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Editors’ Introduction

What Justice Wants

EVE TUCK AND K. WAYNE YANG

Before we turn to the themes and threads of this issue on what justice wants, we pause to express our appreciation and intentions. We are so grateful to the many people whose labors and visions have brought this journal into existence, and into our hands. There is not space enough to name them all; however, we would like to especially acknowledge the work of the founding editors, John D. Márquez and Junaid Rana, and the first managing editor, Kelly Chung. The initial issues of this journal have laid the example for politically committed scholarship across the scope of what Critical Ethnic Studies is and can be.

We enter the scene as editors for a three-year term. We are delighted to be working with managing coeditor LeKeisha Hughes (University of California, San Diego) on this issue, and managing coeditor Sam Spady (OISE, University of Toronto) on our journal’s blog and next issue. One of our early acts as editors was to invite members to the Critical Ethnic Studies Editorial Board, and all of them have been big-hearted with their guidance, critical feedback, and their intellectual and political weight. As authors returned final manuscripts imbued by the feedback of reviewers, they remarked again and again how generative and generous this particular review process had been for them, and we resoundingly agree. Something wonderful is happening.

This second phase of the journal under our leadership will no doubt carry our curatorial accents, and our particular perspectives on the field of critical ethnic studies (CES). The work of critical ethnic studies is far larger than our own particularities, and is taking off across activist intellectual spaces that include extra-academic and academic settings, anywhere that foments an open dialogue that brings together “Indigenous sovereignty, critiques of antiblackness, intersectional feminist and queer analyses, disability studies, border and migration studies, critical refugee studies, and more,” in productive tension, and that is nurturing of ways of life that actively defy
the impulses of “white supremacy, settler colonialism, capitalism, and heteropatriarchy, as well as militarism, occupation, Indigenous erasure, neocolonialism, anti-immigration, anti-Islam,” and other structured harms.¹

The organic intellectual work of organizing collectives who actively produce theory, like the Native Youth Sexual Health Network, Gallery of the Streets, the Palestinian Youth Movement and African Americans for Justice in the Middle East and North Africa, Third Eye Collective, We Charge Genocide, and Sogorea Te Land Trust; of independent research projects like Black/Land Project; of university-resourced resurgence projects like the University of Victoria’s Indigenous Leadership Forum; and of lovingly radical media like Indian and Cowboy and This Is the Read are more influential than our journal in tending these open dialogues, even if their efforts are not named as “critical ethnic studies.”² In academic settings, the first faculty positions that intentionally deploy the terminology “critical ethnic studies” have been created in the last few years, notably at the University of Minnesota, Kalamazoo College, and the University of California, Santa Cruz. The Critical Ethnic Studies Association (CESA) as an academic/activist organism of volunteer, past, present, and future members must be credited with expanding and naming this space, creating this journal, as well as a new book series just launched with Northwestern University Press coedited by Michelle Wright and Jodi Byrd, and a forthcoming anthology called Critical Ethnic Studies: A Reader by the Critical Ethnic Studies Editorial Collective.

Having said this about the state of the field, we must admit that we as editors are agnostic about field building. In part, this is because critical ethnic studies is itself an “interdisciplinary, and un-disciplinary” field that pushes back against the institutionalization of ethnic studies.³ Also, it is because we, like many others, come to the CES conversation not to build a field but as sometime outsiders who find this node of convergence important, exciting, and resonant. Academically speaking, Eve and Wayne are coming to this work from education, a discipline not typically considered part of (critical) ethnic studies. Although Wayne is now in ethnic studies and Eve is in education and Indigenous studies, critical ethnic studies is for us, for now, a node of activist intellectualism committed to Indigenous land/life, Black life, queer life, and decolonization. We feel one of our main editorial commitments is to be caretaking of relationships between critical ethnic studies, Indigenous studies, and Black studies. We do not mean for this commitment to create another exclusive identitarian ordering of “importance” in ethnic studies but rather to provide space for critical dialogue currently underway—space that we do not see sufficiently provided
for elsewhere. We mention this to be transparent about how we as editors might nurture vital topics of inquiry yet, in the process, leave gaps and missing persons and missing pieces. These priorities and gaps are not necessarily representative of CESA, nor of the field of critical ethnic studies. What we miss, we will try to name along the way, and we invite critical submissions that address them to this journal.

Beyond the themed issues we have planned and the selections we will make, we have also implemented some procedural-level interventions in order to cultivate radical citation practices, accountability to communities and community partners, and enhanced obligations of authorship. These interventions will continue to be seasoned over time and our hope is that this will be a journal that enacts a politics of relation that sets it apart from other journals but, better, informs the work of other journals. Of course, we are learning from the practices of other journals, particularly *Native American and Indigenous Studies* (published by the University of Minnesota Press) and *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* (published online and open access), as we endeavor to foster a journal culture of generous criticality.

This special issue connects to currents in the field, largely named by terms like “justice” and, closely related, “social justice,” yet sometimes insufficiently described by them. When formulating this issue and then again after the call for proposals was released, we received numerous affirming comments to the tune of “justice is the defining issue of our time.” These comments resound with the spirit of resistance to the constant re/production of injustice. They also reveal how “justice” is one of those stalwart terms that can come to quickly dominate the terms of the radical agenda. This hegemony of justice is problematic, and that is why we see it as the job of this journal to interrogate it: making space for a critical conversation of what justice is, or more precisely what justice wants, what it produces, whom it fails, where it operates, when it is in effect, and what it lacks.

And because we do not see the interrogation of justice to begin nor end with this themed journal issue, we invite writers to submit future pieces on this theme of what justice wants, particularly addressing the gaps and generative openings of this issue. Articles in future issues might serve as rejoinders of what has been gathered here, or might take us to altogether different aims and urgencies of justice.

Our upcoming themed issue, “Late Identity,” takes another topic of nearly unquestioned hegemony in ethnic studies—identity—to unpack its political impact and question its relevance, before it becomes simply propagated from an “old” ethnic studies canon into a “new” critical ethnic studies one.
We invite proposals for guest edited special issues, especially those that can prod the gaps in our curation of this journal. We also invite general submissions at any time, as well as contributions to our robust *Critical Ethnic Studies* blog, curated by our dynamic managing editors. The blog is a great incubator for ideas for future issues but also is more flexible and even a little irreverent of the types of ideas that can be addressed in a formal journal article. The website for our journal and blog is http://www.criticalethnicstudiesjournal.org/.

**what justice wants**

Before digging in to the rest of your reading of this introduction, and the articles in the issue, we invite you to go somewhere calm within your own thoughts to think about the notion of justice. Perhaps remember a time that you have been witness to this term being used or misused. Maybe let your eyes or fingers or ears linger on the word *justice*: until it starts to dematerialize, to break down into no sense. Of course we can do this with any word, repeat it until it has lost its connotations, until it slides out of understanding; but to rebuild meaning for the word “justice,” we can either believe what other fields say about it or invite it only as a placeholder word, a quick word for busy people doing so much good work. Indeed, justice may only be comprehensible when we do not get too bogged down by its commonly understood denotations. These definitions—a general sense of moral and ethical righteousness; a specific legal sense referring to the fair administration of punishments and rewards—do not in and of themselves inspire. Those accepted meanings do not necessarily satisfy, at least toward delivering their own promises of justice. They may fall apart at their seams when we pay close attention.

Yet justice is a catalytic concept in conversations like critical ethnic studies and among activists and organizers. The word circulates as a placeholder for actions and stances against dispossession, displacement, and death. Justice in this connotation takes many different forms, including holding power accountable to its abuses, pursuing revisions and expansions to civil rights law, and encouraging civil disobedience of the law. Some communities reject the very logics of (state) administration of justice and instead assert sovereignty of selves, communities, land, and living in ways that are right. These efforts exceed the formal meanings of justice. Many communities also use “justice” to call attention to the state of perpetual *injustice*, to the State or occupying nation’s hypocrisy in claiming to administer justice,
and indeed to the direct role of the State in the systemization of injustice. Much goes unsaid about what is meant by justice, but when considered from the perspectives of different communities and their concerns, justice takes on varying and sometimes contradictory meanings.

The lack of justice is overwhelmingly obvious in the face of specific wrongs, such as murdered and missing Indigenous women, girls, trans* and two-spirit peoples (#MMIWG2S), with more recent counts as high as four thousand since 1980.4 The killings by police of Michelle Cusseux, Rekia Boyd, Michael Brown, Eric Garner, Tamir Rice, and Freddie Gray are also instances of justice ripped away.5 We write at a time when trans* people of color and two-spirit people are often murdered; news stories about their deaths frequently misgender trans* and two-spirit people, and worse, depict their lives as likely to perish anyway. At the same time, mechanisms designed to facilitate justice almost always come up short; with this we are thinking of the ambivalence that some Indigenous public figures have expressed over the prospects of reconciliation after the convening of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission on residential schooling for Indigenous children in Canada; the non-indictment and not-guilty verdicts of police officers in the killings of unarmed Black people; and formal inquiries into Indigenous deaths in custody (see Latty et. al., this issue). At best, such mechanisms achieve only a “temporary armistice between me and my oppression.”6 Said another way, these mechanisms promise justice but often deliver deferrals.

When we put out a call for papers for this issue, we did so under the theme of “what justice wants,” because to attend to what justice wants invites at least two potentially simultaneous rehearsals: considering what justice desires and/or considering what justice lacks.7 To consider what justice desires, we might examine the role of the State and its functioning through promising, harnessing, and manufacturing hopes for justice. The State is a desiring-machine of justice in the Deleuze and Guattarian sense of an apparatus that consumes and produces and excretes justice. However, we might also consider how desire alludes to community and nonstate actors’ desires for justice, which exceed those of the State, and their movements toward and away from the State. Desire includes hopes and disappointments with justice, the multiple lines of flight to and from justice.8 To consider what justice lacks is one way to frame the horizons of justice, and to gesture at what is beyond justice. If justice cannot deliver itself, what does it actually deliver and what is lacking in its promise?

In these pages, we offer some definition to justice as comprised of limits and inherent wants. We begin by situating justice as a colonial temporality—
limited actions within a colonial moment against colonial structures. We lean heavily on the work of Saidiya Hartman and Stephen Best in order to frame justice as a “redress discourse” to understand why justice is both desirable and disappointing.9 In a post on our journal’s blog, we deconstruct “social justice” as a related idea developed within the modern colonial era of nation-states, colonies, and chattel slavery. With the limits of justice in mind, we then turn to places that exceed as outside elsewhere to the time and territory of justice. By territory, we mean the legal and political space of supremacist sovereignty normally attributed to states. By time, we mean the colonial application of justice to specific injured, living bodies (lives), and linear notions of past harm and present reconciliation and future irreproachability. These elsewhere include Indigenous concepts of the “good life,”10 strategies for grounded normativity, self-determination, coalition building across movements and issues, transformative justice outside the pathologizing logics of the prison state (see Hwang, this issue), possibilities for art as resistance, the subversion of terms and language that limit our imagination, resurgence politics, the Black social life, and abolition.

This definitional introduction lays some groundwork for the ideas presented by the authors in this issue. We end with short descriptions of their remarkable contributions, which deconstruct and interrogate the wants of justice. Such critical intellectual work helps us understand how resistances to injustice can avoid being hoodwinked by the desiring machines of justice, and how alternatives to justice can name their own possibilities. At a practical organizing level, they help us understand where movements can contingently find objectives in justice and where they can define their own elsewheres beyond justice.

**JUSTICE IS A COLONIAL TEMPORALITY**

Justice is a colonial temporality, always desired and deferred, and delimited by the timeframes of modern colonizing states as well as the self-historicizing, self-perpetuating futurities of their nations. It is instructive to think of justice as a “redress discourse” as analyzed by Stephen Best and Saidiya Hartman, who build upon Hartman’s framework on redress as developed in her profoundly impactful book, *Scenes of Subjection*.11 Analyzing efforts to redress abuse during formal chattel slavery in the U.S. South, Hartman writes, “redress is a limited form of action aimed at relieving the pained body through alternative configurations of self and . . . the body as human flesh, not beast of burden.”12 The action of redress lies not just in
demanding remedy and reparation from the State but also in redressing the Black body as human, and in re-membering the social body as Black life.

If we apply the lens of justice as a redress discourse, we gain several useful insights into its desires and limits:

*Justice re-members.* Drawing from Hartman, demands for justice re-member; they are a kind of ghosting that refuses to forget abduction, violation, displacement, dispossession, and death. They also re-member the fragmented social body back together as life that matters in ways beyond the ontological cages of pained plaintiff or object in need of subjection. They also re-member the fragmented social body back together as life that matters in ways beyond the ontological cages of pained plaintiff or object in need of subjection. We might consider how #BlackLivesMatter is a re-membering in this double sense: a refusal to allow for the infliction of violence against Black bodies to be casually erased and forgotten, and the reminder that those bodies count beyond body counts. Black lives matter beyond the accounts of racial capitalism, where they only count as bodies for exchange and disposal. Black lives matter beyond their neoliberal mattering as im/proper subjects who can/not govern themselves into peaceful acceptance of the social order.

*Justice is a limited form of action.* However, to say that Black life is human and thus matters is at once a re-membering that provides some relief but will always bear repeating. This very rearticulation of the Black body as human is problematic, because the “human” is already predicated on antiblackness. Antiblackness is characterized by the “regularity of domination and terror.” In other words, antiblackness is already a present event taking place, and always a future event under white supremacist rule—a political reality that “engenders the necessity of redress, the inevitability of its failure, and the constancy of repetition yielded by this failure.” Thus, “no justice, no peace” in the liberal reckoning might seem to imply that justice will afford peace. However, another meaning is that both justice and peace are impossible desires bound in the repetition of redress.

*The limit of justice is the state.* The state asserts its monopoly on justice, particularly through its monopoly on the “administration” of violence. To enact justice, the state insists on its right to exceptional power, such as exile, imprisonment, dispossession, arbitration, redistribution, and murder—the very exceptional powers that give rise to the sovereign (in Giorgio Agamben’s treatment) and thus the state as we know it. This monopoly is a claim to supremacist sovereignty, that which we have come to know as the State. Yet let us remember that claims to sovereign
power derive from empires’ insistence of supremacy over an (Indigenous) territory. State sovereignty is the continual product of war. In settler-colonial nations, it is a reproduced claim over land and life not one’s own—a claim that has evolved into the State “over here.” Moreover, in the permanent arena of war “over there,” the very state logic of justice is suspended and replaced by empire’s exceptionalized right to commit mass murder, dispossession, and displacement.19 This is a reality too well understood by Indigenous peoples on Turtle Island whose presence falls under the exceptional legal order of war rather than under the State. The State is the ultimate representation of the possibility for and limit of achieving justice. Justice is delimited by the borders of empire and colony, by the temporalities of “peacetime” and wartime. Thinking through what we learned in our interview with Leanne Betasamosake Simpson (this issue), we wonder if “justice” ought to be considered only within efforts that negotiate the State. Perhaps we do not have to rescue justice; perhaps justice is not rescuable from the limits of state-based forms of justice. If we take this intervention to heart, we would do better to strategize with the understanding that the very limit of justice is the state. Justice is an impossibility. For Hartman, because redress fails and repeats, because the aim of redress is impossible, and because blackness is already configured as outside the human, demands for justice comprise a limited form of action, one that awaits “an event of epic and revolutionary proportions—the abolition of slavery, the destruction of a racist social order, and the actualization of equality.”20

Justice as in between grievance and grief. Even though this “constancy of repetition” means a constant deferral of justice, it also means an unyielding of desire for redress that “is itself an articulation of loss and longing for remedy and reparation.”21 In other words, the chickens will come home to roost; the ghost will not fail to haunt.22 Justice expresses desires between “grievance and grief; between the necessity of legal remedy and the impossibility of redress.”23 Indeed, in demanding justice for those killed, legal remedy against state-condoned killings is necessary, yet redress for the dead is impossible. The demands we make are part grievance and part grief. Considering justice as a redress discourse allows us to take desire seriously; we recognize the productive work of desire, of freedom-dreaming (to borrow similar notions from Robin D. G. Kelley’s work on the audacity to imagine the impossible conditions of liberation).24 Even if the desire for justice is unrequited, it produces futures beyond the current political moment.
Justice is a political interval. Redress is a “political interval . . . between the no longer and not yet,”25 an insight that places in sharp relief the colonial temporality of justice: it is desired, deferred, haunting, always past and promised but never delivered. It is a set of political possibilities for limited relief, for continual resistance, until. The temporality of redress is inverted by Indigenous decolonizing temporalities, which Tuck has described as “involved with the not yet and, at times, the not anymore.”26 Juxtaposing these two temporalities, we see how justice is framed within colonial time, while decolonizing elsewhere contest colonial time and territories.

ELSEWHERE BEYOND JUSTICE

As Leanne Betasamosake Simpson points out in this issue, Indigenous resurgence is about forms of life that do not take oppression as their defining referent. Discussing Black life, Fred Moten writes, “Everything I love survives dispossession, and is therefore before dispossession,” even while Black life is already an effect of a past dispossession and future dispossession to come.27 Such epistemologies precede and exceed injustice and, by the same token, justice.

Beyond justice, there are terms that articulate their theories of change: rematriation, reparations, regeneration, sovereignty, self-determination, decolonization, resurgence, the good life, futurisms.28 Each approach is born of specific material concerns that refuse the abstraction of justice and its limits in the nation-state.

Glen Sean Coulthard’s Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of State Recognition closes with a discussion about the future of Indigenous activism. He presents five theses of Indigenous resurgence and decolonization, each of which unmakes a fundamental co-optation of working within Western forms of systemic change. For example, Coulthard calls us to leave behind the routes of economic development offered through capitalism and to foreground gender justice. The fifth of the five theses is “beyond the nation-state.” Writing from an Indigenous context of engaging the Canadian settler state, he observes that these efforts have “served to subtly reproduce the forms of racist, sexist, economic, and political configurations of power” that decolonizing efforts have intended to dismantle.29 In much North American critical scholarship and activism, “white supremacy” is sometimes taken to be that zero-point of injustice to which social justice efforts are calibrated. This offers many possibilities for “already available”
solidarities,\textsuperscript{30} in seeing white supremacy as a “common enemy,” so to speak. However, Coulthard’s work suggests that the more pressing concern is to see how white supremacy creates common tools that are often picked up, reused, and recycled by efforts considered otherwise as “social justice.” This is what is meant when resurgence is said to start from an “elsewhere” from injustice.

Likewise, these terms, and the articles in this issue, are also refusals of the inherent story-arc of justice (which begins with injustice). Justice as a story-arc falls back on temporality as its major mode, as highlighting a pained plaintiff, and promising redress that it never delivers. These other modes are not trying to tamper with its temporalities but root themselves in elsewhere. The authors in this issue, in our view, do their most difficult and rewarding work when they look beyond the zero-point of white supremacy and discuss the work before and surviving it.

**ARTICLES ON WHAT JUSTICE WANTS**

Articles in this issue sometimes offer a critique of justice, offer explanations of the impossibility of justice, offer dreams of justice that perhaps exceed the very term “justice,” and offer radical alternatives to justice. We also sometimes see in these articles that “justice” is the meeting ground for politics of solidarity, where incommensurabilities are negotiated, where contingent collaborations are battle tested.

Our opening article, “Indigenous Resurgence and Co-resistance” by Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, was crafted from a set of written correspondences between Simpson and Eve Tuck. This was a way to invite Simpson to write directly to the concerns of this themed issue and to learn about how ideas Simpson has attended to across other writings and interviews come together. Simpson highlights the contributions of Indigenous scholars including Sarah Hunt, Jarett Martineau, Glen Coulthard, Audra Simpson, and Jeff Corntassel toward articulating (both naming and putting into related motion) understandings of justice that take shape outside the frames occupied by the settler state. Simpson’s refusal of the notion of justice does important work for this issue, intervening on its very terms and its limits. As always, refusal is not just a no but generates other possibilities, other futures.\textsuperscript{31}

Lena Carla Palacios’s article, “Killing Abstractions: Indigenous Women and Black Trans Girls Challenging Media Necropower in White Settler States,” describes solidarities at the intersections of Indigenous and Black
organizing to address murdered and missing Indigenous women and murdered Black trans and nonconforming girls, in a Canadian and U.S. transnational context. Palacios highlights the strategies for mobilizing the State justice apparatus while avoiding state and media co-optation, and in so doing, for refusing the necropolitics that mark theirs as deserving deaths.

Leigh Patel and Alton Price conduct an important critique of “racial justice” in an unpacking of its histories of use and its effects in use. Their article, “The Origins, Potentials, and Limits of Racial Justice,” expands on the pedagogies of Black radical traditions from W. E. B. Du Bois to contemporary antiracist pedagogies and questions the deployments of race to critique injustice and their elisions with race as a basis for justice.

In “Accounting for Carceral Reformations: Gay and Transgender Jailing in Los Angeles as Justice Impossible,” Ren-yo Hwang describes the multiple routes taken by overincarcerated gay and transgender communities in Los Angeles to challenge strategic abolition and curtail the expansion of the prison system when reforms are undoubtedly predetermined by the hegemonic power of the criminal justice system. Examining K6G, the gay men and transgender women’s unit within the largest jailer in the world, the Los Angeles County Men’s Central Jail, Hwang critiques the advent of “abolitionist reforms” whose calculus of alleviating suffering are exchanged for increased carceral power and authority.

“Unjust Attachments: Mourning as Antagonism in Gauri Gill’s ‘1984’” by Balbir K. Singh is a haunting analysis of the 1984 Sikh genocide on the Indian subcontinent. Leveraging Gauri Gill’s 2014 artistic notebook as a counter-archive, Singh connects mourning as gendered methods for remaining and remembering to political models for resistance and militancy—including contemporary calls for Sikh sovereignty. In this way, Singh’s work explores the affective work of mourning—as ontological and epistemological future-making—in imagining justice beyond the current Indian nation-state.

Juxtaposing the inquest proceedings into the suspicious deaths of Indigenous youth in Thunder Bay, Ontario, and the continual denial of clean drinking water to residents of Flint, Michigan, Stephanie Latty, Megan Scribe, Alena Peters, and Anthony Morgan take on the concept of the category “human,” asking how these divergent events present deep similarities in the way they reveal who is and is not considered “human.” Their article, “Not Enough Human: At the Scenes of Indigenous and Black Dispossession,” considers how the neglect of what would be considered basic human rights to certain populations reveals the “deferral of justice” as a mode of racialization, genocide, and antiblackness. Indeed, their analysis resounds with
Hartman’s observation of redress as bound to fail and repeat. Deferral and cyclical redress indicate the ways that desires for justice are channeled and recirculated in state justice systems, where deaths in custody also connect to concepts of certain populations as not human enough; they are so close to death, thus not worth saving.

In “On Rocks and Hard Places: A Reflection on Antibilackness in Organizing against Islamophobia,” Délice Mugabo examines antiblackness and Islamophobia in the Quebecois political terrain, unearthing the complicity of organizing against Islamophobia with antiblackness on the one hand, and on the other, the anti-Black basis of Islamophobia to begin with. Writing from an activist intellectual perspective as a Muslim Black woman organizer, her goal is to “awaken us to some of the limits of coalition politics” and to be cautious of alliances with “dreams and projects that cannot imagine Black life.” Mugabo’s attention to the importance and timbre of Black life as inclusive of Black religiosity, joy, and indispensability resonates with the contributions throughout this issue.

To meaningfully close this set of articles, Denise Ferreira da Silva has generously contributed another paradigmatic piece, “The Racial Limits of Social Justice: The Ruse of Equality of Opportunity and the Global Affirmative Action Mandate.” Da Silva brings attention to the global phenomenon of the rise of affirmative action (which may be surprising to some readers) and concomitant rise of the global security apparatus. She uses these twin global phenomena to illustrate how the racial is yet to satisfy—and likely cannot—as the horizon for equality.

What’s not in this issue: We acknowledge the labor and efforts of the many people and thoughts not present nor immediately recognizable as present in this issue. In particular, we received numerous submissions for this issue, many of which were carefully reviewed and commented upon; in the interest of favoring activist intellectual work from nonacademic settings, we asked for creative writers to serve as reviewers to provide feedback for forms of writing that perform their theory in ways that are different from academic performances of theory. Despite these layers of review and revision and conversation, some of these pieces were not ready in time for publication. The coincidence of curation and creative timing makes for critical gaps in this issue. We feel that it is important to point to these gaps to gesture toward conversations that are happening about justice beyond the scope of these articles, and to foreshadow what is to come in future issues.

In particular, there is a marked absence on contributions from the conversations in Chicana/o studies and Asian American studies, and important
transnational arenas from Latin American studies, European, and African/diaspora studies. Hartman’s description of justice as repetition resonates with Indigenous and decolonizing descriptions of colonial time (e.g., Scott Lyons, Frantz Fanon), and also resonates with Chicana feminist writings on the in-betweenness of colonial time (and space), of desires that are bounded in borderlands, and how their connections to past, present, and future leak beyond them. Works in Asian American studies and critical refugee studies that interrogate justice as impossible and/or irrelevant in the ontologies of permanent war also excite the thinking represented in this issue. Thus, these gaps engender possibilities for further thinking and writing, but a thinking and writing that we hope will be in conversation with articles that did become part of this publication. We know from our participation in the Critical Ethnic Studies Association conference and annual meetings of the American Studies Association (to name just two examples) that there is much exciting and rich work that is ongoing and exceedingly relevant to the issues described herein.

EVE TUCK (Unangaâ) is a member of the Aleut Community of St. Paul Island in Alaska. She engages in theories of decolonization in a series of collaborations, including with K. Wayne Yang, The Black/Land Project, The Super Futures Haunt Qollective, and the newly formed Land Relationships Super Collective. Her work often returns to the theories of change that (do not) operate in social science research, and moves of refusal needed for life in the undercommons of the university.

K. WAYNE YANG writes about decolonization and everyday epic organizing, particularly from underneath ghetto colonialism, often with his frequent collaborator, Eve Tuck, and sometimes for an avatar called La Paperson. Currently, he has an appointment as a professor of ethnic studies at UC San Diego. He is excited to collaborate with the Land Relationships Super Collective, the Black Teacher Project, and Roses in Concrete.
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