

Bears Ears National Monument, Relationship, and the Rhetoric of Public Lands

By

© 2022

Joshua Smith

M.A., The University of Kansas, 2018

B.A., Truman State University, 2014

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Communication Studies and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Chair: Dr. Dave Tell

Dr. Beth Innocenti

Dr. Jay Childers

Dr. Brett Bricker

Dr. Laura L. Mielke

Date Defended: 1 June 2022

The dissertation committee for Joshua Smith certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:

Bears Ears National Monument, Relationship, and the Rhetoric of Public Lands

Chair: Dr. Dave Tell

Date Approved: 8 June, 2022

Abstract

This dissertation examines the rhetoric of public lands through three case studies related to Bears Ears National Monument (BENM). I argue that a central part of what makes public lands rhetorical are the relationships that people have with the lands, or the experiences, interactions, and meanings that they associate with the land. Chapter Two examines how relationship to land affected the debates over the Utah Public Lands Initiative (PLI), an important precursor to the monument, and the role of three key terms—wilderness, compromise, and certainty—in the debates over the PLI. Chapter Three examines three versions of the monument and argues that the relationships of five Native American Tribes to the land can be precisely calibrated to the size of the monument’s boundaries. Chapter Four argues that a way that settler colonialism operates rhetorically is by subsuming Indigenous relationships to land under settler relationships.

Acknowledgments

Lawrence has been my home for nearly seven years at this point, the place where my personal life grew immensely more rich and my intellectual life developed. Each person mentioned here contributed to this project, either through intellectual or personal support—often both.

To Dave. Thank you for encouraging my intellectual curiosity, strengthening and improving my writing, and teaching me how to tell a good story. Thank you, also, for being enthusiastic, open-minded, and curious with me when I said I wanted to write about public lands—and then spent six years figuring out what that meant and how to do it. You’ve always modeled how to be an academic in teaching and research and I’ve learned so much from you regarding both. Whether or not this was intentional, I began to believe this project was on the right track at the point when our conversations about the dissertation became less about the project and more wide-ranging over beers at LBC. At some point along the way, I realized how far I’ve come as a scholar since fall 2015 when I asked you to be my advisor. This growth is, in so many ways, due to your support and teaching.

The faculty here at KU have been extremely generous with their time and labor. The impact each member of my dissertation committee had on me, my writing, and my scholarly life was profound, and each had a specific contribution for which I would like to thank them. Thanks to: Beth, for always helping me to think about rhetoric in a practical sense; Jay, for being the voice of reservation, always pushing back, and reminding me to think about the bigger picture; Laura, for always asking the best questions; Brett, for helping me see that my research did indeed fit within a scholarly community and that I could contribute to these conversations. Thanks also to Jeff Hall who, though not on my committee nor someone with whom I worked, was a supportive and caring mentor during my time at KU, especially in terms of navigating the job market and professional life as an academic. Other Communication Studies faculty I’d like to thank include Ashley Muddiman, Robert McDonald, Meggie Mapes, Cameron Piercy, and Robert Rowland. Each provided guidance, support,

conversation, and generosity of their time and efforts at various points that went above and beyond my expectations.

A version of Chapter Three was originally published in *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 50, no. 5. Thanks to Jacqueline Rhodes and Emma Frances Bloomfield for their insightful comments and intellectual generosity on drafts of this essay. Thanks also to the reviewers who so gracefully polished its ideas during the earliest stages of the pandemic with immense care and attention.

As is often the case in graduate school, I have a community of friends and colleagues that is a network of support and love. Finishing coursework and beginning a dissertation at the start of a pandemic made me realize just how lonely grad school can be and made me deeply appreciative of the relationships we've built over the years. Chelsea, Sean, Lindsay, Becca, Josh, Gretchen, Mark, Jess, Hunter, Talya, Jake, Abigail, Ryan, Gaby, Peg, Jordan, Marcella—thank you all for the coffee, beers, writing sessions, conversations, and celebrations that we've shared over the years. I wish you each the best.

Outside of KU, thanks to those who make Lawrence so incredibly difficult to leave: Dylan, Lena, Pip, Ben, Josh, Drew, Samantha, Tiffany, Andrew, pups, and littles. You all provided friendship and connections that are incredibly special.

Finally, to Liz, my partner and wife. It's no exaggeration to say that I couldn't have done this without you. I'm lucky that I always had you to learn from and with, both professionally and personally. Professionally, you modeled how to be a teacher and scholar, how to be a grad student, what comps were, and what writing a dissertation looked like. You ask intriguing questions and provide compelling answers. Personally, I've learned so much from you that there isn't space here to list it all. I'm glad that we don't always agree about rhetoric because it means that you approach my ideas from a perspective that's different to mine. Thanks for always being my partner as we go through life. I love the connections that we've made the last seven years and I look forward to making more with you.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iii
Acknowledgements.....	iv
Glossary.....	viii
Chapter I: Introduction: Relationship and the Rhetoric of Public Lands.....	1
Literature Review.....	7
Chapter Two Preview.....	16
Chapter Three Preview.....	19
Chapter Four Preview.....	22
Conclusion.....	24
Chapter II: The Utah Public Lands Initiative: Creating Certainty through Compromise and the Search for “Stable Ground”.....	25
Wilderness, Certainty, and Compromise: Rob Bishop’s PLI.....	28
Utah Diné Bikéyah and the Navajo Nation.....	40
Certainty and Compromise: Grand County and the PLI.....	46
San Juan County and the end of the PLI.....	54
Conclusion.....	58
Chapter III: The Moving Boundaries of Bears Ears: Ecological Rhetorics and the Shrinking of a monument.....	62
The Ecological Turn.....	67
Traditional Knowledge, Ecology, and the Coalition.....	72
Presidential Proclamations, Antiquities Act, Ecologies, Neoliberalisms.....	74
Obama’s Proclamation: The Creation of BENM.....	78

Trump’s Proclamation: The Reduction of BENM.....	82
Conclusion.....	88
Chapter IV: Transforming Relationships, or what Bears Ears National Monument Teaches us about Rhetoric and Colonialism.....	91
Settler Colonialism and the Techniques of Elimination.....	95
First Lee Speech: Opposition to BENM.....	98
Second Lee Speech: The ‘Founders’ Promise’.....	102
The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition: Land, People, Relationship.....	106
Ways of Knowing.....	111
Bodily Being on the Land.....	116
Conclusion.....	120
Chapter V: Conclusion and Implications.....	122
Notes.....	129

Glossary

AA: Antiquities Act

BENM: Bears Ears National Monument

BLM: Bureau of Land Management

Coalition: Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition

NCA: National Conservation Area

PLI: Utah Public Lands Initiative

SJC: San Juan County, Utah

SUWA: Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance

UDB: Utah Diné Bikéyah

USFS: United States Forest Service

WSA: Wilderness Study Area

Chapter One: Relationship and the Rhetoric of Public Lands

At three in the afternoon on July 27, 2016, a crowd of nearly 1,000 gathered in the auditorium of San Juan high school in Blanding, Utah.¹ Assembled to attend a field hearing of the United States Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the crowd listened as a panel of witnesses discussed the “Potential Impacts of Large-scale Monument Designations.” The purpose of this hearing was, according to Senator Mike Lee (R–UT), to discuss the best way to protect the Bears Ears region of San Juan County. In effect, however, the hearing was a response to then-Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell’s visit to Utah the previous week. During Jewell’s visit, she met with stakeholders, organizations, and hundreds of citizens across several days. The purpose of Jewell’s visit was to “solicit input from all interested parties about the various protection proposals for the [Bears Ears] region.”² One of the primary topics of discussion during Jewell’s visit was the potential designation of a new national monument made from public lands in the Bears Ears area, a proposal which, while fiercely opposed by many, also enjoyed wide public support. Utah governor Gary Herbert—one of the witnesses—claimed that, while there was “meaningful disagreement about *how* to protect the Bears Ears region, there [was] virtually zero opposition to the idea that this precious area *should* be protected” among those present on July 27.³ In other words, the primary issue at stake, as the participants that day at the high school saw it, was the mechanism used to protect the Bears Ears region.

In fact, there was actually zero disagreement about the preferred mechanism of protection among those on the record that day in Blanding. The five witnesses all opposed a monument designation, instead expressing support for the long-promised Public Lands Initiative (PLI), a legislative effort spearheaded by Representative Rob Bishop (R–UT) that sought to resolve long-contested issues of land use in Utah. Bishop—another of the witnesses—had been working on

the PLI for more than three years and was adamant that a legislative process through Congress was the best way to resolve land use issues. The primary issue of that day's hearing was not what mechanism should be used to protect Bears Ears—in this respect Herbert's words are misleading. Instead, as Lee and the five witnesses gave their prepared statements, and asked and answered questions, the central point of discussion—whether they admitted it or not—was what these six men meant by “land.”

What is made abundantly clear in the record of the hearing is that “land” means many different things depending on who is speaking and, at times, changes meaning within a speaker's statement. One witness, a member of the Anath Chapter of the Navajo Nation named Chester Johnson, found meaning in land through the context of freedom and independence, and told the committee that “In a traditional view, [land] is a symbol of moral inspiration, of strength, and a sustainer of healthy life.” Soon after Johnson spoke these words, land shifted abruptly from a sign of physical health and morality to an index of civic responsibility. Here, involvement in land decision-making processes is figured as an act of citizenship, one where “ideals of local control, local ownership, and local management of land” are the result of direct citizen participation in the process.⁴

Bruce Adams, San Juan County Commissioner and cattle rancher, and another of the witnesses, advanced yet another definition of land: an economic resource. Adams twice told the committee that “agriculture ranks in the top two” most important industries in San Juan County. For Adams, land means economic stability, but only when it is available to be used for grazing. Land changed meaning yet again when Adams discussed the cultural and ecological importance of land. Although Adams would surely object, his definition of land was a mechanism for introducing colonial politics into the Blanding auditorium. He told a story where the white

settlers of what would become San Juan County established “a settlement among the Native American people and help[ed] them with their domestic needs,” soon becoming “great friends” with these Native people. This is the only time Adams mentions the region’s Indigenous occupants. Adams’ history gradually replaces the fiction of white settlers and Indigenous people living in harmony with a narrative of only the settlers and their love for the land. As Adams says, “When you are raised in a family that depends on cattle grazing. . . . You raise you children to love the land and take care of it so it will take care of you.”⁵ In Adams’ testimony, his relationship with the land revolves around the agricultural work of cattle grazing and the economic benefits of that work.

Not only were Native inhabitants excluded from Adams’ testimony, they were also largely missing from the record that day at the high school. The primary advocates for a new monument was a group of five Tribes who, had they been there, would have brought another vision of land to the conversation. This group, the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, chose to not be at the field hearing.⁶ As they explained, “we do not see how further discussions can be productive. The basic problem is that our two sides hold dramatically different views on what should be done in the Bears Ears area.”⁷ Lee mentions the Coalition’s decision to not be at the hearing, noting that they “declined” to participate. What Lee does not mention is that many Native Americans (some of whom would go on to help found the Coalition) had already attempted to participate in multiple discussions about the PLI for several years and yet “the PLI had never taken us seriously.”⁸ Bears Ears is sacred land to the Coalition Tribes, and, as they saw it, the PLI neither offered enough protection to safeguard the cultural and sacred sites found throughout the region nor offered the Tribes an equitable opportunity to protect their ancestral

lands. Land, from the Coalition's perspective, is a living thing where their people go to learn about their histories and cultures.

At the heart of the controversy surrounding Bears Ears and public lands in July 2016 were competing relations and connections to land. As this story of the Senate hearing shows, caught up in discussions about land are ideas of economics, cultural heritage, histories of colonialism, citizenship, and environmental protection. These were not incidental connections; as the hearing's participants talked about land, it became clear that these cultural-political issues are at the center of the conflict over land at Bears Ears. These enduring issues in American cultural politics discussed by the witnesses were, so to speak, the contents of the land that day in the Blanding auditorium. To talk about land was, among other things, to talk about colonialism, and colonialism could not be fully measured without accounting for the land, Indigenous peoples, grazing, civic responsibility, freedom, and legislative processes.

The five witnesses talked about land and these particular issues because they are indicative of the relationships those five men have with the land. Put differently, Bruce Adams talked about economics, a colonialist history of settlement, and agriculture because these are the experiences he has had with the land. Chester Johnson, having different experiences with the land, talked about morals, strength, and freedom. Our experiences with land are a crucial part of how we see the relationships between ourselves and that land.⁹ In this dissertation, I suggest that this is a general principle; discussions about land are never only discussions about the geographic coordinates of sand, rocks, and soil. Instead, land is a commonplace where cultural-political issues such as colonialism, environmental protection, and citizenship become entangled with coordinates, sand, rocks, and soil: all of these entanglements, the things that people talk about when they talk about land, indicate how those people relate to the land. The tying of culture and

politics to specific patches of earth through relationship is the work of rhetoric. More precisely, it is in relationship, or how people articulate themselves as situated in and experiencing the land, that we see the power of rhetoric to “bind together the materiality of topography with the much less tangible realm of cultural politics.”¹⁰

There could be no better case study to examine the rhetorical power of land and relationship than the long-contested United States public lands system. As environmental historian Char Miller writes, public lands have long been controversial, and “Americans have always fought over the public lands, about their physical existence, political purposes, economic benefits, and environmental values. About them, we have never reached unanimous accord.”¹¹ My dissertation attends to the lands that have been called into question by Bears Ears National Monument (BENM), one of the most high-profile and contentious public lands disputes of recent years. Established on December 28, 2016, by then-president Barack Obama—just five months after the Senate Committee’s field hearing—the struggle over Bears Ears mirrors the contentious history of the United States’ public lands system in many respects. To more fully account for the lands that became BENM, my dissertation also attends to debates about the land that both preceded and followed the monument’s designation.

Just like public lands writ large, the story of Bears Ears, the Public Lands Initiative, and the monument’s eventual designation is one of struggle over this land’s uses, values, and existence. The Coalition’s proposal came after years of work by Utah politicians to settle disagreements about land use, and Obama’s creation—in the last weeks of his presidency—can be seen as a microcosm of the harsh realities of federal public lands. From the perspective of Utah’s Congressional delegation, the creation of BENM is just one more example of a distant and out-of-touch politician intervening at the last moment to determine the fate of millions of

acres of land with no regard to public opinion (though this is a false claim).¹² Representative Jason Chaffetz (R–UT) summed up his state’s official position perfectly, stating: “The midnight monument is a slap in the face to the people of Utah, attempting to silence the voices of those who will bear the heavy burden it imposes. . . . It does not have the support of the Governor, a single member of the state’s Congressional delegation, nor any local elected officials or state legislators who represent the area.”¹³ In truth, however, the reason Obama’s designation came so late in his tenure is because his administration tried to give Utah’s efforts time to make their way through the legislative process.¹⁴ The Utah Congressional delegation’s primary effort—the Public Lands Initiative—ultimately failed as a legislative solution, with little to no support in Congress.¹⁵ Further, Obama’s BENM creation had more public approval than Chaffetz claims, with some evidence suggesting strong support for a monument designation among Utah residents and the wider public.¹⁶

In my dissertation, I examine how people talk about land through three stories about the land that became BENM and the people, relationships, experiences, and problems that have been entangled with that land. I argue that a central part of what makes public lands rhetorical are the relationships people have with the land. When people talk about land and land controversies, they appeal to these relationships. In other words, when people argue about land, they appeal to the things they associate with land, their interactions with the land, what land means for them, and their experiences with the land—all of these constitute what I mean by “relationship.” Reading texts for how people talk about their relationships to the land, my analyses examine the things they consider part of those relationships. In Chapter Two, I examine the PLI as it was talked about by Bishop and the people of two Utah counties. Here, land and relationship are talked about in terms of wilderness, compromise, and certainty. Chapter Three analyzes three

proposals for BENM's boundaries. I argue that the borders of the monument were drawn (and redrawn, and redrawn again) according to different understandings of the Coalition Tribes' relationships to this land. Chapter Four examines two speeches by Mike Lee and documents from the Coalition, arguing that the rhetorics of both Lee and the Coalition seek to establish particular relationships between land and people. The rest of this introduction examines the rhetorical literature on relationship and land and previews my chapters in further detail.

Literature Review

In rhetorical studies, land is often associated with relationship, and how scholars approach relationship can be divided roughly into two categories.¹⁷ The first understands human relationship to land as mediated through symbolic means. Here, "how one symbolically configures the land will be indicative of all relationships, whether environmental, human, or institutional."¹⁸ The second approach to land and rhetoric relies less on the symbolic, and instead understands land itself as productive of relationship and knowledge. In this approach, human understandings of land, knowledge, and relationship come from active participation and experience on the land. Following the symbolic understanding of rhetoric and land, Gregory Clark, in his study of rhetorical landscapes, tourism, and national parks, differentiates between land and landscape. Clark argues that human relationship to land, in the form of identity, is primarily constituted via interaction with symbolic landscapes. For Clark, land is different from landscape, and it is with landscapes that people interact on a rhetorical level. Here's Clark:

Landscape is not the same as *land*. *Land* is material, a particular object, while *landscape* is conceptual. When people act as tourists, they leave the *land* where they make their home to encounter *landscapes*. *Land* becomes *landscape* when it is assigned the role of symbol, and as symbol it functions rhetorically.¹⁹

People relate to landscapes, not to land, Clark argues, because landscapes function as symbols which humans can read to form identity. According to Clark, some landscapes, such as Yellowstone National Park, offer for Americans a shared symbol of identity: for Clark, we find “what we have been taught to find meaningful there.”²⁰ Again writing about Yellowstone, Clark notes that the national parks are public lands, and thus “literally and legally . . . common ground to which all Americans have equal claim.” However, the thing to which Americans lay claim, Clark argues, “is not land but landscape, not territory but identity.”²¹ In other words, land is rhetorical for Clark only when it is a landscape, a symbol in which citizens can read a collective identity.

The relationship people have to land, as Clark describes it, is most powerful when connected to a landscape imbued with symbolic meaning. In Clark’s equation of land as territory, land has no meaning in and of itself; land is merely the material stuff upon which we stand while reading the symbolic landscape. Landscapes, imbued with all the power of symbolism, are tied to identity, and it is from the confluence of identity and symbolism that relationship is constructed. Understood in this way, landscapes are cultural, able to be read and used in the construction of a persuasive rhetorical message. The essential point is that Clark assumes that “land” is a homogenous concept without symbolism and, thus, without meaning. That is, land does not change; it is permanent. Once land acquires meaning, however, it becomes something else, something different altogether from that which it was previously; it is no longer land. Put differently, *landscape* is an idea—a concept—while *land* is the physical, material object upon which we stand. From this perspective, land is “common, universal, and everywhere, even with great variation.”²² In this understanding, land exists everywhere, the same for everybody. Even if what land *looks* like changes, the *concept* of land remains the same. In other words, the symbolic

landscape approach assumes that the meanings *land* holds for people remains largely the same, regardless of whom is talking.

In a similar vein as Clark, Barbara Willard argues that landscapes can function “rhetorically to shape a particular understanding of the natural world and its relationship to human culture” when read as texts.²³ Drawing on an understanding of rhetoric as epistemic, or as a “source of knowledge-building,” Willard argues that landscapes also function as epistemic; that is, “landscapes, if interpreted by humans through observation of a natural environment’s constituent elements (the ontological), can provide a way of knowing.”²⁴ For Willard, however, this way of knowing begins and ends with knowing how the land functions, or understanding the natural environment through reading natural phenomena.²⁵ For Willard, it is the symbolic landscape that is rhetorical, not the land itself, and requires that humans interpret the land. Reading the natural environment through the landscape, as a cultural text, “reveals how humans should act in relationship to that landscape in an effort to allow for a flourishing ecosystem.”²⁶

The second approach to writing about land argues that the symbolic is not the only domain of the rhetorical and aligns with much recent scholarship in the turn to new materialism within rhetorical studies. Here, it is relationship and experience with land, not only the symbolic of a landscape that provides knowledge and ways of knowing. Complicating the symbolic-only understanding of land through her work on a watershed in Iowa, Caroline Gottschalk Druschke notes that Clark regards “the symbolic as the sole territory of the rhetorical,” and that “the landscape is strictly symbolic terrain.”²⁷ According to Clark, Druschke writes, the “rhetoricity of a given landscape exists only in its symbolic content; the material land drops away once that land is imbued with symbolic meaning.”²⁸ Druschke builds on Clark’s understanding of land as only material, and without rhetoricity by describing the land’s

impermanence, or how land—in the *topos* of watershed—changes. For Druschke, the strictly symbolic understanding of land-as-landscape does not work because when people talk about this specific watershed, the material and the symbolic converge. Not solely symbolic, the watershed functions as “an inducement to action” precisely because people relate to the land in both material and symbolic ways.²⁹

Informed by Druschke, I hold that the problem with a strictly symbolic interpretation of land is twofold. First, an implication of the symbolic, landscape approach is that *land* seems largely homogenous, the same for everyone everywhere. Differences in the material land are a secondary concern because it is the *symbolic* landscape that is important for meaning-making and relationship. We relate to the symbol for which land stands, not to the material thing on which we stand. As such, the symbolic-landscape approach to relationship/land does not attend enough to the real differences in the land that are important for relations. Second, Clark writes that when we experience landscapes that provide a national identity, such as Yellowstone, we share “the same, managed experience of this place and, in the process, the same feeling of belonging together in the nation we had all learned to read as represented in the images of this place, where all of us could be equally at home because it was a place where none of us could live.”³⁰ In other words, there is no room for difference in Clark’s description of landscape, symbolism, and identity. The assumption appears to be that landscapes, if read correctly, tell one unifying story. The story of Bears Ears, though, clearly shows us that land is decidedly *not* the same everywhere for everyone. Land means something different for the Coalition, and the individual Tribes that make up the Coalition, than it does for Rob Bishop or Mike Lee or the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance. This fact is most clearly shown, I believe, through the relationships that people have with the land.

In a relational way of thinking about land and rhetoric, understanding, persuasion, and action come from the relationship one has with the land. By relationship, I mean the embodied experience, memories, and sensations one has with particular elements of the environment.³¹ Crucially, these relationships are born out of “active participation with the land.”³² A focus on land necessitates the blending together of symbolic and material, lived experiences combining with understanding the landscape-as-symbolic-text. For both Gabriela Rìos and Kristin Arola, centering the materiality of land “brings relationality,” or “our actual lived experiences,” to the fore.³³ When people talk about land, they talk about their relationship to land, and how they view and understand their lived, embodied experiences. Land-based rhetorics, as Rìos writes, recognize the ways that “nature produces relations,” and value “embodied ways of knowing/being derived from land.”³⁴ Significantly, Rìos pulls from Indigenous authors to describe her land-based rhetorics.

Indigenous conceptions of land are, Eve Tuck and Marcia McKenzie write, “abundant with aspects of relationships.”³⁵ Angelo Baca (Diné) writes that “Our relationships with our families and to people in our communities, region, and environment are intertwined with the lands that we come from. Even now, our names and identification, in some way, are bound to the lands.”³⁶ For Sandra Yellowhorse (Diné) land can be “a pedagogy for teaching relationships and kinship.”³⁷ Both Baca and Yellowhorse are Diné, and so approach land/relationship through traditions and cultural practices specific to their people. However, as Diné scholar Lloyd Lee writes, “land means the world to all native peoples. . . . Their philosophies, origins, histories, and cultures are tied to the land. Land is more than a commodity and property for the people; it is their way of life and identity.”³⁸ Further, other scholars note the commonalities in the ways many Indigenous peoples see land, among them, kinship, knowledge, and relationship.³⁹

While every Indigenous group has relationships to land, they are particular, precise, and diverse; the specific relationships are ungeneralizable. Tuck and McKenzie write that, for Indigenous people, land is “imbued with . . . long relationships” and the “practices and knowledges that have emerged from those relationships.”⁴⁰ Robin Wall Kimmerer (Potawatomi) writes about land in a way that is similar to the Coalition’s descriptions. Kimmerer, writing about the differences between the settler views of land and her people’s, says “to our people, [land] was everything: identity, the connection to our ancestors, the home of our nonhuman kinfolk, our pharmacy, our library, the source of all that sustained us.”⁴¹ Kimmerer writes that, in the face of colonization and loss, where “almost everything was stripped away”—one thing that “our people could not surrender was the meaning of land.”⁴² An important distinction here is that land for many Indigenous peoples and for Kimmerer and the Coalition specifically, means more than the material thing composed of rocks and dirt. Rather, there are “long and vibrant trajectories of Indigenous practice and theory that understand land as encompassing all of the earth, including the urban, and as much more than just the material.”⁴³ As the Coalition themselves remind us, Native people relate differently to land than non-Natives.⁴⁴

Thinking about land and rhetoric in terms of relationship makes a great deal of sense to me. I have been writing about public lands for the majority of my graduate school career and about Bears Ears specifically for five years. Something I never fully understood (and most likely still do not understand) was why land was so controversial. Obviously, money and economics, ancestral dwellings, artifacts, and histories played a major part, and I knew that. Understanding land/rhetoric in terms of relationship, however, showed me at least part of what I had been missing. Relationship with the land is why so many (white, Mormon, republican) Utahns are angry about the federal government controlling public lands from Washington D.C. and why

they deride presidential decisions and monument designations; after Obama’s designation of BENM, Representative Chris Stewart (R–UT) said that this marked “the second time in the recent past that a president has used the Antiquities Act to lock up millions of acres of land in Utah without daring to set foot in the state.”⁴⁵ The first, in 1996, was Bill Clinton established Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument from the rim of the Grand Canyon. Obama, when he designated Bears Ears, was in Hawaii. Both presidents, having never visited this stretch of land, had no physical relationship with it: how could they? Similarly, relationship with land is why so many Native Americans held such strong views on Bears Ears, whether they were for or against the monument. Traditional land uses and cultural, historical, and sacred places all factor in to these relationships.

Being there—having a relationship with the land—matters and is why everyone who talked about the PLI or BENM talked about their own relationship with the land. The Coalition, everywhere they discuss BENM, talk about their tribes’ relationships with the land: how the land holds profound significance for them, and the sacred, ancestral connections they have are an integral part of healing, historical and cultural understanding, and spirituality. Mike Lee, in his speeches against BENM, spends time talking about his own connections to the land at Bears Ears, and how his own cultural and spiritual heritage help him understand and interpret his experiences with the land. No matter if someone was for or against BENM, their relationship to the land was almost always appealed to as an integral part of their argument.

The extent to which relationship matters was a profound realization last summer, when I visited Bears Ears for the first time. Up until June 2021, my relationship with this land had been based solely in what other people said about it: I had no personal experience with the land itself. And so, when I first saw the twin buttes rising above the horizon, I felt something what I can best

describe as a combination of excitement and awe in seeing this particular geological formation which I had read and written about so much for the previous four years. My first sight of the Bears Ears came as my wife Liz and I drove south on Highway 91, just after passing through Monticello, Utah. Looking out of the car window to the west, the twin buttes stood out clearly against the landscape—about forty miles away, they appeared blue, hazy with distance. “Bears Ears”—the English translation of the names given to the buttes by the Hopi Tribe, Navajo, Ute Tribe, and Zuni of Pueblo—is a good name for the area, as the buttes dominate the landscape for miles in every direction, visible anytime one is in a somewhat elevated area. Indeed, the buttes are so visible that we had sight of them as we approached Red Mesa, Arizona, nearly one hundred miles away, when we left for home. My visit taught me, above all else, that land is more than a particular geological formation and is instead invested with all sorts of other things, including emotions, experiences, and knowledge.

My experience in Bears Ears taught me to think more carefully about why people find this land sacred. The people I spoke with in Utah almost all emphasized their personal experiences—their relationships—with this land. Whether for or against a monument designation, these people all spoke about the land through personal relationship: how they saw the land, what they understood the land to be, and what they wanted and thought was best for the land. Some were worried that Bluff, a tiny town of about 200 people, would “become another Moab,” a tourist town too expensive for locals and full of outsiders. Others, who told me they were BENM supporters, worried about the impact of a huge influx of outsiders (such as myself) who had only come to San Juan County because they had heard about the monument. The publicity Bears Ears has gained is both blessing and curse; attracting nation-wide attention helped protect the area as a monument, but also has the potential to overwhelm the area’s limited

infrastructure. Bears Ears isn't ready to be an Arches, a Zion, or a Yellowstone. To stem the tide of damage, local conservation organization Friends of Cedar Mesa (FCM) has begun the "Visit with Respect Education Campaign" in the hopes of orienting visitors within a particular relationship to the land.⁴⁶

Having a relationship with the land, and leveraging that relationship in the service of persuasion, is a central part of all rhetorics where land matters, not only Bears Ears. For example, I would argue that one of the foundational elements of wilderness preservation rhetoric is the appeal to personal relationship with the land. Indeed, as Christine Oravec demonstrates, John Muir relied heavily on his personal experience at Yosemite to convince his readers of the importance of preservation.⁴⁷ Or, consider a more contemporary example, the 2022 Netflix documentary series *Our Great National Parks*, narrated by Barack Obama. With his very first sentences in the first episode's opening scene, Obama tells viewers that Hanauma Bay in Hawaii—where the scene takes place—is "one of my favorite spots in the world." Next, Obama reminds us that he grew up in Hawaii and that "this," as he gestures to the bay and surrounding landscape, "was my backyard." Obama establishes a personal connection and relationship with this place, the spot where, he tells us, his "love of the natural world began."⁴⁸ Obama's relationship appeal sets the tone for the series, orienting viewers in a particular way as they learn about national parks across the globe. Relationship, as a rhetorical appeal, does not always work towards preservation. As I will argue in Chapter Four, settler colonialism works, in part, through rhetorically reconstructing the relationships and experiences Indigenous peoples have with land and privileging the relationships and experiences of the settler.

This dissertation's three case studies all say something about public lands, rhetoric, and relationship. Chapter Two, in part, discusses wilderness and how people talk about the deep need

to resolve the “wilderness question” through compromise with one another in order to attain certainty through the PLI. This chapter also examines Indigenous efforts to protect Bears Ears as part of the PLI. Chapter Three examines the Coalition’s relationships with Bears Ears, and how the monument’s boundaries were drawn according to differential understandings of these relationships. Chapter Four argues that settler colonialism is an attempt to rhetorically reconstruct the proper order of land/relationship, privileging the settler over the Native person.

Chapter Two Preview: The Utah Public Lands Initiative

Chapter Two analyzes the rhetoric of the Utah Public Lands Initiative (PLI) as a precursor to BENM’s designation. Sponsored by Rob Bishop, the PLI was held up by the state of Utah as a piece of model grassroots legislation that sought to address land-use issues with as much involvement and input by local Utahns as possible. The PLI was meant as an answer to the “question of wilderness” in Utah, said to bring stakeholders certainty about wilderness and how the land could be used. To achieve certainty, however, Bishop and participants alike believed that compromise was necessary. In other words, stakeholders needed to compromise with each other about the details of what they wanted in order to attain the promise of certainty. As part of the PLI process, seven counties in eastern Utah submitted proposals to Bishop for inclusion in the legislation. In this chapter, I analyze newspaper accounts and documents from Bishop to examine how people in two counties—Grand and San Juan—talked about public lands and the PLI. In these accounts and documents, wilderness, compromise, and certainty circulate any time the PLI is talked about.

The most striking aspect of the PLI is the trajectory of the legislation’s two god terms, compromise and certainty. Far from delivering greater certainty built on compromise, the PLI instead delivered profound uncertainty and a distinct unwillingness to compromise. Even more

striking is just how quickly this turn of events came about. When Grand and San Juan Counties submitted their proposals, they seemed hopeful about the PLI's success. This hope was quickly abandoned after Bishop introduced his legislation to Congress in July 2016. In response to the legislation, one county commissioner in SJC went so far as to call the PLI a "political agenda" intended to "cheat" his county out of land and economic resources.⁴⁹ While this commissioner's reaction was extreme, many other county leaders and stakeholders who participated in the PLI process expressed their disappointment with Bishop's legislation. Indeed, nearly everyone in both counties who participated in Bishop's PLI, some sooner than others, eventually agreed he changed too much, gave too little, and created a mess, dashing any hope of the citizens of eastern and southeastern Utah deciding what to do with the public lands. Eventually, the House Natural Resources Committee passed the bill with minor changes in September 2016; after this, the House never took further action, and a Senate version was never introduced.⁵⁰ And so, after more than three years of work, hundreds of meetings, seven county-specific proposals, and the participation of multiple non-governmental organizations and un-numbered citizens, the PLI quietly faded into obscurity. Ironically, while the PLI failed to deliver certainty on wilderness, its legislative failure meant that it delivered certainty on a presidential action. On December 28, 2016, Obama created the new Bears Ears National Monument.

According to Utah Republicans, the monument was created seemingly out of thin air, with little to no public support. Representative Jason Chaffetz (R-UT) claimed that Obama's act "politicizes a long-simmering conflict. . . . [and] is a slap in the face to the people of Utah, attempting to silence the voices of those who will bear the heavy burden it imposes."⁵¹ Obama's designation of BENM was a "slap in the face" only to two particular groups of Utahns: first, the small government, anti-wilderness, pro-development Anglo Mormon represented by Mike Lee,

Rob Bishop, Jason Chaffetz, Gary Herbert, and Bruce Adams; second, some members of the Navajo Nation who lived in specific parts of SJC, did not want a monument designation, and instead supported the PLI.⁵² While there were other Native American residents of SJC who opposed BENM, their central reason for their opposition was their fear that a national monument would ban their traditional uses of the land.⁵³ Obama's BENM proclamation specifically protected such uses within the monument.

Far from a "slap in the face" to Utahns, Obama's designation of BENM was a widely-supported decision that came from the kind of grassroots organizing and advocacy championed by the PLI's advocates. Rather, Obama's designation provided Utah Republicans with a convenient scapegoat to hide from their failure to pass the PLI. Further, their vilification of Obama ignores the fact that the Department of the Interior repeatedly offered support and willingness to help Bishop and his allies craft a piece of viable legislation. The Obama administration gave Bishop and his colleagues more than three years to finalize a working solution for the PLI lands, while always making it clear in the process that they intended to protect land in Utah if Bishop could not. According to Sally Jewel, Secretary of the Interior from 2013-2017, "the [Obama] administration had held off establishing the Bears Ears Monument until it failed to reach a deal to address its concerns through the Utah Public Lands Initiative" and that "no credible effort was put forth by the Utah delegation to do it through congressional means in spite of repeated offers and efforts to help them do that."⁵⁴ Indeed, the Obama administration made it clear to Bishop and his colleagues that they were supportive of the PLI throughout the three and a half years Bishop worked on the bill.⁵⁵ These repeated gestures of support and help for the PLI did not stop Utah's congressional delegation and state officials from

claiming that Obama “abused” his powers, and claiming that BENM was a “midnight monument” once they failed to deliver the PLI.

Chapter Three Preview: The Moving Boundaries of Bears Ears

Chapter Three examines three iterations of BENM. Tracing a genealogy of the monument’s boundaries as they became progressively smaller, this chapter shows that land shapes how we think about the Antiquities Act (the statute used to create national monuments), the things the Act can protect, the bounding of geographical space, and the Tribes of the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition. To do so, this chapter examines three texts: the Coalition’s proposal for BENM, Obama’s proclamation that created the monument, and Donald Trump’s proclamation that modified BENM.

This chapter asks a seemingly simple question: why did the boundaries of BENM shrink? The easy answer is they shrank because Obama and Trump both decided to prioritize energy development over land conservation. The more complex answer is that they shrank as the presidents circulated neoliberal discourses about land into the conversation and, as these discourses came into contact with the people, histories, objects, and land that make up Bears Ears, they allowed the presidents to rearticulate what the monument should protect and why. The circulation of these new discourses by first Obama and then Trump changed what “land” meant at BENM. A central thesis of this chapter is that both presidents bounded BENM according to their understanding of the Coalition Tribes’ relationships with ancestral land. Calibrating BENM’s boundaries to the presidents’ articulations of these relationships, I argue that BENM shrank according to how the Antiquities Act was used to protect the Coalition Tribes’ relationships with land.

The primary takeaway from this chapter is that BENM became smaller at the exact moments that the relationships of the Coalition Tribes diminished in official importance. Land's meanings shifted in tandem with the three iterations of BENM's boundaries as proposed by the Coalition, created by Obama, and modified by Trump. These three versions correspond to different commitments to making the ties of the Tribes to land the central feature of the monument, and thus also correspond to different meanings of land. The less that the histories, cultural practices, and ancestral sites of Native Americans factored into the monument's calculus of protection, the more the boundaries shrank.

In this chapter, I describe three competing meanings of land. The first, forwarded by the Coalition, describes land in terms of knowledge, history, and relationship.⁵⁶ In the Coalition's version of BENM, the monument was at its largest, encompassing 1.9 million acres. Obama forwards a second meaning in his proclamation that created BENM. Here, land is understood in context of the Coalition's relationships with Bears Ears, but also includes other perspectives such as considerations of resource extraction and recreation. Land was understood both in terms of resource and relationship, and the boundaries shrank by 500,000 acres, reduced to 1.35 million acres. Land changed meaning yet again when Trump shrank BENM by eighty-five percent less than a year after Obama's designation, down to 201,876 acres. When Trump shrank the monument, he added to the meanings of land a further economic emphasis; land was now squarely seen first and foremost as a resource. In this smallest version of BENM, land was no longer seen through the Coalition's knowledges. Instead, land was seen through the outsider; no longer needing the Coalition's knowledges to understand land, Trump's BENM was figured as a landscape to be consumed by people other than the Coalition Tribes. That is, BENM became a place where sites like House on Fire or the Bears Ears buttes were protected without reckoning

with Indigenous understandings of those sites. In both Obama and Trump's version of the monument, BENM's boundaries—and the meaning of land—changed with the introduction of neoliberal discourses.

As BENM's boundaries changed, so too did the monument's protection priorities. This chapter argues that the smaller boundaries and attendant shifts in protection are best understood through an explanation of the changing visions of "land." By articulating different understandings of land, the Coalition, Obama, and Trump were able to set the boundaries for three very different versions of the monument. More precisely, each version of BENM was uniquely bounded because the Coalition, Obama, and Trump were able to describe a different set of relationships between land, the Tribes, what sorts of cultural, scientific, and historical objects national monuments protect, and the Antiquities Act. These competing relationships enabled the transformation of what "land" meant in each of the three versions of the monument.

In order to make sense of the competing boundaries I employ a rhetorical ecologies framework to show the circulation of neoliberal discourses within the monument's network. My understanding of rhetorical ecologies follows Jenny Edbauer Rice's work and describes how rhetorics and rhetorical elements undergo a viral process of transformation as they interact with other rhetorics and elements, a process that reforms and reshapes the relationships between them. As I use the term, rhetorical elements are the components of any given rhetorical situation. In the case of BENM, these elements are the objects, land, people, and histories used to differentially bound the monument. In this ecological framework, rhetorics and elements circulate within wider fields and are "necessarily contaminated," or transformed, by the other elements with which they come into contact.⁵⁷

Evaluating the histories and ties of the Coalition Tribes in divergent ways, the presidents drew their respective boundaries to accommodate extractive industry and energy development. Both Obama and Trump prioritized economic uses of land, cutting acreage from protection and factoring extraction into the monument's equation. Such prioritization of extractive industry demonstrates that, as Emma Frances Bloomfield writes, economics is a "prominent lens through which society engages . . . environmental policy."⁵⁸ Therefore, I characterize both presidents' decisions to accommodate extractive industry at BENM as an example of what Bloomfield calls a "neoliberal piety," or the idea that "industry need not be sacrificed for the benefit of the environment."⁵⁹ Both Obama and Trump modified the monument's boundaries to accommodate economic interests, making land into a commodity available to industry; this indicates that both presidents saw BENM through the logics of neoliberalism.

Ultimately, the joining of land to economic concerns allowed the refiguration of what objects, what land, and what relationships were protected at Bears Ears. The presidents' proclamations contain two primary competing meanings of land: land as a resource to be used and land as an intrinsic part of the Coalition Tribes' histories, cultures, and faiths. Obama and Trump describe land as a resource to varying degrees in their proclamations, an understanding that allows for a neoliberal conception of land to emerge.

Chapter Four Preview: Bears Ears, Rhetoric, and Settler Colonialism

In Chapter Four I examine two sets of texts: first, two speeches by Mike Lee and second, a series of documents about BENM from the Coalition. Reading these texts for what they can teach us about settler colonialism and rhetoric, I argue that the meanings given to land by Lee and the Coalition respectively further and resist settler colonialism. More precisely, the rhetorics of both Lee and the Coalition seek to establish particular relationships between land and people.

Lee's speeches about BENM and public lands, I contend, further two goals of settler colonialism: removal and assimilation. Removal is the strategy of forcibly expelling Indigenous people from their lands, while assimilation works to dissolve Native difference and identity, an attempt to absorb Indigenous people into settler mainstream society. Lee pulls from and furthers these strategies to subsume Indigenous logics and ways of knowing land and argue against BENM and the Coalition.

Settler colonialism requires new relationships between land and people. Fundamentally, settler colonialism says to the land's Indigenous inhabitants "this land is no longer yours." There are two ways that Lee's speeches capture this shift in relationality, both of which, I argue, rhetorically make Indigenous people absent from the land, thereby establishing a new relationship between people and land based solely in settler logics. First, Lee whitewashes the differences between settlers and Natives, assimilating Native beliefs and connections to land into a mainstream settler society. Here, Lee argues that Native and settler relationships and claims to land are entirely the same. Second, Lee follows the strategy of removal, arguing for a history of public lands where Indigenous peoples never figure, a primary desire of settler logics. According to Lee's telling of history, the relationship of people to these lands begins with the US government acquiring, distributing, and eventually reserving the public lands. Indigenous peoples and their relationships with land never needed accounting because they have been removed.

However, land and relationship can also resist settler colonialism, which the Coalition does through two techniques. First, the organization articulates land through their Tribes' specific Traditional Knowledges (TK). By describing Bears Ears and the land in terms of TK, the Coalition reminds us that colonial logics are not the only way of seeing land. Second, the

Coalition resists colonialism through what I call bodily resistance. That is, the Coalition remind us that there has been continual Indigenous presence on the land and that colonial attempts at elimination and removal have not been wholly successful.

In terms of relationship, the Coalition's rhetorics of resistance offer an excellent case study to examine land, rhetoric, and relationality. Building from the work of Gabriela Rios, I advance land-based rhetorics as a way in which rhetorical studies may better engage with its colonial anatomy and as a way that the Coalition marks their own claims to ancestral land. As Rios writes, land-based rhetorics are those which recognize "the ways in which land can produce relations" and "the value of embodied ways of knowing."⁶⁰ In centering land-based rhetorics, my goal is to show the ways in which these relations and ways of knowing appear in the Coalition's advocacy.

Conclusion

Relationships to land, and how people talk about them, matter. I argue that these relationships, and how people appeal to them, are what make public lands rhetorical. Through three case studies related to the lands that became BENM, I examine how people relate to land and how they appealed to these relationships as they argued and fought over the lands. In Chapter Two, I examine the rhetoric of the PLI, and the relationships to which people appealed when they talked about wilderness, certainty, and compromise.

Chapter Two: The Utah Public Lands Initiative: Creating Certainty through Compromise and the Search for “Stable Ground”

The Utah Public Lands Initiative (PLI) can be dated from February 15, 2013 to September 22, 2016.⁶¹ On February 15, 2013, Representative Rob Bishop (R-UT) sent letters to county officials in Utah inviting them to participate in a new legislative initiative, aimed at tackling public land management problems in the state. Bishop promised three primary goals for his proposed legislation: first, to bring “greater land management certainty”; second, to provide counties with “tangible benefits”; and third, to “resolve land designations where a consensus can be reached.”⁶² These goals never came to pass, and the PLI effectively died on September 22, 2016, when the last action was taken on the bill by the House Committee on Natural Resources.⁶³ In the three years and seven months between these two dates, three key concepts drove discussion of the PLI: wilderness, compromise, and certainty. In Utah, at least for the last forty years, the topic of wilderness has always been bound up with compromise and certainty. The PLI, following in the footsteps of previous attempts to address Utah wilderness, saw “compromise” between wilderness advocates and opponents as that which would lead to “certainty” over wilderness.

Intended to resolve land-use controversies, the PLI was developed in response to the “question of wilderness.” The themes of compromise and certainty, long a factor in Utah’s wilderness debates, were central to Bishop’s answer to the wilderness question. According to Bishop, compromise was absolutely necessary. No one would get everything they wanted, Bishop reminded participants: people would have to give things up. Because of this demand for compromise, the PLI was labeled “Bishop’s grand bargain” in newspapers during the years leading up to the legislation’s introduction to Congress and was envisioned as a process that

would bring hundreds of participants to the table in order to determine what uses lands would be put toward. Compromise was necessary to resolve the wilderness question, Bishop argued, because the gridlock of the past showed that Utah needed a “new way” of thinking about the question of wilderness. By compromising over wilderness, counties could attain certainty.

By certainty, Bishop meant land-users and stakeholders would be able to know how they could use a particular piece of land. The PLI would bring certainty by resolving land-use issues in Utah and give users and stakeholders confidence that management policies would not change. Lee Lonsberry, Bishop’s communications director, said in 2016 that the goal of certainty was “stable ground.”⁶⁴ In other words, certainty would guarantee land-users, stakeholders, and county officials that the management mandate—how federal agencies manage the land—of large amounts of land would be determined once-and-for-all. Bishop specifically demanded certainty for one particular type of land designation, Wilderness Study Areas (WSA). Managed as de facto wilderness without *actually* being wilderness, WSAs were problematic for Bishop because they essentially exist in a state of perpetual limbo. WSAs, above all else, demanded certainty, and certainty, Bishop insisted, could only be realized through compromise.

The PLI touched deeply on issues that govern how many participants relate to the land. Certainty, compromise, and wilderness are the contents of these relationships. For many, the PLI promised much-needed certainty of public lands issues. Uncertain of how they would be able to continue to use the land, stakeholders thought that the PLI would give them finality about these lands. WSAs, for both advocates and opponents of wilderness, were a lightning rod for the debate over how best to attain certainty. Similarly, the PLI’s participants thought they needed to compromise with one another over the specifics of their disagreements so that they could

continue to have a relationship with the land. Utah Diné Bikéyah (UDB), who tried to participate in the PLI, centered relationships as the reason why they wanted to protect Bears Ears.

An ambitious effort, the PLI's state-level approach may, in part, have led to its downfall in the end; while the counties and specific stakeholders in those counties largely showed a willingness to compromise and come to a shared vision for the land, many came to see the PLI as an unwieldy mess that ignored much of the county-specific compromises. The most striking fact about the PLI is that, after more than three years of work negotiating proposals by Bishop, his co-sponsors, seven counties, and stakeholders, compromise and certainty—the two outcomes which Bishop desired most and insisted were central to the PLI's success—were never achieved. Instead, the PLI delivered profound *uncertainty* and a distinct unwillingness to compromise. Southeast Utah's newspapers record this shift from certainty to uncertainty, from a willingness to unwillingness to compromise, over three years as PLI participants worked on their proposals, submitted them to Bishop, and then read the versions of the bill that Bishop released. In the newspaper accounts, many participants initially seemed hopeful that the PLI would be able to resolve the wilderness and other land issues that had persisted for years or, in some cases, decades. However, by the time that Bishop presented the PLI to Congress in September 2016, some of the most ardent supporters of the bill on the county level seemed disappointed by what the PLI had become. No longer certain that the PLI would resolve land-use issues, participants seemed largely frustrated by what they perceived as the unwillingness of everyone else to compromise: pro-development supporters blamed the environmentalists for their unreasonable demands, who in turn blamed Bishop for failing to deliver on land protections.

The outcome described above is unsurprising after examining Bishop's PLI rhetoric in close detail. Bishop's rhetoric of certainty and compromise fundamentally misrepresented the

PLI's true nature: far from being a neutral piece of legislation, the PLI was never intended as a compromise solution to resolving land-use issues where advocates of both conservation and economic development would achieve some of their desires. Instead, the PLI seems to have always been intended as a win for development at the expense of conservation, regardless of Bishop's promises. Accordingly, compromise and certainty were not the innocent terms they first appeared to be, and the fundamental gap between wilderness and development seems to have been too big to bridge. As David Zarefsky notes, the rhetoric of compromise and certainty are most likely "to work where diametrically opposed principles are not deemed to be at stake."⁶⁵ In other words, wilderness and development appear to have been too fundamentally opposed for agreement and compromise, in the specific context of the PLI.

This chapter examines the three key terms that drove discussion of the PLI: wilderness, certainty, and compromise. These three terms appear throughout newspaper accounts of the PLI, in Bishop's correspondence and documents, and in documents from stakeholders; in short, these three terms appear nearly everywhere the PLI was talked about. The PLI was a process said to require compromise on all sides of the issue, with the guarantee that the outcome would provide certainty about how to use the lands. Above all, wilderness was the primary issue that needed certainty and demanded compromise. This chapter proceeds in three parts. First, I give more background and context on wilderness, WSAs, and the PLI.⁶⁶ Second, I examine UDB's attempt to participate in the PLI and their explanations of relationship with land. Finally, I examine the PLI's other two guiding terms, certainty and compromise, from the perspective of two counties who participated in the process: Grand and San Juan.

Wilderness, Certainty, and Compromise: Rob Bishop's PLI

Wilderness has long been a controversial topic in Utah, for both its advocates and opponents. Above all else, according to former Utah Senator Bob Bennett, wilderness was the issue that aroused the most “passionate contention among those Utahns who were affected by it” during his time in office.⁶⁷ In the 1980s, under orders from Congress, the BLM selected 2.6 million acres, mostly in southern Utah, as Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs), largely siding with mining, industry, and ranching interests to select a smaller number than they otherwise would have for their recommendations. After appeals by wilderness groups, the agency expanded their WSA selections to 3.2 million acres.⁶⁸ WSAs are intended as a temporary land designation, managed to maintain wilderness potential while not actually being wilderness. While providing a measure of protection, WSA status can be undone by Congress. James Morton Turner notes in his history of wilderness protection that the wilderness debate in Utah during the 1980s was often marked by a lack of compromise. As Turner writes, what made the “wilderness review in Utah different from almost every wilderness review which had preceded it—dating back to the Wilderness Act of 1964—was that neither side saw any reason to engage in negotiations toward a compromise.”⁶⁹ Opponents of wilderness saw no reason to protect even the 3.2 million acres set aside by the BLM, while advocates “wrote off discussions with the local and county governments, rural citizens, and resource industries” about how to best go about protecting wilderness.⁷⁰

By the time Bishop proposed his PLI, the wilderness debate in Utah had been in a near stalemate for thirty years, and the 3.2 million acres designated during the 1980s largely remained locked in a liminal WSA status. However, the PLI came on the back of a new wave of optimism about resolving the wilderness debate in Utah that began in 2009. That year saw the passage of the Washington County Land Use Bill, hailed at the time as the potential model for Utah

wilderness.⁷¹ Other counties in Utah, including San Juan, wanted to be next, and so began planning their own legislation.⁷² As with the PLI, the key words used to describe the Washington County bill and planned legislation were “compromise” and “certainty.” Bob Bennett—the primary sponsor of the 2009 legislation—wrote that his bill had brought certainty to Washington County, which he named as the one county in Utah where wilderness “is no longer a fighting word.”⁷³ In San Juan County, there was optimism that compromise would lead to certainty. Even Bruce Adams, a county commissioner who did not want any more wilderness, recognized that compromise was necessary, saying “it’s amazing what can happen when you sit down and talk to people.”⁷⁴ On the other side of the issue, Liz Thomas, an attorney with the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance (SUWA) said that their top goal was to get wilderness designations, but that a deal could be worked out, because “they [the county] want something, we want something.”⁷⁵ Wilderness advocates would get some permanent wilderness, and county commissioners would get resolution on which lands could be used for what purposes. On both sides, compromise was seen as leading to certainty.

Other county-specific land bills never came to pass, however, largely because Bob Bennett lost his re-election bid for the US Senate in 2010. Mike Lee, the Republican who replaced Bennett, was less committed to county-level wilderness bills, saying in 2010 that he would not support any Utah wilderness bill unless the State legislature approved it first.⁷⁶ In Bennett’s place came Bishop and the PLI, bringing a different approach. Rather than a localized, county-specific bill, the PLI took a more holistic, state-centric approach to public lands management and the question of wilderness.

The PLI was presented as a comprehensive public lands bill that would permanently designate uses for millions of acres. With wide-ranging support among Utah politicians,

including in the state legislature, the governor, the congressional delegation, and county leaders, the PLI was the state's attempt to "once and for all, try to end the litigation and the controversy surrounding our lands. . . . [and] to come up with a designation for the primary purpose of these lands."⁷⁷ At the very start, the PLI was envisioned as a process that could potentially encompass most of the state and address the majority of Utah's federally owned public lands. Three of Utah's four US representatives were involved in the early planning: Rob Bishop (First District), Jason Chaffetz (Third District), and Chris Stewart (Second District), whose districts contain 97% of the federally owned public lands in the state—roughly 34 million acres. The Fourth—and geographically smallest—District was not included because it was "geographically separated from the initiative planning area."⁷⁸ More importantly, for the PLI's planners, Utah's Fourth District has a relatively small number of federal acres, and most of the land is privately owned. The total number of acres included in the PLI eventually dropped to 18 million acres when only seven counties—Summit, Duchesne, Carbon, Uintah, Grand, Emery, and San Juan—ultimately chose to participate.⁷⁹

Starting in July 2012, Congressmen Bishop, Chaffetz, Stewart and their staffs began meeting with state and local officials and non-governmental organizations about what they termed "the emerging public lands paradigm," or the "shift toward a more balanced, locally-focused use of public lands in Utah."⁸⁰ During these meetings, the participants explored the possibility of codifying this "emerging paradigm" into law through federal legislation. The outcome of these meetings, the congressmen determined, was that there was widespread support in Utah for such legislation and, as a result, began to plan the next step. Accordingly, on January 15, 2013, Bishop sent letters to twenty-one stakeholders seeking input and participation in the PLI. These stakeholders represented a wide variety of groups and interests, including Native

American tribes, conservation and environmental organizations, agricultural groups, and energy interests. These letters were intended to “understand their perspectives, priorities, and goals,” and to begin a collaborative process of determining the best uses of these lands.⁸¹

Encouraged by the response to the initial letters, the congressmen sought input from other organizations and individuals. In June 2013, an additional 60 letters were sent to various organizations in different sectors, such as agriculture, conservation, energy and mineral development, outdoor recreation, and hunting and fishing. According to the congressmen, many of these groups “responded with excitement,” and submitted recommendations with maps and proposals that communicated their specific interests. By mid-November 2013, the congressmen had held more than 400 meetings with organizations, elected officials in Utah, tribal leaders, and individuals. Additionally, fifteen “field trips” were held in six counties at various locations. These trips were intended to visit some of the lands in question, because, when “discussing land management, there is no better way to understand an area than in person and on the ground.”⁸² Stressing that private individuals were important constituents and a central part of their planning, Bishop and Chaffetz noted that, in 2013 alone, more than 500 citizens from several counties met with the congressmen across six public meetings and “different public forums,” and that counties and tribal governments held additional public meetings for their citizens. As the congressmen explained, local citizens “whose livelihoods are directly impacted by land management decisions are key stakeholders in the process.”⁸³

After several years of work, seven counties in eastern and southeastern Utah, along with the Navajo Nation, Utah Diné Bikéyah, and multiple non-governmental organizations, eventually submitted proposals to Bishop and Chaffetz for consideration. The county proposals, crafted by county governments or county-appointed groups of citizens and officials, suggested specific

areas of land to be protected along with the specific type of protection, which places should be designated for energy use zones, and other such recommendations. As evidence of the citizen-driven nature of the process, Bishop claimed the overall bill's development was guided by 65 proposals from 120 groups of stakeholders, including "local governments [and] Native American tribes." Further, according to Bishop, more than 1,200 meetings were held with stakeholders over three years, consultation with the Department of the Interior and the White House, and nearly 50 field trips to the various places included in the legislation.⁸⁴

The PLI, developed to resolve the wilderness problem in Utah, was specifically intended to resolve one particular designation—Wilderness Study Areas—that Bishop found especially irksome. Because WSAs have not yet been formally designated wilderness, these BLM lands are managed to preserve wilderness characteristics.⁸⁵ For an area to become designated as wilderness by Congress, the land must meet certain requirements defined in the 1964 Wilderness Act. In 1976, Congress directed the BLM to evaluate all the agency's land for wilderness characteristics; areas identified under this review were designated as WSAs.⁸⁶ Because WSAs meet the characteristics of wilderness defined by law, they serve as places which Congress may choose to expand the National Wilderness Preservation System.⁸⁷ Essentially, WSAs are places which one day may be formally designated wilderness by Congress. While Utah's WSAs have largely remained static for nearly four decades, a WSA designation is not permanent. Thus, though WSAs give the land wilderness-like protection, these protections may be taken away at any point. Utah wilderness advocates, therefore, would like WSAs to become permanent wilderness—certainty, from this point of view, requires ending the study period, and turning WSAs into wilderness areas.

In the United States, roughly one-sixth of all public lands managed by the federal government are managed as wilderness—either as a WSA or as an actual wilderness area. Together, WSAs and wilderness areas account for approximately 112 million of the 640 million acres of federal public land. The total calculation of WSA acreage is approximately 11,616,634 acres in 491 separate areas.⁸⁸ During the years when Bishop was working on the PLI—2013-2016—there were 86 designated WSAs in Utah, with a combined total of 3.2 million acres, essentially the same amount of acreage that the BLM designated thirty years prior.⁸⁹ Though WSAs are de facto wilderness, they have different management mandates than wilderness areas. Whereas wilderness is managed to “preserve wilderness character,” WSAs are managed to not “impair the suitability” of one day being designated as wilderness.⁹⁰ In other words, WSAs are defined and managed as a liminal designation; WSAs do not have a permanent designation (and thus use) but are instead managed so that uses are temporary and would not harm the area’s chances of becoming permanent wilderness. WSAs remain as de facto wilderness until Congress either releases them from study or designates them as permanent wilderness.

As a land-use designation, wilderness is specifically intended for non-economic purposes: the highest priority values of wilderness management are recreation and scenic. Legally, wilderness is defined by the Wilderness Act of 1964, which states that “in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, [wilderness] is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammelled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain.” To be considered wilderness, the land must be an undeveloped area that: is at least five thousand acres; has largely been affected only by the “forces of nature”; where the human imprint is unnoticeable; and which has “outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation.”⁹¹ As defined by this

law, wilderness is managed to preserve its “natural” state, and for its scenic and recreational values. To preserve the lands in such a state, many types of uses are restricted; no motorized vehicles are permitted, for example, and structures and permanent roads cannot be built within the area. Therefore, wilderness areas are specifically managed for “public purposes,” such as recreation, education, scientific, conservation, historic, and scenic.

For Bishop, Utah’s WSAs represent all that is wrong with federal public lands management: in a state of seemingly perpetual limbo, the land is both not wilderness and yet cannot be used for anything that would impair its suitability to be designated wilderness. The PLI was Bishop’s attempt to resolve these “unsettled land-use designations” that had for years fueled “distrust and acrimony.”⁹² Because many types of uses are restricted on lands that have a wilderness designation, the land functionally only serves as an area for non-motorized recreation. Better, in Bishop’s mind, to achieve finality, and once-and-for-all designate the land as wilderness or release it from study.

Though Bishop would normally have stringently opposed designating wilderness for its own sake, he also recognized that wilderness was key to the economic develop of Utah’s public lands. Further, Bishop understood that, if the PLI was to have any chance at succeeding, he had to first convince those, like him, whose first instincts were to answer any proposal for more permanent wilderness with a resolute “no.” Bishop’s early PLI invitation letters recognize the extremely controversial nature of what he termed such “restrictive” land designations, asking stakeholders to not approach the wilderness issue with the “skepticism, even hostility” common to past discussions of wilderness. Rather than pushing “for as little wilderness as possible,” Bishop argued, stakeholders should see that the “more [wilderness] we’re willing to designate, the more we can expect on the other side of the ledger.”⁹³ Historically, there has been a

competing vision for wilderness lands in this region of the country. Jedediah Rogers, in his history of roads in the Four Corners region, writes that there “are two dominant ways of approaching this country. It is a landscape of dueling perceptions, viewed variously as vulnerable and compromised versus resilient and full of untapped potential, as a scenic wonderland versus a hostile desert, as wild and pristine versus inhabited and productive, as a land ordained by Providence for human labor versus a land ordained by Providence as a refuge for nature.”⁹⁴ Or, as one journalist put it, the “problem with Eastern Utah’s redrock country is it’s too beautiful to be used, but too useful to be left alone.”⁹⁵ Long-beloved by recreationists and conservationists, Utah’s redrock canyon country stretches for miles, the landscape ranging from soaring peaks and steeply-sloped mesas to woody washes and twisting canyons. Alongside the scenic beauty, the ancient cultural heritage deeply embedded in the land has, for decades, been the subject of calls for protection. For nearly as long, however, the resource-rich land has been coveted for the development of minerals, oil, gas, and coal. According to some, mineral development is the entire reason some towns even exist today.⁹⁶ Conceding the chance for continued economic development in order to preserve land as wilderness is, in the minds of many, contrary to their priorities.

Without question, the problem of Utah’s wilderness needed resolution. Importantly, Bishop recognized, the issue of wilderness represented an opportunity. According to Bishop, the PLI was rooted in the belief that “conservation and economic development can coexist.”⁹⁷ Achieving a more balanced use of public lands, he said, was possible only through compromise between those who wanted to use the lands for economic development and conservationists. Whenever Bishop discussed the PLI, he talked about both economic development and wilderness preservation. For Bishop, however, development was more important than preservation; more

wilderness was only a means to an end. For example, on September 19, 2016 (three days before the PLI was last discussed in Congress) a memo was sent to all members of the House Committee on Natural Resources which read, in part, that the PLI was:

designed to benefit the State of Utah’s public education system as a result from increased energy and mineral production, protect and conserve certain lands for future generations, provide regulatory certainty for federal land users, increase revenue to local governments generated from multiple-uses of the land, and result in more opportunities for outdoor recreation and benefit the communities and businesses that support it.⁹⁸

Education, energy and mineral production, preservation, certainty, revenue, outdoor recreation—only one of these terms describes protecting land, with the others concerned primarily with economics. Further, Bishop’s earliest invitations to join his initiative had an economic tint.

From the very beginning of the planning process, Bishop argued that wilderness provisions needed to be a central factor in every county proposal. County leaders and other stakeholders, Bishop said, should treat the wilderness problem differently than they had in the past. Instead of viewing wilderness as a source of annoyance and frustration, Bishop wanted to embrace land conservation as an economic opportunity, writing that “wilderness . . . can act as a currency.” In other words, by embracing wilderness and advocating for new or expanded designations, Bishop argued that county leaders could use these designations to “buy” more of what they wanted: in his words, “the more land we’re willing to designate as wilderness, the more we’re able to purchase with that currency.” If counties approved and advocated for further wilderness, Bishop argued, they should receive “tangible benefits” for those designations. Some of the things that Bishop hoped wilderness could buy for the counties included “the upgrade and control over one or many roads, designation of zones for energy, timber and other resource

development, lands transferred to county control for a new park or airport, or a new dedicated revenue stream to the county generated by swapping school trust lands in your county into more energy rich lands in other counties.”⁹⁹ Swapping wilderness—in Bishop’s mind an unusable piece of land—for economic benefits would provide the counties with greater certainty.

As Bishop used the term, certainty meant achieving a “more reasonable, balanced” way that public lands were used in Utah.¹⁰⁰ Toward this end, Bishop advocated for a shift in the debate over public lands, arguing that pro-development stakeholders needed to “think differently” about public lands and how to best resolve what they saw as long-standing issues. As he wrote in his early letters to county leaders, Bishop was convinced that that there was a “growing consensus that a comprehensive public lands bill can be a powerful vehicle to get other things done.”¹⁰¹ In other words, the central idea behind the PLI was that, if economic interests worked with conservationists to preserve some lands, they would receive designations on other lands that were favorable to economic development. Compromise—working with conservationists—would lead to certainty.

To achieve his goal of certainty, Bishop proposed the PLI, a “grand bargain” that would bring numerous people and organizations together in an effort to determine the lands best uses. Understood as a bargain, stakeholders in each participating county would collectively negotiate the lands’ uses and which lands would be set aside for preservation or for economic development. To put it slightly differently, the PLI was presented as compromise, where conservationists, proponents of economic development, and other stakeholders worked together to find certainty. That is, Bishop recognized from the outset that, in order to pass such wide sweeping legislation, he and others would have to balance many competing interests and get as many people as possible to agree to the plan. To balance interests, Bishop argued, everyone

would need to give up part of what they wanted in order to give everyone at least some of what they desired.

According to Bishop and other advocates, the guiding principle behind the PLI was that the bill would represent the collective will of the people, a way of giving voice to those on the ground in each county. The PLI was, advocates liked to say, a “bottom-up,” “locally-driven” process.¹⁰² As such, the PLI was advertised as a citizen-driven piece of legislation. And, in many ways it largely was. In San Juan County (SJC), the county’s recommendations were put together by a group of twenty individuals who together made up the “Lands Council.” Participating in this Council were ranchers, conservationists, Native American residents, and a mix of other private citizens and county officials. In Grand County—directly north of SJC and Bears Ears, home to Moab and Arches National Park—the proposal was largely written by the County Council, with input from county citizens. Other citizen-led stakeholder groups either submitted their own proposals—as did UDB—or worked closely with counties to ensure these proposals represented their interests—as did SUWA. As documented by the state’s newspapers and these organizations, work on the PLI was often driven by the promise of certainty. And, in order to attain certainty, both Grand and San Juan counties recognized that compromise was necessary. However, as the citizens and officials in these two counties used the term, compromise only meant compromise with each other on the county level: in both Grand and San Juan counties, there was an assumption that Bishop would largely follow whatever recommendations the counties proposed. As the counties and stakeholders came to realize, however, Bishop never intended to only follow their lead. When the draft PLI was unveiled in early 2016, Bishop’s changes to the counties’ recommendations came as a shock to many. Suddenly, after three years of work, doubt was cast again on the certainty the PLI provided.

In the remaining part of this chapter, I examine the PLI process in both Grand and San Juan counties. Grand County's PLI work, in particular, was well documented by two newspapers, the *Moab Sun News* and the *Moab Times Independent*. Both of these papers record the original optimism surrounding the PLI, and the belief that, through compromise, the county could gain certainty over controversial public lands. The papers also record the shift from certainty and compromise to uncertainty and unwillingness to compromise after Bishop unveiled his legislation. In SJC, the record is less complete, but the story largely follows that of Grand County: an initial belief that the county's citizens could compromise together to achieve certainty that was thrown into uncertainty and unwillingness to compromise after the PLI was released. Before examining the county PLI efforts, however, I examine the Navajo PLI efforts in SJC, as represented by Utah Diné Bikéyah. UDB's proposal is an important part of SJC's story, and followed a slightly different path. For UDB, the PLI represented a first opportunity for Native American tribes to participate in official public lands planning with the state. Interestingly, UDB never talked about the PLI in terms of compromise. Instead, UDB's discussion about the PLI largely hinged on issues of inclusion, and whether or not Native Americans felt welcome to participate. At the heart of UDB's work, and what was carried on in the Coalition's later BENM proposal, was the profoundly deep and networked relationships many Indigenous peoples have to the land at Bears Ears.

Utah Diné Bikéyah and the Navajo Nation

What would become Utah Diné Bikéyah (UDB) formed in 2010 after then-Senator Bob Bennett (R-UT) "asked Native people in San Juan County, UT, if they had any interest in how public lands were managed."¹⁰³ Though Native Americans have long observed debates over the use of public lands in Utah, former UDB chairman Willie Grayeyes notes that they have rarely

participated, not out of a lack of interest, but because “simply, no one ever asked us.”¹⁰⁴

Bennett’s invitation was part of his new effort to resolve long-standing issues surrounding public lands, modeled off recent legislation elsewhere in Utah, that would center citizen participation in land-use planning. With Bennett’s invitation in hand, a small group of individuals who would eventually form UDB began working on a plan to represent Utah Navajo interests in Bennett’s process.¹⁰⁵

With the interests of Utah Navajo in mind, the group sought, and gained, the support of the seven Navajo Nation Chapter Houses in Utah for a “cultural mapping” project. An engagement with the ways tribal elders interacted with the land, the knowledge they held about it, and their experiences, the project mapped relationship with the land. Prioritizing the opinions of elders who knew the land and the sacred and cultural significance of various places throughout the region, the group interviewed more than seventy elders over two and a half years.¹⁰⁶ As UDB describes cultural mapping, it is an effort to determine culturally, historically, and spiritually important places in the landscape by interviewing and listening to “elders, traditional leaders, and the grassroots people who know the land, the wildlife, the stories, and traditions.”¹⁰⁷ Interviewees were selected “according to the location of their home (selecting approximately equal numbers from each Native community in Utah) and their depth of traditional knowledge.”¹⁰⁸ Partnering with the Navajo Nation Division of Natural Resources, academic experts, and Round River Conservation Studies, the interviews were conducted by individuals with training in ethnographic research methods.¹⁰⁹ Throughout the study, the group relied on a mix of Traditional Knowledge and western science to determine the importance of areas and sites within the Bears Ears region. Traditional Knowledge (TK) was defined by the group as knowledge “derived from keen observation carried out and passed down over hundreds

or thousands of years. It represents another way of knowing the social and ecological landscape.”¹¹⁰ TK was used by the interviewers to determine the uses and significance of the various places the elders discussed. By western science, UDB means that principles of ethnographic research were incorporated into the process, in order to create a “method that the data-driven world of Western science would understand and respect.”¹¹¹ In other words, UDB recognized early that a combined approach to determining Native American land uses at Bears Ears would enable them to present a stronger case for the land’s protection. Using this methodology, the interviewees were asked to “draw lines, points, and polygraphs on 36”x36” maps and the interviewer labeled each point or polygon according to type of cultural use.” As a result of the interviews, “every acre of public land in San Juan County was identified as important for a variety of objects. Native American decision-makers later determined the optimal (most efficient) boundary selection to represent locations, activities, and objects of greatest value within the smallest area.”¹¹²

When Bennett lost his reelection bid in 2010, UDB continued their work, believing that a new planning process would soon be started by Utah’s congressional delegation, which indeed did happen in the form of the PLI.¹¹³ After finishing much of their research in early 2011, UDB began distributing results of their work in the form of maps and “a book describing Native American interests” in the land to the public, 8,000 copies of which were distributed in Utah and nationally. This book, former Navajo Nation President Peterson Zah wrote, was an attempt from the Navajo People to share “their memories, knowledge, and feelings about these sacred lands that so shaped and continue to enrich our culture and well-being.”¹¹⁴ In other words, the book described some of the relationships that the Navajo have with the lands at Bears Ears. As they wrote:

Diné Bikéyah is the land of the Navajo People. Diné Bikéyah exists as a physical being, and within the hearts of all Navajo, as it has nurtured and sustained our way of life since the beginning of our existence. . . . We, the Navajo, who reside in what is now the State of Utah, wish to communicate to our fellow Utah and American citizens our deep connections and commitments to these lands. . . . Contrary to the beliefs of many, southeastern Utah was not an empty place . . . but rather it was our home and the home to many Paiute and Ute people as well. Each of these tribes, as well as others like the Hopi and Zuni, occupied this land and to this day maintain strong ties to this region called San Juan County, Utah. . . . This beautiful expanse of land between our four sacred mountains, Mount Blanca, Mount Taylor, San Francisco Peaks, and Mount Hesperus is our place of origin. Here our spiritual traditions are rooted. Today, we continue to rely on and utilize public lands for practicing our ceremonies, gathering herbs, firewood, and cedar poles, hunting for game, rejuvenating our spirits and caretaking of our sacred places. Our oral traditions, our stories, spring from the canyons and mountains of San Juan County.¹¹⁵

These strong ties and relationships are why UDB and Navajo Nation participated in Bennett's efforts and, later, Bishop's PLI. These relationships are centrally important to these people and drove their advocacy efforts to protect the land.

In October 2011, the Navajo Nation formally partnered with UDB to begin planning a proposal for the Bears Ears region. For the next year, UDB worked with the Navajo Nation to present their ideas to the Utah state legislature and the San Juan County Commissioners. They reported widespread support among Utah "effort to protect spiritual sites on public lands within the Bears Ears landscape," and entered into a memorandum of agreement with SJC to "create a

shared vision supported by commissioners and the Navajo Nation” in late 2012.¹¹⁶ During this time, Bishop began work on the PLI, meeting with stakeholders during the summer of 2012, though neither the Navajo Nation nor UDB was invited to any of these meetings. However, after Bishop invited both to participate in the PLI in February 2013, they joined that process. Over the next two and a half years, until August 2015, UDB worked with Bishop and SJC on the PLI.

UDB and the Navajo Nation’s proposal for the PLI was to create a National Conservation Area (NCA) in SJC.¹¹⁷ This NCA would have encompassed 1.9 million acres in the county, and includes much of the land that would eventually become BENM. Throughout UDB’s work on the PLI, they always made clear to both Bishop and the SJC Commission that, while they preferred to work with the PLI and pursue a legislative solution, they would seek a national monument designation if they felt legislation was unlikely or unfeasible.¹¹⁸ Specifically, the organization, along with the Navajo Nation, proposed the creation of the Diné Bikéyah National Conservation Area as part of the PLI. As they wrote, they believed that an NCA would be the best designation for the described area, allowing for multiple land uses, while also prioritizing cultural and natural resource protection, which they described as “the priority management issues.”¹¹⁹ Specifically, they proposed that the NCA be managed to recognize the “legitimate interests of Utah Navajo” on these lands and provide a way of incorporating Navajo traditional knowledge into land management. Put otherwise, UDB wanted the relationships their people have with the land to directly influence how the Bears Ears NCA was managed.

Working with the SJC commission and Bishop, UDB and the Navajo Nation gave multiple presentations regarding their proposed NCA. From almost the moment they unveiled their proposal, however, the Navajo described feeling unwelcome in the planning process. The NCA proposal was shared in April 2013 in a meeting where almost “every official involved in

the PLI” was in attendance. During this meeting, UDB and the Navajo Nation “carefully detailed” their proposal, sharing the “development process, as well as why and how decisions were made.” According to UDB, the SJC commission was scheduled to share their own proposal two weeks later but canceled, saying that the Navajo proposal was much more advanced than their own, and that they needed more time to plan. In hindsight, UDB writes, this April meeting “seemed to mark the day when UDB went from being treated as an ally and partner, to being ignored and shut-out of the public process by San Juan County.”¹²⁰ Indeed, the organization notes that their participation was marked by hostility from this date forward: writing about a meeting with Bishop and Chaffetz in August 2013, UDB writes that residents of SJC directed “racist insults at Native American attendees,” and that none of the county leaders did anything to stop it. Subsequently, UDB says, Native Americans stopped “attending public meetings in northern communities” of SJC.¹²¹ As UDB wrote in a letter to Bishop and Chaffetz after this meeting, UDB felt they had a close “professional working relationship” with the Congressmen, and it was because of this relationship they felt surprised and disappointed when neither responded to the insults directed at Navajo people during the meeting. Such remarks, they wrote, “only serve to perpetuate the racism that lingers” in SJC, and that the Congressmen’s “failure to step up and uphold appropriate decorum at the meeting could be viewed as your acquiescence in such behavior and attitude.”¹²²

Though UDB dates the April 2013 meeting as the beginning of their troubles with the PLI process, it is clear that the prospect of Navajo involvement with land planning was treated with distrust and hostility from nearly the beginning. In October 2012, for example, Phil Lyman—then a member of SJC Commission, now a state representative whose district includes all of SJC—invited the UDB board to his office for a meeting. During this meeting, UDB recounts,

Lyman suggested that Native Americans should not be “commenting on public lands issues,” because they “lost the war.”¹²³ These sorts of comments seem indicative of a broad perception among the region’s non-native people: UDB once wrote that, although the “public lands of San Juan County are our home,” they often felt as though “federal agents, recreationists, and outside hunters do not welcome us.”¹²⁴

Due to their increasing frustration with SJC and the state’s lack of welcome, and feeling shut out of the PLI process, in 2015 UDB partnered with four other Tribal Nations to form the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition. “Spurred to action by the popularity of the Bears Ears initiative among Native communities,” the Coalition wrote and submitted their proposal for Bears Ears National Monument to Obama in October 2015. This document called on Obama to “proclaim the Bears Ears National Monument to honor the worldviews of our ancestors, and Tribes today, and their relationships with this landscape,” noting that “Native people always have, and do now, conceive of and relate to the natural world in a different way than does the larger society.”¹²⁵ The Coalition began their efforts for BENM in the same spirit as did UDB for an NCA: informed by their Tribes’ relationships to land and intended to protect those same relationships.

Certainty and Compromise: Grand County and the PLI

In the very beginning, Grand County leaders and citizens were highly supportive of the PLI, linking the legislation with the need to bring resolution to the county’s public lands. Citizens and county leaders who participated all began their PLI work seemingly highly optimistic of the PLI’s ability to bring resolution to their county’s most pressing public lands issues. Bishop and Chaffetz’s first meeting in Moab, in early August 2013, was attended by more than 200 people and set the precedent for the county’s debates. The tension between preservation

and development—two different ways of relating to the land—became the primary obstacle the county faced during its PLI efforts over the next two years, with advocates on both sides at seemingly unwilling to compromise.

During the initial August 2013 meeting, relationship to land was at the center of Grand County residents' minds. Former county council member Mike Holyoak said that he was a firm believer in “multiple use” of public land and claimed that “ninety percent of the trails we now enjoy [around Moab] were built by cattlemen and miners.” Holyoak’s relationship with the land is a mix of recreation and development, where the recreation opportunities in the county are a direct result of the historic economic land uses in the county. In other words, Holyoak understands his experiences with the land as shaped by both recreation and development, where his ability to recreate on the land is a direct product of the “cattlemen and miners” who used the land for economic purposes. Another man, who did not give his name, said that he moved to Moab for his retirement but the news of mining and development concerned him, stating “If I knew I would be surrounded by this, I would not have made this my home.” Heila Ershadi made a more nuanced point, saying “We need to take care of our land, and the people who live here. Extraction industries can bring economic prosperity, but they can also bring serious ecological and public health hazards.”¹²⁶ By appealing to care for both the land and the people, Ershadi notes that neither position of only wilderness or only development is a viable option: both relationalities are necessary.

Aligning with Bishop’s claim that conservation and development can coexist, Grand County Council member Lynn Jackson, who would eventually lead the county’s PLI efforts, said that he saw the PLI as a means of assuring a “future of diversity within the economy,” while also ensuring that the community’s natural scenic beauty remained intact. Significantly, the term

“conservation” was used instead of “preservation.” As Christine Oravec writes, there is a difference between “preservation” and “conservation”; where preservation advocates setting aside the land for its scenic beauty, aesthetic qualities, and recreational value, conservation advocates setting aside land for future use, privileging the economic uses of natural resources.¹²⁷ Bishop, using the language of conservationism, wanted the land to remain useful and economically beneficial. Both development and preservation interests were represented by the county’s citizens, with some expressing their support for both sides, noting the need for stable employment and high wage jobs while also recognizing that the land needed greater protection. Others who spoke also noted their collective desire to see the lands better protected, while also speaking of the uncertainty they currently felt because the rules regarding land use were “consistently changing.”¹²⁸

The feeling of certainty—that the PLI would resolve land-issues—was jeopardized early on in Grand County’s process. Before the council even began drafting a proposal, the PLI process became a source of contention in the county. By December 2014—four months after Bishop’s initial meeting in the county and just over a month after the county council began work on their plans—forty citizens penned a letter asking for a more open public process. Council member Lynn Jackson (who became the council’s spokesperson on the PLI), stated that the council’s process was “as transparent as it gets,” but noted that he and his fellow council members were somewhat unsure how to proceed, citing confusion about what Bishop and his team were supposed to provide to the county as the reason why the process was going slowly. However, Jackson reassured citizens that the public would be involved, promising that there would “be a written comment period. There will be a public meeting showing the alternatives [where] we’ll get more input. The council meeting where we finally vote will be open to the

public so they'll see the deliberative process we'll go through."¹²⁹ The seeds of doubt over the PLI's promise of certainty, initially sown during this period, would lie dormant for a while longer.

The primary sticking point over certainty was the debate over to what exactly the PLI would bring certainty, specifically the question of if the bill would designate more wilderness. For the next two years, the PLI was portrayed in Grand County as a negotiation between two opposing sides, these two ways of relating to the land, those in favor of greater wilderness preservation and those who wanted no more wilderness and instead pushed for greater economic development opportunities. This portrayal of two starkly opposed positions is largely true, at least in terms of how the debate played out in county newspapers, among the county council, and in the public comments. Throughout, the debate over wilderness was portrayed as one needing resolution in order to bring certainty to the county and land-users. As one citizen, who said that greater wilderness protections "made sense," wrote to the *Moab Times Independent*, the county needed to "get certainty . . . through this process."¹³⁰ Certainty, for Grand County just as for Bishop, could be attained only through the hard-to-come-by compromise.

As the debate over certainty played out in the county, citizens appealed to their relationships with the land during their public comments. Soon after Bishop's August 2013 meeting, a group of Moab-area business owners wrote the county council, in support of "openness and collaboration," as business owners "who depend on the sound management of our public lands."¹³¹ As businesspeople, these individuals had a vested interest in the PLI, and saw their relationship with the land in business terms.

During the first half of 2014, Grand County solicited public input through two public comment periods and multiple meetings about the PLI. Public comments received in January

2014 were largely conservation-focused, with the majority of county citizens wanting greater land protections. By May, however, sentiment seemed to be more evenly split between pro-development and pro-wilderness advocates, though the *Moab Sun News* noted that the majority seemed to be in favor of greater protections.¹³² Indeed, the first round of comments included more than 180 letters, with about 90% supporting more wilderness designations. During the second round, sentiment was much more evenly split—about 40-40 between those who wanted “all wilderness” and those who “didn’t want any wilderness at all.”¹³³ For wilderness supporters, greater protection “of these lands will send the message that this state does value the health of its people, wildlife and the natural surroundings that draw people here in the first place.”¹³⁴ According to the *Moab Sun News*, many of these letters “began with residents stating that they moved to the Moab area because of its scenic beauty and asked that it be protected and undeveloped.”¹³⁵ For an energy worker named Curtis Wells, however, “We’ve got a million acres [of protected designations] on the table,” saying “that land is opportunity.”¹³⁶

While Grand County’s citizens were divided about what designations the land should receive, the county council’s initial proposals united the citizens; unfortunately for the council, the citizens were united in opposition. The county council brought forward three alternatives for consideration, with the majority of council members supporting “Alternative No. 1,” which was described as providing “the greatest area of county land for possible future extractive resource development, with no provisions for “any new wilderness or recreation areas.”¹³⁷ As one newspaper describes the May meeting during which the proposals were discussed, “almost none of [the 50 citizens who spoke] gave their unqualified support” for any of the three alternatives. Instead, some pushed for greater wilderness protections, and some argued against any new wilderness at all, arguing for more lands to be opened for development.¹³⁸

Newspaper accounts of Grand County's PLI work consistently noted that the legislation was meant to bring people together; however, as time progressed, and the county worked through their proposal, this claim was always modified by noting how the county's citizens clashed over public lands problems. This is especially true by the second year of the county's PLI process and, by early 2014, citizens seemingly could not come to any agreement on what land to protect, how to go about protecting it, how much land, and to what degree economic development was necessary. The *Moab Sun News* noted in April 2014 that, though the PLI was "meant to develop consensus and support among stakeholders through collaboration and compromise," a recent meeting of the county council showed that "consensual support" for any plan from the county was lacking.¹³⁹ Similarly, a reporter for the *Moab Times Independent* wrote a month later in May 2014 that Bishop's PLI was built around stakeholders moving "beyond past conflicts" and "find[ing] common ground." However, "the gap between those who support greater protections for Grand County's federal lands and others who want more development of its natural resources appeared to be wide last week."¹⁴⁰

As the papers represent the debate, Grand County's struggles to create an acceptable PLI proposal largely revolved around the tension between development and wilderness. Advocates of pro-development and pro-wilderness appealed to their relationships with the land; pulling on their experiences and interactions, citizens on both sides of the debate centered their relationship with the land as they talked about what they wanted from the PLI. Some citizens, desiring greater development, called on the county to create a proposal that would open more lands to developers for uranium, potash, oil, and gas. For these residents, an economy based solely in tourism was unviable, whereas mineral development "has kept local residents employed for generations."¹⁴¹ Wilderness advocates pushed back on this view of the land, one person calling Grand County "a

crazy place to have oil and gas drilling.”¹⁴² By May 2014, consensus about the PLI seemed far away. Though county commissioners said they were trying to find “middle ground” in the debate between conservation and natural resource development, they seemed to be pessimistic about the county’s chance of finding a solution, with one council member saying that “we’re not going to have a solution in my opinion,” while another called the lack of progress “really aggravating.”¹⁴³

The issue of wilderness versus development continued to plague the county’s PLI process; at the county council’s May 16, 2014 meeting, reaching a compromise between conservation and development seemed largely out of reach. At this point, the majority of the council were mostly ready to submit “Alternative No. 1,” the proposed plan that was most friendly to development, and the one which would have created the least amount of wilderness.¹⁴⁴ This alternative would have created roughly 251,841 acres of wilderness, following a county proposal from 1999.¹⁴⁵ In other words, the county council was ready to give up on the idea of creating any new wilderness. One council member argued that he supported this alternative “in its entirety,” because he disagreed with those in the county who “wanted to halt all resource development.” Another noted the lack of compromise, saying he was voting for this plan because “nobody wants to work together.”¹⁴⁶

Though the county council reached an “informal consensus” regarding the problem of wilderness, with five of seven saying they were ready to send a proposal to Bishop, this “informal consensus” seemed born out of frustration that the county’s citizens could not agree about what to do with the land. According to one council member, the most recent round of public comments showed that about forty percent of writers wanted “all wilderness” while about forty percent wanted “no wilderness at all.” Another council member noted that the council worked “really hard” to find a “middle ground. . . . The problem is, we didn’t get anywhere.”¹⁴⁷

Feeling frustrated, the council wanted to send their recommendations to Bishop and be done with the PLI.

Overall, the five council members who wanted to send a recommendation to Bishop cited their increasing frustration at the lack of compromise in the community. The remaining two council members, who did not support a plan at the time, also cited the lack of compromise, though for different reasons. For Elizabeth Tubbs, the problem of compromise needed resolving, saying “There is something wrong with this process when [none of the plans] encompass what a lot of the people in this community want.”¹⁴⁸ For Lynn Jackson, the issue revolved around his belief that the county’s proposal, in its current state, was unviable. The county needed to include some sort of new conservation plan in its proposal and could not rely on old, out of date ideas. Consensus and compromise, Jackson claimed, was never going to happen in the county.¹⁴⁹

By the time the county drafted and submitted its proposal to Bishop in May 2015, nearly a year later than their original estimation, the key questions about wilderness protection versus economic development had largely been resolved, though with seemingly little satisfaction on either side of the issue. Indeed, one reporter wrote, “no faction in the debate over wilderness versus open multiple-use of public lands received everything it wanted.”¹⁵⁰ Certainty, attained for the time being through an uneasy compromise, was not to last long.

Indeed, just eight months later, in late January 2016, the predominant feeling in Grand County seems to have been that the certainty and compromise accomplished by the county’s proposal were being undone. Bishop had just released his “discussion draft” of the PLI and, with it, introduced new uncertainty into the PLI process. From the perspective of wilderness advocates, the inclusion of national parks into the PLI’s wilderness areas caused a great deal of skepticism. Bill Hedden, Executive Director of the Grand Canyon Trust Executive, told the

Moab Times-Independent that Bishop and Chaffetz “designated wilderness in Arches and Canyonlands because they wanted to add up acres for something that doesn’t change anything. Except that it might. It could actually be rolling back protections.”¹⁵¹ The primary source of frustration, for the county council in particular, was that the PLI draft went against or did not include many provisions recommended by Grand County. The PLI—championed as a grassroots, local effort that would give communities a large amount of say in how their lands were managed—seemed to have largely gone against the principles of local determination that Bishop expressly said he desired.

While there are many similarities between how the PLI was talked about in Grand and San Juan counties, with compromise, certainty, and wilderness being the primary talking points, many people in SJC seemed more hesitant about working with Bishop on the bill.¹⁵² The overriding concern for many in the county who worked on the PLI was about control over county lands; for them, certainty meant SJC retaining control over as much county land as possible. Compromise was necessary to making this happen.

San Juan County and the End of the PLI

SJC did not submit a PLI proposal to Bishop until August 2015, when the county commissioners unanimously voted to approve a recent proposal, which they called the “June 15, 2015 proposal.” Created by a special committee, the SJC Lands Council, this proposal was a combination of an earlier county document—called Alternative B—and aspects of UDB’s proposal.¹⁵³ The Lands Council had been appointed two years prior to draft the county’s plan, and was composed of twenty county citizens, representing a range of stakeholder interests. SJC’s proposal would have designated more than 500,000 acres of new, permanent wilderness. Though

many members of the Lands Council “felt the proposal goes farther than they are comfortable with,” they supported the compromise proposal anyway.¹⁵⁴

This new plan seems to have largely satisfied the majority of the planning committee, county commissioners, and county citizens—something none of the previous attempts accomplished. According to Josh Ewing, executive director of Friends of Cedar Mesa (FCM), a local conservation organization, and member of the SJC Lands Council who drafted the proposals, the special council crafted three alternatives, known as A, B, and C. Alternative A protected the least amount of land, while Alternative C protected the most (and was the alternative most similar to UDB’s proposal). Alternative B, meanwhile, more evenly balanced land protection with multiple use. Ewing wrote that public feedback in the county indicated that “86% of commenters (all from San Juan County) expressed support for protecting a large landscape, represented by either Alternative C or the Utah Diné Bikéyah proposal.” Following this feedback, the June 15, 2015 proposal was created, amending Alternative B by adding more acreage for protection in two areas, near the Bears Ears buttes and in Lockhart Basin. Ewing wrote that “the County’s proposal is far beyond what most would have anticipated San Juan County would have put on the table in terms of permanent protective designations,” and proposed the protection of approximately 945,000 acres as either wilderness or as part of an NCA. Further, all “but one of the existing Wilderness Study Areas are proposed for permanent wilderness protection.”¹⁵⁵

Though all who spoke at the August meeting expressed their support for the new proposal, they also expressed reservation about the nature of their county’s need to compromise. Compromise, during this meeting, was a word that people used to mean protection from a national monument. That is, even though no one fully agreed with each other how the land

should be used, they all agreed that a national monument was the worst-case outcome. By compromising with each other about how the land should be used and what designations would go precisely where, a national monument would be avoided. County Commissioner Bruce Adams hoped that this proposal would show Congress what the citizens of SJC wanted, and called the proposal a “citizen proposal,” supported by “hopefully a majority.”¹⁵⁶ Further, multiple members of the council intimated in written statements that it was only by “compromise” that the county could help determine the lands uses. Heidi Redd, a local rancher and member of the council, said the council “have come up with what we hope allows us to retain some control over our County.” In other words, SJC feared that, without compromise, decisions would be made about the land without “any input from our citizens,” and that “much of the county could end up being locked up.”¹⁵⁷ Steve Deeter, another member of the Lands Council, thought the council’s work was necessary to prevent “San Juan County [from being] designated as a national monument.” In a public letter, Deeter described the compromises that council members had to make, noting that “we learned to . . . consider the ideas of others and step outside of our own paradigms.”¹⁵⁸

Before coming to these conclusions, however, Deeter began his statement with a description of his personal relationship with the lands of SJC. In a brief paragraph, Deeter told readers that, since 1972, he and his wife have lived in the county, where they worked and raised their children, and that he and his family enjoy the “open space, beauty and solitude of the county.” According to Deeter: “We all still enjoy the beauty of this area and don’t want to see it locked up so only a select few can use it. We would like to see it stay as it was forty years ago.” By first detailing his experiences in the county, Deeter established why he believed in his work on the Lands Council and PLI mattered. If the county citizens sat back and did nothing, Deeter

believed, their land would be effectively taken away from them because how they would be able to interact with and experience the land, what they would be able to do and how they could enjoy it, would change. Relationship was therefore perhaps the most important thing for Deeter, and that which he was fighting to preserve. As Deeter saw it, his relationship with the land would change if the county could not figure out its PLI proposal. Maintaining relationship, then, was a primary catalyst for Deeter's efforts on the PLI.

When Bishop released his PLI, SJC officials were split over their support for the legislation. Like in Grand County, some former supporters of the legislation backtracked on their support, arguing that the bill would not accomplish what the county proposed. SJC Commissioner Bruce Adams said in January 2016, after the discussion draft's release, that he thought the compromises were fair, and he continued to support for the legislation later that year.¹⁵⁹ After the release of the Congressional draft, in July 2016, Adams stated his continued support for the legislation. Other officials, however, were less certain about the bill, concerned with the lack of many of the county's recommendations.¹⁶⁰ Phil Lyman, a second-term SJC commissioner in 2016, said in August of that year he felt "betrayed by the PLI at this point," citing the removal of issues regarding roads, energy zones, and key land exchanges from SJC's proposal in Bishop's final draft.¹⁶¹ Later that year, in October, Lyman expanded on his feeling of betrayal, writing that the PLI was a "political agenda" intended by Bishop to favor counties in his district at the expense of other counties. Bishop's agenda, according to Lyman, was to take away some of SJC's School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) parcels, trading them for federal parcels so that other counties could gain valuable SITLA parcels (SITLA lands are state-administered lands, intended to benefit county school systems through royalty payments from mineral development). Further, Lyman argued, Bishop never intended to

take SJC seriously, a claim supported by the fact that Bishop took SJC's proposal "and completely gutted it" before releasing the legislation. Lyman also relied on relationship with land to make this argument against Bishop's PLI because, according to him, SITLA lands are "a sort of birthright that predates Statehood."¹⁶² For Lyman, the county's primacy over the state meant that the economic benefits—how Lyman primarily seems to relate to land is through money—should be assured as the county's.

Conclusion

When a draft version of the bill was released nearly four months overdue on January 20, 2016, reaction was decidedly mixed.¹⁶³ On all sides of the issue, the PLI drew criticism. At best, supporters of the PLI felt that they got some of what they wanted, with necessary concessions. As Lynn Jackson, a PLI supporting member of the Grand County Council, said, "I'm not happy with some of it, and some of it's ok. . . . It's the nature of compromise: you give stuff up."¹⁶⁴ At worst, the bill's detractors felt the PLI cut too much of what they wanted from consideration: wilderness and conservation advocates felt especially aggrieved at how little land the bill would actually protect permanently. Scott Groene, director of the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, called it a "terrible bill" and predicted it would never be passed by the Senate (in fact, the PLI never even got a Senate version). The only consensus achieved by the PLI, it seemed, was dissatisfaction with the resulting bill.

Then, in June 2016, a revised version of the PLI was released, and a version was introduced to Congress in July. By this point, even some previous proponents of the bill had changed their minds; Lynn Jackson, who had expressed his support earlier that year, said in August that he no longer supported the bill.¹⁶⁵ By August 2016, the PLI's prospects were looking slim. Obama's presidential term was coming to an end and with it the deadline for a viable land

bill from Bishop. With a monument designation looming, focus began to shift from PLI to BENM. Writing in the *Moab Sun Times*' opinion pages, a local man named Dave Cozzens laid out an argument against BENM based entirely in the relationship of people to land:

What a Bears Ears monument would deliver is yet another blow to the lifestyle and livelihood of rural people of all ethnicities. . . [who] tend to have a relationship with the land that's more complex and close than urban populations that view nature as a postcard rather than the source of all our resources. They may not describe their town's surroundings as sacred, but this love of place shields them from the allure of higher wages in more urban places. Because local people are more affected by public-land decisions, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Forest Service were designed to give them somewhat more say, but monument proclamation would erode this input even further.¹⁶⁶

According to Cozzens, the close relationship "rural people" have with the land primarily understands land in terms of resources. Though he ascribes this view to "all ethnicities," Cozzens clearly has no understanding of how many Indigenous people view the land; the Coalition would certainly disagree with Cozzens' characterization. Cozzens' conclusion is that local populations should have a greater say in land management decisions, and that environmentalists—such as those who wanted BENM—had much to learn from "the wisdom of a local perspective."¹⁶⁷

While the PLI still enjoyed support among the members of Utah's congressional delegation well into the fall of 2016, and even with the Obama administration supportive of the attempt, wider support in Congress was never forthcoming. Indeed, no House Democrat ever supported the bill, Bishop and Chaffetz were unable to build a strong enough coalition among fellow Republicans, and though the bill sped quickly through the House Natural Resources

Committee (which Bishop chaired at the time), it was never brought to a vote in the House.¹⁶⁸

After more than four years of work, over a thousand meetings later, and with the participation of hundreds of citizens, organizations, and leaders, the PLI slowly fizzled out. By the time Obama's tenure was ending, the PLI seemingly had no future, thus paving the way for the establishment of BENM.

Four months after Cozzens' op-ed, Obama established BENM. How people reaction to Obama's monument designation, unsurprisingly, depended on the relationship they had with the land. For Alfred Myerson, a Navajo man who lives in SJC and who supported of BENM, Obama's actions were necessary and ensured that Bears Ears would be "preserved and protected." Myerson also mentioned that cultural practices would be protected under the designation, an important provision for he and his wife, noting "we are directly connected to the land. . . . there is no separation." Bruce Adams, SJC Commissioner, asked why the Obama administration did not "go through that process and receive local input from the people who are going to be most affected by this designation?"¹⁶⁹ Adams ignores two points: first, that the Obama administration did, in fact, go through a process to receive "local input," and second, there were local people—such as Myerson—wanted the monument. Adams' use of "local" is the same as Mike Lee's, a term that figures particular relationships between land and people, based in settler logics (the focus of Chapter Four).

At least three Utah officials who spoke against Obama's designation made the point that Obama himself had no relationship to the land that he was protecting. Bruce Adams pointed to an official press release about BENM, which included a picture of Arches National Park, saying "they don't even know where [Bears Ears] is."¹⁷⁰ Utah Representative Chris Stewart was "disgusted" by the fact that BENM's creation "marks the second time in the recent past that a

president has used the Antiquities Act to lock up millions of acres of land in Utah without daring to set foot in the state.”¹⁷¹ A week after Obama’s designation, Mike Lee noted that Obama was on vacation in Hawaii during the time of the announcement.¹⁷² For Adams, Stewart, and Lee, Obama’s creation of BENM was an affront for many reasons, but the fact that they all noted his absence from the land is striking because this is a strong indication that, for these three men, relationship to land matters.

The PLI, a nearly statewide effort to create a land-use bill, was ultimately a failed experiment. Ambitious in its efforts, the PLI’s statewide approach may, in the end, have contributed to its downfall. Compromise and certainty, Bishop’s key terms, were never delivered, and the state’s wilderness remained largely unaffected. A key component of the debate over the PLI was relationship to land. How people advocated for or against the legislation depended, for them, on how they saw their relationship to the lands they fought over. Whether someone was pro-wilderness or pro-development, pro-BENM or anti-BENM, nearly everyone appealed to the experiences, interactions, what land meant for them during their advocacy. In the next chapter, I focus on how the Coalition’s relationship to land vis-à-vis the monument’s boundaries. I argue that the boundaries shrank when the Coalition tribes’ relationships to land diminished in official importance.

Chapter Three: The Moving Boundaries of Bears Ears: Ecological Rhetorics and the Shrinking of a Monument

On October 15, 2015, the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition formally petitioned then-president Barack Obama to create Bears Ears National Monument (BENM). Prior to this proposal, the Coalition had been formed by a group of five Tribal Nations that came together to work for the monument.¹⁷³ Working closely with the Coalition was UDB, who had spent the previous five and a half years advocating for the protection of the Bears Ears region and attempting to participate in Bishop's PLI. The goal of the Coalition's proposal was twofold. First, they asked for a presidential proclamation to "protect historical and scientific objects . . . [on] ancestral land."¹⁷⁴ Second, they proposed that the monument be collaboratively managed by the Coalition Tribes and federal agencies.¹⁷⁵ Both UDB and the Coalition saw the entirety of Bears Ears as "one great cultural region," and they envision a landscape that connects deeply with their cultures, where objects, people, faiths, land, and histories are closely tied together.¹⁷⁶ The Coalition writes that their peoples have an "intimate connection with Bears Ears, a cultural landscape densely inhabited by the stories, histories, prayers, and practices of people and place over millennia."¹⁷⁷ Put differently, the Coalition proposed the creation of BENM in order to protect their tribes' relationships with the land.¹⁷⁸ As proposed, BENM would encompass 1.9 million acres in SJC.

Following the Coalition's request, Obama established BENM on December 28, 2016. At 1.35 million acres, Obama's version was approximately 500,000 acres—roughly thirty percent—smaller than that proposed by the Coalition. However, Obama also stipulated that a commission be formed with participants from each of the Coalition's five member Tribes providing "guidance and recommendations" on BENM's management.¹⁷⁹ Obama's commission fulfilled

the request for “deep involvement” from the monument proposal.¹⁸⁰ Most importantly, Obama was faithful to the Coalition’s vision of BENM as a monument that would protect their Tribes’ relationships with the land.¹⁸¹ In Obama’s version of BENM, the Coalition tribes’ relationships with Bears Ears mattered, though not to as great a degree as in the organization’s proposal.

On December 4, 2017, President Donald Trump reduced BENM’s size by a further eighty-five percent, down to approximately 201,800 acres, which he divided into two separate units. Trump’s proclamation makes no mention of the Coalition Tribes’ relationship with the land. Instead, Trump dismantles the two provisions that were most important to the Coalition by denying the Tribes significant involvement and discounting the ties between people, objects, histories, and land. In Trump’s monument, the official significance of the Tribes’ relationships with land disappeared almost entirely.

Almost immediately after Trump shrank Bears Ears, accusations of pandering to extractive industry began to surface.¹⁸² What emerged was a murky picture of the influence of economic interests on Trump’s decision to remove protections.¹⁸³ While a Department of the Interior economic analysis showed that the lands Obama included in BENM had little potential for viable energy and mineral production, Trump drew his boundaries to favor extractive industry over the well-documented cultural and sacred significance of Bears Ears.¹⁸⁴ Curiously, though Obama also drew his boundaries with extractive industry in mind, his decisions did not draw the same concerns as did Trump’s. Indeed, the Coalition notes that, while they were “disappointed” about Obama’s changes because “those areas are all culturally important to us and now may well be developed in disruptive ways that detract from the values of the Monument lands themselves,” Obama’s proclamation “achieved our goals.”¹⁸⁵ Even still, Obama’s boundaries were drawn to avoid many of the region’s prominent oil, gas, and uranium sites,

including those the Coalition's boundaries would have incorporated into the monument.¹⁸⁶ To varying degrees, Obama and Trump shrank BENM, privileging extraction over the tribes' relationships with land.

This prioritization of extractive industry demonstrates that, as Emma Frances Bloomfield writes, economics is a “prominent lens through which society engages . . . environmental policy.”¹⁸⁷ Therefore, I characterize both presidents' decisions to accommodate extractive industry at BENM as an example of what Bloomfield calls a “neoliberal piety,” or the idea that “industry need not be sacrificed for the benefit of the environment.”¹⁸⁸ Both Obama and Trump modified the monument's boundaries to accommodate economic interests, making land into a commodity available to industry; this indicates that both presidents saw BENM through the logics of neoliberalism. Ultimately, the consequence of these concessions was the refiguration of what objects and what land were protected at Bears Ears. Neoliberalism is often understood in rhetorical studies as a set of discursive practices that apply the “logic of the market to every facet of our lives.”¹⁸⁹ However, neoliberalism encompasses more than market rationalities, also relying on the biophysical, or material/environmental factors.¹⁹⁰ Critically, Obama's neoliberalism differed from Trump's, each president coming to different conclusions about how best to bound the monument through the reconstitution of BENM's ecology. As neoliberal discourses circulated into the ecology, the monument's elements—land, people, objects—were put into new relationships with one another. BENM's elements became the biophysical mechanisms through which the monument's boundaries were changed, their relationships rearticulated in at least two ways. First, BENM's primary object of protection changed, moving from protecting the Tribes' relationships with land to protecting archaeological and historical

sites. Second, BENM's primary subject also shifted, moving from the Coalition Tribes to the outsider.

The shifting of relationships made significant changes to the Coalition's vision for BENM. At stake in the movement of BENM's boundaries is the fate of more than a million acres of public land and the symbolic and material relationships the Coalition Tribes have to this land. Also at stake are the ways in which the Coalition Tribes' ways of knowing and using land are either enacted in, or silenced by, law. Both Obama and Trump invoked the Antiquities Act of 1906 as the source of their authority to establish and modify BENM. This act authorizes the president "to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest . . . to be national monuments."¹⁹¹ Although they cite the same law, the competing proclamations implement the Act in fundamentally different ways. Where Obama used the Act to protect the ties of the Coalition Tribes to Bears Ears while inviting them to participate in public land management, Trump used the Act to dismiss the ties those same people have to land while removing their voices from management. The presidents' neoliberalisms implemented the Act in conflicting ways, protecting different aspects of the monument and divergently including the Tribes' perspectives as a factor in determining BENM's boundaries.

What happened between December 28, 2016, and December 4, 2017, that so radically shrank the boundaries of BENM? How did the implementation of the Antiquities Act change? Why were the presidents' neoliberal commitments so different? And why did the Coalition deem Obama's BENM acceptable, even with his changes? To answer these questions, I provide a critical genealogy of BENM's moving boundaries, showing that the monument's size depends on a dynamic ecology of the relationships between objects, competing implementations of the

Antiquities Act, differing modes of neoliberalism, and differential histories of Coalition Tribes and their land, all of which combined to shape the geographical boundaries of this Utah landscape.¹⁹²

To this end, I trace the movement of BENM's boundaries across the two presidents' proclamations, following the neoliberal ecologies as they articulate how both presidents understood the monument. I argue that BENM's moving boundaries—and thus also neoliberal ecologies—can be calibrated to the changing status of protection given to BENM's objects. Key to my argument is the shifting of BENM's primary objects and subjects within a neoliberal ecology. In particular, I follow the ways in which the Tribes' relationships with land were made an “object” of protection under the Act by Obama and then disregarded by Trump, also tracing the attendant shift in BENM's primary subject.¹⁹³ As BENM's objects gained new relationalities, the monument's boundaries shrank according to what was protected.

In each iteration of BENM, the monument's boundaries can be precisely calibrated to the Coalition's relationships with the land in official documents. The more BENM honored and protected these relationships, the larger the boundaries were. Put differently, Bears Ears twice became smaller at the exact moments when the ties of Indigenous peoples to land diminished in official importance. The less that the histories, cultural practices, and ancestral sites of Native Americans factored into the monument's calculus of protection, the more the boundaries shrank. One of the most important things that the story of BENM's shrinking boundaries teaches us is that it is possible to literally map the acreage by which Indigenous relationships to land are said to matter.

To make these arguments, I build from what has been called the “ecological turn” in rhetorical studies to analyze the presidential proclamations that differentially bounded the

monument. My essay proceeds in three parts. First, I detail a part of rhetoric's turn to ecology, including the field's engagement with multiple ecological traditions, describing some of the intersections between rhetoric, Indigenous ecological Knowledges, and the Coalition Tribes' own ecological traditions. Suggesting that ecology is sometimes used in rhetorical studies to describe a framework for understanding the virality of rhetorics, or how rhetorics spread, interact, and transform, I also argue that neoliberalism is ecological in this sense: as a concept that moves virally, altering and being altered by the rhetorics it encounters. Second, I review the Coalition's relationships with the land of Bears Ears, detailing the ways in which their ecological knowledges informed their proposal. This section previews the understanding of BENM that largely carried through Obama's proclamation. Finally, using conflicting histories of people and land told by the two presidents, I demonstrate how objects, people, and land were made relevant to the Antiquities Act within the presidents' neoliberal ecologies.

The Ecological Turn

In this chapter, my use of "ecology" follows Jenny Edbauer Rice's work on rhetorical ecologies. This understanding of ecology describes how rhetorics and rhetorical elements undergo a viral process of transformation as they interact with other rhetorics and elements, a process that reforms and reshapes the relationships between them. As I use the term, rhetorical elements are the components of any given rhetorical situation. In the case of BENM, these elements are the neoliberalisms, objects, land, people, and histories used to differentially bound the monument. In this ecological framework, rhetorics and elements circulate within wider fields, and are "necessarily contaminated," or transformed, by the other elements with which they come into contact.¹⁹⁴

This approach differs from other uses of ecology in rhetorical studies, where ecology is sometimes thought of as interconnectivity within a place, between the “earth’s living and non-living systems.”¹⁹⁵ As Nathan Stormer and Bridie McGreavy write, ecology can also “mean a networked, material environment,” or “an orientation to patterns and relationships in the world” that “presumes connectedness and attachment between all manner of things.”¹⁹⁶ As part of the turn to ecology, rhetorical scholars have begun to engage a diversity of ecological traditions, especially in environmental scholarship. Justine Wells writes that there is “a need for engagement within and across ecological traditions, particularly as many recent ecological reformulations of environmentalism have remained largely anchored in white, Western philosophical discourses,” and scholars have increasingly begun to recognize the “vibrant traditions of ecological thinking in indigenous cultures.”¹⁹⁷ Learning from diverse ecological traditions, environmental communication scholars have given us a greater understanding of how “ecological attunement enables deep engagement with, and care for, the natural and human worlds,” though room remains for more productive engagement with these traditions.¹⁹⁸

While the links between ecological rhetorics, multiple Indigenous ecological traditions, and environmental communication scholarship are too numerous to fully engage here, this chapter seeks to add to these literatures by focusing on the relationships the Coalition Tribes have with the land at Bears Ears. Specifically, I examine the ways in which the Coalition discusses Traditional Knowledge (TK), or the ecological and social relationships their Tribes have with the land, and the ways in which these relationships circulate in the presidential proclamations, in turn affecting the different neoliberal ecologies. First, however, I discuss rhetorical ecologies and neoliberalism in more detail.

A framework of rhetorical ecologies demonstrates the movement, intersection, overlap, and transformation of a rhetorical situation's elements. Rice argues that a "given rhetoric is not contained by the elements that comprise its rhetorical situation."¹⁹⁹ Instead, an ecological model of rhetoric stresses how "traditional components of the rhetorical situation are never settled but always temporally and spatially in flux."²⁰⁰ Adding "back dimensions of history and movement" to rhetoric, an ecological perspective understands rhetoric as a process of material and symbolic emergences where elements flow into and from varying rhetorical situations.²⁰¹ As rhetorics flow, they affect and influence other rhetorics and situations, leaking or bleeding into one another, transforming these situations, rhetorics, and elements into something new entirely.²⁰² This process of transformation depends on the interaction of rhetorics and elements with one another. An ecological framework of transformation emphasizes "the symbiotic nature of texts, including the way texts, events, and feelings influence or 'contaminate' one another. . . . One single text or exigence cannot exist apart from its ecology any more than an animal or plant species can."²⁰³

Following a rhetorical ecologies framework, this section argues for an ecological understanding of neoliberalism. An ecological approach allows me to follow the presidents' neoliberalisms as they shift, affecting and being affected by BENM's other elements. When the monument's elements came into contact with the presidents' neoliberalisms, they transformed, their relations and connections altered, and were refigured according to these distinct modes of neoliberalism. Similarly, the differences between the presidents' neoliberalisms can be traced to various factors in the monument's ecology. The factor that I primarily attend to is the degree to which the relationships between the Coalition Tribes and land were included in the presidents' proclamations. A central claim of this essay is therefore that the presidents' divergent

neoliberalisms can be calibrated by the extent to which the Coalition Tribes' relationships with land factored into their proclamations. Where Obama explicitly acknowledged and valued the Coalition Tribes' relationships with the land as significant, Trump did not; this is in many ways the fundamental difference between these two iterations of BENM.

Both Timothy Morton and Rice describe the process of alteration and transformation within ecologies by using the metaphor of a virus. For Morton, the ecological thought is a "virus that infects all other areas of thinking."²⁰⁴ It is a way of thinking that spreads through everything we do, creeping "over other ideas until nowhere is left untouched" by it.²⁰⁵ As described by Rice, rhetorical processes "operate within a viral economy," meaning that the "intensity, force, and circulatory range of a rhetoric are always expanding through the mutations and new exposures attached to that given rhetoric, much like a virus."²⁰⁶ In other words, texts and rhetorics are not constrained by "the elements that comprise its rhetorical situation," but instead emerge "already infected" by other texts and rhetorics.²⁰⁷ Understanding ecological processes as viruses describes rhetorical elements where they cannot exist alone and unaffected. Thought of virally, ecological rhetorics spread through other rhetorics and rhetorical situations, transforming and changing one another as they come into contact.

Understood in terms of virus, interaction, and transformation, neoliberalism is an ecological concept, virally affecting and transforming everything with which it comes into contact.²⁰⁸ As Catherine Chaput writes, neoliberalism "moves from situation to situation, disregarding spatial boundaries between the political, economic, and cultural realms as well as their attendant modes of persuasion."²⁰⁹ As rhetorical scholars commonly use the term, neoliberalism is generally understood as a set of discourses and ideologies in which the economic is applied to other areas of life.²¹⁰ In one such study, Jen Schneider and her co-authors

refer to neoliberalism in three ways, writing that neoliberalism is: 1), “a set of economic and social policies that attempt to significantly alter relationships between markets and the state;” 2), “a set of ideologies or belief systems;” and 3), “a set of discourses and a normative organizing rationality.”²¹¹ Increasingly, scholars are attending to the intersections of neoliberalism and the environment, considering biophysical issues such as climate change, resource management, or energy production.²¹²

However, neoliberalism should not be thought of as simply the enactment of economic policies or regulations upon noneconomic domains. As Chaput writes, neoliberalism “cannot be adequately traced through political policies and economic results.”²¹³ Instead, following Michel Foucault, Chaput tells us that “neoliberalism operates through a biopolitics that emerges simultaneously at multiple points and that gives an organic coherency to myriad life practices. So conceived, neoliberalism governs our everyday activities through an embodied habituation.”²¹⁴ In the case at hand, neoliberalism works through biophysical means, the monument’s elements becoming the mechanism through which BENM’s boundaries were changed. This understanding of neoliberalism follows Foucault’s claim that neoliberalism is “a method of thought, a grid of economic and sociological analysis.”²¹⁵ Neoliberalism is, in other words, a rationality—a set of governing structures—that regulates “the sayable, intelligible, and the truth criteria” of noneconomic domains via the biophysical.²¹⁶ More than economic policy, neoliberal discourses and practices recast the relationships between material rhetorical elements.

Since neoliberalism works through the biophysical, this means that neoliberalism can be traced back to the material practices through which it operates. As Rosaleen Duffy reminds us, such tracing draws “out [neoliberalism’s] complexities and unevenness,” and reveals that neoliberalism is often “ascribed with greater powers and coherence than it really has.”²¹⁷ That is,

neoliberalism can be resisted; it is not necessarily an overpowering hegemonic force. At BENM, the material life of neoliberalism can be tracked through a genealogy of the boundaries as they moved, following the ecologies of objects, people, and land.

As shown by the presidents' different BENMs, the material traces of neoliberalism change according to how various relationships between the monument's elements figure in the ecology and how the network of protection changes. One prominent element is the Coalition Tribes' relationships with land. In order to understand the relationships the Coalition Tribes have with the land at Bears Ears, and their influences on the presidential proclamations and neoliberalisms, it is necessary to discuss the ways in which the Coalition articulates these relationships. I will do this primarily through the Coalition's explanation of Traditional Knowledge (TK).

Traditional Knowledge, Ecology, and the Coalition

The land of Bears Ears is sacred to many of the region's Native people and holds places and sites intrinsic to their cultures, faiths, and histories. Bears Ears is named after a pair of distinctive buttes rising above the landscape, said to resemble the ears of a bear. These buttes are so distinctive that, in "every language of every Native culture in the region, this horizon-defining feature translates as 'Bears Ears.'"²¹⁸ For the Coalition, the "most profound aspect of Bears Ears is the Native presence that has blended into every cliff and corner."²¹⁹ Because of their long presence on the land, Coalition Tribes have thousands of years of stewardship experience.²²⁰ The Coalition Tribes' ties to and relationships with the land are centrally important to their proposal and were the primary reasons the Coalition petitioned for the monument's creation.²²¹

As discussed in Chapter Two, UDB began an ethnographic study of the land's cultural resources in 2010 in anticipation of working with SJC on the PLI. After it became clear that USB

was unwelcome within the PLI, the collected data played a crucial part in the Coalition's BENM proposal, serving as a "primary authoritative source for the purpose of determining the proper boundaries of the proposed Bears Ears National Monument."²²² UDB's "cultural mapping," a technique of ethnographically mapping the landscape, works to center Native conceptions of land and to communicate the relationships between people, land, and objects through a perspective of Traditional Knowledges.²²³ Indigenous ways of seeing land, as Tiara Na'puti writes, offer "practices that address colonial mappings of land, bodies, and lives."²²⁴ Cultural mapping challenges the dominant, western-centric ways of understanding Bears Ears, articulating the land as primarily significant because of the relationships between land and people, and the Knowledges produced from these relationships. As many scholars note, the Knowledges of many Indigenous peoples form a crucial part of their relationships between themselves and their lands.²²⁵ Common among many Indigenous peoples' Knowledges is kinship with land and the web of relationships within a particular locality.²²⁶

When the Coalition refers to their Tribes' Knowledges, they use the umbrella term of "Traditional Knowledge" (TK). The Coalition's descriptions of TK are similar to the descriptions Indigenous scholars Marie Battiste and James Henderson give to wide bodies of Knowledge held by Indigenous peoples:

Perhaps the closest one can get to describing unity in Indigenous knowledge is that knowledge is the expression of the vibrant relationships between people, their ecosystems, and other living beings and spirits that share their lands. . . . All aspects of knowledge are interrelated and cannot be separated from the traditional territories of the people concerned.²²⁷

The Coalition writes that TK is “derived from keen observation carried out and passed down over hundreds or thousands of years. It represents another way of knowing the social and ecological landscape.”²²⁸ TK is intrinsically tied to Bears Ears, with each Tribal Nation holding their own distinct knowledges. Deborah McGregor further explains that Indigenous Knowledges such as TK are “much more than knowledge.”²²⁹ According to McGregor, these Knowledges are inextricable from the people who hold and practice them, the land, and the environment; they are “*a single integrated whole*.”²³⁰ TK is thus not only epistemological but is also ontological, inseparable from the people who hold it and practice it as well as the land and ecosystems with which those people live. The relationships that the Coalition Tribes have with this land form a central part of their proposal, and any understanding of BENM should take these relationships and their articulations through TK into account. Any other perspective on BENM loses sight of what makes this monument unique: the continuous, strong, and ubiquitous Indigenous presence on the land.

Presidential Proclamations, Antiquities Act, Ecologies, Neoliberalisms

Within the presidents’ neoliberal ecologies, the relationality of multiple elements changed. Land, people, and objects were all seen in new ways as the connections between the Antiquities Act, Tribal Knowledges and ties to land, tourism, recreation, and the protection of “historical, cultural, and scientific resources” related to neoliberalism in divergent ways. The shifting circumstances of these elements all factored into the movement of BENM’s boundaries, which shrank as relationships between the elements changed and some elements became more or less important to each president. Put differently, the neoliberal ecologies worked as the presidents understood BENM’s elements within new sets of relations, shifting both the primary objects and subjects of their different monuments.

The Antiquities Act was able to bound two different monuments because both presidents held BENM's elements to different standards of relationality. The Act requires that a monument's boundaries be limited to the smallest area possible for the proper protection of its objects. As shown by the competing proclamations, this requirement makes the Act's scope a fluid concept, as what exactly constitutes the "smallest area" is undefined. The law leaves this open to interpretation, authorizing the president to create national monuments and delineate boundaries "in his discretion."²³¹ The relationships between the monument's elements hinged precariously upon the imprecision of this phrase, because the essential difference between the competing proclamations is that where Obama saw the relationships the Coalition Tribes have with the land as the primary object of protection, Trump saw a set of discrete objects—ancient dwellings, panels of rock art—as the only locatable things worthy of protection. In Trump's BENM, the land's connections to the Coalition Tribes was no longer the primary object of protection. Trump never acknowledged that BENM was proposed and designated to protect the ways in which Coalition Tribes use the land and objects, their spiritual connections to the land, and the ways in which their "history lies within the landscape."²³² While Obama's proclamation was intended to honor and protect these connections the Coalition Tribes have with the land, this idea never entered into Trump's reasoning.²³³

The Antiquities Act of 1906 was passed due to concerns in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries over the looting of Native American "antiquities," or artifacts like pots and baskets, and the destruction of ancestral sites, such as graves and homes. While the Act has generally been associated with the protection of Native American archaeological sites, historian Hal Rothman argues that it is much more flexible, able to protect other things. As Rothman writes, "the Antiquities Act allowed the preservation of different pasts—archaeological, natural,

historical, as well as differing aspects of each of these categories. Its amorphous nature gave it a significance that belies its narrow title.”²³⁴

The Antiquities Act can thus be used to protect objects that do not fit within a narrow category of “antiquities.” BENM, as proposed by the Coalition and bounded by Obama, protected non-antiquities objects. These versions of BENM are similar to the more-common landscape-scale monument, or a monument that protects the landscape itself. Such landscape-scale designations have generally been upheld by the court system.²³⁵ The difference between most landscape monuments and BENM is that the Coalition and Obama framed the relationships the Coalition Tribes have to the land as the primary object of protection.

Though landscape-scale monuments have existed for a long time, Obama’s BENM and implementation of the Antiquities Act was unorthodox, effectively expanding the Act’s temporal reach.²³⁶ As it is typically used, the Act aligns with Charles Wilkinson’s thesis of “conquest by certitude,” which argues that, as James Rasband summarizes, “Americans were sure about what was the best use of the public lands and what was best for the Indian tribes who dwelled there.”²³⁷ White men came to the Southwest and, confident they knew best, arranged the protection of such areas with no input from Indigenous peoples, who were “relegated to the sidelines.”²³⁸

What made BENM different was the Coalition’s approach to its protection from the perspectives of their Traditional Knowledges. Obama, largely following their lead, established a BENM that centered Indigenous understandings of the land, writing that the “traditional ecological knowledge amassed by the Native Americans whose ancestors inhabited this region . . . offers critical insight into the historic and scientific significance of the area. Such knowledge is, itself, a resource to be protected.”²³⁹ Wilkinson argues that the purpose of Obama’s proclamation

is to honor the land, the Tribes, and the Tribes' relationships with the land.²⁴⁰ The Coalition agreed, writing that Obama's proclamation "alludes to, and honors, Native people in a respectful manner. . . . Obama created the Bears Ears National Monument to honor Indian Tribes (both past and present), the land, and the relationship between the Tribes and the land."²⁴¹

BENM's primary object of protection—and primary subject—changed according to how each president positioned it in relation to the other elements of the monument's ecology. Obama's proclamation created a BENM that included the relationships of the Coalition and land as an object protected by the Act. However, Obama's neoliberalism excised a large amount of land—and therefore sites and things that the Coalition has ties to—from figuring as part of this object of protection. Additionally, Obama included other things, such as recreation, flora, fauna, geological, and paleontological resources, to the calculus of protection. These additions shifted the protection priorities, with BENM becoming a monument that protected more than Tribes' ties to land. Trump's shrinking of the monument was essentially a bid to reframe the object of protection at Bears Ears, largely ignoring the Coalition's call for the protection of their Tribes' relationships with land. Instead, Trump refigured the discourses surrounding BENM, arguing that Obama protected too much by including landscapes, geological formations, plants, and animals within the Antiquities Act's scope.²⁴² As Trump writes, "the area of Federal land reserved in the Bears Ears National Monument established by [Obama] is not confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management" of the region's significant objects.²⁴³ As a result, Trump's neoliberalism cut more acreage from the monument and reframed BENM's object of protection as some of the places and sites that the Coalition has ties to rather than the relationships themselves. Most importantly, Trump's proclamation makes no mention of the Coalition Tribes' relationship to the land as an object that can be protected under

the Act, the Tribes' no longer BENM's primary subject. How the presidents' defined BENM's primary object of protection is the central difference between their iterations, with the Coalition's relationships with land occupying a central role in this debate.

Obama's Proclamation: The Creation of BENM

Although Obama's proclamation clearly intended to protect the connections the Coalition Tribes have with the land, he did not protect these relationships in the same manner as the Coalition proposed, and so the boundaries shrank. Obama, changing the monument's calculus, cut half a million acres from the original proposal and removed many objects and places from protection. Obama simultaneously made the relationships between Tribes' and land the primary object of his BENM's protection while also including elements that did not much factor in the Coalition's proposal, such as recreation, paleontological resources, and specific species of plants and animals. Finally, his proclamation did not establish true collaborative management of the monument. The insertion of other protection priorities was accomplished through the changing of relationships in the neoliberal ecology, where the concession of land to economic concerns is figured through the shift in protection priorities.

Obama's proclamation thus changes the focus of what should be protected at BENM, the ties of people to land no longer the only consideration. The addition of elements to BENM is a further justification for the region, a concession that, alone, the ties between the Coalition and the land was not reason enough to protect the area. For example, Obama names objects like the land's topography, vegetation, animal populations, geological formations, and the "star-filled nights and natural quiet" of the region as reasons that it warrants national monument status.²⁴⁴ The "world class" recreation opportunities found here "support a growing travel and tourism sector that is a source of economic opportunity for the region," and finally, protecting the region

will ensure that these significant objects “remain for the benefit of all Americans.”²⁴⁵ Obama’s proclamation added to BENM considerations outside the Coalition’s proposal, considering economic factors as part of the equation. Seeing BENM through a neoliberal lens, Obama’s proclamation cut acreage for extractive industry and included economic interests like tourism and recreation as specific reasons BENM should be created. The monument’s ecology was altered through the neoliberal shifting of relationalities: no longer only for the connections of Indigenous people to land, BENM encompassed a wider range of things and a smaller area of land.

The question remains, then, of why the Coalition deemed Obama’s BENM acceptable. One reason may be that, although his BENM was substantially different from the one the Coalition proposed, Obama still largely kept the Coalition’s understanding of the monument intact, centering their Tribes as BENM’s primary subject. Even though Obama cut acreage and added factors to the calculus of protection, his proclamation nevertheless designated a monument that mostly followed the Coalition’s vision of BENM protecting the relationships between people and land. Understanding these relationships to be the most important aspect of the monument, Obama implemented the Antiquities Act in a way that included the relationships as an object of protection. The focus on people and land was also a significant factor in how much BENM changed, as the ties between people and land worked to restrict the changes possible in this neoliberal ecology.

Obama’s proclamation made the relationships of the Coalition Tribes and the land relevant as an object of the Act’s protection in three ways. First, he established BENM as a cultural landscape, an area of significance *in toto*, valuable first and foremost because of its sacred significance to Coalition Tribes. Second, Obama recognized that this land has been in

continuous use for generations. Finally, Obama built on this last point to extend the temporal reach of the Antiquities Act to protect Tribal relationships with land. In sum, Obama's proclamation affirmed the strong relationships the Coalition Tribes have with this land and the specific sites, objects, and histories it contains.

Obama's proclamation begins by noting that the land of BENM constitutes "one of the densest and most significant cultural landscapes in the United States."²⁴⁶ Within this landscape are objects such as "rock art, ancient cliff dwellings, ceremonial sites, and countless other artifacts" that, while providing an "extraordinary archaeological and cultural record that is important to us all," most notably speaks to the profoundly sacred nature of the land to many Native Americans.²⁴⁷ Weaving together past and present, Obama describes a landscape that tells a cultural history of the region and its people. Using this history to structure his proclamation, Obama constructs a monument understood as a testament to the relationships the Coalition Tribes have with the land.

Obama bounded BENM with the understanding that it is a continually used landscape. Objects are not protected as singular items, stuck in a static past and signaling a prior importance with little meaning for the present. Instead, the ties between ancient objects and contemporary people are strengthened through land use. As their ancestors did, Tribal members perform ceremonies, collect firewood and herbs, and visit sacred sites.²⁴⁸ Obama offers the example of how Moki steps, "hand and toe holds carved into steep canyon walls" by Ancestral Puebloans, who began to occupy the area approximately 2,500 years ago—are still actively used today to access cliff dwellings.²⁴⁹ Many landscape features like Comb Ridge, the San Juan River, and Cedar Mesa, all of which are "closely tied to native stories of creation, danger, protection, and healing," show that the land is profoundly sacred to the Coalition Tribes.²⁵⁰ Everyday objects

that abound in the region, such as baskets, pottery, weapons, and the remains of dwellings, granaries, ceremonial sites, and kivas are every bit as important spiritually and culturally as spectacular places like the House on Fire dwelling.²⁵¹ Much like the difficult to recognize but still visible roads that connect ancient village sites to one another, it is the cultural and sacred significance of the land that connects objects to people and their histories, strengthening the ties between people and land.

In addition to demonstrating the many contemporary uses of the land, Obama's proclamation brings the Antiquities Act into the present day. As written, law professor Rebecca Tsosie says, the Act is "completely unresponsive to tribal concerns," focused as it is on the archaeological and anthropological concerns of white westerners.²⁵² However, it is also true that Obama's proclamation notes that the Coalition Tribes still need and use these lands, and extending the Act "to contemporary people. . . . [Obama's proclamation] doesn't freeze anything in the past."²⁵³ For this reason the Coalition itself acknowledged that Obama was not completely unresponsive to their needs. Indeed, they wrote that Obama's proclamation "is not locked in the past: it acknowledges contributions of both our ancestors and Native Americans today."²⁵⁴ Obama's Antiquities Act was calibrated to the circulation of contemporary objects and was used to protect a large monument and a cultural landscape thick with relationality. Rather than a silencing of Indigenous voices, Obama's use of the Act codifies the Coalition Tribes' understandings of land in law. In Obama's proclamation, the Act's temporal purview was extended through the rhetorical interaction between land use, people, and objects.

This use of the Act recognizes the relationships the Coalition Tribes have with the land, a point made clear by the management directives Obama gives for the monument. The proclamation directs the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to consult the Tribes in order

to ensure the protection of sacred Native sites, as well as to provide Tribe members access to the sites for “traditional cultural and customary uses” consistent with existing law.²⁵⁵ As previously discussed, though in a manner different from the Coalition’s proposed system of collaborative management, Obama included the Coalition Tribes in the monument’s management and directly acknowledged the importance of “tribal expertise and traditional and historical knowledge.”²⁵⁶ To ensure their participation, a Tribal commission was created to “provide guidance and recommendations on the development and implementation of management plans and on management of the monument,” fulfilling one of the Coalition’s requests.²⁵⁷ Through these provisions, Obama extended the scope of the Antiquities Act to explicitly include Coalition Tribes’ Knowledges and ways of seeing land and objects, thereby protecting—to a degree—the Coalitions relationships with the land.

Trump’s Proclamation: The Reduction of BENM

Trump’s proclamation refigures the relationality of BENM’s elements, reshaping discourses about the monument to emphasize new ways of understanding the relations between people, land, objects, and histories. In particular, Trump refigured the extent to which the Coalition’s relationships with the land mattered as a reason for BENM’s existence. Put clearly, for Trump, these relationships did not matter at all. Trump’s proclamation opened the lands he removed back up for use by extractive industry, a clear example of accommodating economic activity at the expense of conservation.²⁵⁸ Additionally, Trump’s BENM was bounded around objects that lend themselves to tourism, making BENM’s primary subject the outsider. The objects protected by Trump are highly visible and accessible, making Trump’s BENM a set of objects disassociated from Tribes, Knowledges, land, and histories. Instead of protecting objects because they are important to Indigenous people, Trump’s proclamation sets significant objects

in new relationships, seeing them from the outsider's point of view. That is, Trump's proclamation protects objects that would immediately stand out to someone unfamiliar with the Bears Ears landscape, passing over and largely ignoring less-visible or less-prominent objects. Trump altered the discourses surrounding BENM, making the monument a place where Tribes' relationships with land no longer figured as an object of protection. To accomplish this refiguration, Trump argued against Obama's protection of landscapes, geological formations, flora, and fauna. Trump's reasoning relies on his understanding of the "proper" scope of the Antiquities Act; in his interpretation, the Act cannot protect these kind of things. In Trump's neoliberal ecology, objects—with a new set of relations to people, the Coalition, histories, and land—intersect with an implementation of the Act which sees things in a static past.

Trump's implementation of the Antiquities Act followed the recommendations of then-Secretary of the Interior Ryan Zinke, who wrote that "Proper use of the Act should specifically identify the 'historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest,' and the quantity of land necessary to protect each object, if any."²⁵⁹ In this report, Zinke recommended that BENM be modified in order to satisfy the Act's purpose and to "ensure compliance with the provisions and intent of the Act."²⁶⁰ Trump's proclamation follows this advice, noting that the Act requires "any reservation of land . . . be confined to the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects" to be protected, and that determining which objects should be protected involves "a number of factors, including the uniqueness and nature of the objects, the nature of the needed protection, and the protection provided by other laws."²⁶¹ According to Trump, some of the objects included in Obama's proclamation "are not unique to the monument," are not "of significant scientific or historic interest," or are not "under threat of damage or destruction."²⁶² To ensure that BENM followed

his interpretation of the Act, Trump shrank the boundaries.²⁶³ The Coalition Tribes' relationships to the land were not considered by Trump to be significant, unique, or under enough threat.

Indeed, Trump never mentions these relationships.

Trump's proclamation makes two references to the land's cultural importance to Native Americans.²⁶⁴ Both come in the context of the Bears Ears buttes after which the monument is named and that Trump considers to be "the heart of the monument."²⁶⁵ Trump makes no mention of the strong ties Coalition Tribes have to the land as a reason to protect the area, instead largely ignoring the land's cultural and sacred significance. By ignoring the relationships Coalition Tribes have with land, Trump's proclamation serves to render Native people "relics of the past, thus absent from (and logically, silent in) the present, and irrelevant to the future."²⁶⁶ For example, Trump's proclamation questions the ancestral lineage of rock art panels found throughout the region. Trump notes that the earliest art is attributable to the Ancestral Puebloans, while more recent art was made by the Ute people who still live in the region. At another point, recent rock art—left behind by Navajo, Ute, and Paiute peoples—is contrasted with older art "attributed to the Ancestral Puebloan people."²⁶⁷ In Trump's narrative, the present-day Tribes came to occupy the area of BENM several centuries after these Ancestral Puebloans. Here Trump implies that much of this art was not actually left by the Coalition Tribes' ancestors—by specifically naming the Tribes that advocated for the monument, he is explicitly contrasting them from those peoples who left many of these objects behind. This narrative of rock art history implies the question of why the Coalition considers these objects to be significant if it was not their ancestors who left the objects behind.

Trump's proclamation reshapes the discourses surrounding the relationships the Coalition Tribes have to the land by dismissing reports by the Coalition of significant objects throughout

the entirety of Bears Ears. Cultural resource maps provided by both the Coalition and the US government show that the entirety of BENM contains sites of cultural significance. However, while maps provided by the Coalition show culturally significant sites covering the originally proposed 1.9 million acres, federal maps show only sites contained within Trump's modified boundaries.²⁶⁸ Though the spread of objects does not just stop outside the modified monument's borders, Trump's boundaries seem to align with archaeological sites within the Bears Ears region that have been inventoried. That is, the modified borders match up fairly well with those archaeological sites that have been officially documented by the State of Utah. There are two significant problems with this. First, the Utah Division of State History estimates that only eight to nine percent of BENM (as bounded by Obama) has been inventoried. While this percentage contains an impressive 8,480 sites (again in Obama's boundaries), it has been estimated that there are at least 100,000 sites total within the Bears Ears region.²⁶⁹ Second, these kinds of official classification do not account for "sacred or spiritually-related places. . . . the number of these places is undetermined at present."²⁷⁰ In other words, many of the places and objects significant to Coalition Tribes are not even officially documented by the State of Utah. By bounding his monument to align with inventoried sites cataloged by professional archaeologists, Trump's proclamation dismisses the importance of other areas named by the Coalition.

Rather than understanding BENM as a landscape where ancient objects continue to be used and appreciated in everyday life, Trump's proclamation does not protect the ties of people to land. Trump's BENM is a place where ancestral sites are evaluated by a metric seemingly based on convenience, and features objects that are near paved roads, easily accessible, clearly visible, well-known by outsiders, and officially documented. Trump's proclamation offers a fundamentally different way of seeing the land that does not need the historic, cultural, and

present-day Knowledges that are lived by the Coalition Tribes in order to understand why the landscape is an important and significant place worthy of protection, thereby changing the relationality of BENM as articulated by the Coalition and followed by Obama.

Trump consistently prioritized for inclusion in his boundaries highly visible and easily accessible objects. The House on Fire site, for example, is said to be “scenic and accessible,” a fact which I discovered last summer is true. The trail to the site is an easy hike, fairly short, well-marked, and not over difficult terrain. Newspaper Rock, a panel of rock art that Trump specifically notes is on the National Register of Historic Places, is said to be a “popular” attraction.²⁷¹ However, perhaps the most significant feature of Trump’s description is that Newspaper Rock is easily accessible—it is near a paved road. The accessibility of objects and sites is an important consideration when examining Trump’s BENM, as many of the sites he lists are places that are popular hiking destinations or are accessible by car. One can imagine that, in Obama’s 1.35-million-acre monument, many areas considered significant were not easily accessible by car or foot (many parts of Bears Ears do not have roads, paved or otherwise).

Other examples of rock art are given only brief attention, Trump merely stating that the Indian Creek unit contains “numerous other significant rock art sites,” never mind that rock art is to be found throughout the majority of the Bears Ears landscape.²⁷² The sites Trump mentions include “the distinctive and well-preserved petroglyphs in Shay Canyon.”²⁷³ This canyon, located roughly two miles from Newspaper Rock, is also just off the highway. Other objects described by Trump throughout the proclamation share these characteristics, often noted to be accessible, or implied to be so by relating that “visitors can see” them.²⁷⁴ Rather than protecting objects because of their connection to the Coalition Tribes, Trump fashions the discourses

surrounding their importance through the visitor, the outsider. Objects are only important if they are seen, and Trump's proclamation values only very limited ways of seeing.

Refiguring the landscape and objects in terms of the outsider, or tourist, is a distinctly neoliberal mode. As Rosaleen Duffy argues,

One of the main processes through which nature can be reconfigured through tourism is via commodification. This involves the creation of economic value from landscapes, animals and experiences. One of the core justifications for nature-based tourism is that nature can be conserved or saved because of its 'market value', and hence it can be commodified.²⁷⁵

Trump's proclamation never mentions the economy, tourism, or recreation, noting only that the lands he removed were opened back up for sale, mineral leasing, mining, and other such uses. And yet, his bounding of BENM included only those highly visible and accessible objects while ignoring the more intangible object of the Coalition Tribes' relationships to land. By ensuring the protection of objects that were unique, accessible, or well-known to outsiders, Trump made his monument one that is an inventory of discrete, singular objects, valuable because they stand out from the rest of the landscape. Most importantly, bounding BENM in this way suggests that the land and its worth can be known without the Coalition's Traditional Knowledges. Trump's monument shifted as BENM's elements were put into new relationalities; rather than protecting the Tribes' relationships with land, Trump protected other relations. The bounding of BENM without the perspective of TK is the mode of the tourist, that subject "who embodies a detached" pose, experiencing the past and the places they visit as a consumer.²⁷⁶ Tourists "*visit* sites where they do not live, they are outsiders to the daily practices of life in tourist destinations."²⁷⁷ The relationships between Tribes and land never figures in Trump's proclamation, allowing for a

neoliberal mode more able to transform the land's relationality. Trump's neoliberal ecology figures BENM as a landscape to be consumed by people other than the Coalition Tribes. That is, BENM became a place where sites like House on Fire or the Bears Ears buttes were protected without reckoning with Indigenous understandings of those sites.

Conclusion

As this genealogy of BENM's boundaries shows, neoliberalism operated by shifting the relationalities of the monument's elements. In this chapter, I argued that neoliberalism should be thought of ecologically. The ways in which objects' relationships were modified in the presidents' proclamations are key to my ecological understanding of neoliberalism. At the center of my analysis are the ways in which BENM's primary objects and subjects were configured by Obama and then by Trump. As these objects circulated within the presidents' neoliberal ecologies, Obama and Trump found divergent articulations to the Antiquities Act. Though the presidents ultimately came to different conclusions about how best to draw BENM's boundaries and what objects to protect, neoliberalism, in both proclamations, influenced the logic through which the monument's ecology was transformed and the boundaries were moved. In this case, neoliberalism worked through biophysical means to refigure the relationships between BENM's elements.

The biophysical life of neoliberalism is thus able to be traced by its articulations with land, Tribes, the Antiquities Act, objects, economic concerns like tourism and extractive industry, and the changing protection priorities given to BENM by both presidents. This holds implications for our understanding of neoliberalism. Bloomfield encourages communicators to emphasize the actors that influence the way the economy functions as a means of shifting "focus onto those who can be held responsible for markets' efforts," a move which "may also

deemphasize the autonomous power of markets.”²⁷⁸ Recalling Duffy, following the human proponents of neoliberal rhetorics helps us decenter neoliberalism’s hegemonic power by uncovering how neoliberal ideologies marketize other areas of life.²⁷⁹ Similarly, following the material and biophysical elements through which neoliberalism operates can give us good insight into the ways neoliberal rhetorics shift the relations of a given rhetorical situation. An ecological understanding of neoliberalism describes how neoliberal discourses incorporate biophysical elements, altering our understandings of these things.

What BENM protected changed as the neoliberal ecologies rearticulated the monument. The organization of BENM’s relationships within the ecology was in near-constant fluctuation, with the monument protecting different things as neoliberal rhetorics rearticulated the monument’s relationships. Obama and Trump prioritized two completely different sets of relationships, and the circulation of these relationships led to the bounding of two very different monuments. This last point implicates new understandings for rhetorical studies’ use of ecology. BENM’s rhetorical elements open up room to engage with ecological traditions that could reframe rhetoric’s understanding of environmentalism, the protection of land, and neoliberalism. For example, the Coalition’s articulations of Bears Ears and land as a set of relationships offers one such frame.

I want to build on this observation to briefly sketch a final implication. Though the primary focus of this chapter was the presidents’ proclamations and boundings of BENM, the Coalition’s understandings of Bears Ears was a crucial component of the monument. Significantly, the Coalition Tribes’ ecological traditions seem resistant to the governing logics of neoliberalism, as seen by these Knowledges’ effects on Obama’s BENM. Though Obama’s monument was clearly affected by neoliberal logics, his choice to make the Coalition Tribes’

relationships with the land a central feature of his BENM seems to have reduced the effects of his neoliberal ecology. The Traditional Knowledges held and practiced by the Coalition Tribes made BENM unique, constituting a monument that protected the continuous, deep, and ubiquitous Indigenous presence on the land. When the calculus of protection changed so that these relationships no longer factored in the same manner, Bears Ears' boundaries changed accordingly.

**Chapter Four: Transforming Relationships, or what Bears Ears National Monument
Teaches us about Rhetoric and Colonialism.**

On January 5, 2017, Utah Senator Mike Lee spoke on the Senate floor denouncing then-president Barack Obama's recent creation of Bears Ears National Monument (BENM) in southeast Utah. In virtually the same breath, the Republican senator argued that Obama had "abused" his executive authority under the Antiquities Act (the statute used to create national monuments), that "locals" did not want the monument, and condemned the "uber-rich environmentalists" who were able to "essentially buy" BENM. Of tangential importance, at least to Lee's mind, was the Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, a group of five Native American tribal nations who were the monument's primary advocates. Indeed, the Coalition mattered so little to Lee that he dismissed the group as nothing more than the pawns of the "radical, wealthy, environmental organizations" who had for so long desired another national monument in Utah. Even though he admitted that the Coalition was "the most prominent Native American group" to advocate for BENM, the most important fact about the Coalition, for Lee, is that "most of its members reside outside of Utah." The residency of the Coalition's members mattered to Lee because, in his estimation, the land that encompassed BENM was Utah's land, land to which the Coalition thus had no claim.²⁸⁰

While Lee, as a senator from Utah, has a duty to advocate on behalf of his constituents, this speech is more than advocacy for Utahns. Lee's speech also indicates a particular kind of relationship to land, one which is grounded in the logics and rhetorical strategies of settler colonialism. In this chapter, I examine two speeches by Lee that demonstrate the extent of his colonial understandings of land and Indigenous relationships. In both speeches, I argue, Lee frames Native American relationships to Bears Ears within the logics of settler colonialism.

These logics allow Lee to place the Coalition as outside Bears Ears' sphere of concern and the Coalition's relationships to land as outside the state of Utah.

When Bears Ears, land, and people are understood in terms of relationship, the Coalition has a claim to the land at Bears Ears that precedes the state of Utah. The Coalition explains that Bears Ears is ancestral land to the people of their five Tribes, and is a landscape that they hold to be profoundly sacred.²⁸¹ While Bears Ears is today within the state of Utah, former Coalition Co-Chair Eric Descheenie (Navajo) explains that "We don't see Bears Ears in terms of state lines."²⁸² Put differently, the Coalition's ancestral claim to Bears Ears exists otherwise to the colonial logics that provide Utah's claim to the land.²⁸³ For the Coalition, their claims to Bears Ears did not stop because they are named as outsiders, or non-residents of Utah. Instead, whenever the Coalition talked about Bears Ears, they always figured their rhetoric in terms of their Tribes' relationships with the land.

Lee's arguments about Utah land and Coalition members' residency are steeped in settler logics of the relationships between land and people. By defining relationship to land through an appeal to state boundaries, Lee participates in what Mary Stuckey and John Murphy call "rhetorical colonialism," a colonial project which "undermines the political and cultural influence of Native Americans and asserts control over their lands and resources."²⁸⁴ Stuckey and Murphy describe rhetorical colonialism, in part, through the drawing of state boundaries and the naming of land, two practices which articulate the land as settler land. To further justify placing the Coalition's relationships to land as outside of Utah, Lee figures other Native Americans—what he terms the "local Utah Navajo"—as those Native people who have a proper claim to and relationship with Bears Ears. These Navajo are made "local" through the same

colonial logics that displace the Coalition. Put differently, for Lee, Native American relationships to land are only relevant when determined by colonial logics.

The acquisition and retention of land is settler colonialism's governing imperative, that which Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang argue is the most important thing for settler colonialism, the thing "most valuable, contested, required."²⁸⁵ To accomplish the acquisition of land, settler colonialism eliminates the land's Indigenous inhabitants. As Patrick Wolfe writes, from the settler perspective, Native Americans "obstructed the expansion of settlement" and so "no effort was spared to eliminate them."²⁸⁶ Rhetorically, this elimination is accomplished by remaking the relationships that Indigenous people have to land, framing them through a settler lens. I focus on two specific rhetorical strategies of removal in this chapter: assimilation and removal. Removal is when Indigenous people are taken from their lands by force—made absent physically, culturally, and spiritually. Land with no one inhabiting it became "free" land, available for settlement. Assimilation, on the other hand, attempts to dissolve Indigenous identity within the larger settler mainstream.

Absence is thus the central rhetorical goal of settler colonialism. Put differently, settler colonialism makes the land a place marked by the absence of the Indigenous person: to accomplish its goal, settler colonialism removes the Indigenous body, the contact that person has with the land, and attempts to hinder the ability of that person to relate with the land through spiritual, cultural, ecological, and historical knowledges. As a structure that dominates through removal of Indigenous peoples from the land, settler colonialism is a regime of control over Native American bodies, cultures, and beliefs.²⁸⁷

Settler colonialism's governing of bodies is directly relevant to the work of rhetoricians. If rhetorical studies is to commit to "resisting forms of dominance such as white supremacy,"

Karma Chávez writes we must “grapple with bodies.”²⁸⁸ Rhetoricians must indeed grapple with bodies, but what to do when those bodies have been made absent? That is, how does rhetorical studies commit to resistance when the objective of particular forms of dominance is to render the dominated bodies missing? Further complicating matters, rhetoric has played a prominent role in settler colonialism. Indeed, Michael Lechuga writes that US American rhetoric, “as a logic of territoriality,” has been leveraged by settler colonialism to “facilitate the material arrangement of ideological power on lands and bodies.”²⁸⁹ Put differently, rhetoric is a “communication practice that organizes people and materials (especially land) to serve the needs of a settlement. . . . [and which] produces and circulates narrative forms that foreclose a postsettler future by reproducing the same sets of relationships between bodies, lands, and power both in our research practices . . . and in our pedagogies.”²⁹⁰ Rhetorical studies, it seems, needs to grapple with bodies of both flesh and literature, both the Indigenous bodies physically and symbolically removed from land and also the metaphorical body of rhetoric that has helped further the ends of settler colonialism.

In this chapter, I examine the different relationships that the Coalition and Mike Lee associate with land to make a two-pointed critique. First, I show how the meanings given to land in the Coalition’s advocacy for BENM articulate a notion of sovereignty and resistance to settler colonialism’s efforts in making their peoples absent from ancestral land. Second, I want to further implicate rhetoric’s role in colonialism and offer lessons learned from the Coalition’s rhetorics as a possible way forward. In offering this twin critique, I forward a notion of rhetoric that seeks to grapple with two sets of bodies, those physical bodies made absent by settler colonialism and the metaphorical body of rhetorical studies’ complicity in colonialism. Building from the work of Gabriela Rios, I advance land-based rhetorics as a way in which rhetorical studies may better engage with its colonial anatomy and as a way that the Coalition marks their

own claims to ancestral land. As Rìos writes, land-based rhetorics are those that recognize “the ways in which land can produce relations” and “the value of embodied ways of knowing.”²⁹¹ In centering land-based rhetorics, my goal is to show the ways in which these relations and ways of knowing appear in the Coalition’s advocacy. However, “land” does not always mean the same thing for all stakeholders; “land” changes meanings, and those shifting meanings are used to both further the goals of settler colonialism and to also resist the colonial project.

My analysis moves in two parts. First, I analyze two speeches by Utah senator Mike Lee. These speeches, about public lands and BENM, perfectly encapsulate the rhetorical strategies of settler colonialism. In my critique, I pay particularly close attention to the meanings that Lee gives to “land”; the meanings he assigns to land, I argue, are one of the primary ways that Lee’s arguments—and thus settler colonialism—operate rhetorically. I use Lee’s speeches as examples of settler colonialism’s rhetorical strategies and the ways in which the Coalition’s Tribes have been rendered absent from their lands. Second, I examine the Coalition’s land-based rhetorics, using their articulations of land to make the two-pointed critique described above. Throughout, my central concerns are to examine the ways in which the changing meanings of “land” are used by both Lee and the Coalition to either advance or push back against the rhetorical strategies of settler colonialism, and to also further interrogate rhetoric’s colonial legacy. I begin with a brief history of settler colonialism in the Four Corners region of the Southwest.

Settler Colonialism and Techniques of Elimination

Settler colonialism employs multiple techniques to gain land and territory, what Wolfe refers to as “a range of strategies of elimination.”²⁹² In my analysis, I focus on two strategies, removal and assimilation. Ultimately, both of these strategies serve the same function: the elimination of Indigenous peoples in order to acquire land. I also contend that removal and

assimilation work rhetorically through rendering Indigenous bodies absent from land. Further, settler colonialism's techniques of elimination work by rhetorically restructuring the relationships that Indigenous people have to land. In the case of removal, Indigenous peoples are forcibly removed from land, the land reoriented through rhetorical processes into property, which makes land "ahistorical in order to hack away the narratives that invoke prior claims and thus reaffirm the myth of terra nullius."²⁹³ Assimilation, on the other hand, the "not necessarily homicidal dissolution of Native difference into the settler mainstream," is the attempt to "eliminate the obstruction presented by the persistence of Native sovereignties along with their attendant territorial claim."²⁹⁴ Settlers, moving onto Native peoples' lands, claimed those territories for themselves. Once a critical mass of land had been acquired, however, Indigenous peoples could only be pushed to different territory so many times and to so many different places. At a certain point in time, the settler project stopped being about the removal of Native populations from land in order to gain that land and instead became about assimilating Native populations into settler American culture, a process that also works through rhetorical means. Both strategies ultimately accomplish the same ends: the acquisition of land and the elimination of Indigenous bodies from that land.

The history of settler colonialism in southeast Utah (and the Four Corners region more broadly) clearly shows the mobilization of both removal and assimilation towards the region's Indigenous peoples. Though a full history is too long to engage here, I briefly discuss settler colonialism's dominance over the Navajo people as a representative example. Between August 1863 and the end of 1866, thousands of Navajo were forced to march from ancestral lands in present-day Arizona and Utah to Fort Sumner in what is now New Mexico. Commonly referred to as "The Long Walk," the journey was "not a walk. It was a forced march driven by harshness

and cruelty.”²⁹⁵ Nor was it a singular event; at least fifty-three separate episodes have been documented.²⁹⁶ Originally intended as a permanent relocation of the Navajo, the US government instead decided to let the Navajo return to parts of their ancestral lands with the 1868 Treaty of Bosque Redondo that created the Navajo reservation in present-day Arizona. As part of the treaty agreement, the US government required that the Navajo be incorporated into mainstream society in a number of ways, including that children aged six to sixteen be sent to school “In order to insure the civilization of the Indians,” and with the ability to “Select . . . a tract of land within said reservation, not exceeding one hundred and sixty acres in extent, which tract . . . shall cease to be held in common, but the same may be occupied and held in the exclusive possession of the person selecting it, and of his family.”²⁹⁷ The act of forcing Navajo to select a tract of 160 acres of land—the same amount given to settlers under the 1862 Homestead Act—is itself an act of assimilation, and was an attempt to make Indigenous relationships with land mirror settler relationships. The settler relationship with land as property is distinctly different to how Indigenous peoples often see land; Patrick Wolfe writes that “Property starts where Indianness stops.”²⁹⁸ As with all attempts at assimilation, the goal of rhetorically reconstructing Indigenous relationships to land is to erase the markers of difference between the settler and the Indigenous person.

Not only did the 1868 treaty attempt to make Indigenous relationships with land, the treaty only gave back to the Navajo those lands which were unwanted by settlers. The lands that the Navajo were allowed to return to were “as far out of the way of the whites, and of [whites’] future probable wants, as possible.”²⁹⁹ In other words, the lands that the Navajo were allowed to return to were those largely unwanted by white settlers; as Peter Iverson notes, there was widespread uncertainty during the 1860s and 1870s about the “economic promise of the

Southwest” in Congress, a fact to which he partially attributes the slowness with which Arizona, Utah, and New Mexico were admitted to the Union.³⁰⁰ As the economic needs of the region changed, however, so did the meaning of the land that became the Navajo Reservation; from lands that were considered almost worthless and as far out of white’s “future probable wants” as possible, Reservation lands became valued for energy production and the electrification of the Southwest. Indeed, Andrew Needham writes that the “power lines that ran between Phoenix and the Navajo Reservation intensified the structural inequalities that had long existed between city and countryside,” and that the terms of

energy production granted extensive control . . . to mining companies and electrical utilities. These terms were not merely the function of economics, they were political decisions reflecting the determination that metropolitan cities stood as the vital agent of postwar growth and the belief that Indian people possessed limited capacity to participate in contemporary economic life. Energy development granted the Navajos money, but left them with little meaningful power over the production occurring on their land once infrastructure was in place.³⁰¹

In sum, the US government sought to both remove—the forced marches—and assimilate—through being placed on a reservation and forced education—the Navajo people. Lee’s speeches perpetuate rhetorical techniques of both assimilation and removal.³⁰²

First Lee Speech: Opposition to BENM

In response to Obama’s late-December 2016 designation of BENM, Lee argued that the incoming Trump administration should undo Obama’s creation of the monument and relied on the concept of the “local” as his primary rhetorical strategy. In this speech, Lee positions the “local” as the valid subject of the land at Bears Ears, the only people who should have a say in

how that land is used. By giving the land meaning via the “local,” Lee is able to build an argument against BENM through three interconnecting warrants. First, “the local” allows him to advance a false history of San Juan County—and Utah more broadly—that centers harmony between Natives and settlers. Second, the concept allows Lee to argue that only certain Native Americans have claim to the land. Third, Lee claims that Settlers have as much right to the land as Native Americans. Throughout the speech, Lee positions the Coalition as “outsiders” who have no authentic claim to the land and thus no rightful voice in its management. Lee’s strategy allows him to move freely between Native American and settler “locals,” shifting the land’s subject while maintaining focus on the fact that it is location within manufactured boundaries that determines authority on land issues. As a settler colonial strategy, the “local” whitewashes the differences between settlers and Native Americans. Lee’s argument, based in logics of assimilation, assumes that settlers and Native Americans relate to land in the same ways.

Lee’s speech portrays the relationships between the settler and Indigenous peoples of SJC as harmonious, united in their common concern for the land. After Lee notes that the “local Navajo” have a “sacred duty” to care for the land, he claims that “the same is true in my own church,” indicating a care for the land that is as equally significant for Mormons as it is for Indigenous peoples. Combining both Navajo and settler residents, Lee claims that “the people of San Juan County understand” that if access to their land is taken from them, “it won’t be long before their culture begins to fade away.” In Lee’s telling, Natives and settlers are “Utahns . . . American patriots” who stand together in their common relationship to land.³⁰³ According to the historical record, however, the relationships between Indigenous peoples and settlers in southern Utah have largely been anything but harmonious. Conflict between settlers and Natives was common in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and, as Nancy Maryboy and David

Begay write, “Life . . . was often uneasy, with frequent hostilities among Navajo, Utes, Mormon settlers, other Anglo ranchers and homesteaders, and, increasingly, prospectors and miners.”³⁰⁴ In particular, conflicts over land were a specific point of contention. Clyde Benally, writing a history of Utah from a Navajo perspective in 1982, writes it gradually became clear to Navajos during the late nineteenth century that the Mormon settlers were competitors for their land.³⁰⁵ The struggle for land between Navajo and settler was so pronounced that, in 1946, Clyde Kluckhohn and Dorothea Leighton were able to write “From 1868 to the present, the persistent theme in Navajo history has been the struggle with the whites for land.”³⁰⁶ These struggles have continued throughout the county’s history. Writing in 2016, Daniel McCool contends that “the early history of San Juan County is characterized by bitter conflict between Anglos and Indians,” and notes that this foundation of conflict “helps explain why the Indians and Anglos of San Juan County today are so polarized.”³⁰⁷ Lee’s insistence on the claim of unity romanticizes the county’s history, ignoring the real differences between settler and Native understandings of land and the injustices that continue to occur.

To substantiate his argument that “locals” did not want BENM, Lee first claims that “local Navajo” were against the monument. Lee claims that “the people of the Navajo Nation who live in San Juan County” opposed BENM because they were afraid that a monument designation would impede their ability to “[care] for their homelands. . . . take away their access to their land [and] restrict their stewardship over the earth’s bounty.” By specifically tokenizing the “people of the Navajo Nation who live in San Juan County,” Lee creates a separation between these individuals and the Coalition members who he claims mostly “reside outside of Utah.”³⁰⁸ By creating this distinction, Lee argues that only certain Native Americans have an authentic tie to the land and, therefore, an authoritative voice in determining its uses. Put

differently, by locating *certain* Navajo within SJC's boundaries, Lee rhetorically constructs the "authentic" Indigenous relationship to land through this boundary work. The ties of people to land matter, but only when those ties and people reside within the same artificial, state boundaries as the land. This artificial distinction is a powerful example of how settler colonialism operates as a structure. That is, by placing the authority to determine land use within a framework of artificial state boundaries, determined by and in place because of settler colonialism, Lee engages in what Scott Lyons calls "rhetorical imperialism," or "the ability of dominant powers to assert control of others by setting the terms of debate. These terms are often definitional—that is, they identify the parties discussed by describing them in certain ways."³⁰⁹ Lee defines the authentic Native American voice for Bears Ears as those "local Navajo" who live in Utah. This is a further operation of settler colonialism's remaking of land-relationships: Lee reinforces the idea that, to have a relationship with land, one must reside within specific artificial boundaries.

Lee's speech also ignores the geographical history of the county. The entirety of the BENM proposed by the Coalition is north of the San Juan River. The river has, at least in the 142 years since the founding of Bluff (the first Mormon settlement in SJC) in 1880 to the present, historically been the geographical boundary demarcating the majority of the Navajo portion of the county from the Settler portion. McCool notes that, after 1880, there was a "determined effort to push the Navajos south of the San Juan River," an example of the settler colonial strategy of removal.³¹⁰ Lee's speech perpetuates the strategy of assimilation, using the county's geography as a method of establishing participation in land decision making processes and authentic relationship to land. When Lee says "local Navajo," he means two groups of people: those who live off-reservation, and those from the Aneth chapter.³¹¹ To live off-reservation in SJC, one

must live north of the San Juan River, because the entire portion of the county south of the river is within the Navajo Nation's borders. The Aneth chapter is also north of the river, the only chapter of the Navajo Nation to sit on the river's northern side. By referring to "local Navajo," Lee refers to the geographical and rhetorical assimilation of those Navajos who live in a specific part of the county, while alienating those who do not.

Finally, "local" is used to provide settlers with an authentic claim to the land. When discussing the "sacred duty" of "local Navajo" to care for the land, Lee claims that "the same is true in my own church, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints." Lee equates settler relationships with land to Native American relationships with land, attempting to show that "locals" have the same kind of claim to the land, whether or not they are "Native." In this way, Lee participates in what Caroline Goodman refers to as a "mechanism of making settlers indigenous" to the land.³¹² In a similar move, Jared Farmer writes that this sort of attachment to place operates by making nonnatives "neonatives," or marking how "settlers [give] meaning to the lands" they settled.³¹³ By referencing such claims to the land, Lee can shift the land's subject—and thus who has authority to speak about land—from the "Navajos of San Juan County," to "the people of San Juan County," and finally to "my fellow Utahns." This moving authority ultimately serves to delegitimize Indigenous voices by subsuming them under settler colonial logics and ways of seeing land.

Second Lee Speech: The "Founders' Promise"

Nearly seven months after Trump reduced BENM's boundaries in December 2017, Lee gave a speech to the Sutherland Institute, a Libertarian-leaning thinktank in Salt Lake City. This speech, which mentions Bears Ears only once, was the first time Lee had publicly spoken about public lands or Bears Ears since Trump's actions the previous year.³¹⁴ Lee's primary grievance

in this speech is the federal government's ownership of land. Of the approximately 640 million acres of federal public land in the US, the vast majority are in the Western states. In Utah specifically, approximately sixty percent of the land is owned by the federal government.³¹⁵

Lee's somewhat convoluted speech moves in four parts, attempting to demonstrate the problems with federal land ownership and his solutions to these problems. First, Lee tells a story of "medieval England," where the monarchs set aside land specifically for royal use. "At their height," Lee claims, "the royal forests enveloped a full third of southern England," and any uses that "would detract from their pristine condition" were forbidden. Using this story to set the scene, Lee moves to the present day, where the federal government's "royal forest" of the public lands system is preserved "for the enjoyment of the very few," just as in medieval England.

However, according to Lee, "it wasn't supposed to be like this," and so he next tells a selective history of the United States, founded upon the idea that individuals could own their piece of land, care for it, and pass it on to their children. As Lee tells the story, this arrangement worked for a while, until the "old-school conservationists" gave way to "a new breed of environmentalists, who saw Westerners . . . as threats to" the land. The rest of the speech is then devoted to resolving what he sees as problems of federal ownership.³¹⁶ In this analysis, I focus on the "Founders' Promise," or the idea that all Americans are entitled to "a land of their own," and the implications of this meaning of land. In sum, Lee's entire speech is premised on removal being a given fact; in his telling of history, Native Americans were seemingly never on the land. This erasure allows Lee to focus on the lie of "free land" that American citizens were able to claim for their own, and avoid reckoning with the US's violent past and present.

The ways Lee talks about public lands in this speech diverge from the previous speech about BENM. Where that speech focused primarily on Bears Ears, "locals," and refuting the

Coalition's claims to ancestral land, this speech is, in some ways, much more radical. Here, Lee's focuses on what he terms "The Founders' Promise," or the idea that, in his words, "Lawmakers sought to facilitate expansion of the nation by acquiring land—and then transferring it to the people, so they could live out their lives as responsible citizens of the republic." If we follow Lee's ideas to their logical end, American citizenship is based in this notion of owning land. This is a history of settler colonial removal, though Lee would never admit it. One implication of Lee's history is that only certain people are allowed to be citizens; those who own land, an implication that has strong foundations in history.³¹⁷ From this foundation, Lee's argument extends to government as well, holding that the very system and legitimacy of governmental power and authority rests in land ownership. Put more precisely, Lee eventually argues in this speech that whoever owns land has the authority to govern: when land is controlled by "the people," they also control the government and when the government controls land, it controls "the people." Land is, for Lee, the basis of an intricate theory of government, states' rights, citizenship, and power.

As Lee tells the story, there were two stages in the federal government's land policy: first, the US government acquired land, and then sold it off or gave it to private citizens. In Lee's words, "Lawmakers sought to facilitate expansion of the nation by acquiring land—and then transferring it to the people, so they could live out their lives as responsible citizens of the republic." The Homestead Act of 1862 is one example of this policy, though Lee argues that the Act did not work in the West as it had in the Midwest; 160 acres—the amount granted to homesteaders—was not enough land to feasibly farm in the arid Western territories.³¹⁸ Because the land was "only fit for grazing livestock," ranchers needed hundreds of acres for a viable operation. But the tide was turning on federal policy. Around the same time as Utah and other

western states were entering the Union (Utah became a state in 1896), which also coincided with the rise of the environmental movement, federal policy regarding the public lands shifted from disposal to retention. This change in policy meant, Lee claims, that “Congress had turned its attention elsewhere. Manifest destiny left us [Western states] behind.” Lee’s claims that the land was “only fit” for grazing is a sign of the land’s meaning changing, as there is ample evidence that agriculture was a consistent feature of ancient Indigenous civilization.³¹⁹ Further, defining land primarily in terms of agriculture is a colonial strategy, an indication of permanence and that settlers are here to stay.³²⁰

Lee’s primary grievance in this speech is the federal ownership of public lands. In Lee’s estimation, the public lands system is “a stranglehold on the West,” which inhibits the ability of Western states to become fully realized political and economic entities: “Western states like Utah entered the Union on inferior terms . . . [as] tenants to negligent landlords.” To address this problem, Lee argues that there is only one solution; to transfer the public lands to the states, an ideology with a long history in the American West. Though the specific cases of controversy have changed over time, present-day arguments about land transfer are very similar to the arguments made over a century ago and, in some cases, are nearly identical. The ideal solution, Lee argues, is to transfer the lands to the states for distribution to private citizens. According to Lee, Manifest Destiny left the Western states behind because the citizens of these states were no longer as easily able “to have a part of this earth they can call their own.” Lee calls private land ownership a “basic tenet of the American Dream,” something on which “so much of American history – and of human happiness” depends. However, full participation in this basic tenet has long been denied to Utahns and the citizens of many other western states, and the “Land of the

Free [has become] a land of stunning inequality” with the government’s retention of the public lands.

Indigenous people cannot be found in Lee’s history of federal public lands, the logical outcome of settler colonialism’s strategies of assimilation and removal. Lee’s arguments about land transfer, Manifest Destiny, and government frame land in colonial terms, where land is epistemologically only knowable as property, and thus able to be discovered, acquired, and owned. Carolyn Gallagher writes that land transfer arguments such as Lee’s rely on a selective history which emphasizes the period when “the government took ownership of land not claimed during the settlement period, instead of the stage leading up to it, when the government seized the indigenous land it would use for settlement.”³²¹ That is, as told by Lee and other land transfer advocates, public lands history begins with the federal government acquiring nominally empty land and then selling and giving it to (predominantly white) settlers, a history that ignores the colonial past and present of public lands. Gallagher makes the important point that this historical frame allows rhetorics like Lee’s to argue that they are “reclaiming the people’s land from the government rather than engaging in a second round of white theft of Indigenous land.”³²²

The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition: Land, People, Relationship

In this section, I examine the Coalition’s descriptions of their Tribes’ relationships with land. These relationships can be grouped into two broad categories: ways of knowing land and bodily being on the land. The Coalition’s relationships form ways of resistance to colonial understandings of land similarly to how, as Scott Lyons has argued, Native Americans have often leveraged their relationship with land as a principle of resistance to colonial imposition. Lyons writes, “While most Indians have a special relationship with the land in the form of an actual land base (reservations), this relationship is made truly meaningful by a consistent cultural

refusal to interact with that land as private property or purely exploitable resource. Land, culture, and community are inseparable” for Native Americans.³²³ The key point here is that, for many Native Americans, the Coalition included, land means something different than it does for settlers.

The inseparability of land’s cultural elements with people is a key feature of the Coalition’s descriptions and explanations of Bears Ears. In many ways, the fundamental tension between Lee and the Coalition’s visions of land is the valuation of these relationships. Indeed, author and journalist Jacqueline Keeler (Navajo/Yankton Dakota Sioux) argues that this is *the* primary question raised by BENM: Keeler asks, “where is the value of the land? Is it purely the economic gain from it (and the further question of who benefits from that economic gain) or in the relationship we as humans (and our ancestors and other life forms) have with the land, itself?”³²⁴ The Coalition fits firmly into the second category, where the value of land is in the relationship between land and people. Lloyd Lee (Diné), a professor at the University of New Mexico, explains how many Native people view their relationship with land, writing that land “frames the world of Native peoples.” For the Navajo, specifically, Lee explains that the land (Níhi Kéyah in Navajo) “is the embodiment of the Diné people’s notion of humanity and what it means to live as a human.”³²⁵ The relationships that the Coalition tribes have with the land is the primary reason the Coalition advocated for BENM’s protection, writing in their proposal that Obama create BENM “to honor the worldviews of our ancestors, and Tribes today, and their relationships with this landscape.”³²⁶

The relationships the Coalition tribes have with the land are many and varied. As the Coalition writes and talks about the land, land provides their peoples with a connection ancestors, holy practices, spiritual traditions and ceremonies, history and culture, home and

lifeways. Land is a way of knowing and understanding the past and present, who the Coalition tribes are as peoples, and their spiritual beliefs. The Bears Ears landscape holds “the spirit and essence of Indigenous history and culture.”³²⁷ Or, as one person said, “Bears Ears is not just a place full of trees, plants and animals. It is life and we are woven into it. . . . When we lose that connection, our connection with our culture, Mother Nature and the cosmic energy of space will be lost.”³²⁸ Through these varied relationships, land provides the Coalition Tribes with connections and links to many parts of life.

The Coalition’s descriptions of land and relationships are similar to the differences Sandra Styres and Dawn Zinga draw between “Land” and “land.” To indicate a focus on relationships with land, Styres and Zinga write of the differences between “Land” (as a proper name) and “land” (as a “fixed geographical and physical space that includes earth, rocks, and waterways”). The proper name “Land” relates “a spiritually infused place grounded in interconnected and interdependent relationships, cultural positioning and is highly contextualized.”³²⁹ Max Liboiron, following the work of Styres and Zinga, writes that “Land” refers to:

the unique entity that is the combined living spirit of plants, animals, air, water, humans, histories, and events recognized by many Indigenous communities. When land is not capitalized, I am referring to the concept from a colonial worldview whereby landscapes are common, universal, and everywhere, even with great variation.³³⁰

While the Coalition does not use capitalization to indicate such differences, the ways in which the organization talks about land share similarities with how Styres, Zinga, and Liboiron discuss relationships with “Land.” In particular, relationships, the “intimate connection” their peoples

have with Bears Ears, are a central part of the Coalition's efforts to protect Bears Ears and are a primary reason they advocated for the land's protection.³³¹

The relationships that the Coalition discusses are also similar to what Rios calls "land-based" rhetorics, which "grow out of active participation with land."³³² Rios uses the term "land" to indicate "an indigenous concept of relationality that is similar to the notion of ecologies—of networked relationships existing among various human and non-human objects" but that instead forwards "a relational ontology at the level of kinship quite literally."³³³ Rios also writes that an "implication of land-based rhetorics, then, is the valuing of embodied ways of knowing/being derived from land and from with working/living/being with land."³³⁴ One of the Coalition's primary rhetorical strategies is to center their tribes' relationships with land and the Knowledges derived from these relationships.

The Coalition's land-based rhetorics result from their Tribes' TKs and continued presence on the land, and the physical, spiritual, and cultural relationships with the land. These rhetorics are a form of interrupting "settler fantasies of becoming native"—a reclamation of land and relationship to the land from settlers.³³⁵ As a principle of resistance, land-based rhetorics, such as the Coalition's might function to unsettle settler logics and ways of knowing land. Through their land-based rhetorics of relationship, the Coalition offers ways of understanding land that unsettle settler perspectives. For example, where Lee's focus on the "local" and the "Founders' Promise" describes land primarily from the perspective of owner to property, the meanings of land described by the Coalition demonstrate other kinds of relationships between their peoples and the land. These descriptions of land, people, and relationship articulate pathways of resistance: in particular, the two meanings of land that I examine—ways of knowing

land, and bodily being on the land—push back against the colonial strategies of assimilation and removal.

Michael Lechuga argues that the organizing logics of settler colonialism are communicated rhetorically, or that rhetorical practices reproduce “sets of relationships between bodies, lands, and power” that further colonialism.³³⁶ However, Lechuga also notes that the opposite can also be true, and that rhetoric can resist the continuation of settler colonial logics. Rather than replicating patterns of “white settler assemblages,” Lechuga challenges rhetoricians to “imagine a future where a study of rhetoric combats antiblack and anti-indigenous ideologies by aligning with activists to cocreate a political future outside and beyond the settler imaginary. . . [and] to learn from activist communities and develop ways of knowing the world that are inspired by those fighting the violent, ongoing North American territorialization of white settler colonialism.”³³⁷ Simply put, Lechuga challenges the field of rhetorical studies to learn from activists, with academic theorizing driven by an ethic of learning from activist communities. In a similar fashion, we can learn from the Coalition’s rhetorics about land, bodies, and sovereignty.

Following Lechuga, there is room for rhetorical studies to learn from the Coalition. By centering relationships with land, the Coalition articulates a rhetoric that circulates knowledges, narratives, and subjectivities resistant to colonialism. In other words, rhetoric can be thought of as a means of organizing decolonial knowledges and acts of resistance. In the Coalition’s understanding, land is not property, able to be stolen, bought, and traded (as in settler colonial logics), but instead life, history, home, culture. In this section, I show how the Coalition describes the land’s meanings apart from colonial techniques: first, by centering the ways of knowing otherwise to colonial logics, in resistance to assimilation strategies, and second, by emphasizing the body as a means of physical resistance to the colonial strategy of removal.

Ways of Knowing

A central part of the Coalition Tribes' deep and long connections to the land is Traditional Knowledge (TK). As they describe and use the term, TK is “derived from keen observation carried out and passed down over hundreds or thousands of years. It represents another way of knowing the social and ecological landscape.”³³⁸ In my understanding of the concept, as defined here by the Coalition, TK includes observations and knowledges about the land such as information concerning plant and animal species (availability, how widespread certain species are, declines in populations and range), changes in weather patterns over the years, and the availability and quality of water sources. These sorts of knowledges comprise the ecological portion of TK. The social portions of TK are the ways of understanding and interpreting the historical, cultural, and sacred aspects of the land. The Coalition often says that Bears Ears is a “cultural landscape”; in other words, it is a landscape inscribed with the cultures and histories of the region's Indigenous people. Lyle Balenquah (Hopi), offers an explanation of the importance of the Bears Ears cultural landscape through the lens of Hopi TK. Balenquah writes that the connection “between modern Hopi people and their forebears” is “contained within the landscapes, where Hopi ancestors interacted with their natural environments, leaving a legacy behind that their descendants must now strive to continue.”³³⁹ Land is a link, in this instance between ancestors and modern people, and TK is here a way of interpreting and making sense of that link. While specific knowledges are not generalizable, many scholars note that the TKs of Indigenous peoples form a crucial part of the relationships between themselves and their lands.³⁴⁰ This is certainly true at Bears Ears, where TK is an integral part of the Coalition Tribes' understanding of the land.

As a principle of resistance central to the Coalition's land-based rhetorics, their Tribes' TKs directly refute settler logics of assimilation.³⁴¹ As a settle strategy, assimilation seeks to incorporate Indigenous peoples into mainstream society. Alongside physical incorporation, assimilation also seeks to make Indigenous knowledge and epistemologies diffuse in order to more easily accomplish the acquisition of land. By directly appealing to their TK in their advocacy for BENM, the Coalition shows that settler attempts to assimilate their peoples never fully happened.

The Coalition's articulations of Bears Ears through such knowledges create space for resistance to colonial land epistemologies and practices—such as those espoused by Mike Lee. As I demonstrated in the previous section, Lee follows the long settler tradition of discounting the ties and significance of Indigenous peoples to their lands. Though Native Americans still visit the land at Bears Ears, live nearby, and use the land for a variety of purposes, Lee's arguments position most Indigenous people as outsiders to debates about the land. In sum, the Coalition's explanations of how they see Bears Ears vis-à-vis their Traditional Knowledges is a way of saying, "we're still here, and our ways of knowing are still here." Put differently, the explanation of Bears Ears' significance through their Tribes' TKs positions land as a principal of resistance to the strategy of assimilation; giving meaning to land through their Tribes' knowledges functions to push back against the notion that Indigenous peoples were wholly integrated in the settler mainstream. That is, TKs are a practical way of showing that settler meanings of land are not the only meanings that matter and that settler attempts to remove or assimilate these tribes were not wholly successful—they are still in proximity to the land, and their TKs still guide their relationships to the land. Traditional Knowledges demonstrate that

Indigenous understandings of land have persisted despite repeated attempts to incorporate Indigenous people and knowledge into the settler mainstream.

By centering their Tribes' TK, the Coalition places their emphasis on understandings of land that push back against dominant Western conceptions. Put differently, the Coalition understands Bears Ears and the land as otherwise to the settler logics that drew and maintain boundaries through and around their Tribes' homelands, lives, and knowledges. For example, in contrast to views such as Lee's, which center the role of state boundaries to define land, the Coalition writes that they "don't see Bears Ears in terms of state lines."³⁴² Lee's emphasis on boundaries, locality, and ownership define land as for his Utah constituents, and mark the relationship between land and people in a particular fashion. The Coalition positions land and people into different relationships, where land continues as a sustainer of life, culture, history, and ceremony, regardless of whether or not one lives within recently drawn state lines. Robin Wall Kimmerer's explanations of land, TK, and relationship are helpful for better understanding the differences between Western and Indigenous conceptions of land. Kimmerer writes, in the context of BENM, that the land is living, and is "understood as . . . the source of identity, knowledge, the healer, the library, the sacred, the home of our ancestors and our more than human relatives." Kimmerer writes of the difference between land in scientific and Indigenous ways of knowing; where science "intentionally keeps human cultural values out of the equation," Traditional Knowledges, such as the Coalition Tribes', provide "far more than observations and explanations of the living world. She continues, TK is both philosophy and practice, embedded in the indigenous worldview which guides right relationships between humans and the living world through the principles of respect, reciprocity, relationship and reverence." Seen through this lens, Kimmerer writes that land and humans are inseparably linked and that humans have a

responsibility to give “their own gifts”—of “gratitude, respect, attention, restoration, art, science, ceremony and care”—in return “for all that the land so generously provides.”³⁴³ Land encompasses, as Styres, Haig-Brown, and Blimkie write, more than just materiality, but also refers to “spiritual, emotional, and intellectual aspects.”³⁴⁴ There are many similarities between Kimmerer’s explanations and how the Coalition Tribes talk about land, TK, and relationship.

Common ways in which the Coalition describes land and TK include themes of ecological and social relationships embedded in the land. These themes emerge in the Coalition’s descriptions of TK and Bears Ears, including the ways in which land is “densely inhabited by the stories, histories, prayers, and practices of people and place over millennia.”³⁴⁵ In a quotation that perfectly encapsulates the differences between the dominant Western conception of land as property and the vision of land put forth by the Coalition, one Ute man said: “Older Utes would say that all of San Juan County was special. . . . No one really owned the land. It was as if the land owned us – the Ute people.”³⁴⁶ Such relationships with the land are at the center of the Coalition’s advocacy efforts and what the land means to the organization’s Tribes. Eric Descheenie (Navajo), a former co-chair of the Coalition, has said “When Indigenous peoples are asked what they think about the Bears Ears, their answers come through these other, wholly valid ways of knowing. Listen carefully.”³⁴⁷ Descheenie’s admonishment to “listen carefully” reminds us that these ways of knowing have not historically been given the same weight as settler perspectives.

The Coalition’s efforts to protect BENM are deeply informed by these knowledges and relationships that their Tribes have with the land. Prior to the Coalition’s 2015 BENM proposal, UDB began collecting cultural information about the Bear Ears region. This effort, begun in 2010, was a response to then-Senator Bob Bennett’s (R-UT) new conservation plan—as I

discuss in Chapter Two, Bennett's plan was not continued when he was not re-elected to office.³⁴⁸ UDB, however, determined to proceed with their efforts. The organization collected traditional cultural information about the land from Navajo elders and, over time, began to encompass knowledge from other area tribes in their project.³⁴⁹ This knowledge and cultural information form the center of the Coalition's BENM proposal, and which informs their desire for the American public to learn about Bears Ears, sharing the land and their knowledges so that others may learn how to "listen to this sacred landscape and visit with respect."³⁵⁰ After all, they note, no one knows better how to live in this landscape than "those of us who have lived here since the beginning of time."³⁵¹

Using the information gathered, UDB mapped the landscape through a process they called "cultural mapping." Using this methodology, more than seventy interviews with elders were conducted to determine the importance of areas and sites within the Bears Ears region. The interviewees were selected "according to the location of their home (selecting approximately equal numbers from each Native community in Utah) and their depth of traditional knowledge."³⁵² The interviewees were asked to "draw lines, points, and polygraphs on 36" x 36" maps and the interviewer labeled each point or polygon according to type of cultural use."³⁵³ The information gathered and the resulting maps were used to determine the boundaries of the BENM proposed by the Coalition.³⁵⁴ Ultimately, as a result of the interviews, "every acre of public land in San Juan County was identified as important for a variety of objects. Native American decision-makers later determined the optimal (most efficient) boundary selection to represent locations, activities, and objects of greatest value within the smallest area."³⁵⁵

The TK that informs the Coalition's proposal is central to their understanding of Bears Ears and the land. Regina Lopez-Whiteskunk, a Coalition leader from the Ute Mountain Ute,

explains that their peoples bring to the table “direct ties to land” and, with these ties, tribal customs and cultural practices that are beneficial in taking care of the land.³⁵⁶ These ties inform Native people about the land, with specific and deep understandings of their surrounding environment, including the plants, land, animals, and weather patterns.³⁵⁷ As such, TK demonstrates a way of knowing the land, relationships with the land, and the ecosystems, plants, and animals that live on the land that are fundamentally different from Western, colonial understandings of land. As I argued in Chapter Three, the connection of the Coalition tribes to land is what made their proposal for BENM unique, set apart from both Obama and Trump.

These ways of knowing push back against dominant settler understandings of land, advancing views where TK is a crucial part of understanding the land itself. Protecting Bears Ears is a way of also protecting the knowledges and histories of the region’s Indigenous peoples, a way of ensuring that they are not ignored and forgotten. As Zuni Elder Octavius Seowtewa asserted, Bears Ears must be protected because the “cultural resources here, the petroglyphs, the structures, all of this. . . . if this information is lost, it’s lost forever.”³⁵⁸

Bodily Being on the Land

The Coalition’s rhetorics of resistance include ways in which members of the Coalition Tribes describe and articulate their physical and material connection to their ancestors and the land. Such acts include stories told about ancestors returning to the land after forced removal, present-day visits, the continued use of the land for ceremonial purposes, and the lineage that links present-day peoples to ancestors who lived on this land. Indeed, the Coalition’s entire advocacy for Bears Ears’ protection as a national monument is a form of resistance to colonial desires for Indigenous erasure. One of settler colonialism’s goals is to remove Native peoples from land, and a Native-led campaign to protect land their ancestors were forcibly removed from

is a direct refutation of this colonial goal—simply put, Indigenous people having a voice in how the land is managed is a refutation of settler colonialism.

One way in which the Coalition articulates resistance to the colonial strategy of removal by connecting their peoples' relationships with land to stories of being forcibly removed from Bears Ears and traveling back to the land. In other instances, the Coalition describes their Tribes' histories in ways that run counter to dominant Western narratives, a form of resistance that challenges the dominant settler conceptions of land and Indigenous connection to that land. These rhetorics push back against settler colonial strategies of removal, describing the ways that their Tribes have defied physical settler techniques of elimination by continued return to the land.

In the late nineteenth century, settlers came to the Southwest, which meant “moving Indian people off many traditional lands, including Bears Ears,” and so “Utes and Navajos were force-marched to reservations.”³⁵⁹ After they were removed from Bears Ears, “federal policy required Indian people to remain on their reservations and pueblos,” and if they returned, “the non-Indian residents of San Juan County regularly forced Native Americans out of Bears Ears, sometimes violently.”³⁶⁰ However, the Coalition relates that the connections of their people to land, the “sense of homeland and the ancestors,” was too strong, and so “our people continued to find ways to return.”³⁶¹ These physical, bodily acts of resistance to removal were based in their relationships with the land, connections that endure to this day. As the Coalition writes, “our people revere the Bears Ears area, and we continue to visit it in spite of the conduct of others because for us it remains a special place, where we can be among our ancestors and their songs and wisdom, where the traumas of the past can be alleviated, where we can connect with the land and our deepest values and heal.”³⁶² As resistance to removal, the Coalition's bodily rhetoric

challenges colonial understandings of land. In contrast to Lee, who tells a false history of harmony and the necessity of land for citizenship, the Coalition relates a history of violence, reminding us that the “Founders’ Promise” Lee’s desires depends on the physical absence of Native Americans.

The Coalition’s connections to land, and the physical act of being on the land, are reminders of their Tribes’ histories. At the center of the Coalition’s advocacy for Bears Ears is the fact that this land is a homeland. As the Coalition Tribes understand Bears Ears, it is a place where “the culture is everywhere,” and the “canyons and forests hold many of our stories.” Members of the Coalition Tribes go to Bears Ears for traditional purposes, such as ceremonies and gatherings, or to harvest medicines, weaving materials, and different types of food. Bears Ears is “a place of healing.”³⁶³ For many people, Bear Ears is somewhere they can go to learn about the past and their ancestors. In some instances, the Coalition describes their Tribes’ histories in ways counter to dominant perceptions of the area. For example, the Coalition writes that “Our Tribes came to the Bears Ears landscape at different times. Some of us have been there forever, and some came later.”³⁶⁴ Jim Enote (Zuni) says that “We hope to go to Bears Ears to learn. Our history lies within the landscape.”³⁶⁵ As a homeland, people continue to return to Bears Ears, even with the history of removal and erasure.

In addition to being a present-day form of resistance, Bears Ears reminds people of the resistance of their grandparents and ancestors. As one person wrote, recounting part of their family history, Bears Ears is an ancestral homeland, which provided their grandparents sanctuary during the round-ups before the forced relocations during the 1800s. They wrote of the connection they have with the land, and that “each time I see the ears, it makes me feel safe and connected to my ancestors and family.”³⁶⁶

Relationship and being on the land reflect the profound sense of care the Coalition has for Bears Ears. They write:

we will gather ourselves together to continue the fight to save our lands for the future of not just Native people, but all people who connect with these lands. Bears Ears National Monument is more than just mere federal land to us, as it may be to many other stakeholders – it is a living landscape; it has a pulse. Bears Ears is a fulfillment of our duty to preserve our cultures and our ancestral lands, and its designation was the result of a long, deliberative process to fight for our ancestors as well as access for contemporary use of the lands by our Tribal members.³⁶⁷

Further, they relate that tribal members find a “source of strength” as they “continue to practice traditions and seek the solace of public lands.”³⁶⁸ The Coalition also tells of a profound ethos of care between people and land, where “In our view, the lands take care of us and nourishes our spiritual and physical well-being. In return, we are obligated to protect her from further desecration that looting, pot hunting, oil and gas drilling, and rampant uranium mining has brought to these sacred lands.”³⁶⁹

For many members of the five Coalition Tribes, the land at Bears Ears remains a central part of their identities. The Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (UMUT) notes that “the identity, well-being, and worldviews of the UMUT are intricately tied to these lands.” Bears Ears is not only a place where tribal members harvest firewood, gather medicinal plants, herbs, and foods, but is “a spiritual place of ceremony, prayer and healing.” As these words show, Bears Ears is a place where people continue to come, using the land as their ancestors did before them. However, land is more than a container of resources, something that only has use in what people can take from it. Instead, the UMUT’s understanding of land demonstrates a reciprocal relationship between

people and land; as they state, “In our view, the lands take care of us and nourishes our spiritual and physical well-being. In return, we are obligated to protect her from further desecration that looting, pot hunting, oil and gas drilling, and rampant uranium mining has brought to these sacred lands.”³⁷⁰

The Hopi Tribe writes that Bears Ears is a “spiritually occupied landscape” that is a testament to “Hopi stewardship through thousands of years.” At Bears Ears, the Hopi see evidence of their sacred covenant to protect the earth; the ‘footprints’ their ancestors left behind, such as ancient villages, petroglyphs, artifacts, and other reminders were left behind as evidence of their fulfillment of this covenant. They write that Bears Ears is “immensely important to the Hopi Tribe. . . . [it is] part of our history and who we are as a people.” The Hopi’s advocacy for Bears Ears is a way of protecting their tribe’s history and a reminder to others that they remain committed to the covenant. As a resistance to colonialism, the Hopi remind us that, though they no longer live near Bears Ears, the physical presence of their ancestors is an important part of their identities. Further, advocacy for the land’s protection reminds us that, though settlers have tried, Indigenous connections to this land have not been fully erased.³⁷¹

Conclusion

In this chapter, I described how the Coalition’s land-based rhetorics offer a form of resistance to colonial attempts to remake Indigenous relationships to land. Colonialism, as evidenced by Lee’s speeches, attempts to rhetorically remake Indigenous relationships to land, casting these relationships within settler logics in order to acquire that land. Specifically, Lee’s speeches further the goals of settler colonialism through two logics of absence, removal and assimilation. Both removal and assimilation attempt to rhetorically remake Indigenous relationships to land. For strategies of assimilation, the goal is to rhetorically reconstruct

Indigenous relationships to land through erasing the markers of difference between the settler and the Indigenous person. Strategies of physical removal work rhetorically to cast the Indigenous person as having never been on the land, allowing settlers to advance a history of empty, free land, the myth of *terra nullius*. Ultimately, both strategies work rhetorically to give settlers a dominant claim and relationship to the land.

Chapter Five: Conclusion and Implications

Last summer, on June 27, 2021, my wife Liz and I set out on our first hike in BENM, first driving to Arch Canyon, nearly an hour away from where we were staying in Bluff. We began our hike at 7:30am, because temperatures were forecasted to be in the mid-90s by early afternoon, and we wanted to be done before it got too hot. At 7:30, it was perfect hiking weather. We had some difficulty finding the trailhead, even with a guidebook as it was not well marked. Eventually locating it, we set off on our hike. Hiking more than two hours, I estimate we only went about two miles—not very far at all. We followed the trail, looking for ancient dwelling sites (finding one) and rock art (finding none).

My first experiences in the land taught me that Trump’s monument—smaller than Obama’s and the Coalition’s by about 1.1 million and 1.7 million acres, respectively—was made for people like me. As I argued in Chapter Three, Trump’s 201,800-acre monument was bounded to be a consumable landscape for outsiders like myself. Trump picked a relatively bite-sized amount of land, never straying too far from the paved roads and the easy, well-marked hikes. Indeed, Trump’s southern portion, the “Shash Jáa” unit, where we stayed for the entirety of our trip, is run-through by two east-west highways, 95 in the north and 163 in the south. This is not to say there are not inaccessible portions of Trump’s monument, but rather that it doesn’t *feel* daunting if you’ve never been there before. Trump’s monument feels safe, like one can drive there, hike, and get out again relatively untroubled. A lot of this landscape can be seen in several days by looking at a map, some online research, and a commitment to a couple hours of driving per day. This is what we did on our trip in the summer of 2021.

Of course, one could spend decades learning the land in Trump’s monument. My experiences showed me that 201,800 acres is a *lot* of land to see, and we got nowhere close to

seeing all the well-known sites, let alone those that are not as popular and famous. The primary lesson I learned from my experiences at Bears Ears was that my knowledge of this land is incomplete: indeed, how could it be otherwise? I was an outsider, a tourist. Even though Trump's monument was made with the tourist in mind, what stands out is that I knew next to nothing about the land: I don't know what plants are edible, which can be used for medicine, or where to find them; I don't know how to identify which ancient sites were used for what purposes, where they can be found, or their histories. Simply put, I don't know the stories of the land. What I learned through my personal experience with this land is that Bears Ears National Monument, when understood through the Coalition Tribes' particular TKs and relationships, is a very different place than when BENM is *not* understood through these relationships and knowledges.

Obama's monument was created to protect a specific object, the relationships that the Coalition Tribes have with the land. How well Obama accomplished this goal is debatable, as I discussed in Chapter Three, though he did a good enough job that the Coalition declared his BENM to be satisfactory. This fact is something that many people misunderstood, or willfully ignored about BENM, however. For example, Joe Lyman (former mayor of Blanding, UT) asked in 2016 "What object is being protected that requires a landmass larger than Delaware to protect it?"³⁷² To answer him, relationships are what is being protected. If any white Mormon should understand this, it is a member of the Lyman family.³⁷³ Liz and I met Joe during our trip to Utah, when we randomly walked into a store in Blanding. We got to talking, he asked where we were from and guessed we were hiking in the area. When we said yes, and told him the specific trail we had hiked that morning, he launched into a story about, back when he was a teenager in the 1970s, he hiked that trail and camped there overnight with friends. The story's details don't particularly matter, because the important point is this: without knowing anything about us, he

immediately began talking about his relationship with the land. I'm sure that, if we had talked long enough, he would have told us about his great-grandfather, SJC settler Walter C. Lyman or that, if I'd asked him about BENM, he would have told me something like his 2016 answer to why he opposed BENM's designation, when he wrote:

For generations, the local people have used and cared for this land. We are the reason it is still in the relatively pristine condition that others deem worthy of protection. . . . We have been told by proponents of the monument that our reliance on the land doesn't matter or that it is a lie. We have been told we have no right to live here and that we should move. . . . To us it is part of our way of life and the source of our livelihood and the backbone of our culture and traditions.³⁷⁴

Lyman clearly gets it; relationship to land matters. As with Lee, however, behind Lyman's opposition to the monument is the mediation by white settlers of whose relationships to land matter most. Put otherwise, it is whom gets to speak of their relationships—and so which relationships are said to matter in official documents, maps, and boundaries—that is at stake at Bears Ears.

In this dissertation, I have analyzed how people talk about land through three stories about the land that became BENM and the people, relationships, experiences, and problems that have been entangled with that land. I argued that a central part of what makes public lands rhetorical are the relationships people have with the land. Whenever people talk about land and land controversies, they appeal to the things they associate with land, their interactions with the land, what land means for them, and their experiences with the land—all of these constitute what I mean by “relationship.” These relationships are what is at stake in these stories of BENM.

In Chapter Two, I examined the rhetoric of the PLI. Bishop and the people of two Utah counties talked about land and relationship in terms of wilderness, compromise, and certainty. The PLI, meant as an answer to the “question of wilderness” in Utah, was promised as a solution to wilderness and land-use certainty. To achieve certainty, compromise was necessary. In other words, stakeholders and Bishop argued that everyone needed to compromise with each other about the details of what they wanted in order to attain the promise of certainty. As part of the PLI process, seven counties in eastern Utah submitted proposals to Bishop for inclusion in the legislation. In this chapter, I examined newspaper accounts and documents from Bishop to examine how people in two counties—Grand and San Juan—talked about public lands and the PLI.

Chapter Two also examined UDB’s proposal for a Bears Ears NCA as part of the PLI process. Largely unconcerned with either compromise or certainty—at least to the extent to which white communities were focused on these issues—UDB instead focused on documenting the ways Indigenous peoples relate to the land at Bears Ears. As a primarily Navajo organization, UDB at first largely focused on Navajo relationships and ways of knowing, though they began to ask other tribes for their input near the end of the PLI process, recognizing the value of a combined effort. UDB’s NCA proposal was not taken seriously by the PLI, and so the Coalition was formed and the BENM proposal was created.

Chapter Three analyzed three proposals for BENM’s boundaries and I argued that the borders of the monument were drawn three times according to different understandings of the Coalition Tribes’ relationships to this land. Asking why the boundaries shrank, my analysis in this chapter examined the neoliberal discourses that Obama and Trump circulated in their administrations’ discourses about the monument. As the new discourses about land came into

contact with the people, histories, objects, and land that make up Bears Ears, they allowed the presidents to rearticulate what the monument should protect and why. A central thesis of this chapter was that both presidents bounded BENM according to their understanding of the Coalition Tribes' relationships with ancestral land. Arguing that BENM shrank according to how the Antiquities Act was used to protect the Coalition Tribes' relationships with land, the primary takeaway from this chapter was that BENM became smaller at the exact moments that the relationships of the Coalition Tribes diminished in official importance. The less that the histories, cultural practices, and ancestral sites of Native Americans factored into what the monument officially protected, the more the boundaries shrank.

Chapter Four examined two speeches by Mike Lee and documents from the Coalition, arguing that the rhetorics of both Lee and the Coalition seek to establish particular relationships between land and people. Reading this chapter's texts for what they can teach us about settler colonialism and rhetoric, I argued that the meanings given to land by Lee and the Coalition respectively further and resist settler colonialism. More precisely, the rhetorics of both Lee and the Coalition seek to establish particular relationships between land and people. Lee's speeches about BENM and public lands further two goals of settler colonialism, removal and assimilation. Lee pulls from and furthers these strategies to subsume Indigenous logics and ways of knowing land and argue against BENM and the Coalition.

However, rhetorics of land and relationship can also resist settler colonialism, which I argued the Coalition does in two ways. First, the organization articulates land through their Tribes' specific Traditional Knowledges (TK). By describing Bears Ears and the land in terms of TK, the Coalition reminds us that colonial logics are not the only way of seeing land. Second, the Coalition resists colonialism through what I called bodily resistance. That is, the Coalition

remind us that there has been continual Indigenous presence on the land, and that colonial attempts at elimination and removal have not been wholly successful. The primary takeaway from this chapter was that a large part of the way settler colonialism works rhetorically is through restructuring the relationships between Indigenous people, settlers, and land.

Rhetoric, as an academic discipline and a practice, is deeply implicated in settler colonialism. Raka Shome wrote nearly thirty years ago that we need to investigate the epistemologies that underpin our rhetorical theories and practices, for “if texts are sites of power that are reproduced by their social conditions, then neocolonial and racial forces are, to some extent, always already written into our texts.”³⁷⁵ If land is the foundation, the most important thing, of settler colonialism, then it is surely evident that the dominant ways of thinking about land in a settler society are *settler* notions of land. What land means and how it is understood in the mainstream United States society is based in settler logics, discourses, and practices. The confluence of relationships and land with broader cultural understandings is a fundamentally rhetorical process, “for what besides rhetoric could tie particular patches of land with the broader configurations of political culture?”³⁷⁶ Put otherwise, it is rhetoric that makes possible the tying of material land to particular relationships, such that a particular stretch of land becomes understood and used for resource extraction instead of sacred ceremony, or bought and sold as property instead of being primarily the locus of cultural knowledge.

As the discipline of rhetorical studies grapples with its deep implications in settler colonialism and whiteness, it is important that we examine the material consequences of rhetoric. Michael Lechuga, for example, has called on rhetoricians to investigate our discipline’s deep implications in settler colonialism and also “how settler colonialism leverages rhetoric to facilitate the material arrangement of ideological power on lands and bodies.”³⁷⁷ One step future

studies might take toward answering Lechuga's call could be the further examination of land rhetorics. Future work might build on this study of land and relationship to better listen, as Jordan Christiansen writes, "to how peoples communicate about resisting settler coloniality and their talk about ensuring their material existence by challenging material injustices."³⁷⁸ How people relate to land, and how they leverage these relationships rhetorically, have material consequences.

Part of this future work might also be to tell different stories about land, and center epistemologies and ontologies that have too often been ignored by the academy. For example, there have been recent calls in rhetorical studies to center indigeneity as a way of countering settler colonialism.³⁷⁹ Indigeneity as analytic, Tiara Na'puti explains, offers a "different epistemology toward land and place" that centers relationship—with place and also ancestors.³⁸⁰ Because the dominant relationships to land that are privileged in settler society are settler relationships, and relating to land is fundamentally rhetorical exercise, we need to think carefully about what sorts of relationships to land prevail in our writing and theorizing.

Notes

-
- ¹ “Senator Lee hosts standing-room only hearing on PLI,” San Juan Record, 2 August, 2016, <https://www.sjrnews.com/senator-lee-hosts-standing-room-only-hearing-pli>.
- ² “Timeline of Events in the Public Process,” (Executive Order 13792), part 22, p. 2, <https://www.doi.gov/foia/os/national-monuments-review-executive-order-13792>).
- ³ Gary Herbert “Testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,” Oversight Hearing on ‘Potential Impacts of Large-Scale Monuments,’ 27 July, 2016, https://www.energy.senate.gov/hearings/2016/7/field-hearing_3. Emphasis in original.
- ⁴ Chester Johnson, “Written testimony of Chester Johnson,” Oversight Hearing on ‘Potential Impacts of Large-Scale Monuments,’ 27 July, 2016, https://www.energy.senate.gov/hearings/2016/7/field-hearing_3.
- ⁵ Bruce Adams, “Testimony of Bruce Adams,” Oversight Hearing on ‘Potential Impacts of Large-Scale Monuments,’ 27 July, 2016, https://www.energy.senate.gov/hearings/2016/7/field-hearing_3.
- ⁶ The Coalition consists of the Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Pueblo of Zuni, and Ute Indian Tribe.
- ⁷ Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, “Letter to Chaffetz and Bishop,” *House Committee on Oversight and Reform*, 23 July, 2016, <https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/documents/13-July%202023%202016%20Letter%20from%20Bears%20Ears%20Inter-Tribal%20Coalition%20to%20Chairmen%20Chaffetz%20and%20Bishop.pdf>.

-
- ⁸ The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, “Status of the Bears Ears Coalition-PLI Discussions,” December 31, 2015, https://bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/BEIC_Bishop_Letter_123115.pdf; Coalition, “Letter to Chaffetz and Bishop,” 23 July, 2016.
- ⁹ Kristin L. Arola, “A Land-Based Digital Design Rhetoric,” in *Routledge Companion to Digital Writing & Rhetoric*, eds. Jonathan Alexander and Jacqueline Rhodes (New York: Routledge, 2018), 199-213.
- ¹⁰ Dave Tell, “The Meanings of Kansas: Rhetoric, Regions, and Counter Regions,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (2012): 215, doi:10.1080/02773945.2012.682843.
- ¹¹ Char Miller, *Public Lands, Public Debates* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2012), 1.
- ¹² The Obama administration was, contrary to Republican claims, extremely conscientious in soliciting public input about BENM’s proposed creation. See “Documents Obtained by Oversight Committee Refute Republican Claims That Obama Administration Did Not Consult on Bears Ears Monument Designation,” *House Committee on Oversight and Reform*, 13 April, 2017, <https://oversight.house.gov/news/press-releases/documents-obtained-by-oversight-committee-refute-republican-claims-that-obama>.
- ¹³ “Reactions to Utah's new Bears Ears National Monument, from scathing to celebratory,” *The Salt Lake Tribune*, 29 December, 2017, <https://archive.sltrib.com/article.php?id=4758522&itype=CMSID>.
- ¹⁴ Terry Tempest Williams and Bill Hedden, “Op-ed: 'Midnight monument'? No, Utah leaders had years to make a Bears Ears deal,” *The Salt Lake Tribune*, 20 December, 2016, <https://archive.sltrib.com/article.php?id=4732301&itype=CMSID#undefined.uxfs>;

Robinson Meyer, “Obama’s Environmental Legacy, in Two Buttes,” *The Atlantic*, 30 December, 2016, <https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2016/12/obamas-environmental-legacy-in-two-buttes/511889/>.

¹⁵ Meyer, “Obama’s Environmental Legacy.”

¹⁶ Terry Tempest Williams and Bill Hedden write that 64 percent of San Juan County residents supported a monument, while a May 2016 survey found that 71 percent of Utah voters supported BENM. Utah Diné Bikéyah report similar findings. Further, numerous environmental organizations based in Utah supported the monument. See Williams and Hedden, “Op-Ed”; Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Fact Sheet: A Majority of Residents in San Juan County Supports Bears Ears-5/19,” 2 May, 2019, <http://utahdinebikeyah.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/Fact-Sheet-SJC-supports-Bears-Ears-5-2-19r.pdf>; Public Opinion Strategies poll, National Monuments Review, (Executive Order 13792), part 25, p. 585, <https://www.doi.gov/foia/os/national-monuments-review-executive-order-13792>).

¹⁷ Of course, not only rhetoricians concerned with land specifically orient their research toward relationship. An orientation to relationship is representative of broader commitments within environmental rhetoric and communication. See: Danielle Endres, “Environmental Criticism,” *Western Journal of Communication* 84, no.3 (2020): 314-331, doi:10.1080/10570314.2019.1689288.

¹⁸ Jeff Motter and Ross Singer, “Review Essay: Cultivating a Rhetoric of Agrarianism,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 98, no. 4 (2012): 440, DOI: 10.1080/00335630.2012.719083.

¹⁹ Gregory Clark, *Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme from Kenneth Burke* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004), 9. Emphasis in original.

-
- ²⁰ Clark, *Rhetorical Landscapes*, 13.
- ²¹ Clark, *Rhetorical Landscapes*, 71.
- ²² Max Libroiron, *Pollution is Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2021), 6-7, fn. 19.
- ²³ Barbara E. Willard, "Rhetorical Landscapes as Epistemic: Revisiting Aldo Leopold's A Sand County Almanac," *Environmental Communication* 1, No. 2 (November 2007): 220.
- ²⁴ Willard, "Rhetorical Landscapes as Epistemic," 220, 221.
- ²⁵ Willard, "Rhetorical Landscapes as Epistemic," 219.
- ²⁶ Willard, "Rhetorical Landscapes as Epistemic," 221.
- ²⁷ Caroline Gottschalk Druschke, "Watershed as Common-Place: Communicating for Conservation at the Watershed Scale," *Environmental Communication* 7, no. 1 (2013): 93. doi:10.1080/17524032.2012.749295.
- ²⁸ Druschke, "Watershed as Common-Place," 93.
- ²⁹ Druschke, "Watershed as Common-Place," 93.
- ³⁰ Clark, *Rhetorical Landscapes*, 70.
- ³¹ Arola, "A Land-Based Digital Design Rhetoric," 205.
- ³² Gabriela Rios, "Cultivating Land-Based Literacies and Rhetorics," *Literacy in Composition Studies* 3, no. 1 (2015): 64.
- ³³ Rios, "Cultivating," 64; Arola, "A Land-Based Digital Design Rhetoric," 202.
- ³⁴ Rios, "Cultivating," 64.
- ³⁵ Eve Tuck and Marcia McKenzie, *Place in Research Theory, Methodology, and Methods* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2015), 11.
- ³⁶ Angelo Baca, "The Power of 'Bears Ears' and Indigenous Place Names," *Folklife*, 21 February, 2018, accessed 19 January 2021, <https://folklife.si.edu/magazine/the-power-of->

[bears-ears-and-indigenous-place-names](#). Baca is on the staff of Utah Diné Bikéyah and has also worked with the Coalition.

- ³⁷ Sandra Yellowhorse, “My Tongue is a Mountain: Land, Belonging and the Politics of Voice,” *Genealogy*, 4, no. 4 (2020): 112, doi:10.3390/genealogy4040112.
- ³⁸ Lloyd Lee, “Land: Nihi Kéyah,” in *Edge of Morning: Native Voices Speak for the Bears Ears*, ed. Jacqueline Keeler (Salt Lake City: Torrey House Press, 2017), 57.
- ³⁹ Marie Battiste and James Youngblood Henderson, *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge* (Sakatoon, CA: Purich Publishing, 2008), 44; Danielle Endres, “Sacred Land or National Sacrifice Zone: The Role of Values in the Yucca Mountain Participation Process,” *Environmental Communication* 6, no. 3 (September 2012): 335-336, doi:10.1080/17524032.2012.688060; Rebecca Tsosie, “Indigenous Peoples and “Cultural Sustainability”: The Role of Law and Traditional Knowledge,” in *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Learning from Indigenous Practices for Environmental Sustainability*, ed. M.K. Nelson and D. Shilling (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 237.
- ⁴⁰ Tuck and McKenzie, *Place in Research Theory, Methodology, and Methods*, 55.
- ⁴¹ Robin Wall Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge, and the Teachings of Plants* (Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 2013), 17.
- ⁴² Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass*, 17.
- ⁴³ Eve Tuck, Marcia McKenzie, and Kate McCoy, “Land education: Indigenous, post-colonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research,” *Environmental Education Research* 20, no. 1 (2014): 8, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2013.877708>.

-
- ⁴⁴ The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, “Proposal to President Barack Obama for the Creation of Bears Ears National Monument,” 15 October, 2015, p. 2, <https://bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Bears-Ears-Inter-Tribal-Coalition-Proposal-10-15-15.pdf>.
- ⁴⁵ “Utah Leaders Decry Monument Designation,” *Deseret News*, 28 December, 2016, accessed 6 April, 2022, <https://www.deseret.com/2016/12/28/20603077/utah-leaders-decry-monument-designation>.
- ⁴⁶ “Visit with Respect Campaign,” *Friends of Cedar Mesa*, 16 March, 2016, accessed 10 May, 2022, <https://www.friendsofcedarmesa.org/visit-with-respect/>.
- ⁴⁷ Christine Oravec, “John Muir, Yosemite, and the Sublime: A Study in the Rhetoric of Preservationism,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 67 (1981): 245-258.
- ⁴⁸ *Our Great National Parks*, episode one, “Our World of Wonder,” April 13, 2022, Netflix.
- ⁴⁹ Phil Lyman, “EDITORIAL: Politically-Motivated Lands Deal Cheats Utah’s Most Impoverished County,” *Free Range Report*, 25 October, 2016, accessed 13 April, 2021, <https://freerangereport.com/editorial-politically-motivated-lands-deal-cheats-utahs-impooverished-county/>.
- ⁵⁰ “Timeline of Events in the Public Process,” 3.
- ⁵¹ “Utah Leaders Decry Monument Designation,” *Deseret News*, 28 December, 2016, accessed 6 April, 2022, <https://www.deseret.com/2016/12/28/20603077/utah-leaders-decry-monument-designation>.
- ⁵² Those Navajo who supported the PLI over BENM did so, so far as I can tell, for purely monetary reasons, and were largely members of the Aneth Chapter of the Navajo Nation. The primary issue at stake for these particular Navajo was the oil and gas royalties from a

piece of land known as McCracken Mesa, which is located with the Aneth Chapter in Utah. The majority of these royalties, in 2016, went to the Navajo Nation at large, with the Aneth Chapter of the Navajo Nation receiving the minority of the money. The PLI would have flipped the equation, giving the Aneth Chapter the majority of the funds. BENM, significantly, held no such provisions about McCracken Mesa. See:

“Congressmen release past-due Public Lands Initiative,” *San Juan Record*, 19 July, 2016, accessed 7 April, 2021, <https://sjrnews.com/congressmen-release-past-due-public-lands-initiative>.

⁵³ See for example, a September 9, 2016 letter from members of the White Mesa community of the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, https://republicans-naturalresources.house.gov/uploadedfiles/ptr_white_mesa_ute_tribe.pdf.

⁵⁴ National Monuments Review, Bears Ears NM, 2018-11, Set 4, Doc 32, <https://www.doi.gov/foia/os/bears-ears-nm>.

⁵⁵ “Timeline of Events in the Public Process.”

⁵⁶ Each of the five Tribes that form the Coalition has their own perspectives and traditions concerning Bears Ears and land; though I will discuss some of these differences in detail because they are important distinctions, the Coalition, in their discussions about BENM, tend to generalize among the five Tribes’ traditions when discussing Bears Ears. This move, the Coalition’s combination and generalization of historic and cultural differences, can be seen most readily in the name of the monument: while each of the five Tribes has their own name for the land, each of these names translates to “Bears Ears.” The Coalition chose the English name, signaling that no one Tribe was more important than the others.

-
- ⁵⁷ Nathaniel A. Rivers and Maarten Derksen, “Ecologies of Deception in Psychology and Rhetoric,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 101, no. 4 (2015): 638, doi:10.1080/00335630.2015.1127404.
- ⁵⁸ Emma Frances Bloomfield, “The Rhetoric of Energy Darwinism: Neoliberal Piety and Market Autonomy in Economic Discourse,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 49, no. 4 (2019): 320, doi:10.1080/02773945.2019.1634831.
- ⁵⁹ Bloomfield, “The Rhetoric of Energy Darwinism,” 321.
- ⁶⁰ Rios, “Cultivating,” 60. In forwarding this land-rhetoric, I recognize both Tiara Na’puti and Tiffany Lethabo King’s arguments about land-centric stories. In sum, Na’puti writes that the “propensity [of communication scholars] to solely examine land-based and human-built environments significantly impacts theories of rhetoric and place by foreclosing opportunities to decenter colonial epistemologies about land itself” (5), and King contends that, by focusing on land, “an actual discussion of Native genocide is displaced by a focus on White settlers’ relationship to land rather than their parasitic and genocidal relationship to Indigenous and Black peoples” (68). Yes and yes. However, in this specific context and place—settler Utah—land-centric stories make sense and seem necessary, especially because the centrality of land is nowhere more apparent than in the Coalition’s advocacy for BENM. That is, since the Coalition centers land, it seems appropriate for me to also do so. See: Tiara R. Na’puti, “Archipelagic rhetoric: remapping the Marianas and challenging militarization from ‘A Stirring Place,’” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 16, no. 1 (2019): 4-25, doi:10.1080/14791420.2019.1572905; Tiffany Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2019).

⁶¹ It was only between these dates that there was serious effort to pass the PLI into law. Though Bishop began talking about a public lands bill in 2012, the PLI’s key features—including collaboration between counties, stakeholders, and citizens—were not present until after the February 2013 letters were sent. After September 2016, Bishop never again introduced the PLI in Congress. Further, after Obama designated BENM on December 28, 2016, Bishop’s efforts and priorities shifted toward overturning the monument. Bishop retired from Congress in January 2021, with BENM’s boundaries reduced, and the question of wilderness still unsettled.

⁶² Rob Bishop to Wayne County Commissioners, February 15, 2013, *The Wayne and Garfield County Insider* April 11, 2013. “Timeline of Events.”

⁶³ H.R.5780 - Utah Public Lands Initiative Act, *Library of Congress*, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/5780/all-actions>.

⁶⁴ Sonja Horoshko, “Crunch time for a public-lands bill: Will Utah’s ‘Grand Bargain’ succeed, or be quashed by opponents?,” *Four Corners Free Press*, 4 February, 2016, accessed 16 December, 2021, <https://fourcornersfreepress.com/crunch-time-public-lands-bill-will-utahs-grand-bargain-succeed-quashed-opponents/>.

⁶⁵ David Zarefsky, “Henry Clay and the Election of 1844: The Limits of a Rhetoric of Compromise,” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 6, no. 1 (Spring 2003): 93, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41939810>.

⁶⁶ My discussion of wilderness in this dissertation differs from most of the literature on wilderness in rhetorical studies, where wilderness is generally studied as “not a natural, universal essential object, but a contested social construction rooted in particular cultures and historical periods” (DeLuca 2001, 641). In other words, environmental rhetoric

generally is concerned with wilderness as a theoretical construct, a construct based in the nature/culture split (Clary-Lemon 2019).

Instead, my dissertation attends to wilderness in terms of policy, and the specifics of WSAs as they relate to certainty and compromise. For wilderness as often written about in rhetoric, see: Jennifer Clary-Lemon, *Planting the Anthropocene: Rhetorics of Nature-Culture* (Louisville, Colorado: Utah State University Press, 2019); Kevin Michael DeLuca and Anne Teresa Demo, "Imaging Nature: Watkins, Yosemite, and the Birth of Environmentalism," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 17, no. 3 (2000): 241–260; Kevin Michael DeLuca, "Trains in the Wilderness: The Corporate Roots of Environmentalism," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 4, no. 4 (2001): 633-652; Kevin Michael DeLuca, "Salvaging Wilderness from the Tomb of History: A Response to The National Parks: America's Best Idea," *Environmental Communication* 4, no. 4 (December 2010): 484–493; Chelsea Graham, "Resisting 'the World of the Powerful': 'Wild' Steam and the Creation of Yellowstone National Park," *Frontiers in Communication*, 6, no. 722527, doi:10.3389/fcomm.2021.722527; Samantha Senda-Cook, "Materializing Tensions: How Maps and Trails Mediate Nature," *Environmental Communication* 7, no. 3 (2013): 355-371; Casey R. Schmitt, "Deconstructing Trailheads: Six Frames for Wilderness and a Rhetorical Intervention for Ecology," *Harlot: A Revealing Look at the Arts of Persuasion* 15 (2016): http://harlotofthearts.org/issues/issue_15/schmitt/index.html#bio; Casey R. Schmitt, "Mounting Tensions: Materializing Strategies and Tactics on National Park 'Social Trails,'" *Environmental Communication* 10, no. 4 (2016): 418–431, doi:10.1080/17524032.2015.1018297.

-
- ⁶⁷ Robert Bennett, “Resolving Utah’s wilderness conflict,” *Deseret News*, 24 June, 2013, accessed 19 March, 2022, <https://www.deseret.com/2013/6/24/20454060/robert-bennett-resolving-utah-s-wilderness-conflict>.
- ⁶⁸ James Morton Turner, *The Promise of Wilderness: American Environmental Politics Since 1964* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012), 243.
- ⁶⁹ Turner, *The Promise of Wilderness*, 244.
- ⁷⁰ Turner, *The Promise of Wilderness*, 244.
- ⁷¹ Matt Canham, “Washington County lands bill may be the wilderness model,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, 30 March, 2009, accessed 21 March, 2009, https://archive.sltrib.com/story.php?ref=/ci_12032209.
- ⁷² “San Juan County Land Use proposal for BLM may have new life,” *San Juan Record*, 15 June, 2011, accessed 7 April, 2021, <https://sjrnews.com/san-juan-county-land-use-proposal-blm-may-have-new-life>; Craig Bigler, “Collaboration begins on San Juan lands bill,” *Moab Sun News*, 29 April, 2010, accessed 21 March, 2022, <https://www.moabtimes.com/articles/collaboration-begins-on-san-juan-lands-bill/>.
- ⁷³ Bennett, “Resolving Utah’s wilderness conflict.”
- ⁷⁴ Bigler, “Collaboration begins.”
- ⁷⁵ Bigler, “Collaboration begins.”
- ⁷⁶ Matt Canham, “Lee's wilds idea: Let Legislature sign off on any Utah wilderness bill,” *Salt Lake Tribune*, 5 August, 2010, accessed 23 March, 2022, <https://archive.sltrib.com/article.php?id=10518038&itype=storyID>.

⁷⁷ “Chairman Bishop on Utah’s Public Lands Initiative,” Youtube video, 2:10, posted by House Committee on Natural Resources GOP, September 21,

2016 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h24nhQ-a3m8>.

⁷⁸ Staff, “Utah Public Lands Initiative: Status report for stakeholders, interested parties, and the public,” November 19, 2013, p. 7, <https://collections.lib.utah.edu/details?id=785661>.

⁷⁹ PLI FAQ Sheet, accessed 10 May, 2020, <http://sanjuancounty.org/sjc-content/documents/LandsBillFreqQuestions.pdf>.

⁸⁰ “Status report,” 8.

⁸¹ “Status report,” 9.

⁸² At least one of these field trips included visiting Cedar Mesa with Utah Diné Bikéyah. Cedar Mesa is an area that was included in both the Coalition and Obama’s versions of BENM, though was cut from Trump’s

⁸³ “Status report,” 12-13.

⁸⁴ “Markup Memorandum,” *Committee on Natural Resources*, September 9, 2016, accessed 10 May, 2020, p. 1-2, https://republicans-naturalresources.house.gov/uploadedfiles/markup_memo_-_h.r._5780_09.21.16_09.22.16.pdf.

⁸⁵ Such characteristics include “minimum size, naturalness, and outstanding opportunities for recreation. “Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas,” *Bureau of Land Management*, n.d., accessed 26 January, 2022, <https://www.blm.gov/programs/national-conservation-lands/wilderness>.

⁸⁶ “Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas.”

⁸⁷ “Wilderness and Wilderness Study Areas.”

⁸⁸ “U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, *Federal Lands and Related Resources: Overview and Selected Issues for the 117th Congress*, by Katie Hoover, Anne A. Riddle, Laura B. Comay, Brandon S. Tracy, R. Eliot Crafton, Harold F. Upton, Mark K. DeSantis, Carol Hardy Vincent, Tana Fitzpatrick, R43429 (2021). The vast majority of wilderness is within 44 states, though this number also includes land in Puerto Rico.

⁸⁹ According to James Morton Turner, the BLM designated 88 WSAs in Utah after its initial review and appeals by wilderness advocates. As of October 2016, the BLM managed 86 WSAs. Both sources indicate 3.2 million acres of WSAs. See: Turner, *The Promise of Wilderness*, 243; U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Utah Region, *Utah National Conservation Lands: 5-Years Strategy* (Utah, October 19, 2016), p. 7,

https://www.blm.gov/sites/blm.gov/files/documents/files/Utah_National%20Conservation%20Lands%20State%20Stepdown.pdf.

⁹⁰ Management of Wilderness Study Areas: Manual 6330,” *Bureau of Land Management*, n.d., accessed 22 December, 2021, p. 6,

https://www.ntc.blm.gov/krc/uploads/709/Management%20of%20WSAs%20text%20only_public.pdf.

⁹¹ Public Law 88-577 (16 U.S. C. 1131-1136).

⁹² Bishop to Wayne County Commissioners.

⁹³ 2 Bishop to Wayne County Commissioners.

⁹⁴ Jedediah S. Rogers, *Roads in the Wilderness : Conflict in Canyon Country* (University of Utah Press, 2013), 3.

-
- ⁹⁵ Gail Binkly, “A Utah lands bill: Mission impossible?,” *Four Corners Free Press*, 1 November, 2013, accessed 13 December, 2021, <https://fourcornersfreepress.com/a-utah-lands-bill-mission-impossible/>.
- ⁹⁶ Kristin Millis, “Congressmen hear diverse opinions at open house,” *Moab Sun News*, 14 August, 2013, accessed 2 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/news/article_fd4b3ae6-045c-11e3-8943-0019bb30f31a.html, specifically in the context of uranium mining. For a history of the effects of uranium on the Four Corners region, see: Sarah Alisabeth Fox, *Downwind: A People’s History of the Nuclear West* (Lincoln: The University of Nebraska Press, 2014).
- ⁹⁷ “Markup Memorandum,” *Committee on Natural Resources*, September 9, 2016, 1, https://republicans-naturalresources.house.gov/uploadedfiles/markup_memo_--h.r._5780_09.21.16_09.22.16.pdf.
- ⁹⁸ “Mark-Up Memorandum,” 1.
- ⁹⁹ Bishop to Wayne County Commissioners.
- ¹⁰⁰ Bishop to Wayne County Commissioners.
- ¹⁰¹ Bishop to Wayne County Commissioners.
- ¹⁰² Bishop to Wayne County Commissioners; David Ure, “Statement of David Ure,” House Committee on Natural Resources Subcommittee on Federal Lands Hearing on H.R. 5780: Utah Public Lands Initiative Act, 14 September, 2016, <https://docs.house.gov/Committee/Calendar/ByEvent.aspx?EventID=105304>; Representative Tom McClintock, speaking on H.R. 5780: Utah Public Lands Initiative Act, 14 September, 2016, <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CHRG-114hrg21547/html/CHRG-114hrg21547.htm>; “Status report,” 4; “Mark-up memo,” 1.

-
- ¹⁰³ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “History,” *Utah Diné Bikéyah*, n.d., accessed 14 April, 2021, <https://utahdinebikeyah.org/history/>; Utah Diné Bikéyah means “the Utah people’s land”, Willie Grayeyes, “Willie Grayeyes, Chair, Addresses Utah Public Lands Initiative at the Utah State Capitol,” (January 22, 2014, <https://utahdinebikeyah.org/land-planning/pulic-lands-initiative/>).
- ¹⁰⁴ Grayeyes, “Addresses Utah Public Lands Initiative.”
- ¹⁰⁵ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Exhibit One: A Timeline: The Relationship of the Public Lands Initiative with the Tribes and Their Members,” *Utah Diné Bikéyah*, n.d., accessed 14 April, 2021, p. 3, <https://utahdinebikeyah.org////wp-content/uploads/2016/04/BearsEarsProposalTimeline.pdf>.
- ¹⁰⁶ “Exhibit One,” p. 3; The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, *Protecting the Whole Bears Ears Landscape: A Call to Honor the Full Cultural and Ecological Boundaries*, October 18, 2016, National Monuments Review, (Executive Order 13792), Part 24, p. 804, <https://www.doi.gov/foia/os/national-monuments-review-executive-order-13792>.
- ¹⁰⁷ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “History.”
- ¹⁰⁸ Coalition, “Protecting,” 804.
- ¹⁰⁹ Coalition, “Protecting,” 804. Round River is “an ecological research and education organization whose goal is the formulation and implementation of conservation strategies that conserve and restore wildness,” <https://www.roundriver.org/about-us/>.
- ¹¹⁰ Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Ute Tribe of Indians, and Zuni Pueblo, “Supplemental Comments Addressing The Secretary Of Interior’s Interim Report On Bears Ears National Monument And Related Statements,” July 10, 2017, 16,

<http://bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2017-07-10-updated-fr-monument-review-final.pdf>.

- ¹¹¹ Rebecca M. Robinson and Stephen E. Strom, *Voices from Bears Ears: Seeking Common Ground on Sacred Land* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2018), 107.
- ¹¹² Coalition, “Protecting,” 804-806.
- ¹¹³ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Exhibit One,” 4.
- ¹¹⁴ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Diné History,” *Diné Bikéyah Book*, 2011, accessed April 30, 2018, p. 3, <http://utahdinebikeyah.org/wp-content/documents/Dine-Bikeyah-book.pdf>.
- ¹¹⁵ Utah Diné Bikéyah, *Diné Bikéyah Book*, 6.
- ¹¹⁶ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Exhibit One,” 4 and 5.
- ¹¹⁷ NCAs are designated by Congress in order to “conserve, protect, and manage public lands. . . . [for] cultural, ecological, historical, scientific, and recreational values” (Robinson and Strom, *Voices from Bears Ears*, 388). The strength of protection varies from NCA to NCA, but often allow economic uses such as grazing to be grandfathered in.
- ¹¹⁸ Letter from Willie Grayeyes, Chairman, Utah Diné Bikéyah to Bruce Adams, Chairman San Juan County Commission, “Letters Referenced in Timeline,” *Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition*, n.d, accessed 28 March, 2022, p. 22, <http://www.bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Letters-referenced-in-timelline.pdf>; “Exhibit One,” pp. 4, 6, 9; Utah Diné Bikéyah, “History.”
- ¹¹⁹ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Diné History,” *Diné Bikéyah Book*, 2011, accessed April 30, 2018, p. 22, <http://utahdinebikeyah.org/wp-content/documents/Dine-Bikeyah-book.pdf>.
- ¹²⁰ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “History.”

-
- ¹²¹ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “History.” The northern communities of Blanding and Monticello are predominantly white and Mormon.
- ¹²² Mark Maryboy and Willie Grayeyes letter to Rob Bishop and Jason Chaffetz, “Letters referenced in timeline,” 21.
- ¹²³ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Exhibit One,” 4-5.
- ¹²⁴ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Diné History,” 20.
- ¹²⁵ Coalition, “Proposal,” 2.
- ¹²⁶ Kristin Millis, “Congressmen hear diverse opinions at open house,” *Moab Sun News*, 14 August, 2013, accessed 2 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/news/article_fd4b3ae6-045c-11e3-8943-0019bb30f31a.html.
- ¹²⁷ Christine Oravec, “Conservationism Vs. Preservationism: The ‘Public Interest’ in the Hetch Hetchy Controversy,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (November 1984): 444–458.
- ¹²⁸ Kristin Millis, “Congressmen hear diverse opinions at open house,” *Moab Sun News*, 14 August, 2013, accessed 2 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/news/article_fd4b3ae6-045c-11e3-8943-0019bb30f31a.html.
- ¹²⁹ Utah Outdoor Business Network, “Thank you for continuing the conversation on public Lands,” *Moab Sun News*, 25 September, 2013, accessed 2 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/opinion/article_8386928a-25fb-11e3-b464-0019bb30f31a.html.
- ¹³⁰ Gerrish Willis, “Certainty needed on wilderness and motorized access,” *Moab Times Independent*, 27 November, 2014, accessed 8 March, 2022,

<https://www.moabtimes.com/articles/certainty-needed-on-wilderness-and-motorized-access/>.

- ¹³¹ Utah Outdoor Business Network, “Thank you for continuing the conversation on public Lands,” *Moab Sun News*, 25 September, 2013, accessed 2 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/opinion/article_8386928a-25fb-11e3-b464-0019bb30f31a.html.
- ¹³² Eric Trenbeath, “Council members: No more wilderness,” *Moab Sun News*, 21 May, 2014, accessed 2 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/news/article_724368f0-e0f8-11e3-b5ba-0017a43b2370.html.
- ¹³³ Rudy Herndon “Comments reveal sharp divisions over management of public lands,” *Moab Times Independent*, 1 May, 2014, accessed 7 March, 2022, <https://www.moabtimes.com/articles/comments-reveal-sharp-divisions-over-management-of-public-lands/>.
- ¹³⁴ Kristin Millis, “County gets 170 letters on land bill,” *Moab Sun News*, 19 February, 2014, accessed 2 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/news/article_36539fd0-997d-11e3-b342-001a4bcf6878.html.
- ¹³⁵ Millis, “County gets 170 letters.”
- ¹³⁶ Pippa Thomas, “Hundreds turn out to discuss public-land maps,” *Moab Sun News*, 30 April, 2014, accessed 2 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/news/article_bf111d48-d03c-11e3-8875-0017a43b2370.html; Rudy Herndon “Comments reveal sharp divisions over management of public lands,” *Moab Times Independent*, 1 May, 2014, accessed 7 March, 2022,

<https://www.moabtimes.com/articles/comments-reveal-sharp-divisions-over-management-of-public-lands/>.

¹³⁷ Trenbeath, “Council members,” 21 May, 2014.

¹³⁸ Trenbeath, “Council members,” 21 May, 2014.

¹³⁹ Trenbeath, “Council members,” 21 May, 2014..

¹⁴⁰ Herndon “Comments reveal sharp divisions.”

¹⁴¹ Herndon “Comments reveal sharp divisions.”

¹⁴² Herndon “Comments reveal sharp divisions.”

¹⁴³ Herndon “Comments reveal sharp divisions.”

¹⁴⁴ Trenbeath, “Council members.”

¹⁴⁵ Herndon “Comments reveal sharp divisions.”

¹⁴⁶ Trenbeath, “Council members.”

¹⁴⁷ Herndon “Comments reveal sharp divisions.”

¹⁴⁸ Trenbeath, “Council members,.”

¹⁴⁹ Herndon “Comments reveal sharp divisions.”

¹⁵⁰ *Moab Times Independent*, April 2, 2015. Multiple-use is a management mandate that public lands be used for multiple purposes, not just preservation

¹⁵¹ *Moab Times Independent*, Jan. 28, 2016.

¹⁵² “San Juan County will participate in public lands bill,” *San Juan Record*, 11 December, 2013, accessed 9 May, 2022, <https://sjrnews.com/san-juan-county-will-participate-public-lands-bill>.

-
- ¹⁵³ Sonja Horoshko, “Utah lands talks produce a new idea,” *Four Corners Free Press*, 10 August, 2015, accessed 16 December, 2021, <https://fourcornersfreepress.com/utah-lands-talks-produce-a-new-idea/>.
- ¹⁵⁴ Josh Ewing, qtd. in Sonja Horoshko, “Utah lands talks produce a new idea,” *Four Corners Free Press*, 10 August, 2015, accessed 16 December, 2021, <https://fourcornersfreepress.com/utah-lands-talks-produce-a-new-idea/>.
- ¹⁵⁵ Josh Ewing, “Major update on the Public Lands Initiative legislative process,” *Friends of Cedar Mesa*, 20 August, 2015, accessed 23 December, 2020, <https://www.friendsofcedar mesa.org/major-update-on-the-public-lands-initiative-legislative-process/>.
- ¹⁵⁶ Minutes from the August 14, 2016 San Juan County Commission meeting, accessed 17 May, 2022, <https://web.archive.org/web/20151222020121/http://www.sanjuancounty.org/archives/Commission%20Audio/20150804-1.mp3>.
- ¹⁵⁷ Heidi Redd Comments, Eastern Utah Public Lands Initiative, September 30, 2016, accessed 31 January, 2022, https://web.archive.org/web/20151231194140/www.sanjuancounty.org/lands_bill.htm;
Steven Deeter Comments, Eastern Utah Public Lands Initiative, September 30, 2016, accessed 31 January, 2022, https://web.archive.org/web/20151231194140/www.sanjuancounty.org/lands_bill.htm.
- ¹⁵⁸ Deeter Comments.
- ¹⁵⁹ David Boyle, “Legislation addresses entrenched public land issues,” *Capitol West News / San Juan Record*, 27 January, 2016, accessed 7 April, 2021, <https://sjrnews.com/legislation->

-
- [*addresses-entrenched-public-land-issues*](#); “Congressmen release past-due Public Lands Initiative,” *San Juan Record*, 19 July, 2016, accessed 7 April, 2021, <https://sjrnews.com/congressmen-release-past-due-public-lands-initiative>.
- ¹⁶⁰ “Congressmen release past-due Public Lands Initiative,” *San Juan Record*.
- ¹⁶¹ Dennis Romboy, “Commissioner Phil Lyman tells of jail, ‘Hamilton’ and his right to public land,” *Deseret News*, 13 August, 2016, accessed 26 March, 2022, <https://www.deseret.com/2016/8/13/20593962/commissioner-phil-lyman-tells-of-jail-hamilton-and-his-right-to-public-land>.
- ¹⁶² Phil Lyman, “EDITORIAL: Politically-Motivated Lands Deal Cheats Utah’s Most Impoverished County,” *Free Range Report*, 25 October, 2016, accessed 13 April, 2021, <https://freerangereport.com/editorial-politically-motivated-lands-deal-cheats-utahs-impoverished-county/>.
- ¹⁶³ “Reps. Chaffetz, Bishop expect to release “discussion draft” for Public Lands Initiative,” *San Juan Record*, 2 September, 2015, accessed 7 April, 2021, <https://sjrnews.com/rebs-chaffetz-bishop-expect-release-%E2%80%9Cdiscussion-draft%E2%80%9D-public-lands-initiative>; David Boyle, “Legislation addresses entrenched public land issues,” *Capitol West News / San Juan Record*, 27 January, 2016, accessed 7 April, 2021, <https://sjrnews.com/legislation-addresses-entrenched-public-land-issues>.
- ¹⁶⁴ Rudy Herndon, “Bishop and Chaffetz release draft of public lands bill,” *Moab Sun News*, 21 January, 2015, accessed 2 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/news/article_303b220c-c055-11e5-a90e-877046d97f19.html.

-
- ¹⁶⁵ Rudy Herndon, “County appears steadfast in opposition to PLI,” *Moab Sun News*, 4 August, 2016, accessed 3 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/news/article_b8af951a-5a55-11e6-a102-ff61230e80b3.html.
- ¹⁶⁶ Dave Cozzens, “A monumental error,” *Moab Sun News*, 25 August, 2016, accessed 3 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/opinion/article_ef5971ce-6ad3-11e6-9df0-7f8b753a069a.html.
- ¹⁶⁷ Cozzens, “A monumental error.”
- ¹⁶⁸ Meyer, “Obama’s Environmental Legacy.”
- ¹⁶⁹ Rudy Herndon, “In southeast Utah, monument designation raises ire of some and brings joy to others,” *Moab Sun News*, 30 December, 2016, accessed 3 December, 2021, https://www.moabsunnews.com/news/article_3f6b33b6-cef5-11e6-a3ce-374d95ff05cc.html.
- ¹⁷⁰ Herndon, “In southeast Utah.”
- ¹⁷¹ “Utah Leaders Decry Monument Designation,” *Deseret News*, 28 December, 2016, accessed 6 April, 2022, <https://www.deseret.com/2016/12/28/20603077/utah-leaders-decry-monument-designation>.
- ¹⁷² Mike Lee, “Floor Speech on Bears Ears National Monument” (January 5, 2017, <https://www.lee.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2017/1/floor-speech-on-bears-ears-national-monument>).
- ¹⁷³ The Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Pueblo of Zuni, and Ute Indian Tribe. I refer to these Nations collectively as “the Coalition” or “the Coalition Tribes”

because this is how they generally refer to themselves in texts about BENM. The exceptions to this are when the texts themselves make other kinds of generalizations.

¹⁷⁴ The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, “Proposal to President Barack Obama for the Creation of Bears Ears National Monument,” 15 October, 2015, p. 27,

<https://bearssearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Bears-Ears-Inter-Tribal-Coalition-Proposal-10-15-15.pdf>.

¹⁷⁵ Coalition, “Proposal,” 27.

¹⁷⁶ Coalition, *Protecting the Whole Bears Ears Landscape*, 808..

¹⁷⁷ Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Ute Tribe of Indians, and Zuni Pueblo,

“Supplemental Comments Addressing The Secretary Of Interior’s Interim Report On Bears Ears National Monument And Related Statements,” July 10, 2017, p. 10,

<http://bearssearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2017-07-10-updated-fr-monument-review-final.pdf>.

¹⁷⁸ Coalition, “Proposal,” 2.

¹⁷⁹ U.S. President, “Establishment of Bears Ears National Monument; Proclamation 9558,” 82

Federal Register no. 3 (January 5, 2017), 1144,

<https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2017/01/05/2017-00038/establishment-of-the-bears-ears-national-monument>.

¹⁸⁰ Hopi Tribe et. al, “Supplemental Comments,” 16. As Charles Wilkinson notes, Obama’s provision is not the same as the collaborative management plan proposed by the Coalition, though the Coalition would “have a truly robust role in management and decision-making that goes far beyond traditional consultation” (331). Despite these differences, Obama’s commission seemed to satisfy the Coalition.

¹⁸¹ Hopi Tribe et. al, “Supplemental Comments,” 17.

¹⁸² Juliet Eilperin, “Uranium firm urged Trump officials to shrink Bears Ears National Monument.” *The Washington Post*, 8 December, 2017, accessed 23 December 2017, https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/health-science/uranium-firm-urged-trump-officials-to-shrink-bears-ears-national-monument/2017/12/08/2eea39b6-dc31-11e7-b1a8-62589434a581_story.html?noredirect=on&utm_term=.385917f43ba5.%20Accessed%2023%20Dec.%202017; Rose Marcario, “Patagonia CEO: This Is Why We’re Suing President Trump,” *Time*, 6 December, 2017, accessed 6 April 2019, www.time.com/5052617/patagonia-ceo-suing-donald-trump/.

¹⁸³ Hiroko Tabuchi, “Uranium Miners Pushed Hard for a Comeback. They Got Their Wish,” *New York Times*, 13 January, 2018, accessed 17 April, 2018, www.nytimes.com/2018/01/13/climate/trump-uranium-bears-ears.html; Eric Lipton and Lisa Friedman, “Oil Was Central In Decision To Shrink National Monument, Emails Show,” *New York Times*, 2 March, 2018, accessed 17 April, 2018, www.nytimes.com/2018/03/02/climate/bears-ears-national-monument.html; Johnathon Thompson, “At Bears Ears, Trump and Zinke ignored everyone but industry,” *High Country News*, 13 March, 2018, accessed 17 April, 2018, www.hcn.org/articles/bears-ears-national-monument-trump-and-zinke-ignored-everyone-but-industry.

¹⁸⁴ “Bears Ears National Monument: Economic Values and Economics Contributions,” *Department of the Interior*, National Monuments Review, Bears Ears NM, 2018-08, Set 2, Doc 7, pdf p. 4-6, www.doi.gov/foia/os/bears-ears-nm; U.S. President, “Modifying the

-
- Bears Ears National Monument; Proclamation 9681,” 82 *Federal Register* no. 235 (8 Dec. 2017), 58085.
- ¹⁸⁵ Hopi Tribe et al., “Supplemental Comments,” 16.
- ¹⁸⁶ Leigh Paterson, “Oil & Gas Eyes Fringes Of Bears Ears,” *Inside Energy News*, 1 September, 2017, accessed 5 February, 2020, <http://insideenergy.org/2017/09/01/oil-gas-eyes-bears-ears-fringes/>; Tim Peterson, “Controversial Daneros Uranium Mine nears Bears Ears Appealed,” *Grand Canyon Trust*, 15 August, 2018, accessed 5 February, 2020, <https://www.grandcanyontrust.org/blog/daneros-uranium-mine-bears-ears-appeal/>; Jonathan Thompson, “Bears Ears a go — but here’s where Obama drew the line.” *High Country News*, 29 December, 2016, accessed 5 February, 2020, https://www.hcn.org/articles/obama-designates-bears-ears-national-monument/print_view.
- ¹⁸⁷ Emma Frances Bloomfield, “The Rhetoric of Energy Darwinism: Neoliberal Piety and Market Autonomy in Economic Discourse,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 49, no. 4 (2019): 320, doi:10.1080/02773945.2019.1634831.
- ¹⁸⁸ Bloomfield, “The Rhetoric of Energy Darwinism,” 321.
- ¹⁸⁹ Jeremy David Engels, *The Art of Gratitude* (Albany: The State University of New York Press, 2018), 4.
- ¹⁹⁰ Eve Tuck and Marcia McKenzie, *Place in Research Theory, Methodology, and Methods* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2015), 3-4.
- ¹⁹¹ *Antiquities Act of 1906*, Public Law No. 59-209, 34 Stat. 225 (54 U.S.C. § 320301).
- ¹⁹² Andreas Folkers writes that genealogy excavates a thing’s “conditions of emergence, existence and becoming” (6). Andreas Folkers, “Daring the Truth: Foucault, Parrhesia

and the Genealogy of Critique” *Theory, Culture & Society* 33, no. 1 (2016): 3-28,
doi:10.1177/0263276414558885.

¹⁹³ I call the relationships between Tribes and land an “object” in order to align with the language used in the Antiquities Act. This move is intended to highlight the ways that Obama’s proclamation protects these relationships.

¹⁹⁴ Nathaniel A. Rivers and Maarten Derksen, “Ecologies of Deception in Psychology and Rhetoric,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 101, no. 4 (2015): 638,
doi:10.1080/00335630.2015.1127404.

¹⁹⁵ Justine Wells, Bridie McGreavy, Samantha Senda-Cook, and George F. McHendry, Jr., “Introduction: Rhetoric’s Ecologies,” in *Tracing Rhetoric and Material Life. Ecological Approaches*, ed. Bridie McGreavy, Justine Wells, George F. McHendry Jr., and Samantha Senda-Cook (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), 2.

¹⁹⁶ Nathan Stormer and Bridie McGreavy, “Thinking Ecologically About Rhetoric’s Ontology: Capacity, Vulnerability, and Resilience,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 50, no. 1 (2017): 3.

¹⁹⁷ Justine Wells, “W. E. B. Du Bois and the Conservation of Races: A Piece of Ecological Ancestry,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 49, no. 4 (2019): 343,
doi:10.1080/02773945.2019.1634830.

¹⁹⁸ Wells et al, “Introduction,” 3, 4.

¹⁹⁹ Jenny Edbauer Rice, “Unframing Models of Public Distribution: From Rhetorical Situation to Rhetorical Ecologies,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 35, no. 4 (2005): 14,
doi:10.1080/02773940509391320.

-
- ²⁰⁰ Joe Edward Hatfield, "The Queer Kairotic: Digital Transgender Suicide Memories and Ecological Rhetorical Agency," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 49, no. 1 (2019): 29, doi:10.1080/02773945.2018.1549334.
- ²⁰¹ Edbauer Rice, "Unframing," 9.
- ²⁰² Edbauer Rice, "Unframing," 9.
- ²⁰³ Nathaniel A. Rivers and Ryan P. Weber, "Ecological, Pedagogical, Public Rhetoric," *College Composition and Communication* 63, no. 2 (December 2011): 193-194.
- ²⁰⁴ Timothy Morton, *The Ecological Thought* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 2.
- ²⁰⁵ Morton, *The Ecological Thought*, 2.
- ²⁰⁶ Edbauer Rice, "Unframing," 13.
- ²⁰⁷ Edbauer Rice, "Unframing," 14.
- ²⁰⁸ Engels, *The Art of Gratitude*, 4, 42.
- ²⁰⁹ Catherine Chaput, "Rhetorical Circulation in Late Capitalism: Neoliberalism and the Overdetermination of Affective Energy," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 43, no. 1 (2010): 2-3.
- ²¹⁰ Robert Asen, "Neoliberalism, the public sphere, and a public good," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 103, no. 4 (2017): 329-349, doi:10.1080/00335630.2017.1360507; Bloomfield, "The Rhetoric of Energy Darwinism"; Engels, *The Art of Gratitude*; Jen Schneider, Steve Schwarze, Peter K. Bsumek, and Jennifer Peeples, *Under Pressure: Coal Industry Rhetoric and Neoliberalism*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).
- ²¹¹ Schneider et al., *Under Pressure*, 9-10.
- ²¹² Tuck and McKenzie, *Place in Research*, 4.
- ²¹³ Chaput, "Rhetorical Circulation," 4.
- ²¹⁴ Chaput, "Rhetorical Circulation," 4.

-
- ²¹⁵ Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-79*, ed. Michel Senellart, trans. Graham Burchell, (London: Palgrave Macmillon, 2008), 218.
- ²¹⁶ Wendy Brown, “American Nightmare: Neoliberalism, Neoconservatism, and De-Democratization.” *Political Theory* 34, no. 6 (December 2006): 693.
- ²¹⁷ Rosaleen Duffy, “Interactive elephants: Nature, tourism and neoliberalism,” *Annals of Tourism Research* 44 (January 2014): 89, doi:10.1016/j.annals.2013.09.003.
- ²¹⁸ Coalition, “Protecting,” 797.
- ²¹⁹ Coalition, “Proposal,” 8.
- ²²⁰ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Native Wisdom Speaks at Bears Ears National Monument: Will America listen?,” n.d., accessed December 18, 2019, <http://utahdinebikeyah.org/media-kit/booklet.pdf>.
- ²²¹ Coalition, “Proposal,” 2.
- ²²² Utah Diné Bikéyah “Exhibit One,” 5; Coalition “Protecting,” 804.
- ²²³ Coalition “Protecting,” 804.
- ²²⁴ Tiara R. Na’puti, “Archipelagic rhetoric: remapping the Marianas and challenging militarization from ‘A Stirring Place,’” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 16, no. 1 (2019): 5, doi:10.1080/14791420.2019.1572905.
- ²²⁵ Marie Battiste and James Youngblood Henderson, *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge* (Sakatoon, CA: Purich Publishing, 2008), 44; Danielle Endres, “Sacred Land or National Sacrifice Zone: The Role of Values in the Yucca Mountain Participation Process,” *Environmental Communication* 6, no. 3 (September 2012): 335-336, doi:10.1080/17524032.2012.688060.

-
- ²²⁶ Rebecca Tsosie, “Indigenous Peoples and “Cultural Sustainability”: The Role of Law and Traditional Knowledge,” in *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Learning from Indigenous Practices for Environmental Sustainability*, ed. M.K. Nelson and D. Shilling (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 237.
- ²²⁷ Battiste and Henderson, *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage*, 42.
- ²²⁸ Hopi Tribe et al., “Supplemental Comments,” 5.
- ²²⁹ Deborah McGregor, “Coming Full Circle: Indigenous Knowledge, Environment, and Our Future,” *American Indian Quarterly* 28, nos. 3 & 4 (2004): 390.
- ²³⁰ McGregor, “Coming Full Circle,” 390, 395. Emphasis in original.
- ²³¹ Antiquities Act.
- ²³² Coalition, “Proposal,” 19.
- ²³³ Charles Wilkinson, “At Bears Ears We Can Hear the Voices of Our Ancestors in Every Canyon and on Every Mesa Top: The Creation of the First Native National Monument,” *Arizona State Law Journal* 50, no. 1 (2018): 329. Heinonline.
- ²³⁴ Hal Rothman, *America’s National Monuments: The Politics of Preservation* (Lawrence: Kansas University Press, 1994), xiii.
- ²³⁵ James R. Rasband, “The Future of the Antiquities Act,” *Journal of Land, Resources, & Environmental Law* 21, no. 2B (2001): 628.
- ²³⁶ Meyer, “Obama’s Environmental Legacy.”
- ²³⁷ Wilkinson qtd. in Rasband, “The Future of the Antiquities Act,” 633.
- ²³⁸ Richard West Sellars, “A Very Large Array: Early Federal Historic Preservation – The Antiquities Act, Mesa Verde, and the National Park Service Act,” *Natural Resources Journal* 47, no. 2 (2007): 270. Heinonline.

-
- ²³⁹ “Establishment,” 1140.
- ²⁴⁰ Wilkinson, “At Bears Ears,” 329.
- ²⁴¹ Hopi Tribe et al., “Supplemental Comments,” 17.
- ²⁴² “Modifying,” 58081-2.
- ²⁴³ “Modifying,” 58082.
- ²⁴⁴ “Establishment,” 1141-2.
- ²⁴⁵ “Establishment,” 1143.
- ²⁴⁶ “Establishment,” 1139.
- ²⁴⁷ “Establishment,” 1139.
- ²⁴⁸ “Establishment,” 1140, 1145.
- ²⁴⁹ “Establishment,” 1139.
- ²⁵⁰ “Establishment,” 1140.
- ²⁵¹ “Establishment,” 1139-40.
- ²⁵² Tsosie, “Indigenous Rights,” 68.
- ²⁵³ Tsosie qtd. in Meyer, “Obama’s Environmental Legacy.”
- ²⁵⁴ Hopi Tribe et al., “Supplemental Comments,” 17.
- ²⁵⁵ “Establishment,” 1145.
- ²⁵⁶ “Establishment,” 1144.
- ²⁵⁷ “Establishment,” 1144; Hopi Tribe et al., Supplemental Comments,” 16.
- ²⁵⁸ “Modifying,” 58085; Eilperin, “Uranium firm”; Eric Lipton and Lisa Friedman, “Oil Was Central In Decision To Shrink National Monument, Emails Show.” *New York Times*, 2 March, 2018, accessed 17 April, 2018, www.nytimes.com/2018/03/02/climate/bears-ears-national-monument.html.

-
- ²⁵⁹ Ryan K. Zinke, “Memorandum for the President: Final Report Summarizing Findings of the Review of Designations Under the Antiquities Act,” p. 7, 5 December, 2017, accessed 5 February, 2020, https://www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/uploads/revised_final_report.pdf.
- ²⁶⁰ Zinke, “Memorandum,” 10.
- ²⁶¹ “Modifying,” 58081.
- ²⁶² “Modifying,” 58081.
- ²⁶³ “Modifying,” 58082.
- ²⁶⁴ Trump’s proclamation refers to “Native Americans” generally. There is no mention of the specific Tribal Nations that formed the Coalition and who proposed BENM’s creation.
- ²⁶⁵ “Modifying,” 58082, 58085-6.
- ²⁶⁶ Randall Lake, “Between Myth and History: Enacting Time in Native American Protest Rhetoric,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 77, no. 2 (1991): 124-125.
- ²⁶⁷ “Modifying,” 58083-4.
- ²⁶⁸ Coalition “Protecting,” 828-836; “Cultural Resources Map: Indian Creek.” *Bureau of Land Management*, accessed 2 December, 2019, eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/eplanning/planAndProjectSite.do?methodName=dispatchToPatternPage¤tPageId=140966; “Cultural Resources Map: Shash Jáa.” *Bureau of Land Management*, accessed 2 December, 2019, eplanning.blm.gov/epl-front-office/eplanning/planAndProjectSite.do?methodName=dispatchToPatternPage¤tPageId=140966.
- ²⁶⁹ “An Archaeological Perspective on the Bears Ears National Monument,” *Department of the Interior*, National Monuments Review, (Executive Order 13792), Part 33, pdf p. 3, accessed 2 Dec. 2019, www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/uploads/17-

-
- [00538_first_production_combined_files.pdf](#); William H. Doelle, “Bears Ears: Archaeological Experts Gathering,” *Archaeology Southwest*, p. 4
www.archaeologysouthwest.org/2017/08/23/whats-at-stake-if-protections-are-eliminated-for-any-part-of-bears-ears-national-monument/.
- ²⁷⁰ “Information Sheet: Bears Ears National Monument, UT-SHPO and the National Historic Preservation Act’s Section 106,” *Department of the Interior*, National Monuments Review, (Executive Order 13792), Part 33, pdf p. 1, accessed 2 December, 2019, www.doi.gov/sites/doi.gov/files/uploads/17-00538_first_production_combined_files.pdf.
- ²⁷¹ “Modifying,” 58083, 58084.
- ²⁷² “Modifying,” 58084.
- ²⁷³ “Modifying,” 58084.
- ²⁷⁴ “Modifying,” 58083.
- ²⁷⁵ Duffy, “Interactive elephants,” 92.
- ²⁷⁶ Marita Sturken, *Tourists of History: Memory, Kitsch, and Consumerism from Oklahoma City to Ground Zero* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 9.
- ²⁷⁷ Sturken, *Tourists of History*, 9-10. Emphasis in original.
- ²⁷⁸ Bloomfield, “The Rhetoric of Energy Darwinism,” 337.
- ²⁷⁹ Duffy, “Interactive elephants,” 92.
- ²⁸⁰ Mike Lee, “Floor Speech on Bears Ears National Monument” (January 5, 2017, <https://www.lee.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2017/1/floor-speech-on-bears-ears-national-monument>).
- ²⁸¹ Coalition, “Proposal,” 18, 20, 28.
- ²⁸² Coalition, “Proposal,” 13.

-
- ²⁸³ By this I mean that the Coalition understands Bears Ears, land, and related topics in ways that are outside the colonial, Western view of land; they are ways of knowing the land “otherwise.” See: Arturo Escobar, “Worlds and Knowledges Otherwise,” *Cultural Studies* 21, no.2-3 (2007): 179-210, doi:10.1080/09502380601162506.
- ²⁸⁴ Mary E. Stuckey and John M. Murphy, “By Any Other Name: Rhetorical Colonialism in North America,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 24, no. 4 (2001): 85.
- ²⁸⁵ Patrick Wolfe, *Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race* (New York: Verso, 2016), 15; Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012): 5.
- ²⁸⁶ Wolfe, *Traces of History*, 3.
- ²⁸⁷ Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (New York: Cassell, 1999), 2.
- ²⁸⁸ Karma R. Chávez, “The Body: An Abstract and Actual Rhetorical Concept,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 48, no. 3 (2018): 242, doi:10.1080/02773945.2018.1454182.
- ²⁸⁹ Michael Lechuga, “An anticolonial future: reassembling the way we do rhetoric,” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 17, no. 4 (2020): 378, doi:10.1080/14791420.2020.1829659.
- ²⁹⁰ Lechuga, “An anticolonial future,” 380.
- ²⁹¹ Gabriela Rios, “Cultivating Land-Based Literacies and Rhetorics,” *Literacy in Composition Studies* 3, no. 1 (2015): 60. In forwarding this land-rhetoric, I recognize both Tiara Na’puti and Tiffany Lethabo King’s arguments about land-centric stories. In sum, Na’puti writes that the “propensity [of communication scholars] to solely examine land-based and human-built environments significantly impacts theories of rhetoric and place

by foreclosing opportunities to decenter colonial epistemologies about land itself” (5), and King contends that, by focusing on land, “an actual discussion of Native genocide is displaced by a focus on White settlers’ relationship to land rather than their parasitic and genocidal relationship to Indigenous and Black peoples” (68). Yes and yes. However, in this specific context and place—settler Utah—land-centric stories make sense and seem necessary, especially because the centrality of land is nowhere more apparent than in the Coalition’s advocacy for BENM. That is, since the Coalition centers land, it seems appropriate for me to also do so. See: Tiara R. Na’puti, “Archipelagic rhetoric: remapping the Marianas and challenging militarization from ‘A Stirring Place,’” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 16, no. 1 (2019): 4-25, doi:10.1080/14791420.2019.1572905; Tiffany Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2019).

²⁹² Patrick Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December 2006): 401.

²⁹³ Eve Tuck and Marcia McKenzie, *Place in Research Theory, Methodology, and Methods* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2015), 64.

²⁹⁴ Wolfe, *Traces of History*, 15.

²⁹⁵ Peter Iverson, *Diné: A History of the Navajos* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), 51.

²⁹⁶ Iverson, *Diné*, 52.

²⁹⁷ “Treaty with the Navajo,” conclusion date: June 1, 1868, *Indian Affairs: Laws and Treaties* vol. 2, p. 1017, <https://americanindian.si.edu/static/nationtonation/pdf/Navajo-Treaty-1868.pdf>.

²⁹⁸ Wolfe, *Traces of History*, 145.

²⁹⁹ Robert Athearn, *William Tecumseh Sherman and the Settlement of the West* (Tulsa: University of Oklahoma Press, 1956), 204, qtd. in Daniel McCool, “Expert Witness Report by Dr. Daniel McCool in the case of: Navajo Nation v. San Juan County, UT Case. No. 2:12-cv-00039-RS August 18, 2015,” p. 25, <https://utahdinebikeyah.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Discrimination-Report-McCool-8-15.pdf>

³⁰⁰ Peter Iverson, *Diné: A History of the Navajos* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2002), 71. Intriguingly, Andrew Needham argues that the regional descriptor “Southwest” has always been a “form of organizing space politically, a means toward claiming resources and contesting their proper distribution.” Not in widespread use until after 1941, the term “Southwest” followed the settler history of the region; in other words, the organization of space, land, and people towards the “proper distribution of resources” to white settlers. Land and people were assimilated into settler society. See: Andrew Needham, *Power Lines: Phoenix and the Making of the Modern Southwest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014), 15.

³⁰¹ Needham, *Power Lines*, 17.

³⁰² Needham also notes that forced assimilation remain the favored policy at least through the 1950s, with relocation and removal from the Navajo Reservation mooted multiple times after the reservation’s creation. *Power Lines*, 122.

³⁰³ Lee, “Floor Speech.”

³⁰⁴ Nancy Maryboy, and David Begay, “The Navajos of Utah,” In *A History of Utah’s American Indians*, Ed. Forrest Cuch (Logan: Utah State University Press, 2003), 290

-
- ³⁰⁵ Clyde Benally, *Dinéjí Nákéé' Nááhané: A Utah Navajo History* (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Printing Service, 1982), 122.
- ³⁰⁶ Clyde Kluckhohn & Dorothea Leighton, *The Navaho* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946/1974), 43.
- ³⁰⁷ Daniel McCool, “Expert Witness Report by Dr. Daniel McCool in the case of: Navajo Nation v. San Juan County, UT Case. No. 2:12-cv-00039-RS August 18, 2015,” p. 35, <https://utahdinebikeyah.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Discrimination-Report-McCool-8-15.pdf>.
- ³⁰⁸ Lee, “Floor Speech.”
- ³⁰⁹ Scott Richard Lyons, “Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from Writing?” *College Composition and Communication* 51, no. 3 (Feb., 2000): 452.
- ³¹⁰ McCool, “Expert Witness Report,” 31.
- ³¹¹ Every instance that I have found from a Native American opposed to BENM who identifies themselves as a Navajo from Utah either lives off reservation or in the Aneth chapter section. For example, see: Blue Mountain Diné Facebook page, “About,” https://www.facebook.com/Blue-Mountain-Din%C3%A9-114599778591889/about/?ref=page_internal. This organization describes themselves as “An association for Off-Reservation Navajos who resides within San Juan County, Utah.”
- ³¹² Caroline Goodman, “Reclaiming the Land: Indigenous Articulations of Environmentalism at Bears Ears,” (Master’s Thesis, University of New Mexico, 2016), 15, https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/amst_etds/46.

-
- ³¹³ Jared Farmer, *On Zion's Mount: Mormons, Indians, and the American Landscape* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 16.
- ³¹⁴ Lee's Senate website lists no public lands speeches or op-eds between these times. Neither of his public pages on Instagram or Facebook contain posts about Bears Ears that are still visible. His Twitter account lists only two tweets, one on December 13, 2017 and one on April 26, 2018. Neither of these tweets discuss much of substance.
- ³¹⁵ U.S. Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, Federal Land Ownership: Overview and Data, by Carol Hardy Vincent, Laura A. Hanson, Carla A. Argueta, R42346 (2017), 8.
- ³¹⁶ Mike Lee, "Honoring the Founders Promise on Federal Lands" (June 29, 2018, <https://www.lee.senate.gov/public/index.cfm/2018/6/honoring-the-founders-promise-on-federal-lands>).
- ³¹⁷ Indeed, there is a long history—particularly in San Juan County—of denying Native Americans the basic rights of American citizens, much of which has revolved around issues of land. See: Krista Langlois, "How a Utah county silenced Native American voters — and how Navajos are fighting back," *High Country News*, 13 June, 2016, accessed 22 December, 2020, <https://www.hcn.org/issues/48.10/how-a-utah-county-silenced-native-american-voters-and-how-navajos-are-fighting-back>; "Expert Witness Report by Dr. Daniel McCool in the case of: Navajo Nation v. San Juan County, UT Case. No. 2:12-cv-00039-RS August 18, 2015," p. 109, <https://utahdinebikeyah.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Discrimination-Report-McCool-8-15.pdf>.
- ³¹⁸ Lee's argument has merit, though it is oversimplified. The arid nature of much of the West certainly had an impact on settlement, but other factors, such as changing views on how

-
- much land one should be able to accumulate and changing surveying practices, also had effects. See: Paul W. Gates and Robert W. Swenson, "History of public land law development," (Washington: U.S. Government Print Office, 1968), 419–422, doi: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.32106000891595>.
- ³¹⁹ R. E. Burrillo, Joan Brenner Coltrain, Micahel D. Lewis, and William D. Lipe, "Ancient Farming Strategies in Greater Bears Ears," in "Sacred and Threatened: The Cultural Landscape of Greater Bears Ears," ed. R. E. Burrillo and Benjamin A. Bellorado, Special issue *Archaeology Southwest* 31, no. 4 & 32, no. 1 (Fall 2017 & Winter 2018): 24-26; Jerry D. Spangler, Andrew T. Yentsch, and Rachelle Green, *Farming and Foraging on the Southwestern Frontier: An Overview of Previous Research of the Archaeological and Historical Resources of the Greater Cedar Mesa Area*, Antiquities Section Selected Papers Volume IX, No. 18, Utah Division of State History Salt Lake City, Utah ed. Kevin Jones (February, 2010), 80-86.
- ³²⁰ Wolfe, "Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native," 395.
- ³²¹ Carolyn Gallaher, "Placing the Militia Occupation of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge in Harney County, Oregon," *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* 15, no. 2 (2016): 295.
- ³²² Gallaher, "Placing the Militia Occupation," 295.
- ³²³ Lyons, "Rhetorical Sovereignty," 457-458.
- ³²⁴ Jacqueline Keeler, "Afterword," in *Edge of Morning: Native Voices Speak for the Bears Ears*, Jacqueline Keeler, ed. (Salt Lake City: Torrey House Press, 2017), 163.
- ³²⁵ Lloyd Lee, "Land: Níhi Kéyah," in *Edge of Morning*, 59.
- ³²⁶ Coalition, "Proposal," 2.

-
- ³²⁷ Lyle Balenquah, “Spirit of Place: Preserving the Cultural Landscape of The Bears Ears,” in *Edge of Morning*, 80.
- ³²⁸ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Native Wisdom Speaks at Bears Ears National Monument: Will America listen?,” n.d., p. 2, <http://utahdinebikeyah.org/media-kit/booklet.pdf>.
- ³²⁹ Sandra Styres and Dawn Zinga, “The Community-First Land-Centred Theoretical Framework: Bringing a ‘Good Mind’ to Indigenous Education Research?” *Canadian Journal of Education* 36, no. 2 (2013): 300-301.
- ³³⁰ Max Libroiron, *Pollution is Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2021), 6-7, fn. 19.
- ³³¹ Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Ute Tribe of Indians, and Zuni Pueblo, “Supplemental Comments Addressing The Secretary Of Interior’s Interim Report On Bears Ears National Monument And Related Statements,” July 10, 2017, 10, <http://bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2017-07-10-updated-fr-monument-review-final.pdf>.
- ³³² Ríos, “Cultivating,” 60, 64.
- ³³³ Ríos, “Cultivating,” 64
- ³³⁴ Ríos, “Cultivating,” 65.
- ³³⁵ Eve Tuck, Marcia McKenzie, and Kate McCoy, “Land education: Indigenous, post-colonial, and decolonizing perspectives on place and environmental education research,” *Environmental Education Research* 20, no. 1 (2014): 1–23, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2013.877708>.
- ³³⁶ Lechuga, “An anticolonial future,” 384, 380.
- ³³⁷ Lechuga, “An anticolonial future,” 384.
- ³³⁸ Hopi Tribe et al., “Supplemental Comments,” 5.

-
- ³³⁹ Lyle Balenquah, “Spirit of Place, 79.
- ³⁴⁰ See, for example: Marie Battiste and James Youngblood Henderson, *Protecting Indigenous Knowledge and Heritage: A Global Challenge* (Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, CA: Purich Publishing), 44; Danielle Endres, “Sacred Land or National Sacrifice Zone: The Role of Values in the Yucca Mountain Participation Process,” *Environmental Communication* 6, no. 3 (September 2012): 335-6, doi:10.1080/17524032.2012.688060.
- ³⁴¹ I artificially distinguish between assimilation and removal, and also Traditional Knowledge and being on the land in order to clearly demonstrate how the Coalition’s rhetorics provide refutation to these settler logics.
- ³⁴² Eric Descheenie qtd. in Coalition, “Proposal,” 13.
- ³⁴³ Robin Wall Kimmerer, “Renewing Relationship Between Land and Culture,” *Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition*, <https://bearscoalition.org/traditional-knowledge-and-bears-ears/>.
- ³⁴⁴ Sandra Styres, Celia-Haig-Brown, and Melissa Blimkie, “Towards a Pedagogy of Land: The Urban Context,” *Canadian Journal of Education* 36, no. 2 (2013): 34-67.
- ³⁴⁵ Coalition, “Protecting,” 4.
- ³⁴⁶ Billy Mike qtd. in The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, “Bears Ears: A Native Perspective on America’s Most Significant Unprotected Cultural Landscape,” *Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition* n.d., p. 15, https://bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Bears-Ears-bro.sm_.pdf
- ³⁴⁷ Eric Descheenie, “Ways of Knowing,” in “Sacred and Threatened: The Cultural Landscape of Greater Bears Ears,” ed. R. E. Burrillo and Benjamin A. Bellorado, Special issue *Archaeology Southwest* 31, no. 4 & 32, no. 1 (Fall 2017 & Winter 2018): 13.

³⁴⁸ Much of the work that UDB began to protect the region was included in the Coalition’s BENM proposal. The shift from “UDB” to “the Coalition” in my telling of this story reflects the shift from the Navajo-centric “Diné Bikéyah” to “Bears Ears” and “the Coalition” as more tribes became involved in the efforts to protect the land.

³⁴⁹ Utah Diné Bikéyah, “History,” *Utah Diné Bikéyah*, n.d., accessed 14 April, 2021, <https://utahdinebikeyah.org/history/>; Diné Bikéyah et al. v. Donald Trump, 7.

³⁵⁰ Native Wisdom Speaks, 7.

³⁵¹ Native Wisdom Speaks, 7.

³⁵² Coalition “Protecting,” 804.

³⁵³ Coalition “Protecting,” 806.

³⁵⁴ Coalition “Protecting,” 804.

³⁵⁵ Coalition “Protecting,” 806.

³⁵⁶ “A Native Perspective,” 10

³⁵⁷ “Native Wisdom Speaks,” 7.

³⁵⁸ Qtd. in “Native Perspective,” 7.

³⁵⁹ Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Ute Tribe of Indians, and Zuni Pueblo, “Supplemental Comments Addressing The Secretary Of Interior’s Interim Report On Bears Ears National Monument And Related Statements,” July 10, 2017, p. 3, <http://bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2017-07-10-updated-fr-monument-review-final.pdf>. The Coalition notes that the “Zuni and Hopi were spared the violence of the forced removal because they had by this time relocated to their current pueblos to the south and southeast” (3). Bears Ears remains sacred to Zuni and Hopi because of long-recognized ancestral connections.

-
- ³⁶⁰ Hopi Tribe, Navajo Nation, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, Ute Tribe of Indians, and Zuni Pueblo, “Supplemental Comments Addressing The Secretary Of Interior’s Interim Report On Bears Ears National Monument And Related Statements,” July 10, 2017, p. 4, <http://bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/2017-07-10-updated-fr-monument-review-final.pdf>
- ³⁶¹ Hopi Tribe et al., “Supplemental Comments,” 4.
- ³⁶² The Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, “RE: Status of the Bears Ears Coalition-PLI Discussions – dated December 31, 2015,” p. 1, https://bearscoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/BEIC_Bishop_Letter_123115.pdf.
- ³⁶³ Hopi Tribe et al. “Supplemental Comments,” 1.
- ³⁶⁴ Hopi Tribe et al., “Supplemental Comments,” 3.
- ³⁶⁵ Jim Enote, qtd. in Coalition, “Proposal,” 19.
- ³⁶⁶ “Native Wisdom Speaks,” 3.
- ³⁶⁷ Shaun Champoos qtd. in Utah Diné Bikéyah, “Native Wisdom Speaks at Bears Ears National Monument: Will America listen?,” n.d. p. 7, <http://utahdinebikeyah.org/media-kit/booklet.pdf>.
- ³⁶⁸ Bears Ears Inter-Tribal Coalition, “Letters-All-Combined-small-10-14-15,” p. 2, <http://utahdinebikeyah.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Letters-All-Combined-small-10-14-15.pdf>.
- ³⁶⁹ Hopi Tribe et al, “Supplemental Comments,” 38-39.
- ³⁷⁰ Hopi Tribe et al., “Supplemental Comments,” 38, 39.
- ³⁷¹ The Hopi Tribe, “Testimony of the Hopi Tribe,” 2-4.

-
- ³⁷² Joe Lyman, “Why Oppose the Bears Ears National Monument?,” *& the West*, 15 November, 2016, accessed 26 September, 2020, <https://andthewest.stanford.edu/2016/why-oppose-the-bears-ears-national-monument/>.
- ³⁷³ The Lymans were among the first settlers of San Juan County. One, Albert (1880-1973), was known as “The Father of Blanding,” and, as of 2005, was said to have more than 1,000 living descendants. See: Buckley Jensen, “Albert R. Lyman,” *San Juan Record*, 4 June, 2008, accessed 13 May, 2022, <https://sjrnews.com/giants-san-juan/albert-r-lyman>.
- ³⁷⁴ Lyman, “Why Oppose the Bears Ears National Monument?”
- ³⁷⁵ Raka Shome, “Postcolonial Interventions in the Rhetorical Canon: An “Other” View,” *Communication Theory* 6, no. 1 (1996): 51.
- ³⁷⁶ Dave Tell, “The Meanings of Kansas: Rhetoric, Regions, and Counter Regions,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 42, no. 3 (2012): 215, doi:10.1080/02773945.2012.682843.
- ³⁷⁷ Lechuga, “An anticolonial future,” 378.
- ³⁷⁸ Jordan Christiansen, “Elimination Through the Production of Race: The Settler Colonial Constitution of ‘Native Americans’ and Indigenous Attempts to Define Themselves,” PhD diss (University of Kansas, 2021), 145.
- ³⁷⁹ Tiara R. Na’puti, “Speaking of indigeneity: Navigating genealogies against erasure and #RhetoricSoWhite,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 105, no. 4 (2019): 495-501, doi: 10.1080/00335630.2019.1669895; Taylor N. Johnson and Danielle Endres, “Decolonizing Settler Public Address: The Role of Settler Scholars,” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 4, no. 1-2 (2021): 333–348. ISSN 1094-8392.
- ³⁸⁰ Na’puti, “Speaking of indigeneity,” 497.