



Association of Mexican American Educators Journal

Volume 13 Issue 2

A peer-reviewed, open access
journal

2019

AMAE Special Issue

Critical Latinx Indigeneities and Education

Guest Editors

Luis Urrieta, Jr.
*University of Texas at
Austin*

Melissa Mesinas
Stanford University

Ramón Antonio
Martínez
Stanford University

Editors

Patricia Sánchez
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Antonio J. Camacho
AMAE, Inc.

Associate Editors

Julie L. Figueroa
Sacramento State

Lucila D. Ek
The University of Texas at San Antonio

Critical Latinx Indigeneities: Unpacking Indigeneity from Within and Outside of Latinized Entanglements

Luis Urrieta, Jr.

University of Texas, Austin

Dolores Calderón

Western Washington University

Abstract

This article engages an important, but difficult conversation about the erasure of indigeneity in narratives, curriculum, identities, and racial projects that uphold settler colonial logics that fall under the rubric of Hispanic, Latina/o/x, and Chicana/o/x. These settler colonial logics include violence by these groupings against Indigenous people, or *indios*, that has been part of Mexican and U.S. history in the Southwest. We examine Hispanic, Latina/o/x, and Chicana/o/x settlers' complicity with myths that support white settler futurity, including through social studies curricula and contemporary discourses of the U.S. as a nation of immigrants. The problematics of *Hispanidad* and *Latinidad* are also engaged as part of officialized U.S. state regulation and as an expression of *mestizaje* based on indigenism (*indigenismo*). *Indigenismo* worked hand-in-hand with *mestizaje* and functioned not so much as a celebration of racial mixture, but as state eugenicist programs of Indigenous erasure throughout Latin America, and by extension in Latino communities in the U.S. Finally, we provide diverse examples of how this process works to advance a theory and praxis of Critical Latinx Indigeneities to decolonize *Latinidad* and *mestizaje* in order to envision Indigenous futurities within and outside of the Latinized entanglements of the present.

Keywords: Indigenous, *Mestizaje*, *Latinidad*, Indigeneity, Critical Latinx Indigeneities

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24974/amae.13.2.432>

Introduction

Research studies and media coverage have for years heightened attention to the growing Latinx population in the U.S., including of children in schools. But, by simply noting the increase in population size, they rarely recognize the growth in Latinx diversity. Indigenous Latinxs make up some of that increasing diversity and for better or worse they often become engulfed in the larger regulatory narratives of experience in the U.S., such as Hispanic or Latinx, that tend to disappear and assimilate Indigenous peoples. However, even within these larger categorical entrapments, intra-Latinx racism continues to position Indigenous Latinx families and children, as the invisible or inferior Other (Machado-Casas, 2009).

In this article we argue that mestizo violence against Indigenous people, or *indios*, is not new and has always been part of Mexican and U.S. history in the Southwest and also as part of larger white settler colonial processes (Olguín, 2013). The term *indio* (Indian), for instance, is usually loaded with collectivized negative associations and often also used as an insult. To highlight this anti-*indio* violence, we engage an important, but difficult conversation about the erasure of indigeneity in narratives, curriculum, identities, and racial projects that uphold settler colonial logics that fall under the rubric of Hispanic, Latina/o/x, and Chicana/o/x. Specifically, we will explore how Spanish, Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Hispanos, Tejanos, Californios, and others have been settlers on Native lands and can become complicit with myths that ensure settler futurity (Tuck & Gaztimbide-Fernández, 2013) through the social studies curriculum and through contemporary Hispanic and Latinx discourses about the U.S. as a nation of immigrants. Relatedly, we also explore the problematics of Hispanidad and Latinidad as a part of officialized U.S. state regulation, but also as an expression of mestizaje based on indigenism (*indigenismo*), the main ideology, state tenet, and intellectual project for regulating Indigenous communities throughout Latin America (and by extension the U.S.), that worked hand-in-hand with mestizaje and functioned not so much as a celebration of racial mixture, but as a state eugenicist program of Indigenous erasure (Alberto, 2016).¹ Finally, we will advance a theory and praxis of Critical Latinx Indigeneities—CLI (Blackwell, Boj López, Urrieta, 2017) to decolonize Latinidad and mestizaje in

¹ We are not arguing that Latinx people are not subject to racism and white supremacy. Instead, in this paper we highlight Latinx intragroup racism/discrimination. We believe this is necessary for nuanced educational policy, curriculum, pedagogy, and practice.

order to envision Indigenous futurities within and outside of the Latinized entanglements of the present.

CLI as an Analytic Frame

Critical Latinx Indigeneities (CLI) can be useful to explore and forefront the experiences of Indigenous Latinx families and education. According to Blackwell et al. (2017), CLI is a lens for understanding the ways gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race, class and other oppressions intersect with indigeneity and are produced over multiple colonial contexts, including within schools. CLI recognizes that Indigenous communities and families organize around language, epistemology, transnationalism and youth cultural practice to survive and to confront displacement and migration with creative forms of cultural cohesion (Urrieta, 2016). CLI centers the experiences and epistemes of Indigenous Latinx communities to push the boundaries of regulatory categories. CLI thus creates room for the multilayered discourses and ideologies of local, national, and transnational social and cultural flows both in Latin America and in diaspora.

Until CLI, a collective effort to name and theorize the varied expressions of Indigenous Latinx experiences, which tend to be simultaneously outside of and within dominant narratives of Latinidad, was largely absent (Blackwell et al., 2017). CLI fills this need by critically engaging and critiquing enduring colonial logics and practices that operate from different localities of power and the violence targeted at Indigenous Latinx families and communities, including state and police violence, cultural appropriation, economic exploitation, gender violence, social exclusion, and psychological abuse—including forms of violence inflicted in schools. CLI also centers the various forms of resistance, including activism, rage, healing, love, and communality that inform Latinx Indigenous experiences, including in and through education.

Multiple scales of analysis in CLI allow us to consider overlaps and differences of multiple Indigenous migrant groups and U.S. Native nations, including from policies of genocide in countries like Mexico, Guatemala, or Honduras, to hybridization with U.S. racial hierarchies and U.S. Native dispossession and sovereignty. For example, consider the complexity of the Garífuna peoples of Honduras, who identify largely as Indigenous but are of African, Carib, and Arawak ancestry, and who also share an affinity with a broader sense of Blackness. Since the 2009 military coup, the Garífuna are being dispossessed of their coastal lands through extractivist development (colonial) policies that are promoting tourist corporate interests with

the aid of multinational banks, the military, and the Honduran mestizo elite (Loperena, 2017). The Garífuna along with other Indigenous groups and poor mestizos form part of the refugee and asylum seeking exodus caravans currently fleeing Honduras. The Garífuna travel with thousands of other refugees and asylees through Guatemala's and then Mexico's normative nationalisms, and the racial structures regulating Indigeneity and Blackness, which for the Garífuna mean a complicated and complex experience of their indigeneity. Ultimately, they reach the U.S. with its own settler colonial racial formations and logics that regulate Indigeneity and race relations, where the Garífuna are not likely read as Indigenous, but as Black bodies. The Garífuna would likely be criminalized due to their crimmigration, but also be subject to anti-Blackness in three different national contexts. CLI allows us to look at both the local and larger scales across their trans-migration, as well as the asymmetrical relations of power and hybrid hegemonies that form through multiple colonial experiences converging in new places, as we think about the changing meanings of race, place, indigeneity, and blackness in their experiences.

CLI is thus an “interdisciplinary analytic that reflects how indigeneity is defined and constructed across multiple countries and at times, across overlapping colonialities” (Blackwell et al., 2017, p. 126). CLI's examination of multiple racial structures and the hybrid hegemonies that are formed in transmigration allow us to understand how indigeneity is re/shaped in local as well as hemispheric scales (Blackwell, 2017). According to Blackwell (2017, p. 159) CLI:

...addresses how indigeneity is produced differentially by multiple colonialities present on Indigenous land where different Indigenous diasporas exist in a shared space. It refuses the way migration scholars fail to see the “receiving countries” as Indigenous territories and nations, reenacting the terra nullius of settler colonialism. Thus, Critical Latinx Indigeneities works against the erasure of the Indigenous peoples and homelands that are transited and settled on. Further, it examines mobility as a global Indigenous process of displacement...It considers the shifts in racial formations and the ways Indigenous people are racialized differently across and between different settler states.

CLI therefore addresses how Indigenous peoples are created as colonial subjects and re/positioned in their countries of origin and in receiving countries, including through re/defined gender, sexuality, ethnicity, race, class, and other categorical understandings. Barillas-Chón (this

issue) highlights attention to language and labor incorporation in relation to CLI as issues tied to racial hierarchies that often function as proxies for indigeneity in different contexts.

CLI further calls attention to ways communities negotiate ongoing movement to maintain identity, and ways of knowing, being, and doing while at the crossroads of complex intersectional nuances, intergroup oppression, and enduring multiple colonialities of power. CLI is critical of mestizaje and whitening discourses across disciplines, including in Chicana Studies, and argues for the inclusion of multilayered discourses and ideologies, while thinking of how power is distributed along ethnicity and race across contexts. Finally, CLI also challenges U.S. settler colonial logics of erasure by adjuring Indigenous migrants to consider the tensions, responsibilities, and opportunities of relations with U.S. Native nations, including solidarity ties and the restructuring of transnationalism while catering to Indigenous-to-Indigenous relationships and alliances within the respected boundaries of U.S. Native nations' sovereignty (Blackwell et al., 2017; Ramírez, 2006). CLI ultimately serves as a bridge that draws from coloniality (Quijano, 2000), settler colonial studies (Wolfe, 2006) and critical indigenous studies (Moreton Robinson, 2016; Tuck and Yang, 2012) that highlights how multiple colonialisms (caste, rogue, settler, etc.) overlap, interact, and reproduce power. CLI very purposefully focuses on Latinx Indigenous populations in order to draw attention to both the unique educational challenges faced alongside the well-documented issues of inequity, generally.

Old and New Encounters

Heeding CLI's call for complexity, here we explore Indigenous and mestizo historical proximity as well as Indigenous migration from the South to the North to show that this "new" phenomenon of what we call "Indigenous Latinxs" is and is not new. People referring to themselves as Spanish, Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Hispanos, Tejanos, Californios, etc., have been in relation with Native peoples for hundreds of years, and those relations have generally not always been harmonious. Spanish and Mestizo violence against Indigenous people, or *indios*, was/is part of these old and new settler colonial contexts of encounter (Olguín, 2013).

Native peoples have been dehumanized under Spanish, Mexican, and U.S.-Anglo-White settler colonialism. Verástique (2000) contends that the historiography of the Hispanic invasion of Mesoamerica and later its northern territories (U.S. Southwest) "has come to be known as 'the problem of the Indian'" (xv). Early colonial debates argued either for or against Indigenous peoples' humanity, often identifying Natives mostly as a "problem" as Hispanics positioned

themselves as superior. According to Saldaña-Portillo (2016), the most notable debate was between Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda and Bartolomé de las Casas at the convened Junta de Valladolid in 1550². Sepúlveda argued that Natives were not rational beings (*gente de razón*) and were naturally suited for enslavement, servitude, or extermination. De las Casas argued for Natives' undisputable rationality and their natural right to possessions, self-government, and Christian evangelization. Without an official judgment over the debate, according to Saldaña-Portillo, Indigenous peoples became positioned at an infantile stage of humanity either as nomads and barbaric (*indios bárbaros*) or as pagan Indians (*indios gentiles*), usually settled, with the potential to be assimilated through Catholic indoctrination (*adoctrinados*). As minors, *indios gentiles* were placed under the tutelage of Spanish administrators, military, Catholic priests, or *encomenderos*, or Spanish people who had the right to request labor or tribute from Indigenous peoples, who treated Natives according to their racist and spiritual views of them (Verástique, 2000; Saldaña-Portillo, 2016).

Violence was justified against *indios bárbaros* who warred or resisted Hispanics, enforcing submission or extermination (Saldaña-Portillo 2016). *Indios bárbaros* in the Southwest included those Cotera & Sandaña-Portillo (2014, p. 559) refer to as “equestrian” Tribes like the Comanche, Seri, Navajo, Apache, Yaqui, Utes, and other nations that did not completely succumb to Hispanic dominion and raided Spanish, Mexican, and later white settlements for livestock for their profitable and interrelated trade economies. *Indios gentiles* eventually settled in Catholic missions, in segregated barrios (neighborhood) within Spanish and later Mexican pueblos, or in their own *pueblos de indios* (Indian republics) as independent nations, such as the Pueblo Indian nations of New Mexico, and throughout Mesoamerica, such as the city of Tlaxcala. Detribalized Indians, often Indians captured and sold into slavery in Hispanic and mestizo households also formed part of the Indigenous populations in the Southwest. Referred to as *neofíos* (neophytes), or *genízaros*, these Natives became Spanish-speaking and largely lived according to Hispanic customs, but with distinct collective memories of their Indigenous origins (Gonzales, 2017). Meticulous Spanish records, including maps, surveys, and censuses consistently identified people according to their caste, which included

² Saldaña-Portillo (2016) engages this debate extensively in chapter one (Savages Welcomed) of her book *Indian Given: Racial geographies across Mexico and the United States* (Duke University Press).

categories such as Spanish, mestizo, indio, negro, mulato, etc., indicating that despite the social distance, different racialized groups were in proximity of each other.

Demise in the Indigenous population occurred in the first century of Spanish dominion and up to 90% of Native depopulation occurred through displacement, disease, and harsh working conditions in some regions (Einfield, 2001; Stannard, 1992). Displacement occurred through forced labor in distant mining regions or for harvesting crops, and also by incorporating Natives into the Spanish invading frontier armies. For example, contingents of Tlaxcalans and Tarascans (P'urhépechas) travelled north with the Spanish armies to advance their frontier expeditions and eventually settled into towns as far north as New Mexico (DeLay, 2008). *Barrio de Analco* in Santa Fe, New Mexico is an example of Tlaxcalan migration and resettlement from South to North. The mining areas in Zacatecas and Chihuahua also drew migration, including of Indigenous people into the edges of colonial expansion (Thornton, 2012). Northern Natives like the Yaqui were also later forced to settle into villages after violent military clashes against Mexican armies, while others were dispersed, or relocated to aid in warring, labor, and resettlement efforts against other Indigenous peoples (Evans, 2007).

Spanish authorities consolidated Indigenous pueblos through *reducciones* or *congregaciones* due to depopulation, unless they were already in pueblos large enough to remain their own entities. *Repúblicas de indios* (Indian Republics), were guaranteed legal rights, privileges, and protections (Ramírez Zavala, 2011), including a *cabildo indio* (self-elected municipal council) and religious council, which held collective landholdings (*ejidos*) through the *leyes de Mercedes* (Spanish land grants) (Einfield, 2001), and the right to petition and file grievances. Smaller pueblos under *barrio* status also enjoyed protections, but, were under the “care” of local parishes or a nearby Spanish (*cabecera*) town. Spain justified *congregaciones* on the basis of Indigenous numerical decline, but these mostly served the purpose of Indigenous land dispossession and consolidation for control and indoctrination.

In *Genealogical Fictions*, Martínez (2008) highlighted that the term mestizo surfaced in Mexico in the 1530s and was initially synonymous with illegitimacy, meant “mixed” and was associated in Spain with zoological vocabulary, the mixing of animals. However, racialized caste hierarchies eventually became complicated and while Indigenous people were considered “pure,” they were legally minors and subject to tribute and labor regimes, while mestizos were not and some mestizos eventually acquired access to restricted elite spaces. *Mestizaje* as an

intermediary buffer zone between indio and white (Criollos and Peninsulares) became inherently implicated in the continued economic marginalization, racism, and social/cultural erasure of Indigenous peoples. Mestizos came to occupy a middle, often both hostile and romanticized, space between Mexicans of European descent and Indigenous peoples. Ceceña and Barreda (1998) stated:

Actually, the mestizo culture has grown at the expense of the indigenous one and has no interest in recuperating it. To do so would deny their own superior authority over natural and human resources and would limit their possibilities for exploitation, thus affecting their profit margins. Thus, their predatory spirit reaches into the cultural realm. (p. 51)

Mestizaje is at the crux of economic exploitation and the accumulation of wealth on the part of Latin American elite, usually at the expense of Indigenous dispossession and labor exploitation.

According to Hernández Castillo (2001), Indigenous women's wombs are the epicenter of mestizaje as an absorbing process into whiteness. She explained that *mestizaje* is about racism and historical erasure under the guise of inclusivity in Latin America:

Whereas in other contexts racism has been characterized by its segregationist impulse, in some Latin American nations where mestizo identity has been the crux of nationalist identities, the discourse on the need for 'racial interbreeding' has deeply racist connotations.(29)

Indigenous women's bodies were/are exploited and literally raped in nation-building projects. While mestizaje absorbs indigeneity into the nation, according to Castellanos (2017), it is also "contingent on remembering, at times memorializing, the Indian" (p. 778), to assert national belonging. To be clear mestizos were/are not inherently evil (as "predatory spirit" suggests), but had and have an investment in a normative mestizaje that privileges them and positions them as superior to their romanticized and disavowed Indigenous cousins, much like whites are not inherently racist (by nature), but have an inherent and protective investment in the normativity and property of whiteness in U.S. society (Harris, 1993).

Enfield and O'Hara (2010) stated that between 1620 and 1670 economic hardship, agricultural crisis, and out migration from Indian pueblos was due to the great difficulty of meeting expected tributary demands. Land dispossession was also fueled by the growth of opportunistic haciendas, *latifundios*, *fincas*, and *ranchos*—single large agribusiness landholdings or

livestock enterprises—dependent on Indigenous, Afro-descendent, and increasingly mestizo landless labor. Indigenous peoples, however, resisted Spanish and mestizo encroachment through *pleitos*, juridical grievances and demands for disputed lands restitutions by the Spanish Crown (Einfield, 2001). From 1670 to 1821 debt peonage and sharecropping increased between pueblos and local haciendas and Indigenous landholdings were even more heavily reduced. Einfield and O’Hara (2010) identified the eighteenth century as the most acute in terms of encroachment, squatting and landgrabs on Indigenous lands by landless mestizos and rancheros.

In the eighteenth century, Spanish land grants were also authorized in the northern territories (today the US-Mexico borderlands) and without Native people’s consent. Nuevo Santander (South Texas and Tamaulipas), the province of Tejas (1758), and Alta California were “granted” during that time period. In addition to the fortunes that might be made in these new territories by warring against *indios bárbaros* and the appropriation of their economies, there was also the rationale of fighting for the “secular humanity” and conversion of gentile Indians by Spanish friars (Saldaña-Portillo, 2016, p. 64). Mission enterprises in California, Arizona, and Texas were subsidized and undertaken. Whether through physical violent encounters or a type of benevolent Christian racism, Native peoples were largely dispossessed of their original homelands and settled into Spanish pueblos, presidios (forts) and missions, or massacred.

In 1821, Criollos, or individuals of “pure” Spanish descent born in the Spanish colonies, secured political power with Mexican independence from Spain, and Indigenous people did not fare well under the new republic. Under Agustín de Iturbide, all terms associated with colonial castas (castes) were eliminated and the term *indio* was slowly replaced with *indígena* as a generic and homogenizing reference to Indians (Ramírez Zavala, 2011). The 1824 Mexican Constitution upheld the equality of all *vecinos* (citizens) and the protection of individual private property rights. Constitutional recognition of Indigenous peoples’ citizenship, however, revoked the protective status of *repúblicas indias*, setting off a push by liberal elites (*criollos* and *mestizos*) for the dispossession of Indigenous pueblo lands (Vandervort, 2006). One way Indigenous people resisted the onslaughts on their communal lands was by overlooking their unsympathetic local or state governments and travelling directly to Mexico City, often by foot, to petition the central government and courts on their pueblo’s behalf. A Laguna Pueblo Indian delegation, for example, traveled to Mexico City in 1830 to present their case to federal authorities when Hispanic local political leaders overlooked settler trespassing into their

communal lands (Vlasich, 2005). By the 1840s, however, indio became symbolic of backwardness in Mexico, viewed as an obstacle to economic progress, representing primitiveness, and targeted to be abolished.

The U.S. Anglo invasion of the Southwest brought on a new colonial regime onto the previous Mexican and Spanish ones (Gómez, 2018). Anglo settler colonialism imposed itself on top of the caste system in the Southwest. The myth of terra nullius, or the idea that the land was empty, open, and free for territorial occupation and colonization was and continues to be fundamental to US-Anglo legal mechanisms, such as the doctrine of discovery, used to dispossess Indigenous peoples (Calderón, 2014). Settler colonialism, according to Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013), is a form of colonialism where the invaders, through violent processes, come to stay and to replace the Natives by instituting structures of Indigenous erasure and matrices of social relations and conditions that define life in enduring ways that are “reasserted each day of occupation” (p. 73). For Wolfe (2006), the structure of settler colonialism destroys to replace, including the original peoples, through the logic of elimination. Native people in this logic become a dying race, people of the past, and erased from the public conscious. For Calderón (2014), settler ideologies of Indian absence and presence effectively erase the complexity of Indianness through settler grammars that ensure settler futurity.

For settlers, the West was savage, wild, and available to Anglo-white civilizing projects, such as Manifest Destiny (Horseman, 1981; Calderón, 2014b) and Mexicans (and by extension today’s Latinxs) like Native Americans, were dehumanized through Anglo-Saxon race ideologies (Gómez, 2018; Menchaca & Valencia, 1990). However, it is crucial to acknowledge that Mexicans in these regions are also settlers even when Mexican people were collectively racialized as inferior by whites (Gómez, 2018). In a pseudo-religious, racist mindset, Mexicans were viewed as un-industrious, un-Christian, amoral, and genetically inferior, half-breed “Indian/savage” people unworthy of occupying vast amounts of land (Horseman, 1981). Men were especially dehumanized “...as a breed of cruel and cowardly mongrels who were indolent, ignorant, and superstitious, given to cheating, thieving, gambling, drinking, cursing, and dancing” (Gutiérrez, 2001, p. 204). Such dehumanizing discourses justified Texas Independence (1836) and later the US-Mexican War (1846-1848). James K. Polk justified the war by declaring that Mexicans were “feeble and lacking in self-respect” and not worthy of occupying the land (Horsman, 1981). These racial ideologies later impacted the Mexican community in the U.S.

through segregation policies, exclusion from the full political process, land dispossession, and denial of access to resources. Amongst the Mexican *vecinos* (citizens) in the invaded Southwest were Indians, and although they initially were granted citizenship as were other “Mexicans,” it was later revoked as they were incorporated into U.S. racial schemas of indigeneity.

Wild West, frontiersmen, pioneers, and Anglo colonist and settler images abound in the officialized curricula of settler states (Tuck & Gaztambide-Fernández, 2013). The U.S. was established with a white supremacist structure from its foundation based on settler nationalism (Calderón, 2014). The U.S. depends on settler nationalist narratives, myths, discourses, and ideologies that support its national identity as good, fair, and exceptionalist. Saldaña-Portillo (2016) stated that through the 1790 Indian Intercourse Act, Congress appropriated for the U.S. government the right to Indian lands and transitioned the transfer of these from contract to treaty. Saldaña-Portillo (2016) concludes that “These treaties were no less fraudulent in their coercive inducements to pressure Indians to surrender their lands” (p. 63), and the process of Indian land dispossession, in the settler mindset, was conducted legally and fairly. In *Johnson v. McIntosh* (1830), the U.S. Supreme court granted the government “ultimate dominion” over land, and Indians the “right to occupancy”, but not to ownership of the land. In settler logic, Natives, through treaties, “voluntarily” agreed to cede lands. Settler colonialism is thus normalized as fair, just, and part of a civilizing mission. White settlers eventually appropriated “nativeness” for themselves and now claim to have the “Indigenous ancestry” that forms the basis of American exceptionalism (Calderón, 2014) and that undergirds nativist discourses. “American” is thus normalized to white Americans, as is citizenship. Faced with a minority majority future population, today, “make America great again,” really means make America white again.

Taxation became an institutional practice for land dispossession in the Southwest. Au, Brown and Calderón (2016, p. 88-89) wrote:

One of the main mechanisms put in place to speed up the disenfranchisement of Mexican landholdings [in the US Southwest] specifically was taxation. Estrada et al. (1981) tell us that “the Spanish-Mexican traditional practice had been to tax the products of the land. Under the new Anglo regime, land itself was taxed.” (106). Because taxes no longer depended on what the land produced, farmers with less access to capital were unable to meet the new increased taxes, causing many to lose their land

(Estrada et al., 1981). This taxation scheme was in some ways similar to the Allotment Act (also known as the Dawes Act) of 1887, which shifted communal tribal land holdings into private individual parcels, the result of which was the inability of individual tribal members to pay taxes on lands, thus paving the way for the purchase of these lands by Whites.

Au et al. (2016) thus claimed that taxation schemes are “a part of a sustained ideological and policy practice put in place by Whites to gain territory” (p. 89). These schemes continue to impact Native Americans and also impact other communities through gentrification and other more deliberate ways of dispossessing to this day. Taxes and hiking taxes are thus used to take over property, and over land. Urban renewal, eminent domain, land acquisition, compulsory purchase, resumption, and expropriation of private property have become part of “settling in.”

This context of multiple and intersecting forms of colonialisms (Spanish, Mexican, Anglo-White) in Mexico and the Southwest we explored is fundamentally important to understand how Latinxs have and continue to become complicit with the futurity of settler colonialism and against their U.S. Native and Latinx Indigenous kin, despite the fact that they have been similarly impacted and affected by U.S. Anglo settler colonial structures and processes. Indeed, it impacted how Latinxs came to receive land, the type of schooling they received, as well as their access to political representation. We are not arguing that Latinxs did not and do not continue to experience racism. At least in this historical context, Latinx experiences were mediated by what legal scholar Laura Gómez (2018) referred to as their off-white status, shaped by the racial caste ordering of the region and their position as not Black and not Indian in the U.S. Anglo settler colonial context.

Replacement Curriculum, Settler Grammars, and White Futurity

Critical Latinx Indigeneities encourages an engagement with settler colonialism. Using the concepts of *settler colonial curricular project of replacement* and *settler grammars*, we will next examine California and Texas curricula that 1) include Latino history but maintain Indigenous absence and inferiority and 2) invoke and often celebrate Spanish settler colonialism to highlight the silent tension between mestizo/Hispanic/Latino and Indigenous relations. Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013, 75) referred to schools as instruments of settlement that explicitly and implicitly justify the theft and occupation of Indigenous land through their concept of *replacement curricula*. Replacement, according to Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013),

“aims to vanish Indigenous peoples and replace them with settlers, who see themselves as the rightful claimants to land, and indeed, as indigenous” (p.73). For Tuck and Gaztambide-Fernández (2013), the *settler colonial curricular project of replacement* soothes settler anxieties over Indigenous land displacement and genocide and invests in white futurity.

Advancing anticolonial and decolonial analyses of settler colonial curricular replacement, Calderón (2014) identifies the *settler grammars* in social studies curricula that depict Native peoples as absent, relics of the past and the U.S. as a “new” state, a “nation of (European) immigrants.” Calderón explained that the nation of immigrants ideology asserts that Indigenous peoples are also immigrants (i.e. Bering Strait migration) and their migration is simply part of a national immigration narrative, and not one of origins in what we call the Americas, effectively destabilizing Indigenous land claims. In settler grammars, beliefs of (white) settler superiority over Natives justify the “inevitable” replacement of Indigenous peoples, especially over the “emptiness” of their purposefully created “absence,” allowing settlers access to territory and to “nativeness” itself; thus, whites become the “natives” of a “new” and superior nation while Natives are occasionally conjured up to make specter-like and problematic curricular apparitions.

Curricular depictions of Latinxs or Hispanics are minimal and are usually limited to either settler or immigrant origins. Conquistadors and explorers like Juan Ponce de León, Cabeza de Vaca, and Juan de Oñate, as well as Catholic missionaries such as Junípero Serra are depicted as the precursors to modern-day Latinxs. Juan de Oñate is notorious for his brutality against the Acoma Pueblo, especially for overseeing the killing of 800 people in the pueblo, for imprisoning dozens of Acoma girls in Mexico City convents, and for having men’s feet cut off. At a time when confederate statues generate controversy and many such monuments have been removed, effigies that celebrate Spanish conquest (atrocities) largely remain.

Indeed, to some Hispanics, Latinxs, even when they consider themselves mestizos, Spanish is the side of their heritage that they most identify with, glorify, and that they defend, often displaying anti-Indian hatred against Native people and against Latinxs that demand that symbols of conquest be banished (see the controversy around the Santa Fe fiestas in New Mexico that celebrate the Spanish Entrada into the region). Spanish priests, such as Junípero Serra in California, Eusebio Kino in Arizona, and their mission enterprises in the Southwest, including the famous Alamo in San Antonio, Texas, are also largely celebrated in social studies

texts. Serra was even heralded as a hero of sorts for the Hispanic community in Spanish media when he was canonized by Pope Francis during his papal visit to the U.S. in September of 2015.

While California curriculum maintains dominant Anglo settler grammars, the grammars of previous colonialisms bleed through. For example, the California Missions (4th grade) curriculum encourages students to build model missions and promotes a celebration of Spanish California, offering insight into why Junípero Serra remains a prominent historical figure despite the controversies that surround his legacy. Curricular inclusion of the missions and men like Serra upholds multiple settler projects (Spanish & Mexican), yet these projects remain subservient to Anglo settler colonial nationalism.

The California History/Social Science Framework (CA-HSS) was revised in 2016 due to an increased outcry against the uncritical perspective of the 4th grade Mission curriculum (Gutfreund, 2010). The revision includes a less celebratory view of the missions yet it nevertheless maintains language that frames the Spanish legacy as a benefit, sustaining a teleological view of history that assumes societies inevitably improve from primitive to civilized by necessarily removing Indigenous peoples who cannot overcome their primitiveness (Brayboy, 2005; Smith, 2008). For example, the section, “Missions, Ranchos, and the Mexican War for Independence,” (Chapter 7, grade 4) of the California History-Social Science Framework arguably promotes Spanish cultural transmission as not, in and of itself, violent:

Spanish culture, religion, and economic endeavors—combined with indigenous peoples and practices—all converged to shape the developing society and environment during Spanish-era California. With so few colonists, Spanish authorities believed they could transform Indian peoples into loyal Spanish subjects by converting them to Christianity, introducing them to Spanish culture and language, and intermarriage. The introduction of Christianity affected native peoples, many of whom combined Catholicism with their own belief systems. Vastly outnumbered by native peoples, missionaries relied on some Indian leaders to help manage the economic, religious, and social activities of the missions. Colonists introduced European plants, agriculture, and a pastoral economy based mainly on cattle... Under the guidance of Fray Junipero Serra, 54,000 Indians became baptized at the missions where they spent anywhere from two to fifty weeks each year, laboring to sustain the missions.” (pp. 74-75).

The discursive choices in the passage above carefully delink Spanish cultural imposition from violence. In spite of the changes, the CA-HSS does not go far enough to name the California Indian genocide (Fenelon & Trafzer, 2014). For Tinker (1993), cultural genocide is “the effective destruction of a people by systematically or systemically...destroying, eroding, or undermining the integrity of the culture and system of values that defines a people and gives them life” (p. 6). The CA-HSS thus do little to interrupt the discourse that cultural exchange was beneficial.

Missing from the CA-HSS is Indigenous peoples’ own perspective. The CA-HSS Framework (2016) notes, “The historical record of this era remains incomplete due to the limited documentation of Native testimony” (p. 75). Strangely, the CA-HSS crafters cannot imagine that the many California Indians not only have oral histories, but their own archives on this period (such as the Amah Mutson Tribal Band). Instead, this serves as an example of the way Indigenous absence as a settler colonial logic works. Before moving to condemn the impact of the Mission system on Indigenous peoples, the CA-HSS works to sustain the Spanish civilizing mission brought to Indigenous peoples: “However, it is clear that even though missionaries brought agriculture, the Spanish language and culture, and Christianity to the native population, American Indians suffered in many California missions” (p. 75). Differently stated, the CA-HSS tells teachers that while this Mission system caused Indigenous peoples’ suffering, the Spanish brought many good things (i.e. agriculture, language, culture, and Christianity). Conquistadors and priests along with the forts and missions are thus heralded as early attempts at European “civilization.” However, before the onslaught of white settlers their attempts at “civilizing” fall short, but still create a buffer zone between the “primitive” Indians and the ultimate superior white settlers. It is also in this in between state, as mestizo, as off-white (Gómez, 2018), that the project of mestizaje was cultivated. The CA-HSS preserve this, affirming the foundation for rejecting Indigenous peoples and indigeneity, thus not giving diverse Latinx students the opportunity to examine intra-difference and complexity in historical contexts.

The CA-HSS framework does offer some context about the violence suffered by Indigenous peoples in California:

The death rate was extremely high; during the mission period, the Indian population plummeted from 72,000 to 18,000. This high death rate was due primarily to the introduction of diseases for which the native population did not have immunity, as well as the hardships of forced labor and separation from traditional ways of life. (p. 75).

Even so, the CA-HSS offer scant context to the even more brutal genocide inflicted on California Indians by the U.S. Benjamin Madley (2016), historian of Indigenous genocide shares that in 1890, historian Huber Howe Bancroft wrote of the genocide of California Natives: “The savages were in the way: the miners and settlers were arrogant and impatient; there were no missionaries or others present with even the poor pretense of soul-saving or civilizing. It was one of the last human hunts of civilization, and the basest and most brutal of them all” (Howe Bancroft in Mandel, 2016, p. 3). Bancroft’s statement reminds us of varying forms of colonial violence and genocide that oscillated between cultural genocide (Spanish civilizing mission) and the physical genocide of Anglo settler colonialism. The CA-HSS thus allows us to consider how the multiple layers of colonialism are embedded within curriculum in a way that affirms the latest and most dominant mode of settler colonialism. While it allows for some critique of previous colonial forms and less of Anglo-US settler colonialism, the CA-HSS’s “inclusion” of Spanish and Mexican history depicts Indians as past primitive remnants that gave way to Californians today.

Considering complex historical entanglements, Mexican American students’ experiences with Texas Independence, goes a step further than the California mission curriculum by explicitly promoting identification with Anglo settler colonialism. “Remember the Alamo!,” is part of a larger Anglo-settler invasion narrative that is framed as an independence struggle against an oppressive Mexican government and “pseudo-savage,” mixed Indigenous and Spanish heritage people (Horseman, 1991). Piety around the Battle of the Alamo, the physical and symbolic site of The Alamo and Anglo “martyrdom” has become representative of “Texian” and by default U.S. (i.e. Anglo) freedom (Flores, 2010). This historical perspective is standardized in the state curriculum (and broader national Social Studies curricula because Texas and California textbook adoption has a major influence in text adoption nationwide) that is taught in lessons to Mexican American and other students of color in ways that position them in a contentious space where they are bringing their own personal histories, including counter narratives of Anglo settler logics of invasion against the normative curriculum of Texas’ independence.

In these contentious positionings, Mexican American students along with all students are sometimes asked by teachers whose side, Texians (i.e. Anglos) or Mexican (i.e. bad guys), they would be on. This positioning is often explained as an attempt to be “critical” and inclusive of

diverse perspectives; thus, placing students before a binary choice in their identification and allegiance processes. Positioning Mexican American students against themselves, their parents, or ancestors (so to speak) is a dichotomous colonialist framing of the Texas Anglo invasion of Texas that further obscures the multiple and hybrid forms of colonialities that Critical Latinx Indigenities seeks to make lucid (Blackwell, 2017). Such colonial logics include additional settler colonial structures beyond those that impacted and impact Mexicans and Mexican Americans; the Anglo struggle to maintain the Black enslavement that provided the labor force for the settler state, the forced acculturation and genocide the Alamo represents as a Spanish mission itself, and the murder, expulsion, and erasure of Native peoples from Texas especially by the Texas Rangers under Anglo domination. In these interlocking instantiations of colonial logics, their overlaps, entanglements, and hybrids, the myth of terra nullius, Spanish conquistadors and priests, Anglo settlement, Westward expansion, and Manifest Destiny, Native peoples are dispossessed to the degree that Texans today (regardless of race) generally believe that there never were many Natives to begin with; the land was indeed “empty.” This is not true, Native peoples in Texas include Alabama Coushatta, Lipan Apache, Comanche, Coahuilteca, Kikapoo, Comecrudo, Caddo, Carrizo, and the Ysleta del Sur Pueblo amongst others.

The “Remember the Alamo!” curriculum therefore limits students to a binary positioning of White Texan “good guys” and Mexican “bad guys.” Students of color are asked explicitly or implicitly to situate themselves either in support of Anglo domination (whether they are Anglo themselves or not) through the white settler colonial curricular project in Texas, which included African enslavement and Native American dispossession; Or, risk being part of the few, usually Mexican students who in an effort to maintain some public form of dignity express support for Mexico and Mexicans at the expense of suffering the indignities of being ridiculed and dismissed, even by their teachers. Within these whitestream contentious classroom spaces and school contexts, students’ identities are shaped within limited possibilities geared to structuring support for white supremacy and white settler nationalism.

Mexican and Mexican American students often learn to internalize the villainization (oppression) of Mexicans through the Alamo curriculum, usually by rejecting their own culture, identity, and language (Urrieta, 2004); by ignoring Black enslavement, while learning that Native Americans (by omission) are missing from the curriculum and the history of Texas altogether, or by justifying that Indians seemed better off in the Spanish missions than later under Anglo

white supremacy. White settler colonialism is thus normalized as fair, just, and part of a civilizing mission (again!). Settlers, white settlers in particular appropriate "nativeness" for themselves in Texas, as they do at the larger national scale, and claim to be the "true Texians". Similarly, Tejanos also stake claim to land ownership and origins (over Native Americans) in Tejas and in contention with white settlers. Tejanos invest in their real or imagined genealogical connection to Spain (or other European origins) and their settler legitimacy by affirming land ownership through the land grants endowed by the Spanish Crown, and without Native consent.

The curricular examples we just reviewed use particular settler colonial historical perspectives to (consciously or unconsciously) reposition Hispanics, Latinxs as settlers (again!), either as conquistadors and missionaries or as newly arrived immigrants, in ways that support white futurity. Critical Latinx Indigeneities' challenge to incorporate a settler colonial analysis (amongst others) indicates for us that any social justice Latinx equity agenda and critical ethnic studies curriculum must start by recognizing settler status (i.e. as Spanish, Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Hispanos, Tejanos, Californios, etc.), and that generations of Latinxs and Latinx im/migrants live and arrive on the homelands of sovereign Indigenous nations. Being guests on Native lands brings with it responsibilities that begin with a land acknowledgement, and the possibility of new relationships of tension and solidarity with Native Americans in the pursuit of social justice (Boj López, 2015). A Latinx equity agenda in education must start by acknowledging and challenging the *settler colonial curricular project of replacement* and the *settler grammars*, such as those we reviewed and others, that continue to erase and displace Native/Indigenous peoples, and that incorporate Latinxs as early, yet primitive settlers in the development of the "superior" white settler state. Finally, CLI challenges collectivist Latinx agendas for equity and citizen-incorporation to upfront the recognition that we as Latinxs and im/migration scholars often collude with the myth that the U.S. is a nation of immigrants, which by default delegitimizes Indigenous origins, land claims, and sovereignty.

Nation of Immigrants Myth

Critical Latinx Indigeneities would suggest that any meaningful discussion about immigration and citizenship in the U.S. cannot be divorced from a broader context of colonialism because the "nation of immigrants" myth replicates the settler colonial logic of erasure and the elimination of Indigenous peoples. Nation of immigrants ideology, according to

Calderón (2014a), by default asserts that Indigenous peoples are also immigrants who migrated to the “Americas” via the Bering Strait and their migration is simply part of a larger national immigration narrative. This contention destabilizes Indigenous land claims because it puts Native peoples’ “nativeness” into scientific dispute and denial. Nation of immigrants discourse relies on terra nullius, the idea that the land was/is vacant and available to (some) immigrants who are seeking better lives and fortunes (i.e. American Dreams). Therefore, the enduring myths of a “land of opportunity” and of “living American dreams,” as often taught in schools reproduce doctrine of discovery discourses whereby occupation and settlement are justified through the idea that the U.S. remains a land, space, place to be explored or to find fortunes (i.e. discovered), a blank slate on which immigrants (including Latinxs) make and remake lives and transnational communities. The narrative of living out dreams in the U.S. often become “Un Orgullo Hispano” immigrant, rags to riches stories of “making it in America” on Spanish media, especially by middle class Latinx immigrants and early Cuban exiles, that intentionally and unintentionally uphold the “pull yourself by your bootstraps” myth of meritocracy and U.S. exceptionalism.

While the “melting pot” myth has also been used to invoke that the U.S. is a country of immigrants where all (i.e. cultures, races, ethnicities) “mix” into the pot and harmoniously become “Americans,” that is not a universal experience or expectation for all. In fact, it is a very violent idea first and foremost because it erases the genocide of Native Americans from the national consciousness and second because it requires assimilation premised on processes of exclusion (i.e. exclusion from citizenship, exclusion from whiteness). The melting pot myth is therefore violent to People of Color because not everyone is meant to be included in the pot. And even though the discourse is meant to encourage assimilation, People of Color, no matter how hard they try to assimilate, will never be considered “true Americans.”³

Finally, the focus on U.S. immigration policy shines light on our continuing ignorance of coloniality (Quijano, 2000), and its current impact on the Indigenous and Afro-descendent

³ African Americans, for example, have been excluded historically as sub-human through the dehumanization of the 3/5 compromise and as property, and they continue to be excluded today through the legal system, economically, through police and other forms of violence. This is true for other communities as well. The melting pot myth is also violent toward whites, because they had to give up their European heritage cultures and languages in exchange for the full citizenship, for inclusion into whiteness. Whiteness is powerful and it is protected by structures and institutional power in the U.S. Even poor whites are overwhelmingly more invested in whiteness than in their own potential economic and political alliances with People of Color for social justice.³

peoples that are displaced into migration in Latin America. Often referred to as a migrant, refugee, asylee “crisis,” the mass dislocation of peoples coming to the U.S. is the result of decades of U.S. foreign policy, of global climate change precipitated by western capitalism, and a form of ongoing global neoliberal (colonial) dispossession. Hernández Castillo (2016) contended that in the neoliberal era, “Indigenous” has become a new identity, “which came into being through the construction of an imaginary community with other oppressed peoples around the world” (p. 4). The emergence of indigeneity as an expression of neoliberal modernity, she attributes as a response to neoliberal capitalism’s extractivist policies of accumulation by dispossession (Harvey, 2004) and the subsequent militarization of nation-states, that make Indigenous women, especially activists, the targets of violence and murder. Such is the case of Berta Cáceres, Lenca environmental activist, murdered in Honduras on March 3, 2016 (Loperena, 2017). While neoliberal states have recognized Indigenous culture and identity rights through neoliberal multiculturalism policies in Latin America (Hale, 2004), the governmentality that accompanies the identities that are formed in this process of recognition politics further engulf Indigenous peoples in the participatory citizenship of the neoliberal state (Hernández Castillo, 2016) that ultimately seeks to exploit their labor and/or dispossess them of their homelands. CLI encourages a more nuanced focus on the recent waves of asylum seekers and refugees in the Central American caravans, especially how the Indigenous and Afro-descended within them are dehumanized (racialized) across multiple national contexts in a long history of enduring colonialisms. Like, others in the past, they are considered ineligible for citizenship in the U.S. settler state, even before their arrival, challenging further the myth that the U.S. is indeed a nation of immigrants.

The Problematics of Latinidad as Mestizaje

Critical Latinx Indigeneities encourages an interrogation of Latinidad, in order to begin to deconstruct what we mean by Latinxs and Latinidad, because for better or for worse Indigenous peoples from Latin America are lumped within this category and experience life under this label in the U.S. The need to create a CLI analytic itself and its attention to the experiences of Indigenous migrants and youth is a challenge from the start, first and foremost against the essentialist, stereotypical portrayals of Latinxs in simplistic, festive, uncritical, “fiesta menu” approaches to multicultural curricula in our schools. Even as the collectivized “Brown” people in Chicana Studies, which emerges from the empowering constructs of “Brown power!”

and “Brown Pride”, there is a homogenizing aspect that does not do justice to the diversity of Indigenous and Afro-Latinx experiences within the larger collective brownness (Laó-Montes, 2005). Brownness, for some of us, alludes too much to mestizo-ness and the normative nationalisms that have historically regulated, erased and controlled Indigeneity and Blackness.

Like *mestizaje* and *indigenismo* that have tended to be locked at arms’ length in the history of most Latin American countries’ nationalist discourses, *Latinidad* and *Hispanidad* are also colonizing projects of erasure for Indigenous peoples, both migrants and Northern Tribal peoples, in the U.S. When Indigenous migrants arrive from their/our countries of origin, whether they/we like it or not, they/we are associated with *Latinidad* and usually also with their/our country of origin; some, for the very first time. For instance, some Indigenous communities might not have thought of themselves as Mexican first when they lived in Mexico. As Muehlmann (2013) identified with the Cucapá people in Baja California (cousins of the Cocopah in Arizona), who often referred to mestizos as “Mexicans” and vice versa in her study. Or Luis’ friend Juan, P’urhépecha from Capacuaro who after Luis asked him in 2009 what he would be doing for Mexican independence day retorted, “Whose independence?” Even though many Indigenous migrants recreate in the U.S. communities that maintain their identities around their respective pueblos (Alberto, 2017), like a web, Latinized entanglements engulf, are persistent, and the imposed and resisted engulfment within the larger construction of *Latinidad* is continuous and sometimes difficult to avoid.

For example, when Indigenous migrant children are enrolled at U.S. schools, there is usually a home language survey taken. If a language other than English is spoken at home as their first language, the child is automatically placed either in a bilingual Spanish/English program or in ESL, when these programs are available. For many Indigenous Latinx children, who are speakers of Indigenous languages that means that they will likely be learning in their second language (Spanish), while they learn their third language (English); both languages Spanish and English being colonial languages. Their new U.S.-based racialized association by proxy to *Latinidad* will then have these children navigate the U.S. school system through a double colonization, first to the most immediate peer group of Spanish-speaking Latinxs who often tease and bully their Indigenous peers (Barillas-Chón, 2010), and also to the grammars of whitestream, subtractive, white settler schooling (Valenzuela, 1999; Urrieta, 2010; Calderón, 2014).

We do not disavow decades of scholarship that shows that the educational field is generally unequal for Latinxs. Latinxs have less access to resources and information such as quality schools, education programs, and access to higher education usually because of segregation, exclusionary practices, and insufficient economic access. However, CLI challenges that not all Latinxs share the same experience in regard to access to resources and information, primarily due to inter-group inequities and oppression that are reinscribed forms of colonialism that create hybrid hegemonies (Blackwell, 2010). In regard to Indigenous Latinxs and Afro-Latinx youth this includes the anti-Indian and anti-Black hatred that often prevails within schools and in the larger mestizo Latinx communities. Although all Latinxs face the potential threat and real life effects of racialization as “Latinxs” if not always, at least at some point in their lives, some Latinxs enjoy more privileged lives than others outside and within the Latinx community. CLI highlights the intergroup diversity that Indigenous and Afro-Latinxs bring and the intergroup inequities that manifested in unequal relations of power, including internalized oppression as well as inter-group oppression that distinguish between the indio, the rascuache and High-spanic, *los de aquí y los de allá*, the queer, *los atravesados*, the Julian Castro and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s, as well as the Susana Martínez and Ted Cruz’s of the Latinx world.

An example of this intergroup oppression of racism and prejudice against Afro-Latinxs and Indigenous peoples (or anti-Indio hatred) by their mestizo, or in the U.S.—Latinx peers is exemplified in Barillas-Chón’s (2010) study of the anti-hate speech campaigns aimed at Latinx youth for bullying their Oaxacan peers in the city of Oxnard as well as in other parts of California by referring to them as “*Oaxaquitas*.” Other studies corroborate similar findings in which diminutives meant to ridicule Indigenous Latinx youth exemplify the intersection of structural factors that create hybrid hegemonies of racism from Latin America and racism in the U.S. (Blackwell, 2017). These hybrid hegemonies do not only impact Indigenous Oaxacan youth in Oxnard’s schools, but are also illustrated by the fact that the Latinx labor market is also highly stratified—as pointed out by Barillas-Chón; these youths’ parents mostly migrant farm workers, usually earn less than their mestizo “Latinx” counterparts for the same work (Holmes, 2011). This of course leads to intergroup economic disparities, even at the lowest levels of socioeconomic power. CLI encourages the examination, for example, of the transnational movement of anti-Indian hatred that allows us to delve into a deeper exploration of multiple colonialities, including of how the Latinx category erases Indigenous difference even as it enacts

violence against Indigenous migrants, refugees, and youth. These fissures and contradictions show that Latinx populations are multiracial. CLI demands that this multiracial and multilingual diversity be fully engaged in any agenda for Latinx equity in education as well as in any curricular representations, including in ethnic studies.

Therefore, while the identifier “Latinx” serves many good purposes such as that of enabling organizational, advocacy, policy, and political mobilization within limitations—Latinx/Hispanic also serve as racial formations of state regulatory categories (Omi & Winant, 2015). Latinx, as a regulatory category and signifier, positions and labels a collective into the landscape of the whitestream settler imaginary. In this imaginary Latinxs are homogenized into categorical difference despite our diversity, and it becomes a norming difference, a racial project in order to fit into the white supremacist vertical, racial, settler colonial structure on which this country is founded. CLI demands that we understand that Latinx—although it was created as a more inclusive term than Hispanic by invoking Latin American origin or ancestry—brings with it a broader historical context and sociopolitical landscape of identity that includes these multiple mappings and graphings of coloniality and hybrid hegemonies of power around ethnoracial, class, gender, and sexuality difference. CLI would signal that pan-Latinidad as a collective identity is therefore indeed based on an assumed mestizaje linked with indigenism that obscures and invisibilizes the racial, ethnic, cultural, class, sexuality and religious diversity and structures of power and dispossession in Latin America and of those within this Latinidad in the U.S.

To seriously engage the challenges that CLI represents for ethnic studies curricula, especially in Chicanx Studies, these disciplines must move toward employing critical interdisciplinary analytic frames. Interdisciplinarity allows for local, hemispheric, as well as global scales of analysis like those proposed by CLI, especially as they pertain to the ways that race and its various intersections gets constructed and deployed across multiple countries (or regions) and overlapping colonialities, including through displacement by state structures and the flows of neoliberal global capitalism. CLI encourages the examination of more than one racial structure and an intersectional multi-axis approach that recognizes the multiracial and multilingual diversity of ethnoracial groupings, as well as the multiple genealogies involved in migration. The recognition of multiple genealogies of indigeneity, especially for Chicanx Studies, encourages the disruption of the dated Mexican (Aztec)-centric approach to indigeneity that

often, even today, appropriates and essentializes what it means to be Indigenous with a longing for loss in ways that resemble indigenismo (Spears-Rico, 2015). Indigenismo has worked together with mestizaje as a state eugenicist program of racial whitening (Alberto, 2016). Thus, although the *mestizaje* discourse is empowering for Chicanx, Latinx scholars in the U.S., *mestizaje* also embodies a historical location of racism and Indigenous erasure and in the U.S. a complicity with white settler futurity that is rarely engaged in more profound ways.

Indigenous Futurity within Latinized Entanglements

Pulido (2017) stated that Chicana Studies is ambivalent about engaging settler colonialism "... due to settler colonialism's potential to disrupt core elements of Chicana/o political subjectivity" (p. 2) such as mestizaje. Pulido continues, "Specifically, it unsettles Chicanas/os' conception of themselves as colonized people by highlighting their role as colonizers. Acknowledging such a role is difficult not only because it challenges key dimensions of Chicana/o identity... but also because of the precarious nature of Chicana/o indigeneity" (p. 2). Conceptual mestizaje thus emerges as what Stoler (2016) would refer to as a seductive and powerful agent of imperial power. Hence, this is a conceptual question that necessitates engagement with settler colonial studies generally, critical Indigenous studies specifically, and more robustly, Critical Latinx Indigenities. In a similar manner, the claim to Aztlan as an Indigenous homeland in Chicana Studies naturalizes the displacement of U.S. Tribal peoples because it centers the Mexica migration from Aztlan myth as its sole genealogy of indigeneity. The claim to Aztlan also erases the multiple and varied past and present Indigenous origin stories of various Indigenous communities and fails to recognize and honor the contemporary diversity of displaced Indigenous migrants and refugees from Latin America and their future descendants.

To heed CLI's move in the direction of recognizing varied Indigenous genealogies, we tried early in this article to engage history and complexity by highlighting the complicated contexts of Indigenous/Native and mestizo/Hispanic/Latinx encounters. We explored Indigenous and mestizo/Hispanic/Latino historical proximity not as "new" phenomenon by implicitly alluding only to who we refer to as "Indigenous Latinxs" today, but to the possible varied existences of this "experience" that have existed over centuries through, for example, the Indigenous South to North migration and settlement of P'urhépechas and Tlaxcalans we highlighted in the early Spanish colonial period or through the detribalized *neofío* and *genízaro*

Spanish-speaking Indian communities throughout the Southwest to name only a few cases that might illustrate the complexities of the entanglements. We also highlighted that people referring to themselves as Spanish, Mexicans, Mexican Americans, Hispanos, Tejanos, Californios, etc., forbearers of what today we might call mestizo/Hispanics/Latinxs have been in relation with Native peoples for hundreds of years, and those relations have generally not always been harmonious. Therefore, in the Critical Latinx Indigeneities frame, it is imperative to recognize this complicated and painful history, to recognize the violence targeted at Indigenous peoples by these forbearers as well as their settler status, to take up the challenging of taking on the *settler colonial curricular project of replacement* and the *settler grammars* in order to re-right and rewrite the school curricula, and to decolonize Latinidad and mestizaje in order to envision Indigenous futurities within and outside of the Latinized entanglements of our present.

Moving forward, CLI encourages a focus on Indigenous youth as of utmost importance for our imagined futurities, especially because of the potential for organizing and activism that Indigenous Latinx youth possess due to their exposure to their or their parents' community (pueblo) ties and relational ways of being through *comunalidad*, which is a process of active opposition to colonial dispossession and neoliberalism (Aquino Moreschi, 2013). For example, Indigenous Latinx youth have organized and mobilized in support of various Native causes, including marches in defense of Yanawana, the Coahuiltecan name for water, and traveling to and supporting the Native peoples of Standing Rock in 2016. Diasporic community knowledges provide Indigenous Latinx youth epistemologies from which to critically engage the world that can potentially benefit not just their peers but the larger community in general (Urrieta, 2016), especially in the ways that learning is organized in education and in the potential relational relationships to foment solidarities with both the larger "Latino" community and U.S. Tribal nations.

To conclude, CLI recognizes that Indigenous migrants are not victims, but have always been agentic in directing their own lives and the survival of their communities in diaspora. This has been documented through the organizing of hometown associations and binational organizations that go to great lengths to maintain political and economic ties with their home communities and that instill the identity, cultural practices, often language, and activism on the migrant and U.S.-born youth in their communities (Stephen, 2007; Sánchez, 2018). U.S.-born Zapotec anthropologist, Daina Sánchez (2018) documents this well in her recent and

representative study of Solaga children and youth's involvement in a musical band in Southern California. Her study shows how through the *banda* (or musical band) community, the children and youth expressed ethnic pride, as well as an appreciation for the music, the identity, the traditional and newly emerging cultural practices of the Solaga Zapotec community in Los Angeles. Sánchez (2018) argued that the space to recognize themselves as different in the *banda*, also allowed the U.S. Solaga youth healthier ways to face anti-Indigenous discrimination from the broader Latinx community as well as the anti-immigrant Trump-era hostility of the whitestream settler society. Sánchez's study of Indigenous migrant communities' future generations, indicates the need to situate the migrants' experiences at the unique crossroads of Critical Latinx Indigeneities, precisely where Latinx Studies, Latin American Studies, and Native American and Indigenous Studies cross paths in intersectional ways. We agree, and look forward to Indigenous Latinx youth's futurity, within and outside of the Latinized entanglements.

References

- Alberto, L. (2016). Nations, Nationalisms, and Indígenas: The “Indian” in the Chicano Revolutionary Imaginary. *Critical Ethnic Studies*, 2(1), 107-127.
- Alberto, L. (2017). Coming out as Indian: On being an indigenous Latina in the US. *Latino Studies*, 15(2), 247-253.
- Aquino Moreschi, A. (2013). La comunalidad como epistemología del sur, aportes y retos. *Cuadernos del Sur*, 18(34), 7-20.
- Au, W., Brown, A. L., and Calderón, D. (2016). *Reclaiming the Multicultural Roots of U.S. Curriculum: Communities of Color and Official Knowledge in Education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Barillas-Chón, D. W. (2010). Oaxaqueño/a Students’ (Un)Welcoming High School Experiences, *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 9(4), 303-320.
- Blackwell, M. (2010). Líderes Campesinas: Nepantla strategies and grassroots organizing at the intersection of gender and globalization. *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies*, 35(1), 13-47.
- Blackwell, M. (2017). Geographies of indigeneity: Indigenous migrant women’s organizing and translocal politics of place. *Latino Studies*, 15(2), 156-181
- Blackwell, M., Boj López, F. & Urrieta, L. Jr. 2017. Special Issue: Critical Latinx Indigeneities. *Latino Studies*, 15(2), 126-137.
- Boj López, F. (2015). Mobilizing Transgression: Red Pedagogy and Maya Migrant Positionalities. In S. M. Grande (Ed.) *Red Pedagogy: Native American Social and Political Thought* (10th Anniversary, deluxe edition) (pp. 283-287). Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Boyer, C. R. (2003). *Becoming Campesinos: Politics, Identity, and Agrarian Struggle in Postrevolutionary Michoacan, 1920-1935*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brayboy, B. M. J. (2005). Toward a tribal critical race theory in education. *The Urban Review*, 37(5), 425-446.
- Calderón, D. (2014a). Anticolonial methodologies in education: Embodying land and indigeneity in Chicana feminisms. *Journal of Latino/Latin American Studies*, 6(2), 81-96.
- Calderón, D. (2014). Uncovering settler grammars in curriculum. *Educational Studies*, 50(4), 313-338.
- California Department of Education, 2016 History—Social Science Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve, 2016
- Castellanos, B. M. (2017). Introduction: Settler colonialism in Latin America. *American Quarterly*, 69(4), 777-781.
- Ceceña, A. E. and Barreda, A. (1998). Chiapas and the Global Restructuring of Capital. In J. Holloway & E. Peláez (Eds.), *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico* (pp. 19-39). London/Sterling: Pluto Press.
- Cotera, M. E., & Saldaña-Portillo, M. J. (2014). Indigenous but Not Indian?: Chicanos and the politics of indigeneity. In R. Warrior (Ed.) *The World of Indigenous North America* (pp. 549-568). New York, NY: Routledge.
- DeLay, B. (2008). *War of a Thousand Deserts: Indian Raids and the US-Mexico War*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press
- Einfield, G.H. (2001). “Pinturas,” land and lawsuits: Maps in colonial Mexican legal documents. *Imago Mundi*, 53, 7-27
- Einfield, G.H. and O’Hara S. L. (2010). Degradation, drought, and dissent: An environmental

- history of colonial Michoacán, West Central Mexico. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 89(3), 402-419.
- Evans, S. (2007). *Bound in Twine: The History and Ecology of the Henequen-Wheat Complex for Mexico and the American and Canadian Plains, 1880-1950*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Fenelon, J. V., & Trafzer, C. E. (2014). From colonialism to denial of California genocide to misrepresentations: Special issue on indigenous struggles in the Americas. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 58(1), 3-29.
- Flores, R.R. (2010). *Remembering the Alamo: Memory, Modernity, and the Master Symbol*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press
- Gallegos, B. (2017). *Postcolonial Indigenous Performances: Coyote Musings on Genízaros, Hybridity, Education, and Slavery*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers
- Gómez, L. E. (2018). *Manifest destinies: The making of the Mexican American race*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- Gonzales, G. (2017). Otro cuento del Genizaro Pedro de Urdemalas. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, 41(2), 139-143.
- Gutfreund, Z. (2010). Standing up to sugar cubes: The contest over ethnic identity in California's fourth-grade mission curriculum. *Southern California Quarterly*, 92(2), 161-197.
- Gutiérrez, R. (2001). Historical and social science research on Mexican Americans. In J. Banks and C. Banks (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 261-287). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hale, C. (2004). "Rethinking indigenous politics in the era of the 'indio permitido.'" *Nacla Report on the Americas, Report on Race, Part I*, 16-21
- Harris, C. (1993). Whiteness as property. *Harvard Law Review*. 106 (8), 1709-1791
- Harvey, D. (2004). The "new" imperialism: Accumulation by dispossession. *Socialist Register*, 40(40), 63-87.
- Hernández Castillo, R. A. (2001). *Histories and Stories from Chiapas, Border Identities in Southern Mexico*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Hernández Castillo, R. A. (2016). *Multiple Injustices: Indigenous Women, Law, and Political Struggle in Latin America*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Holmes, S. M. (2011). Structural vulnerability and hierarchies of ethnicity and citizenship on the farm. *Medical Anthropology*, 30(4), 425-449.
- Horseman, R. (1981). *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo Saxonism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Laó-Montes, A. (2005). Afro-Latinidades and the diasporic imaginary. *Iberoamericana*, 5(17), 117-130
- Loperena, C. (2017). Settler violence? Race and emergent frontiers of progress in Honduras. *American Quarterly*, 69(4), 801-807
- Machado-Casas, M. (2009). The politics of organic phylogeny: The art of parenting and surviving as transnational multilingual Latino Indigenous migrants in the US. *High School Journal*, 92(4), 82-99.
- Madley, B. (2016). *An American Genocide: The United States and the California Indian Catastrophe, 1846-1873*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Martínez, M. E. (2008). *Genealogical Fictions: Limpieza de Sangre, Religion, and Gender in Colonial Mexico*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Menchaca, M, and Valencia, R. (1990). Anglo-saxon ideologies in the 1920s—1930s: Their impact on the segregation of Mexican students in California. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 21, 3, 222-249.
- Moreton-Robinson, A. (2016). *Critical Indigenous Studies: Engagements in First World Locations*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Muehlmann, S. (2013). *Where the River Ends: Contested Indigeneity in the Mexican Colorado Delta*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Olguin, B.V. (2013). “Caballeros” and Indians: Mexican American whiteness, hegemonic mestizaje, and ambivalent indigeneity in proto-Chicana/o autobiographical discourse, 1858-2008. *MELUS*, 38(1), 30-49
- Omi, M. & Winant, H. (2015). *Racial Formations in the United States* (3rd edition). New York: Routledge.
- Pulido, L. (2017). Geographies of race and ethnicity II: Environmental racism, racial capitalism and state-sanctioned violence. *Progress in Human Geography*, 41(4), 524-533
- Quijano, A. (2000). “Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America.” *Nepantla: Views from the South* 1(3), 533-580
- Ramírez, R. (2006) *Native Hubs: Culture, community, and belonging in Silicon Valley and beyond*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ramírez Zavala, A. L. (2011). Indio/Indígena, 1750-1850. *Historia Mexicana*, 60(3), (239), 1643-1681.
- Saldaña-Portillo, M. J. (2016). *Indian Given: Racial Geographies across Mexico and the United States*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press
- Sánchez, D. (2018). Racial and Structural Discrimination Toward the Children of Indigenous Mexican Immigrants. *Race and Social Problems*, 10(4), 306-319.
- Smith, M. (2008). Colonialism and nature. *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*, 19(2), 123-126, 134.
- Spears-Rico, G. (2015). *Consuming the Native Other: Mestiza/o Melancholia and the Performance of Indigeneity in Michoacán*. Unpublished dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Stannard, D. E. (1992). *American Holocaust, The Conquest of the New World*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.
- Stephen, Lynn. (2007). *Transborder Lives: Indigenous Oaxacans in Mexico, California, and Oregon*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stoler, A. L. (2016). *Duress: Imperial Durabilities in our Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Thornton, J. K. (2012). *A Cultural History of the Atlantic World, 1250-1820*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Tinker, G. (1993). *Missionary Conquest: The Gospel and the Native American Cultural Genocide*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press
- Tuck, E. & Gaztambide-Fernández, R. (2013). Curriculum, replacement, and settler futurity. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 29(1), 72-89.
- Tuck, E. & Yang, E.W. (2012). “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society*, 1(1), 1-40.
- Urrieta, L. (2004). Dis-connections in “American” citizenship and the post/neo-colonial: People of Mexican descent and Whitestream2 Pedagogy and curriculum. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 32(4), 433-458.

- Urrieta, L. (2010). *Working from within: Chicana and Chicano activist educators in whitestream schools*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Urrieta, L. (2016). Diasporic community smartness: saberes (knowings) beyond schooling and borders. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 19(6), 1186-1199.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S. Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Vandervort, B. (2006) *Indian Wars of Canada, Mexico and the United States, 1812-1900*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Verástique, B. (2000). *Michoacán and Eden: Vasco de Quiroga and the Evangelization of Western Mexico*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press
- Vizenor, G. (1999). *Manifest Manners: Narratives on Postindian Survivance*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press
- Vlasich, J. A. (2005). *Pueblo Indian Agriculture*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press
- Wolfe, P. 2006. Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native, *Journal of Genocide Research*, 8:4, 387-409