacred, but it is also an important aspect to Lakota identity. This is the case with the sacred Black Hills and other resources such as the buffalo, both of which were subject to US mechanisms
of exploitation and control — the US reneged on treaties concerning land rights and corralled the Lakota onto ever-shrinking reservations.\(^\text{12}\)

Reservations are ethnic and environmental enclaves held in trust, or “reserved,” by the US government. Beginning in the nineteenth century as a way to isolate Natives, this has been a way to surveil and control Native communities (as seen in chapter 5). On-reservation Lakota have been subjected to a multi-layered arrangement under Tribal, state, and federal Indian law. This has allowed them to be not fully guaranteed of constitutional rights of US citizenship on reservation, while off-reservation they are considered ethnic minorities with all the constitutional guarantees of full American citizens (Cheyfitz 2006).\(^\text{13}\)

Tribal identity allows access to particular resources — whether you are tribally enrolled and to which tribe can make the difference of whether one has access to food commodities, housing assistance, and healthcare. This has impacted Native identity in ways that have proven to be divisive at best and pernicious at worst. The Dawes Act of 1887 allocated land swaths to enrolled tribal members, land that has been passed down from generation to generation and pooled by family members. This land can now bring in significant sums of money for families willing to rent it to ranchers and farmers. The large amounts of money transfers, combined with the relative poverty of Lakota reservations today, has caused this to be an area of infighting, corruption, and political manipulation. Access to resources and their allotment has been the cause for a recent rise in disenrollments in various tribes throughout the US. Though this did not significantly impact the Lakota reservation where fieldwork was conducted, it is a challenge with tribal communities seeing increasing casino incomes — fewer enrolled members translates to larger individual payouts for each member and this has caused
tribes to adopt extreme approaches to lessen the numbers of families listed on registries (Romero 2015). This has caused families that can trace their lineage to previous tribal members and former tribal leaders still being facing with threats of disenrollment. Tribal identity created through US policy has become a source of insecurity for many Native tribes in the US.

Military service is based on suppressing local identities and foregrounding national identities. Historically, the US has been active in altering and bounding Native identity, doing everything within their power to break up Native communities and identities. This includes the corralling of the Lakota onto reservations, shrinking those reservations to mere fractions of their original size, basing tribal membership on incorrect census data, developing the concept of blood quantum, and allocating resources according to tribal membership. Weakening local identities and having to navigate the continued identity challenges brought on by US policy can pose obstacles for Native communities attempting to engage the phenomenal social order.

Section 3: Concluding Thoughts

There are many ways for minority groups to engage transforming the phenomenal social order. One particular way that is seen throughout Native communities in the US is through military service. In addition to the reinscribing of colonial violence and the controlling of Native identity (as explored throughout this chapter), military service has additional impacts Native communities. One such challenge is the prevalence of post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) among returning Native veterans — Native veterans face higher rates of PTSD than both African
American veterans and national averages (Department of Health and Human Services 2001). This largely can be accounted for by the high rights of combat exposure Native soldiers face, with some studies finding nearly half of Native Vietnam veterans suffering from PTSD. Among tribes from the Great Plains, the rates increase to nearly sixty per cent (Gross 2007). An outcome of this is a high rate of suicide of Native veterans — Lakota communities, specifically, have been faced with the challenge of high rates of suicide amongst veterans and young people alike, with some estimates putting rates at seven times the national average (Claymore 1988, Yellow Horse Brave Heart 1999). Nationwide, suicide rates in 2010 of US veterans eclipsed military combat deaths (Klein 2010, LaDuke and Cruz 2013: 17). Beyond suicide rates, which can often fail to tell the entire picture of disaffected veterans, deaths from self-destructive behavior such as speeding and car crashes, drug and alcohol abuse, and physical altercations are also significantly high on Lakota reservations (Yellow Horse Brave Heart 2003). Native communities disproportionately carry the burden of military service, communities that are already resource stretched, economically impoverished, politically marginalized, and dealing with historical trauma. In spite of these challenges, the Lakota are rebuilding their communities and renewing traditions through self-affirmative cultural practices. These practices provide renewed foundations for the continued transformation of the phenomenal social order.

What can be learned from struggles of other minority groups

The Chicano movement, which arose during the Vietnam War era and included Chicana feminists and students, interrogated veteran’s use of military service as leverage for gains in equal treatment in the US. Lorena Oropeza (2005) explains,
By protesting the war, Chicano activists willingly forsook a venerable Mexican American civil rights tradition that had emphasized ethnic-group patriotism, especially as manifested through military service, in the hopes of obtaining first-class citizenship. Instead, as they voiced their opposition to the conflict, the central refrain of anti-war Chicano activists was that Chicanos — and Chicanas — should struggle at home for their raza, their fellow Mexican Americans, not fight and die in a faraway land (5).

Chicano activists pointed out that the US government treated Latino soldiers as an expendable resource on the battlefield, only to come back home to be treated as second-class citizens. Rather than having their young men going to other far off countries and either dying or being scarred for life, they should be working on behalf of their communities back home. They stressed that the military service and loyalty of the Latino community to the American political order was undeserved and unrequited. It is through the “strident criticism of the existing political order and a narrative of ethnic unity embracing persons of Mexican-American, and later Latino, heritage of all nationalities could Mexican-Americans aspire to equal citizenship” (Sullivan 2014: 254). The Chicano movement asserted that military service cannot be used to achieve the goals of equal treatment at home; instead, the focus should on ethnic unity and critical examination of the current phenomenal social order.

A need for new tools

African American poet, scholar, and activist Audre Lorde (1984) suggests that group differences, not similarities, are the key to creative societal social transformation. Her essay The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's
House puts forward a theory of difference premised on interdependence. Lorde (1984) explains,

Difference must be not merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic. Only then does the necessity for interdependency become unthreatening. Only within that interdependency of difference strengths, acknowledged and equal, can the power to seek new ways of being in the world generate, as well as the courage and sustenance to act where there are no charters. … those of us who have been forged in the crucibles of difference … know that survival is not an academic skill. It is learning how to take our differences and make them strengths. For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. They may allow us temporarily to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change (111-112).

Differences do not have to be seen as threatening and need not be hidden. These differences are what set people apart from the dominant social order. These differences, rather than a liability, can be made into strengths.

The Lakota hold different values in approaching warfare, violence, and gender roles and these difference that can act as a creative force to reimagine of new phenomenal social order. The dominant military colonial order, premised on dominance and racial superiority, has been the animating force of the US policies that have marginalized, brought to near extinction, and stolen land from Natives. The adversarial model of the military order has brought much pain and hardships to the Lakota. A new order premised on interdependence and unity is sorely needed. Interdependence is a central guiding principle for many Native peoples — this includes the Lakota principle of Mitakuye Oyasin.
In 1847, when the Choctaw and Cherokee Nations heard about the plight of Irish people and the great famine that was sweeping their country, they raised all the resources they could and sent them across the Atlantic. Just sixteen years prior, these Native Nations were dispossessed, decimated, and relocated to Indian Territory to what is now Oklahoma. In spite of this, these Native communities raised what little they had and gave. They recognized the challenges humans go through when dealing with hunger and forced migration. They recognized the shared humanity with a minority group half way around the world, a group they knew they would never physically encounter. During that time, the Cherokee Nation newspaper read, “Although we may never receive any pecuniary benefit or aid in return, we will be richly repaid by the consciousness of having done a good act, by the moral effect it will produce abroad” (Kinealy 2006: 80).

This act of unsolicited graciousness and compassion — reaching out to other people in a far off nation facing similar challenges and oppressions — is still celebrated by the Irish today.¹⁵ More recently, in 2015, the San Manuel Band and the Morongo Band of Mission Indians in California donated significantly to the San Bernardino United Relief Fund to aid families effected by the San Bernardino mass shooting — their donation amassed to over sixty-percent of all the entire Relief Fund (Native News Online 2015). Native Nations have long recognize their well-being is premised on the well-being of others.

Military service has been used by many minority groups to make equal rights claims and transform their oppressive social realities, their phenomenal social order. African American and Latino Americans have both engaged this approach to varying
degrees of success. Natives have not made concerted efforts to engage these types of claims, though many have been made on their behalf.

The logic of citizen-soldier is problematic for multiple reasons, including reinforcing patriarchal structures of military and state, reenacting the logics of rape (the forcible taking without consent), and acting a means of control of Native identity. As a result, military service reenacts and reinscribes colonial violence. Lakota communities are already facing many challenges from the legacy of colonialism and the influx of veterans back into these communities only makes it more challenging to rebuild and renew traditions while planning for the future. New tools premised on interdependence and unity are needed. These tools, generated from the very characteristics which make Native communities different from the dominant social order, are essential for the ability to image and work for new possibilities. The phenomenal social order needs to be transformed in ways that engaging in military service alone cannot achieve. Alternative ways of being can be generated from the experiences and insight of Native communities.
1 There are also suggestions that jealousies among rival indigenous tribes also causes some tension which led to his killing (see his biography at the American National Biography Online).

2 Mohammad Ali made this statement during the Vietnam War. He was drafted into the military at the height of his boxing career. Because of his refusal to go and fight he faced a lengthy prison sentence, which he legally contested, he was stripped of his boxing title, and was banned from fighting. It wasn’t until after four years of legal battles that the US Supreme Court overturned his conviction in 1971.

3 The following is an exploration of the impact and efficacy of military service in gaining recognition and equal rights in the US. By critically exploring these themes, I intend on creating space for the imagining of new ways of being between marginalized and dominant social groups. This is not a critique of the individuals who take on military service and their sacrifices they have made and continue to make on behalf of others. There are many people in my live who I care deeply who are veterans and this piece is by no means a condemnation of their actions; rather, it is part of the process of critically assessing the patterns which and structures in which people of color find themselves.

4 On the whole, Natives themselves did not petition or solicit US citizenship based on their military service in World War I (see Bruyneel 2004). This includes Iroquois Tuscarora Chief Clinton Richard who was strongly anti-assimilation and US citizenship but enlisted and fought for the US during World War I. On the other side, one Native exception was Yakama leader Nipo T. Strongheart who also served in World War I, advocated and collected signatures for the obtainment of US citizenship. His claims were strongly premised on Native military service and he ended up encouraging hundreds of Natives to enlist. Many white groups used military service to leverage citizen claims on “behalf of Natives.” This included the so-called “Friends of the Indian” group.

5 Though this chapter only focuses on African Americans and Latinos, in addition to Native Americans in the US, this phenomenon is much broader — it also includes, but not limited to, Mahatma Gandhi advocating for Indians to actively fight for the British government during their own claims to ending colonial rule and colonizers utilizing
special combat units of indigenous peoples (including the Gurkhas of Nepal and the Acholi of Uganda, both indigenous tribes with history of strong warrior cultures).

6 US Military traditions draw significantly upon the “heroics” of the Indian Wars (Kaplan 2005). For example, the 1890 massacre at Wounded Knee where nearly three hundred mainly elderly men, women, and children who were starving and looking for refuge and were brutally slaughtered by a vengeful US 7th Calvary, is still remembered as a heroic battle for which US soldiers received the highest commendations for, including twenty Medal of Honors, the military’s highest award (Dunbar-Ortiz 2014). Even the language used during military engagements alludes to the “great” battles of the Indian Wars. For instance, the code word for the operation to hunt and kill Osama Bin Laden was Geronimo, the great Apache warrior who eluded the US and was one of the most prominent symbols of Native resistance (LaDuke and Cruz 2013). It is also widely held that the tactics of the marines, valuing stealth and cunning, was adopted from the US military engagements with Natives during early US military battles with the French and British.

7 Daschle was speaking specifically about creating the National American Indian Veteran’s Association.

8 These claims come from the 1972 Trail of Broken Treaties march on Washington DC, where AIM put forward a twenty-point position paper for the “reconstruction of Indian communities and security an Indian future in America.”

9 There are, of course, multiple types of military engagements including humanitarian interventions, peacekeeping missions, and intelligence sharing and military training. It has becoming increasingly difficult to differentiate between wars of conquest, exploitation, and domination and so-called benevolent wars. This is largely in part due to the need to maintain specialized fighting skills that war-fighting requires. This almost guarantees that once a specialized military is created and trained, they are very rarely abandoned after the military engagement for which they were created. Such is the case with the US which has been in a “permanent war” for the last century (Bacevich 2011).

10 Rape is not merely about satiating sexual urges, but also a tool of domination and humiliation. Rape is often used as a “weapon of war” and has been found to be motivated by various reasons and to fulfill multiple purposes. Maria E. Baaz and Maria Stern (2009) found that rape was often more than merely an act motivated by carnal desires. By interviewing soldiers in the Democratic Republic of Congo, they found that aside from carnal rape, soldiers also raped as a way to express domination and to humiliate. Baaz and Stern (2009) explain through the sharing of an interview
with a soldier, “There are different types of rape … There is the rape when a soldier is away, when he has not seen his women for a while and has needs and no money. This is the lust/need rape [viol ya posa]. But there are also the bad rapes, as a result of the spirit of war … to humiliate the dignity of people. This is an evil rape” (495).

11 This section looks at how the US has enacted upon and altered Native identity. This, however, can happen both ways, with Americans influencing Native identity and with Natives reshaping the US narrative of what American society can look like. This dialectic relationship is representative of the Lacanian science of the subject described at the outset. Rosier (2010) suggests that Native communities represent a hybrid patriotism, one which functions as in “dialogical rather than dictatorial ways, Indians trying to reform America as a pluralist society even as non-Indians coercively pushed for a homogeneous society” (9).

12 The US government drove the buffalo to extinction and stole and exploited the Black Hills. The Buffalo were the primary source of sustaining life for the Lakota. The US government recognized this and sought out to eliminate this source of identity and survival. Beginning from the 1860’s to the end of the Indian Wars in 1890, concerted efforts by the US army, along with poachers and traders who acted unimpeded by federal legislation, successfully carried out the extermination of the buffalo. Estimations suggest that during this period 5,000 buffalo were killed daily (US Fish and Wildlife Service). In 1883, Yellowstone National Park was the only place where Buffalo could free ranging, there was an estimated twenty-three buffalo remaining (National Park Service). Estimations at the time bring the entire US population to less than 325, down from an estimated four million (US Fish and Wildlife Service). The Black Hills in modern-day South Dakota and Wyoming is central to the Lakota creation myth. The wind cave, located in the Black Hills, is believed to be the site where the Lakota emerged onto the earth. It holds multiple sacred sites and had been the center of cultural and social activity for centuries. Treaties by the US government and the Lakota were made in 1851 and 1868 and granted ownership and assured the unlimited Lakota use of the Black Hills. Then, in 1874, gold was found in Black Hills. The following year the US ordered the Lakota to abandon the Black Hills and only three years later, in 1877, the US signed an illegal treaty passing ownership of the Black Hills from the Lakota to the US. In the span of three years, staring from the finding of gold, the Lakota were forced off their sacred lands.

13 This duality has its origins in the US Supreme Court decisions known as the Marshall Trilogy of 1823-1832. The three cases that make up the Marshall Trilogy are Johnson v M’Intosh (1823), Cherokee Nation v Georgia (1831), and Worcester v Georgia (1832). These decisions led by Chief Justice John Marshall established the grounds for tribal sovereignty as a domestic dependent nation through aboriginal land
claims (established and negotiated through the US government), tribal sovereignty as nations with the authority to self-govern, and US federal trust responsibilities (established to “look over” and “protect” Indian lands) (Cassidy 1998, Cheyfitz 2006).

14 Alcohol mortality rates among Lakota reservations are nearly thirty times (29x) higher than national averages and overall, age-adjusted mortality rates are almost four times (3.6x) national averages (Aberdeen Area Indian Health Service 1999, Yellow Horse Brave Heart 2003: 8).

15 An annual Famine Walk takes place in Louisburgh, County Mayo, Ireland on May 19 to commemorate the Great Irish Famine. For nearly the last twenty years the walk is led by Choctaw Gary White Deer, an act recognizing the unsolicited generosity and kindness of Native American Nations. Tom Cooper of Knocklyon, Dublin comments, “This was a most remarkable act of generosity as the only link between Ireland and the Choctaw Nation was a common bond of humanity” (Irish Examiner 2012).
Chapter 8

LAKOTA SEVEN GENERATIONS VISION AND PHENOMENAL SOCIAL ORDER

Field Note: Cycle of Decay and Renewal

I meet Lucas outside his modest one-story home and, after greeting me, he takes me in through the side door. Once inside, Lucas walks over to open the two windows to the left, flanking the front door. To the right are two couches against the walls and two wooden chairs near another set of windows. Crossing the room, Lucas moves the chairs slighting indicating to me to have a seat and then proceeds to open the windows near the chairs. The breeze from the Great Plains immediately makes its presence known as the thin white lace curtains next to the chairs waft towards me as if reaching out to touch me and welcome me into their space. The wind is blowing east to west, from the back of the house to the front door. It has been an unseasonably cool summer, warm enough to only have to carry a thin jacket for the evening and cool enough that you can be out picking chokecherries and sage during the day without having to take a break. Out here it always seems to be windy.

Lucas is a stout man, broad chested and in surprisingly good shape for a man in his late 50’s. His long black hair is pulled straight back into a single braid that runs down to just the top of his lower back. He wears a dark blue button up long sleeve, well-worn jeans, and dusty cowboy boots. Lucas’ voice is low and a bit raspy and his
tough external demeanor belies his gentleness and warmth. He moves around the living room, organizing the colorful pieces of powwow dance regalia — a red and yellow vest and a beaded belt — laying on the couches. “I did all the beadwork on this one, just picked up bead working a few years ago and this was one of my first pieces,” he tells me. He’s been dancing in powwows since a young boy and he continued to do with his son. As I sit down, I notice a beautiful bustle with feathers hanging on the wall underneath a large picture of a young man dancing in full dance regalia. The picture is of Lucas’ son, who would have been near my age, had it not been for a heart condition just three years prior.

“With what little international travel I’ve done, there are some things that we indigenous people need to get together on, worldwide,” Lucas says as he sits down on the wooden chair opposite from me. He passes me a glass of water and we sit enjoying the breeze. I sit patiently and listen — with no neighboring houses in sight all I can hear is the wind coming through the windows. “My hunka grandfather, Felix Green, had an adventuresome life, he was a medicine man but didn’t take it up seriously until he became elderly,” Lucas explains, “I started to get to know him in the winter of 1971; he was highly intellectual, he was a seer — he could see and know, talk and tell.” He and Felix spent a lot of time together during Lucas’ formative political years, when he was a member of the American Indian Movement (AIM) and traveled the US and the world. They would talk about the influence of the White man and the ways of their ancestors. On one of their trips to Montana, Felix spoke about a vision he had which involved a children’s dance — a dance that hadn’t happened yet and wouldn’t
happen within Felix’s lifetime. Felix then told Lucas that, at sometime in the future, he will come back and speak to him — two years later Felix passed to the spirit world. That was 1979.

“In 2007 and 2008, he started to appear in my dreams,” Lucas said, “This was the culmination of the vision he once talked about.” The vision is referred to as the *Wicowicaqe Sakowin Ihanble*, or the Lakota Seven Generations Vision. Lucas explains,

> When the White man first landed here on this holy island, the spirits here told the Lakota people that the White man is here. They told them for seven generations your people are going to walk away from what you have now. The seventh generation born is going to have the curiosity to want to know who and what they are and where they come from. It is this generation that is going to turn around and begin the journey to where you are now, so pay attention. Everything you pass on the way there, they’re going to pass on the way back and as long as it takes for you to get there, that’s how long it’s going to take to get back.

Dreams of Felix continued for a few more years. “I dreamed about the children’s dance a couple times and, all of a sudden in the dream, he was right here in front of me,” Lucas told me, “He said, I’m trying to talk to you but you’re not listening!” Soon after, Lucas, along with his community, organized a children’s dance to take place on the summer solstice of 2010. That day, 15 boys and 15 girls danced from sunrise to high noon in the South Dakota heat.

Lucas continues to tell me that the Vision requires hard work, perseverance, and ingenuity. The Lakota cannot just cut themselves off from the modern world,
place moccasins on their feet and step onto the grass of their ancestors. “As each
generation comes, [they need tools to understand] the things embedded in this modern
culture,” he says, “We have to wean ourselves out of this.” It is in the “reviewing our
history” that the problems needing to be addressed will be revealed. As a result, it is
critical to train and equip the children and generations to come with the tools needed
to make the journey back.

Lucas sits back and sips on his water, the curtains get picked up by the breeze
and stretch out again to touch me. The sun is beginning to set and the birds that were
once quiet in the midday sun are beginning to fill the wind with their songs. He tells
me that if one looks at the cycles of the earth, there is always balance — a cycle of
decay and renewal. “In the spring, beautiful positiveness takes place, everything is
growing and everything is strong,” he tells me as he peers out the window, “Then the
days get hotter and dryer and they start to cool down after everything has dried; soon
the cold comes and covers all the dry materials and it begins the decay, it’s the
negativeness.” Lucas smiles slightly and continues, “Negativeness is necessary
because it fertilizes the earth, it refertilizes its own seeds, then when the positiveness
comes again in the spring the positive grows.” Every period of decay is followed by a
period of renewal and growth — disintegration followed by integration. Though the
nature of each season may vary, the cycles of life are inescapable.

“The Seventh Generation Vision is the foundation for a strategy — they knew
then what was going to happen,” Lucas tells me, “They just didn’t know the incidental
details along the way; now, in reviewing it [history], we know it.” It provides a
framework and plan for a recapturing of the ways of the ancestors and the creation of a world based on reciprocity and not destruction. “Our roots for me, for our people, are in that Seven Generations Vision and getting back to that point where we can have a longer, healthier life, a more fruitful life.”

The evening continues and we move from one topic to the next. Lucas speaks in a soft, gracefully manner and, as we get to know each other more and more, it becomes evident that there is a quiet wisdom and nobility about him. Lucas gets up and turns on a small lamp on the table between the windows. He says that even though it may seem to the outsider that they have submitted to US assimilation, the Lakota still have traditional ceremonies to keep their traditional ways alive — ceremonies like the Sundance and people like the Sacred Pipe Keeper, the holder of the original pipe bestowed upon the Lakota by the Sacred White Buffalo Calf Woman. The Lakota could have given up on their traditions, it actually would have been an easier path, but they haven’t. Sitting down again, Lucas says, “We still have that hope and what little knowledge we have of our ancestral ways, we apply it with hope that next year is going to be better for our relatives.”

We sat in silence for some time, listening to the birds outside and the wind rustling the curtains. The evening continues to wind down and Lucas tells me he has a message for me, though I feel it is more a message for you, the reader,

I wanted to tell you [about the Seven Generations Vision] because you are a highly intellectual person and birds of the feather flock together. If you are this intelligent, I’m sure that there are other people [you know] of the same intelligence level, maybe some not as great, maybe some greater. But those are
the people that typically end up in the decision-making capacities. So we need to start sharing this and getting it out there so people will look at us and know that we’re not just sitting here burdened with diabetes, cancer and alcoholism. There is a subtle movement going on here, but we need help in defining [what happened] between then and now, by people that were born and raised in it and understand the terminology and how to use that terminology to readdress all of these wrongs, so that we can continue that process of decolonization.
This chapter places the Lakota Seven Generations Vision into dialogue with the Lacanian dialect relational framework. It describes the Vision and then creates a conceptual scaffolding to better understand its significant implications. The Vision charts a course for the evolving role of Natives in modern American society and the emergent role of Indigenous experiences and worldviews within the Western academic project. Both a Lacanian framework and the Lakota Seven Generations Vision place great significance on the role of self-affirmative cultural practices in the engagement and transformation of the phenomenal social order. The Vision provides a productive way to address negative consequences of US policy and its implications are far reaching — affecting Lakota society and beyond. This chapter introduces the Lakota Seven Generations Vision and puts forward a way the Lakota can engage the phenomenal social order.

The Lakota of South Dakota, like so many Natives, have faced generations of unimaginable treatment at the hands of the dominant Euro-American society. Federal policy stripped them of their lands, forced assimilation through abusive boarding schools, and banned religious and cultural expression. The legacy of these policies are clearly visible within many Lakota communities stuck in cycles of extreme poverty, plagued with illnesses of alcohol and drug abuse, and faced with high suicide and violence rates. Cultural erosion and deterioration has been brought upon by a brutal process of colonization. This is only part of the history of Natives in the US. Native communities had been resisting and struggling against colonialism every step of the way. Since the first contact with white settlers, the Lakota have been doing much more than merely surviving.
As explored in Chapter 6, *survivance*, the combination of surviving, endurance, and resistance, captures this quality. Looking further into this desire to survive is the recognition that Lakota culture and ways of being are worth preserving and worth enduring extreme hardships and oppression. These cultural gems carried the Lakota people through the toughest of times. At the heart of survivance is a hope for a better future, a future where all can practice their way of life and be seen as contributing to the progression of society — both their own and those with whom they come into contact.

One such Lakota vision of hope is the *Wicowicaqe Sakowin Ihanble*, or the Seven Generations Vision. The Vision charts a course for the evolving role of Natives in modern America. More specifically, it provides an understanding of the emergent importance of Indigenous worldviews within the Western academic project. The Vision calls for a period of seven generations of persecution, attack and deterioration. After which, a new generation spurned by the desire to know who they are, how they came to be, and where they come from, will start a new seven generation process of (re)building and renewal. This new journey back will be fueled by self- and community-affirmative cultural practices. Seven generations from the late 1960s, a time of an emergent Native rights consciousness, would take you back to the first Lakota contact with the 1804 Louis and Clark expedition; while going back from today would be in the heart of the Indian Wars.

This chapter places the Lakota Seven Generations Vision in conversation with the Lacanian dialectic framework as a means of better understanding Lakota engagement and transformation the phenomenal social order, while still attending to the central role of self- and community-affirmative cultural practices. The concept of
constructive resilience provides a non-adversarial approach for social change appropriate to be employed in an Indigenous context. The Vision charts a course for the role of the Lakota in transforming the phenomenal social order and constructive resilience provides a powerful guiding framework for a seven-generation period of (re)building and renewal. The following is divided into three sections: (1) survivance, (2) constructive resilience, and (3) concluding thoughts. Before moving to these sections, however, this chapter looks at two important themes: going back seven generations and Native American intellectual sovereignty.

**Going back seven generations**

The Vision suggests the importance of paying attention to all that has taken place along the journey of deterioration and repression. This allows the generations to come, who are carrying out the rebuilding process, to know the wrongs that need to be addressed. “Going back” seven generations, however, does not mean the rolling back of the clock in a chronological sense. Instead, in line with indigenous understandings of time being more cyclical in nature, the Vision implies a renewal of the same qualities that were once possessed by previous generations.

One key distinction between traditional Lakota ways and more modern ways is the approach to spirituality and materialism — the Lakota emphasizing the former and modernity the latter. This chapter suggests that a “going back” refers to a spiritual renewal — just as the seasons are marked with deterioration and renewal, so too is society’s spiritual progress. Viewed in a spiritual sense, rather than purely material, the Vision carries relevant and timely significance. The Vision represents a cycle of deterioration and renewal, from a period in which the Lakota experienced spiritual and
cultural repression and near extinction, to a period of spiritual and cultural renewal and richness — realizing the gaze of the Other through self- and community-affirmative cultural practices and the engagement and transformation of the hegemonic social order. The period of turning back is marked by a moment of renaissance, indicating a shift from merely surviving to contributing and transforming. The implications are not only for the Lakota people, but also all societies in which they influence and live. It has serious implications for the Western academic project and, more specifically, IR and NAS.

What do I mean by spiritual? When I employ spiritual I do not mean to imply religious connotations; rather, I am referring to the qualities that have to do with the human spirit. I use the term spiritual as a marker to stand for the spiritual perceptions that could be awakened by indigenous worldviews, experiences, and knowledges. To gesture toward the different ways of thinking which are often at odds with Western thought — encompassing a wide range of ontological, cosmological, axiological, philosophical, and epistemological considerations and differences. An overwhelming sentiment from those I spent time with on the reservation is that American society is overly individualistic, excessively focused on material wealth, indifferent to the protection of land and nature, and spiritually void. These traits are at odds with traditional Lakota values — presenting a struggle for many to reconcile varying perceptions of reality. The Vision challenges the US master narrative of the eradication of Natives as being a forward step for civilization and democracy. Rather, US action and policy towards the Indigenous have been a step “backward” through the severing of important human values, human values which are present and expressed within and through Lakota worldviews.
Native American intellectual sovereignty and academia

The Vision has significant implications on how the manner in which academic research is carried out. A shift from survival (Natives-as-object-of-study) to contribution can already be seen as underway — Native scholars have began advocating for a Native and Indigenous studies characterized by its contributions to all academic thought, not merely bound to a single discipline nor object of study (LT Smith 1999). Robert Warrior (1992) has referred to this as intellectual sovereignty, or the ability for Indigenous knowledge to be used in the critical examination of the dominant society and applied in “wider contexts” (18). Indigenous experiences and contributions impact the study of reality and carry distinct philosophic and scientific ontological, epistemological, and methodological assumptions that undergird what it means to study.

Indigenous people have had very different encounters with scientific study — Western science has brought disorder, fragmentation, and separation for Native communities. Scholars acting in the name of science, have dissected Native communities and bodies, disconnecting them from their land, languages, histories, social relations, and ways of thinking and being. Academic disciplines have carved up Native America in ways that put “bones, mummies and skulls to the museums, art work to private collectors, languages to linguistics, 'customs' to anthropologists, beliefs and behaviors to psychologists” (LT Smith 1999: 28). This “thingification,” as Aime Cesaire (1972) refers to it as, reflects that Indigenous peoples were never granted “humanness,” allowing them instead to be viewed as objects of dissection and study. Natives were not seen as human beings, let alone complete human beings. This
historical context is being challenged through the struggle for intellectual sovereignty — a sovereignty that asserts that Native thoughts, perceptions, and worldviews substantively contribute to the understanding and ordering of the world. The Western academic project of study and research substantiated and reinforced notions of white supremacy and Manifest Destiny. Indigenous perspectives within academia will necessarily transform what it means to study.

Latent within the Vision is the assertion that the era of Natives as “object of study” is definitively coming to a close, supplanted by a period of renaissance and renewal. It brings with it an intellectual sovereignty and the attendant truth that Native experiences, frameworks, and worldviews contribute to the overall understanding of reality. Indigenous studies scholars such as Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999), Shari Huhndorf (2009), Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (2000), and Sandy Grande (2004) have all recognized this shift — a shift that is placed into greater context through the Vision.

Section 1: Survivance

Survivance means that Natives have resisted and continue to resist suppression and marginalization. This is reflected in Native scholarship (see LaRocque 2010). One important work that places survival and resilience in conversation is Don Fixico’s (2013) Indian Resilience and Rebuilding: Indigenous Nations in the Modern American West. Fixico (2013) puts forward a narrative description of the role of Natives in modern society and suggests a prolonged period of resilience — he refers to it as Natives “resiliently survived” — that has now given way to a contemporary moment.
of self-determination (6). Resiliently surviving characterizes many Indigenous peoples throughout the world, but Fixico (2013) suggests this is particularly apt for Native Americans — where Indigenous peoples around the world saw population declines, assimilation, and loss of language, in the US “something drastic has happened: the vanishing race of the late nineteenth century chose not to disappear” (7). Fixico’s conceptualization of resilience and rebuilding corresponds with the two concepts explored within this chapter: survivance (resilience) and constructive (rebuilding). The Vision, however, adds more context and depth to his understanding by suggesting that gains in self-determination are merely a start, a moment of renaissance, to a much longer seven generation period of (re)building.

The idea of “walking backwards into the future” suggests the value of looking backwards to get a better understanding of how to go forward (Wesley-Esquimaux 2009: 19). One of the most important concepts in NAS that attempts to capture Native resistance and resilience is survivance (Vizenor 1994, 1998, 1999, 2008). Survivance challenges narratives that characterizing Natives as passive or merely being an object of colonialism control; they are acts of “renunciations of dominance, detractions, obtrusions, the unbearable sentiments of tragedy, and the legacy of victimry” (Vizenor 2008: 1).

Limitations of Survivance

Survivance is a useful term to understand active resistance, though it falls short in speaking to the quality and spirit of the expression of agency. Acts of survivance are acts that are not always productive for community and human progress and can vary significantly. Acts of recognition express agency, though “not all forms of
‘being seen’ are equal in a colonial context” (Carlson 2011: 19). For instance, Alan Velie (2008) has characterized survivance as “survival with attitude … using aggressive means not only to stay alive but to flourish” (147). Aggressive means as a way to stay alive and flourish foregrounds the ends over the means. In this manner, a focus on staying alive and flourishing can leave the oppressive structures of visibility in place. Survivance as “act[s] of being seen by others,” begs one to ask who is doing the seeing and recognizing (Carlson 2011: 19).

Colonial structures of visibility pose a challenge for acts of survivance. Glen Coulthard (2014) talks about this challenge in terms of representation. That representation through liberal politics holds false promises of recognition that only reinforces state interest.10 This is similar to what Winona LaDuke and Sean A. Cruz (2013) refer to as an “ironic dichotomy” Natives face when dealing with military service — fighting for the people while, at the same time, reinforcing and carrying out imperial command of the US and risk imposing “colonial rule on an unwilling population” (LaDuke and Cruz 2013: 3).11 Within a survivance framework, there is no consideration for which acts of being seen are conducted, how they are carried out, or whether they are for the long-term benefit of the people.

Though survivance “reduces the power of the destroyer,” (Kroeber 2008: 25) it allows the oppressor to dictate the scope of possible outcomes. Stephen W. Silliman (2014) explains:

Survivance recognizes that people in the past may have acted to persist as individuals, as households, as communities, or as other entities. This act of ‘moving forward’ involved social actors sometimes thinking they would change things and other times thinking they would keep them constant, but not ever knowing with absolute certainty what effect those
actions would end up having or how they would be remembered (60-61).

This is the case surrounding the fate of two great Lakota leaders Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse. Sitting Bull was killed in 1890 by Indian police and Crazy Horse was escorted by members of his own band in 1877 to Fort Robinson, where he was ultimately killed. These Lakota were carrying out orders of the US Government, making calculated decisions based on what they felt was in their best interest and the interest of their family. Though not necessarily acts of betrayal, these acts were an internalization of white supremacy, the idea that Natives are going to be eliminated anyway, so better to be on the side of the winners (Ju 2000).

Survivance does not address or supplant oppressive frameworks; instead, it leaves the colonizer’s framework intact. Acts to be present and be seen take place within colonial structures of visibility. Survivance is motivated by “change in order to stay the same” (Silliman 2014: 59); staying the same within an oppressive colonial context is not a good thing.

In summary, survivance does not advocate for actions productive for communities and human progress. Actions of survivance can vary significantly and there is no emphasis on the quality or character of those actions. Acts of being seen or recognized do not challenge the colonial structures of visibility, nor do they create alternatives. New theoretical and methodological frameworks and tools are needed to address and challenge the oppressive social order.

Section 2: Constructive Resilience
If the qualities of survivance are insufficient, how then can a long-term period of rebuilding be understood? This section puts forward one potential means of addressing how a multi-generational process of rebuilding could look like by focusing on the concept of constructive resilience. As a “non-adversarial approach to social change under conditions of violent oppression,” constructive resilience resists (or exists outside of) colonial structures and its attendant oppressions (Karlberg 2010: 222). It puts forward a dignified response characterized by neither concession and resignation nor the adoption of the negative characteristics of the oppressor. Instead, it harnesses efforts to (re)build society and intentionally works to put forward alternative ways of being and lay the groundwork for new social foundations and structures. Once oppressive forces end, these alternatives provide new ways and possibilities of ordering society in a manner that matches the Lakota Seven Generations Vision’s depth, meaning, and spiritual emphasis. Constructive resilience is a potential framework it could provide guidance for seven generations of rebuilding.

Constructive resilience calls for the focus on qualities and characteristics needed to transform and rebuild society through self-affirmative culture practice. Constructive resilience is a term put forward by the governing body of the Bahá’í faith the Universal House of Justice (UHJ), as a way to characterize and give descriptive power to the qualities of action displayed by persecuted Bahá’ís in Iran. For the Baha'is in Iran, it was an emphasis on education, though this is only one of the many possible avenues of action. Other possibilities involve any self- and community-affirmative cultural practices that provide a means of transforming and rebuilding society, such as Lakota language revival, revitalization of spiritual ceremonies,
preserving and protecting water resources, restoration of sacred lands, and revitalization of traditional medicines to name a few.

Why Constructive Resilience and the Lakota

There are many ways to understand different modes of rebuilding, ranging from the tactics of AIM and Red Power activism of the 60’s to nonviolence movements of Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. Why, then, is constructive resilience particularly relevant to a Lakota worldview? There are core values of the Lakota (also shared with many Indigenous peoples) that directly align with the constructive resilience framework. For example, three guiding Lakota principles are: (1) the inseparability between spiritual and material reality, (2) Mitakuye Oyasin, describing the spiritual reality that all are related, and (3) the concept of seven generations as an embodiment for multigenerational change and stability.

There is an inseparability of the spiritual and material dimensions of reality for the Lakota. On multiple occasions I was reminded “everything we do is spiritual.” This was expressed through prayers at the beginning and ending of every meeting, as well as the centrality of Native spirituality and ceremony in every day community life. The emphasis on relations described by Mitakuye Oyasin, as well the four aspects of the soul as described in Chapter 1, refers to not only all human beings, but also to all animals, trees, all earth and water. Interconnectedness and unity permeates all reality. Long-term and multigenerational change is represented through the concept of seven generations (as distinct from the Seven Generations Vision), which describes the Lakota orientation of thinking about how one’s actions will impact their future generations. Maryanne, a Lakota elder, explains, “Seven generations ago there were
people praying for me and that it’s my responsibility to pray for the seven generations ahead of me.” Similarly, these three Lakota principles also characterize central aspects of the constructive resilience framework: it is a spiritual tool for spiritual ends, it carries a strong emphasis on unity, and is multigenerational in its scope, suggesting long-term and evolving transformation.

Identification of “gems” and overarching vision

Constructive resilience also helps place struggles into a larger narrative — the long-term construction a social order built upon principles of unity. This is another unique characteristic of constructive resilience: it provides space for a community to articulate motivating purpose(s) and the identification of the cultural “gems” worth preserving and sharing. A key aspect to this approach is the evaluation and recognition of why something is worth persevering in the first place. Long-term surviving and (re)building requires an articulated overarching vision, or as Paul Lample (2015) asks, “What are the gems preserved which were so precious that they need to be brought out and polished?” Crafting an understanding of this is critically important so to motivate the multigenerational task of (re)building, providing individuals sustained purpose over a long period of time.

An overarching vision allows for a mechanisms of discernment providing each generation a means to evaluate and decide which elements should remain and which new elements to be added. If there are certain aspects that are found to be no longer in line with the preserved principle, they should be forfeited for new techniques and elements. Progressively, each generation will be able to refine techniques and elements from previous generations. These gems and mechanisms cannot be imposed
from outside. Important Lakota cultural values have survived and have, for the most part, been identified, articulated, and safeguarded. Constructive resilience foregrounds these qualities and weaves them into a guiding framework of (re)building and spiritual renewal. It is a spiritual mode of change that effects transformation of the individual and the transformation of society — reinforcing the Lacanian dialectic framework between the science of the subject and the phenomenal social order. Social transformation cannot take sustainable form if it is not for the individual transformation requisite of supporting social structures. Transformation on both levels suggests changes in the behavior and conduct of individuals and changes in the phenomenal social order.

Section 3: Concluding Thoughts: Moments of Renaissance

Constructive resilience comprises three characteristics that parallel important Lakota principles: it accounts for an integrated spiritual and material reality, it foregrounds unity and the principle of Mitakuye Oyasin, and is oriented towards long-term multigenerational change. It is a guiding framework for a multigenerational period of (re)building that calls for an articulated overarching vision to sustain long-term efforts, one founded in strong moral footing and arises from the community itself. The Vision provides this overarching vision and the context for which to understand the significance of generations of survivance and provides a way to approach a newly emergent, yet long-term, period of (re)building marked by self- and community-affirmative cultural practices.
Renaissance

The turning point of the generation begins with a period of renaissance. There are multiple indications pointing to a Native renaissance and the beginning of the Vision’s period of rebuilding. This involves a rise in self- and community-affirmative cultural practices, this includes an increase in the number of spiritual ceremonies being revived and practiced, growing number of youth identifying with a Native identity, revival of Lakota language, shifting of Native presence in academic scholarship, and changes in US-Native relations.

The number of spiritual ceremonies being practices on Lakota reservations is increasing. This is in part because of the 1978 Indian Self Determination Act that lifted the legal ban on Native Ceremonies. The ban came into law in the latter half of the nineteenth century and since then ceremonies were conducted underground, if practiced at all. It was not until the AIM and Red Power movement of the late 1960s that interest in Native spirituality reawakened. The Red Road, as the Lakota refer to it as, is coming out of secrecy and is beginning to be more commonly practiced throughout Lakota communities.

Youth identifying with Lakota identity is also becoming more accepted and appreciated. So much so that, even Lakota in their mid-twenties differ significantly from teenagers. One twenty-four year old young man explains, “There were no role models for us growing up … we used to look to rappers who talk about dealing, smoking and gang-banging; but this younger generation, people like … [naming an eighteen year old we both know] are able to find ways to express themselves.” It used to be uncool to be identifying with traditional Lakota identity, but now that has changed. It is much more acceptable on the reservation to be dancing in powwows and learning to speak Lakota.
A revitalization of the Lakota language is slowly beginning. V. F. Cordova (2007) explains the importance of language as a “window that frames a particular view of the world,” continuing, “Even when the world disappears, they view that it framed remains” (76). Starting from meetings that took place in 1973 on various Lakota reservations in South Dakota, there have been multiple attempts to rejuvenate interest in Lakota that carried on throughout the 1980s and 1990s. The 2000s marked a shift in Lakota language training, seeing the creation of the Lakota Language Consortium (LLC) and Lakota Language Program (LLP) — the former producing language materials for children and training second-language teachers and the latter an on-reservation school with intensive language learning (requiring daily hour-long classes). In 2011, the US Department of Education funded the Lakota Language Education Action Program (LLEAP) training thirty professionals in Lakota language teaching. Lakota Language Immersion Nests throughout various Lakota reservations in the Dakotas were formed in 2012 from these efforts, allowing for language immersion for young children. The 2011 Federal funds were the “first time a Native American professional development program has focused on Native language education as a career path” (Revitalizing Lakota 2015).

Native scholarly presence and influence is also changing (Weaver 2010: 14-21). NAS created its own academic association in 2005 (now called Native American and Indigenous Studies Association) and had its first conference two years later. Since then, NAS departments have formed in universities throughout North America. Multiple NAS journals have emerged and, in a short period of time, NAS has moved from an association-less and barely recognized group to a bonafide discipline reaching a global audience (Weaver 2010).
There has also been a shift in the nature of US-Native relations. In particular, the Obama Administration has been committed to Native affairs, increasing dialogue and collaboration. For instance, in 2014 President Obama became one of few standing presidents to visit Lakota Country. Soon before this, the passing of the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) of 2013 included a special domestic violence criminal jurisdiction clause that closed up loopholes and provided better protection for Native women. Other US Federal efforts such as the Generation Indigenous Initiative (2014), Native energy efficiency programs (2015), and the US Department of the Interior seeking Native input on a Climate Action Plan all indicate that there is an emergent new pattern of interaction between Native communities and the Federal government.

This is to say, there is substantial evidence to believe that there has been (or it is in the midst of) a Native renaissance. Regardless of whether these occurrences are moments of renaissance or the beginnings of (re)building, Native contributions and revitalizations are taking place. The Visions provides the important context and direction to these changes.

This chapter explores a framework in which to understand the possibilities of self- and community-affirming cultural practices and described in detail the Lakota Seven Generations Vision. The Vision places survivance and constructive resilience into meaningful dialogue and charts a course for the evolving role of Natives in modern American society and the emergent role of Indigenous experiences and worldviews within the Western academic project, the phenomenal social order. Survivance is an important concept to characterize how Natives navigated the first seven generations of contact with Euro-American society, while constructive
resilience puts forward a guiding framework to understand the following generations of (re)building premised on self- and community-affirmative cultural practices. Three characteristics at the heart of constructive resilience parallel important Lakota principles — a perception of both a spiritual and material reality, the emphasis on unity and the principle of Mitakuye Oyasin, and the notion of long-term multigenerational change. The Lakota Seven Generations Vision provides a productive way to address negative consequences of US policy and its implications are far reaching — affecting Lakota society and beyond. It places the dialectic Lacanian framework of the science of the subject and phenomenology within a Lakota context and emphasizes the importance of self-affirmative cultural practices.
When speaking to him about anonymity, he shared with me his candid thoughts: “Information exchange without identity is more powerful. When you want to tag your name and you own it, then it becomes all these other issues that come with it. But if it is given freely — as it's received from the universe through nature or through the elders or the animal or the experience — if it comes without ownership, I think it travels further and it carries more power, more potency to the end result.” These excerpts are from an interview with Lucas on August 14, 2014.

I recognize the boldness and broadness of this assertion; I draw later upon the work of Fixico (2013) who suggests that resilience and rebuilding are synonymous with survivance and constructive resilience. Just as Fixico suggests resilience and rebuilding are instrumental in understanding the role of Indigenous Nations in modern America, I suggest the same of survivance and constructive resilience.

Twenty-five years is the average estimation for a generation — from 1970, it would take you back to the exact year of first Lakota contact with US explores in 1804. From 2015, would take you back to 1840, during the Indian Wars.

See “Engaging the past” in the introductory chapter.

Qwo-Li Driskill (2010) suggests the master narrative is one in which “Native people are erased from an understanding of racial formations, Native histories are ignored, Native people are thought of as historical rather than contemporary, and our homelands aren’t seen as occupied by colonial powers” (78).

An example of a similar shift can be seen in the evolution of feminist theory. Feminism emerged in the mid-nineteenth century and has moved from a practice that conceptualized woman as “object of study” to a theoretical and methodological foundation in which to study all aspects of reality; one which contributes to and operates across a multitude of disciplines. “The feminist reconstruction of theory shifts from 'adding women' to rethinking such categories and their relationship to knowledge, power, and community,” suggests Spike V. Peterson (1992), continuing, “It simultaneously shifts from treating women as 'knowable' to women as 'knowers' (194).
By employing the term “renewal” I do not mean to imply that Native cultures and ways of being were ever dead, I merely hope to suggest there will be a centralizing of Native principles and contributions into mainstream society.


For a feminist take on oppression and phenomenology see Sandra L. Bartky (1990).

Others who contribute to this understanding this paradox are de Silva (2007) and Simpson (2007) and the notion of “ethnographic entrapment,” describing the navigation of identity within the colonizer’s terms and the double standard of identity. Simpson (2007) suggests “ethnographic refusal” as a means to break out of this cycle.

This unresolved dichotomy results in many psychological challenges. For instance, Lakota who served in the Vietnam War faced the horrifying predicament when they were killing “enemies” who looked more like themselves than the US soldiers (LaDuke and Cruz 2013).

The Indian police who carried out the murder of Sitting Bull received posthumous US military commendation. Another example would be Elias Boudinot, a bilingual and bicultural Cherokee who, in 1826, gave a speech in Philadelphia to raise funds for schools in Cherokee Nation. He was a great advocate for the Cherokee people but only ten years later he illegally signed away Cherokee lands in Georgia.

I use these two examples because they illustrate the strengths of constructive resilience. For example, nonviolent opposition, a mode of transformation often set forth as exemplary in the face of violent oppression, lacks an emphasis on spiritual transformation and rebuilding. Non-violent opposition does not address root spiritual causes. Without which, oppression can quickly transform into non-violent oppression. For instance, this is what happened during the US Civil Rights Movement where Martin Luther King, Jr. took the movement in a nonviolent direction, opting for peaceful marches in the South. The Civil Rights Movement was not able to transform a system of racism and prejudice because it did not address the root causes of hatred and disunity. Secondly, non-violence does not allocate resources to focus on construction of viable alternative institutions and structures. Invariably oppressive structure and institutions lose their grip, causing a vacuum of leadership and alternatives, creating a “rush to power among competing interest groups that merely invites new forms of oppression” (Karlberg 2010: 244). When Gandhi’s nonviolent movement succeeded in shedding the imperial grasp of the British; rather than being able to function as a unified political entity, India divided into multiple countries,
setting the stage for a long and bloody war that accounted for half a million deaths. Gandhi and Martin Luther King, Jr. were brave and enlightened individuals who provided an important alternative to previous violent modes of resistance, though the studying of the outcomes of their efforts allows for following generations to improve upon their legacy. Nonviolence has altered but not transformed the phenomenal social order.

14 These principles are based on observations from a particular moment in time. It is possible that principles have changed in the past and will change in the future. Constructive resilience allows for a significant amount of dynamism. It is not possible to know the full extent of the possibilities of change hundreds of years from now. Later generations will be better equipped in creating solutions that we are today because they will be facing situations that we could not imagine.

15 The differing accounts of the meaning of Mitakuye Oyasin is discussed in the introductory chapter.

16 Interview with Martin on April 5, 2014.

17 The LLC has grown to a current participation of tens of thousands of children in more than 53 schools in North and South Dakota, while the LLP is a single school (composed of three schools) and serves hundreds of K-12 students. More can be found at their respective websites — Lakota Language Consortium’s website at www.lakota.org and Lakota Language Program’s at http://www.redcloudschool.org/LLP. This information comes from an interview with a teacher at the LLP named Theresa on June 30, 2015.

18 The actual number of graduated practitioners was closer to 25. This comes from conversations with a member of LLEAP who now teaches at LLP. This allowed children to become fluent speakers — from 2010 to 2015, one reservation went from zero children who were fluent speakers to eight children. Though these advances are modest, these efforts do mark a period of renewed interest in reclaiming and relearning the all but lost Lakota language.

19 There are also more emergent efforts, I recently assisted in putting together a grant proposal for a multi-year Lakota language revitalization project within the community I conducted my fieldwork. This occurred on April 29, 2016.

20 Journals include American Indian Quarterly, Wicazo Sa Review, and American Indian Culture and Research Journal.
Chapter 9
CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

This chapter summarizes many of the main points found in this dissertation, including highlighting the importance of a dialectic framework, the major theoretical, analytical, and empirical contributions, and areas of future research. It starts with a brief overview of salient themes and then it proceeds in three sections: (1) Lacanian dialectic of individual and social transformation, (2) future research, and (3) concluding thoughts. The first section is further subdivided into three parts: constructivism and IR, dual transformation of society, and the trickster and seven generations. Section two is subdivided into four parts: master signifier and the law, the theoretical applicability within other Indigenous contexts, Lakota change and continuity, and the use of Lacan as a decolonial intervention.

I came to a Lakota reservation to try to gain some insight as to how the Lakota experience and understand security. The intersection(s) of security, military, and colonialism creates tensions, paradoxes, and ruptures, that, when given attention, can significantly further the study of security. It is within intersecting and overlapping spaces that interesting puzzles emerge. As Indigenous people who have had a long history of military engagement, while still living inside of the US (one of the most, if not the most, militarized state in the world), Lakota experiences and understandings have the potential to greatly enrich the IR study of security. Likewise, the Lakota can also benefit significantly from the engagement of the Lacanian dialectic, relational framework as a means to inform decolonial modalities. The Lakota are US citizens,
with many living in major cities nationwide. In spite of this, they maintain a distinct sense of self—both culturally and politically. Foregrounding Lakota experiences provides a critical possibility, the opening of space for engagement and transformation of the phenomenal social order, while also providing a path to interrogate Western philosophical thought.

This dissertation represents an exploration of multiple ways the Lakota have come to understand security. Interviews and experiences with Lakota men and women reveal different conceptualizations of security and insecurity, conceptualizations that resist the traditional security framework. Instead of focusing on serious physical threats such as genocide, assimilation practices through boarding schools, or crime and policing, many spoke about the insecurity of losing traditional ways of being—security comes from having strong individual foundations, foundation premised on traditional Lakota practices. At first glance, this could be simply dismissed as an unrealistic, over-romanticizing of the past—a longing for an unachievable bygone era, free from outside Euro-American intervention. This valuing of traditions, however, must be placed in proper historical context. The Lakota were expelled from their sacred lands, confined on reservations, slaughtered in mass numbers, pushed to near extinction, and forced at gunpoint into violent assimilation practices. Throughout these challenges, however, the Lakota never disappeared. Don Fixico (2013) explains,

The twentieth century has been the most progressive century in the history of humankind, and it has been one of the most destructive eras of imperialist oppression and blatant exploitation of peoples, including Hitler’s Nazism, Soviet communism, Middle Eastern dictatorships, South African apartheid, Chinese communism, and the rise of North Korea. In each case, the victims, especially the indigenous, have suffered horrifically… Their courses are predictable in the postmodern
history of sharp population declines, complete mainstream absorption, language loss, and ethnic cleansing from the late nineteenth century to the present. Yet in America, in the modern West, something drastic has happened: the vanishing race of the late nineteenth century chose not to disappear (7).

An important aspect to how the Lakota were able to survive was their foundation in traditional ways of life. These traditional ways not only influenced Lakota social arrangement (such as gender roles, guidelines of how to be good relatives, and socially organizing societies or institutions), but they also emphasized the need for spiritual perception that is lacking in much of modern life. These Lakota social, cultural, and spiritual practices provided a foundation that permitted the Lakota to persevere through the most extreme hardships and oppressions. Lakota traditional ways of life allowed the Lakota to make it through genocide, warfare, and violence — all key themes thoroughly examined within the traditional security studies paradigm. As a result, the loss (or potential loss) of traditional ways of life evokes a greater sense of insecurity than physical security threats.

This dissertation turns to French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan and his work on the science of the subject and phenomenology to understand the dialect relationship between self- and community-affirmative cultural practices and transformation of the colonial social order. Lacan’s dialectical approach to the science of the subject splits the gaze into two constituent parts: the look of the subject and the gaze of the Other. The look of the subject is not merely a one way relationship since the Other is always observing and looking back. Lacan also places the science of the subject into a dialectic relationship with phenomenology, or the phenomenal social order.

The constitution of subjectivity takes place in a phenomenal reality — *le nom du père*, or Name of the Father. This phenomenal reality is ordered by an organizing
principle, a master signifier (settler colonialism). The inherent indeterminacy that comes with the inability of the subject to fully comprehend the view of the Other (as Lacan illustrates through the looking at a sardine can floating in the ocean) is also carried over to the phenomenal social order. This social order is always incomplete. These gaps, in turn, are filled by a master signifier. Edkins (2003) explains, “There is always some lack or excess around which that order is constituted, a lack which is concealed by the presence of a master signifier. It has to be concealed for what we call social reality — or what Slavoj Žižek calls social fantasy — to work” (366-67). This framework further highlights the importance of traditional practices within Lakota communities and puts forward the notion that, through self- and community-affirmative cultural practices, the Lakota are able to engage and transform the phenomenal social order. More precisely, to intervene and transform the master signifier of settler colonialism.

Section 1: Lacanian Dialectic: Individual and social transformation

A key aspect of the Lacanian dialectic is that it brings the individual and social levels of analysis into relationship and conversation. In doing so, it provides a framework better suited to understand and theorize change and continuity. The following will look at the importance of the relationship between the individual and the social in IR, the Bahá’í faith, and Lakota traditions. It looks at the emergence of Constructivism in IR and its ability to theorize on both the agentic and structural levels, the Bahá’í principle of dual transformation of society, and the Lakota figure of the trickster and the cultural principle of seven generations.
Constructivism and International Relations

The ability to theorize the individual and structural levels revolutionized the discipline of IR. The fall of the Soviet Union and the subsequent ending of the Cold War ushered in a historical moment unanticipated by preexisting theories and scholars. The prevailing neorealism and neoliberalism debate dominated IR in the 1980s and 1990s and these approaches were unable to account for change occurring in world politics. In particular, they were unable to predict the end of the Cold War and the ensuing Third Wave of Democracy. This void provided the space for the rise of constructivism, filling a critical gap in IR scholarship during this unique historical moment.

Constructivism borrows from sociology and critical theory, making it better situated to theorize change in IR. It did this by focusing not only on structure, but also agency. The "neo-neo" debates, as the neorealism-neoliberalism debate came to be known, pitted two paradigms to explain and understand international state behavior. Though these two differed significantly, they shared some commonalities. One commonality was that states have fixed and inherent interests realized through material resources (through distribution of power, technology, or geography). Contributions from sociology and critical theory urged the discipline to give further consideration to ideational factors such as norms, ideas, knowledge, rules, and the construction of identity as a way to better understand state interest and the organizing of international affairs.

Constructivism rose in importance because of its commitment to understanding global change or how the world is made and remade (Ruggie 1983, Kratochwil 1986,
Onuf 1989, Wendt 1987, Finnemore and Sikkink 1998, Risse et. al. 1999). This shift revolutionized how the international was theorized. It allowed for IR theorists to make sense of new and changing times. At the heart of this was the constructivist concept of the social construction of reality — an emphasis on how actors and their identities and interests are socially constructed. Actors were recast as being historical, created, and produced by cultural environment and context. Constructivism placed agency and structure in a dialectic. This stood in contrast to prevailing theories which emphasized the constitutive nature of structure in determining subjectivity. Knowledge, consisting of rules, symbols, categories, concepts, and meanings, shapes how agents make, remake, and interpret their world.

The world is socially constructed through interactions between the individuals and the structures they create and recreate — the individual cannot be separated from the social. The added value of constructivism (or why constructivism significantly advanced the field of IR) was the ability to theorize and place into relationship agentic and structural analysis.

Dual transformation of society

Central to the Bahá’í faith is the reshaping of society through individual and social change. The UHJ describes the importance of this dual transformation of society — it is incumbent upon every individual “to develop their inherent potentialities and to contribute to the transformation of society” (UHJ 2010). In order to create a world premised on the eradication of all forms of prejudice, gender equity, and the eradication of extremes of wealth and poverty, transformation must occur in both the individual and social spheres. One cannot happen without the other — individual
growth must take place in order for a new social order to be promoted and created. This duality requires a “twofold moral purpose” that urges the individual to recognize their responsibility to take ownership of their own growth, as well as, the need to contribute to the betterment of society.

A key aspect of the Bahá’í Faith is to “effect a transformation in the whole character of mankind, a transformation that shall manifest itself, both outwardly and inwardly, that shall affect both its inner life and external conditions” (Bahá’u'lláh 1989: 14). A dual transformation of society suggests the creation of a new world requires both changes in the behavior and conduct of the individual, as well as how society is organized — one cannot happen without the other.

Trickster and seven generations

Individual transformation and social order are two themes also present in Lakota traditions. The trickster, or Iktomi, is a featured character in Lakota oral history as one who is actively attempting to outwit or cheat others. “Generally, the trickster is a mischief maker, someone who transgresses boundaries, tries to dupe others and often creates more problems for himself than for others,” explains David MacDonald (2014), continuing, “The core of the trickster narratives is unpredictability and thus bears some similarities to complexity theory” (27). One form of the trickster is the Heyoka, or clown. Employing clownish speech and behavior, the Heyoka attempts to influence the behavior of others. In one of the most sacred Lakota ceremonies, the Heyoka jeers and mocks participants. Carrying water and food, he tempts participants to give up their fast and waiver in their spiritual commitment. Those participants resist these temptations and choose to continue on their spiritual
quest. The trickster represents temptation and a path away from virtue and spirituality. The Lakota refer to this as the Black Road. In contrast, the Red Road represents virtuous living that can only be embarked upon through individual volition. The trickster character is an ever-present figure, waiting to tempt and derail an individual’s spiritual quest. To stay on the Red Road, one must actively resist temptation.

The trickster character also signifies a means of resistance through cunning agency. In this manner, the trickster comes to describe how the Lakota unsuspectingly outwitted their colonizers. Miranda Brady (2008) explains,

> These [trickster] stories are akin to the performances of American Indians in Buffalo Bill Cody’s Wild West Shows or posing for postcard photographs. While American Indians were fetishized and treated as entertainment, they benefited mutually from the fascination majority culture had with them. By playing to the stereotypes, they were in essence ‘pulling one over’ on majority culture, and in the process maintained a sense of humor (767).

The Iktomi acts “within the space of another when they do not have a space of their own, as with guerrilla warfare” (Brady 2008: 767). The trickster character comes to represent individual agency and violation and is closely tied to navigating unfavorable paths. It is a way to understand how individual agency plays a role within Lakota communities.

Another important aspect to Lakota life is the principle of seven generations, describing the Lakota orientation of thinking about how one’s actions will impact future generations. This is closely related to the Lakota Seven Generations Vision, though the principle of seven generations is distinct and a more widespread guiding principle for the Lakota. It stands for the idea that seven generations ago your
ancestors were thinking about you and praying for you. Now, your duty is to think and pray for your offspring seven generations down the line — all your actions must be geared towards the betterment of your family and community generations after you. The notion of seven generations implies continuity and structure. It provides a framework to guide behavior towards the needs of those coming after you. It suggests there is a larger structure greater than just the individual and acts as a means to safeguard the well-being and sustainability of the community.

The way the trickster and the principle of seven generations interact allows for both an understanding of individual volition and change, as well as structure and continuity. This dialectic is not only present in IR theory and the Bahá’í faith, but also within Lakota culture.

Section 2: Further Research

The complexity of this political ethnography lends itself to revealing multiples points in need of further research. This includes further research on the master signifier, exploring the findings of this dissertation within other Indigenous contexts, the role of change and continuity within Lakota culture, and a more detailed examination of the use of a Lacanian dialectic framework as a decolonial intervention.

Master signifier and the law

The theoretical framework put forward in this dissertation identifies the presence of an ordering principle, a master signifier, that coheres and masks the
inherent indeterminacy of the social order. Though Lacan provides significant
treatment of signifiers and the master signifier, the way the master signifier is utilized
throughout this dissertation stems from the contributions of Edkins (2003). This use of
master signifier as the ordering social principle, however, is not entirely clear and
precise. Another potentially path of inquiry would be the evaluation of the relationship
between the master signifier and the discourse on the concept of law. Law orders
behavior and is closely related to desire and negation. “First, desire is conceived as an
actual state resulting from a possibility allowed by law,” asserts Copjec (1989),
continuing, “Second, if desire is something one simply and positively has, nothing can
prevent its realization except a purely external force … the being of the subject [is]
dependent on the negation of desire” (61, author’s emphasis).

The discourse on law suggests two principles, law as “(1) unconditional, that it
must be obeyed, since only that which it allows can come into existence — being is,
by definition, obedience — and that it is (2) unconditioned, since nothing, that is, no
desire, precedes the law” (Copjec 1989: 61-62, author’s emphasis). The discourse on
law puts forward a dialectic between repression and desire, negation and fulfillment,
while also controlling and ordering behavior. A focus on the discourse on law is
especially significant because it is a broader term than master signifier and it is a
concept discussed by both Lacan and Foucault.

Theoretical applicability within other Indigenous contexts

The findings of this dissertation are generated from one particular moment on a
single reservation. Within the US, there are nearly one-thousand Native tribes. This is
to say that the findings of this dissertation are not fashioned for broad-scale
applicability — ethnographic commitments prevent these findings from being widely generalizable. It can, however, inform additional scholarship on Lakota experiences of security that may have larger applicability. The applicability of the framework put forward in this dissertation would provide insight into the role of self- and community-affirmative cultural practices within other Native contexts. Expanding the applicability of this theoretical framework would require fieldwork with other Indigenous peoples.

Lakota change and continuity

As mentioned in the previous section, the concepts of change and continuity can be seen through the Lakota character of the trickster and the principle of seven generations. The trickster acts to either derail individuals in their quest on the Red Road or as a way to make navigate unfavorable circumstances through cunning and guile. The trickster represents agency and change. The seven generations vision, on the other hand, represents continuity and structure. It provides a way for important social conventions and cultural institutions to be passed down from generation to generation. These two themes are at the heart of constructivist IR and examining this dialectic from an Indigenous perspective could provide a significant contribution to the theorizing of change and continuity within IR.

Lacan as decolonial intervention

The use of a Lacanian relational and dialectic framework provides a means of informing a decolonial process, particularly in relationship with Indigenous
experiences and worldviews. On a practical level, it is premised on relational presuppositions, it acknowledges the ability to transform the phenomenal social order, and it places importance on individual-level action in engaging the social order. In a larger sense, this relational framework provides the foundation for decolonizing acts and disrupts Western philosophical foundations that favor reason, thinking, and a mind-world independence.

Connecting the Nagila (or Aya) to decolonial practice is a significant contribution to the process of foregrounding self-affirmative cultural practices to transforming the phenomenal social order. Though this connection is explored in the introductory chapter, its significance is such that it merits further exploration. In particular, because unity and interconnectedness is a prevalent theme in many Indigenous cultures, it would be important to see how this concept informs actions of various Indigenous groups and, in turn, how it can impact decolonial praxis.

Section 3: Concluding Thoughts

The way the Lakota envision future security is through reestablishing the balance of the hoop through self-affirmative cultural practices. For Lacan, security is a “response to our desire to know about and understand the future” (Burgess 2011: 63). For the Lakota, looking to secure the future requires examining the past. In so doing, it reveals the need for a recognition and commitment to what allowed for survival of the harshest of genocidal treatment in the first place. These are traditional values and a spiritual foundation. The Lakota know and understand that their future must involve a resurgence of traditional ways of being through self- and community-affirmative
cultural practices. Invariably, Lakota understandings of insecurity turned to the loss of traditional, cultural, and spiritual foundations. It is through reclaiming and revitalizing traditions that the phenomenal social order can be meaningfully engaged and transformed.

The use of Lacan provides a means to interpret Lakota experiences and worldviews into a language that IR scholars can understand. This is not a reflection of the shortcomings of Lakota articulations or experiences; rather, it is a reflection of the invisibility of Indigenous experiences to IR — thereby rendering them unintelligible, and, therefore, silent. Lacan allows the non-Native scholar to better understand the intimate relationship of self-affirmative cultural practices and the phenomenal order. Lakota experiences and worldviews significantly further the Lacanian framework described throughout by placing it into a more profound and expansive space of interrelated mutuality. Where Lacan goes so far to suggest a constructed world of dialectic relationships, the Lakota take it further to paint a spiritual world of mutuality and interconnectedness.

This dissertation finds that the Lakota’s understanding of security does not primarily focus on physical security; rather, it conceives security coming from a strong foundation from traditional values and self- and community-affirmative cultural practices. It contributes to significant works in both IR and NAS. For instance, Edkins (2003) emphasizes the importance of a Lacanian framework within security studies. This dissertation carries out this call for integrating Lacan into security studies and provides empirical evidences for her assertions. Beier (2009) calls for Lakota cosmology to be taken serious in the study of security and suggests the continued omission of Lakota experiences of security is a form of violence. In response, this
dissertation foregrounds Lakota experiences in the study of security and takes seriously Lakota cosmology to reveal interesting conceptualizations of security and insecurity. Coulthard (2014) scrutinizes the problems of state-based forms of recognition and, instead, calls for the engagement of self-affirmative cultural practices. This dissertation places his contributions into a larger dialectic framework, brings his contributions into the IR study of security, and provides empirical evidence of the Lakota recognizing the importance of self-affirmative cultural practices.

The Lakota have been through the worst excesses of colonialism. They have overcome genocidal policies of confinement, relocation, and boarding schools and have come out alive. Native communities are vibrant, proud, and doing their best to preserve their traditional ways. Having a foundation premised on self- and community-affirmative cultural practices allows the Lakota to never fully succumb to colonial violences. The dialectic relation between the science of the subject and the phenomenal social order provides the connective tissue linking individual and social transformation. This dissertation provides a larger framework of understanding for the Lakota communities who are working to revive and recapture the importance of traditions.
1 This idea arose out of a panel at the 2014 International Studies Association in Toronto, Canada. Specifically, David MacDonald was presenting about Red Power in IR and the role of the trickster.
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Appendix A

HISTORICAL TIMELINE

Period I: SIOUX MOVEMENT (prior to 1804)

10,000 years ago; the ancestors of the Sioux began to differentiate themselves culturally. They lived in the Appalachian area.

By 1300; Ancestors of Sioux migrate to what is now northern Minnesota and create the Blackduck-Kathio-Clam River Continuum, a string of sites that featured fortified villages, pottery making, agriculture, and rice gathering. These ancestors intermixed and were influenced by the Oneota and Mississippian cultures.

By 1500; The Sioux are formed and the Seven Councils Fire was created. The Assiniboine (Nakota) move north from the Sioux and are no longer considered part of the Sioux. The Yanktonai, Santee (both Dakota), and the Teton (Lakota) move south and west, while others move towards Michigan and Wisconsin.

1641 First encounter with Jesuits in Minnesota near Lake Superior. The first mention of the Nadouessis, or the Sioux, is made by Jesuit missionaries. They are said to live 14 days from Sault St. Marie. The first French-Sioux direct interactions are believed to have taken place in 1640.

1690s-1700; Dakota-Chippewa economic alliances are established. Dakota allow Chippewa to settle in Dakota land in return for the bringing of French goods onto Dakota land.

1750 Lakota have moved into the Great Plains

Period II: REMOVAL (early 1800s to late 1800s)

1804 Lewis and Clark encounter Lakota at White River, SD
1812 War of 1812, a two-and-a-half year conflict between the US and Great Britain (and their Native American allies), after which, the US increased its efforts to move Natives east of the Appalachian Mountains westward.

1830 Indian Removal Act, authorized the moving all tribes located east of the Mississippi River westward to what was known as the Indian Territory (now Oklahoma).

1830 Trail of Tears, caused by the Indian Removal Act, was the forced relocation of the Cherokee (though included the Seminole, Choctaw, and others) in which tens of thousands did not survive — eight thousand Cherokee died from the walk alone.

1831 Fort Laramie Treaty is signed, allowed white travelers through area

1868 Treaty at Fort Laramie (Great Sioux Reservation Treaty) signed with Red Cloud; Lakota agreed to live within the boundaries of the Great Sioux Reservation, “Essentially the entire western half of what is now the state of South Dakota, bordered on the East by the Missouri River. They could continue to hunt in southeastern Montana, eastern Wyoming, and northern Nebraska. The Lakota were led to believe that this treaty was to last ‘as long as the waters flow and grasses grow.’” (Marshall 2012: 19)

1874 Gold found in Black Hills

1875 US order for the Lakota to abandon the Powder River hunting ground — are southwest of the Black Hills - triggering war between the US and the Lakota

1876 Black Hills are taken by US; Battles with US continue

1876 Battle of Little Bighorn (Battle of Greasy Grass, June 25-26)

1877 Gold Rush in Black Hills

1877 Treaty at Fort Laramie (western third cut off, including passing ownership of the Black Hills to the US)

1877 Crazy Horse is killed (September); at time only two bands were left, one led by Crazy Horse and the other Sitting Bull – who fled towards Canada.

1879 Carlisle Indian School opened in Pennsylvania, acting as a model for the Native Boarding Schools to come during the assimilation period.

1881 Celebration of Sun Dance is outlawed by US government
1883 Indian Religious ceremonies were made illegal through the 1883 Religious Crimes Code, initiated by Secretary of the Interior Henry M. Teller, causing those who were engaged in traditional rites to be imprisoned. Native religions were forbidden under Federal “Civilization Regulations” until the 1930s. Natives were not permitted to pray at their sacred places. Religions were driven underground and some practices became extinct. The Freedom of Religion Act of 1978 allowed Natives to practice religion without fear of imprisonment, which they could have served up to 30 year sentences.

1883 Last bison herd is slaughtered by white buffalo hunters

**Period III: ASSIMILATION (late 1800s to 1930)**

1887 US Dawes General Allotment Act (also known as Dawes Severalty Act and Indian Homestead Act), individualized ownership of Indian land. This occurred after Natives were decimated and isolated to Indian Territory. Native extinction was anticipated, leading to the heightened policy of Native Boarding Schools for children.

1889 Ghost Dance movement led by Wovaka (Paiute holy man)

1889 US Sioux Act, created six distinct reservations; “the Great Sioux Reservation was no more. Lands not regarded as reservations were removed from Lakota ownership, meaning that eleven million acres of land from the original single reservation were lost” (Marshall 2012: 21)

1890 Sitting Bull killed (December 15)

1890 Massacre at Wounded Knee (December 29, marking end of Indian Wars)


1924 Indian Citizenship Act or Snyder Act, gave Native Americans citizenship

1928 Meriam Report “The Problem of Indian Administration” commissioned the Institute for Government Research, later known as the Brookings Institute and recommended: (1) the abolishment of “The Uniform Course of Study,” or the teaching of only European-American values, (2) schooling Native children closer to home and not in Native Boarding Schools, and (3) encouraged education to be relevant to their
own communities and US society. The report showed the shocking nature of the assimilation and allotment programs and it signaled the end of ineffective and disastrous assimilation and allotment policies and rolled out a new era of more tribal cultural respect, it brought a basic amount of infrastructure development to reservations, and it ushered in the eventual passage of the 1934 Indian Reorganization Act.

1932 Black Elk shares story with John Niehardt, “Dakota Texts” is published

**Period IV: INDIAN NEW DEAL (early 1930s to 1946)**

1934 Indian Reorganization Act (IRA), granted particular rights for Native Americans. The IRA recognized, for the first time, the right for Native Americans to have a modicum of self-determination and autonomy by allowing for Indian self-governance in the affairs of their respective reservations. The caveat, however, was that Native governance was to be established as representative democracies under the auspices of US federal government control, rather than other forms of traditional tribal rule. Signing the IRA meant the normalization of dependent nature of Native tribes and, as a result, not all tribes were in favor of signing.

**Period V: TERMINATION AND RELOCATION (1946 to 1960s)**

1945 End of World War II, saw the US terminating relations with Native American tribes.

1946 Indian Claims Commission, created to settle outstanding Indian legal claims though became bogged down with prolonged cases and was disbanded thirty years later. It processed 484 of the 617 original claims (Fixico 1986).

1949 Department of the Interior created to take over Native American polices and programs, US Department of War disbanded after its formation in 1789.

1952 Urban Indian Relocation Program, program aimed at relocating Native Americans from reservations to urban areas; the Bureau of Indian Affairs created relocation offices in LA, San Francisco, San Jose, Denver, Dallas, Chicago, St. Louis, Cincinnati, and Cleveland.

1953 House Concurrent Resolution 108, set up the dissolution of special programming for Native Americans. It also called for the termination of all Native reservations —
though due to opposition, only two were eventually disbanded (Klamath in Oregon and Menominee in Wisconsin, both reestablished a few decades later).

1956 Indian Relocation Act (also known as Public Law 959 and Adult Vocational Training Program) expanded the Relocation Program by providing vocational training. Other benefits included medical insurance, grants for work clothing and vocational tools, temporary per diem payments, covering relocation costs, and transportation costs. In 1940, 8% of Native population was living in cities; by 1980, nearly three-quarters of a million, roughly 53%, lived in cities (Indian Country Diaries, Urban Relocation).

**Period VI: SELF-DETERMINATION (mid-1960s to current)**

1968 American Indian Movement, by this time government relocation programs did not achieve desired outcomes and Native activists brought to attention harmful US policies; the social climate of the time (with the Civil Rights Movement in full swing) contributed to Native leaders’ desire for self-determination.

1969 Vine Deloria publishes *Custer Died For Your Sins: An Indian Manifesto*.

1970s Land ownership, “Whites owned 60 percent in four of the five counties. Increased white land ownership led to the diminishment of the 1881 reservation boundary. Today, the Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation is one-fifth its original area, its boundaries coinciding with one of sixty-seven counties in the state” (Marshall 2012: 22).

1973 Wounded Knee II or Siege at Wounded Knee

1975 Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, make a shift in US policy giving tribes more autonomy and allowing for an increased role for tribal governments, including matters of cultural preservation, education, welfare programs, housing, and infrastructure (Snipp and Summers 1991).

1978 Native American Freedom of Religion Act

1980 US v Sioux Nation of Indians found Black Hills illegally taken, awarded nearly $106 million

1989 US Congressional Bill creates the National Museum of American Indian (NMAI)
1990 Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA)

1994 Right to possess eagle feathers

1995 Use of peyote for Native Churches

2012 UN Report by Special Rapporteur on Rights of Indigenous Peoples
recommended US give back the Black Hills (May 4)

2014 President Barak Obama visits the Standing Rock Lakota Reservation (June 13)
Appendix B

OCETI SAKOWIN, THE SEVEN COUNCIL FIRES

1. Dakota/Santee (Referred to as Eastern Dakota, Dakota, Santee, Dakota Sioux)
   • Southern Minnesota
   • Four fires (Mdewakanton, Wahpeton, Wahpekute, and Sisseton)
   • “D” dialect

2. Dakota/Yankton and Yanktonai (Western Dakota, Yankton, Nakota, Yankton Sioux)
   • Two council fires
   • Sioux and Missouri rivers (southeastern South Dakota, southwest Minnesota, and northwestern Iowa)
   • So-called “N” dialect

3. Lakota/Teton (Lakota, Teton, Lakota Sioux)
   • One council fire, the largest
   • North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska; “Lakota Country” is from Canadian border in the Platte River, Nebraska (North to South) and the Bighorn Mountains, Wyoming to the Missouri River (East to West)
   • Seven sub-tribes (Sichangu, Oglala, Itazipeho, Hunkpapha, Mnikhowozu, Sihasapa, and Oohenunpa)
   • Four sub-tribes in CRTR (Mnicouiou, Sihasapa, Itazipco and Oohenumpa)
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UNIVERSITY OF DELAWARE INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Please keep a copy of this form for your own records.  Rev. 021516

University of Delaware
Informed Consent Form

Title of Project: "International Relations: Lakota Sioux, SD"
Principal Investigator: Justin de Leon, Department of International Relations

You are being asked to participate in a research study. This form tells you about the study including its purpose, what you will do if you decide to participate, and any risks and benefits of being in the study. Please read the information below and ask the research team questions about anything we have not made clear before you decide whether to participate. Your participation is voluntary and you can refuse to participate or withdraw at anytime without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to sign this form and a copy will be given to you to keep for your reference.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?
The purpose of this study is an understanding through the collection of experiences of the challenges that men and women face on the Reservation. Further details are:

- This research is for the dissertation requirements for a Ph.D. in international relations.
- The intention is to produce research that is beneficial to the respondent and their community.
- The field of international relations has been dominated by narrow understandings of security – devotion to a military-premised notions of security – which has left other forms of violence (and security) unseen and under-theorized.
- This research explores how marginalized perspectives and experiences can challenge fundamental notions of international relations.

You are being asked to take part in this study because:

- You are a member of the Lakota Sioux community of reservation who is over the age of 18.
- You have interacted with the Lakota Sioux community of reservation.
- You are familiar with the experiences that Native Americans face.

WHAT WILL YOU BE ASKED TO DO?
This research relies on first-person interviews with individuals familiar with the experiences of the Lakota Sioux:

- Interviews take place in environments that are comfortable for the respondent and can last (on the average) 45 minutes to an hour, though interviews can vary in length.
- Questions will be directed at understanding the personal experiences and challenges of the respondent.
Please keep a copy of this form for your own records. Rev. 021516

- Follow-up interviews could be requested if more detail is deemed beneficial for the research. Follow-up interviews, similar to all interviews conducted in this research, are purely voluntary and the respondent can withdraw participation at any point.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?
- Private stories and information shared may compromise relationship and/or social or cultural standing.
- Because the researcher is not from the Reservation, there may be some repercussions in being seen or meeting with the researcher.
- The participant may be asked to recall personal situations of hardship that may present some discomfort.

Safeguards that have been taken:
- The researcher will safeguard all information through (1) removing any identifying names of respondents in reports and field notes, (2) password protecting field notes and drafts, and (3) by not disclosing information gathered to third parties. If video recording is consented to, then confidentiality of use of name and identifying factors will be discussed and agreed upon by each individual respondent.
- To minimize "outsider" challenges, the researcher has taken the following steps: (1) received invitation from a tribal member of the Tribal Council, and (3) has been in contact with the Oglala Lakota College about conducting research.
- The researcher has undergone Human Subjects in Research training and has received Institutional Review Board consent.

WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE BENEFITS?
The desire of the researcher is to create research that is beneficial to the respondents and their community(ies).
- The benefit to the individual respondents is that their individual stories and experiences will be shared with a broader audience (with specific identities protected). Outside of this, there will be no other direct benefit from taking part of this research.
- The future potential benefits to others or the community is that the knowledge gained from this study may contribute to the understanding of how security and insecurity are experienced on Native American reservations.
- These are potential (and desired by the researcher) benefits and cannot be guaranteed.

HOW WILL CONFIDENTIALITY BE MAINTAINED?
Confidentiality is of utmost importance to the researcher. As a result, the researcher will:
- Use pseudonyms (or nicknames) for all respondents in all final writings.
Please keep a copy of this form for your own records.  Rev. 021516

• Pseudonym key will be kept on a password protected digital document.
• All research related material will be store on a password protected computer (and password protected word document) and the password will be changed multiple times over the course of the research.
• The researcher will value and protect the confidentiality of the respondents by not disclosing information gathered to third parties.
• Photographs and video recording may accompany the research. If they do, individual consent will be sought and a secondary media consent form must be signed. Pseudonyms can be used in any display or use of images and/or video gathered, depending on the subjects desires.

Research records may be viewed by the University of Delaware Institutional Review Board, but the confidentiality of records will be protected to the extent permitted by law.

WILL THERE BE ANY COSTS RELATED TO THE RESEARCH? No.
WILL THERE BE ANY COMPENSATION FOR PARTICIPATION? No.

DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?
Taking part in this research study is entirely voluntary. You do not have to participate in this research. If you choose to take part, you have the right to stop at any time. If you decide not to participate or if you decide to stop taking part in the research at a later date, there will be no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. Your refusal will not influence current or future relationships with the University of Delaware and/or any other groups of institutions.

WHO SHOULD YOU CALL IF YOU HAVE QUESTIONS OR CONCERNS?
If you have any questions about this study, please contact the Principal Investigator, Justin de Leon, at deleon@udel.edu or (302) 831-2355, or his affiliated institution, the University of Delaware, Lynn Corbett, llcorbet@udel.edu or (302) 831-2355. If you have any questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the University of Delaware Institutional Review Board at (302) 831-2137.

Your signature below indicates that you are agreeing to take part in this research study. You have been informed about the study's purpose, procedures, possible risks and benefits. You have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the research and those questions have been answered. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep. By signing this consent form, you indicate that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant ___________ Date ___________

Printed Name of Participant ___________
University of Delaware
Media Consent Form
(for photograph, video, and audio recordings only)

The undersigned gives permission to Justin de Leon [and his representatives] use of the collected media data – including interviews, photographs, video, audio recordings, or observation – for use of research purposes. The research explores the experiences and challenges the Lakota Sioux face as a way to see how marginalized perspectives and experiences of security and insecurity can greater inform notions of security in international relations. These collected data will be used in the research as ethnographic documentary film and/or photographic accompaniment.

AUTHORIZATION
This form authorizes the recording of my likeness, image, voice, sound effects, interview and/or performance concerning the research of security in international relations.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The researcher values the participant’s confidentiality. The researcher will use the actual names of individuals photographed or video taped, UNLESS THE PARTICIPANT NOTIFIES OTHERWISE. Upon which, pseudonyms can and will be used. Regardless, all media files will be kept on a secure password protected computer. Under specified circumstances, the researcher can mask/alter the face and voice of the respondent.

I hereby certify and represent that I am over eighteen years of age and have read the foregoing and fully understand the meaning and effect thereof. By signing this consent form, you indicate that you voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

_________________________   ________________
Signature of Participant          Date

_________________________   ________________
Printed Name of Participant
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TRIBAL COUNCIL APPROVAL MEMORANDUM

TRIBAL MEMORANDUM
DATE: 8/17/14
TO: Tribal Chairman
FROM: Tribal Secretary
SUBJECT: Justin DeLeon's Request

The Tribal Council during Special Session held on June 17, 2014 approved a motion to give permission to Justin DeLeon, University of Delaware Student, to conduct interviews and gather information for his college thesis report regarding security and colonization.

(Note: No document(s) was submitted for the record.)

Cc: Chairman
    Treasurer
    Administrative Officer
    Tribal Comptroller
    Central Records
    Committee Secretary
    District Officers (6)
    File/2