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Abstract:
As awareness of the environmental impacts caused by capitalist driven industries such as fossil fuel extraction continues to grow, so do the number of communities engaging in protest against these industries. The shared vision among these communities to protect the land has the potential to build stronger resistance, but too often oppressive power structures such as white supremacy, manifestations of racism, colonialism, and different ways of conceptualizing land have undermined cross-cultural action; especially for Indigenous resistance. One of the most challenging tensions between and among white-settler activists and Indigenous activists exists around the term decolonization and what it really looks like, particularly regarding the role of land within the decolonization process. This essay explores how settlers might engage with and defend the stolen land they occupy from environmental destruction in ways that work in solidarity with Indigenous autonomy. Inspired by theorists like Dave, Deleuze, Haraway, and Silko, I consider the possibilities that ‘ceremony as becoming’ offers as a catalyst to a land-based ethic, alternative to the capitalist ethic common in settler communities. I am especially interested in how the space created by ceremony might offer separate and cross-cultural healing that would facilitate temporary or even long-term coexistence.

The word he chose to express “fragile” was filled with the intricacies of a continuing process, and with a strength inherent in spider webs woven across paths through sand hills where early in the morning the sun becomes entangled in each filament of web. It took a long time to explain the fragility and intricacy because no word exists alone, and the reason for choosing each word had to be explained with a story about why it must be said this certain way. That was the responsibility that went with being human, old Ku'oosh said, the story behind each word must be told so there could be no mistake in the meaning of what had been said; and this demanded great patience and love.

Leslie Marmon Silko, Ceremony¹

Introduction:

I found myself attempting this essay after a year of what I can only call a becoming. Introduction to theory set me on a track of intensive reflection on my own positionality, and into an unlearning process that brought me to the SIAH program and Unis’to’ten territory for their fifth annual action camp. I am a middle-class settler of European descent living on Duwamish territory, commonly referred to as Seattle. Previously trained as a wildlife scientist, my affection toward and engagement with the Pacific Northwest was greatly challenged by ideas decolonization and occupation. In confronting this, and as an environmental activist attempting to work in solidarity toward Indigenous autonomy, this essay gave me an opportunity to investigate how to become a better ally and to continue my research on engagements with the non-human world.

In their article *Decolonization is Not a Metaphor*, Eve Tuck and Wayne K. Yang use the term ‘Settler moves to innocence’ to describe the strategies/positionings that settlers use to “…attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege, without having to change much at all”. Although this essay challenges the process of decolonization as it is above defined, ‘moving toward innocence’ is not this essays intent. If anything, I hope this essay conveys, maybe even inspires, a desperate call to action and an acknowledgement of the courage and patience that will be necessary from all participants to begin this work.

---

2 Unis’to’ten Camp is a live blockade of multiple pipelines on the Wet’suwt’en territory. It is grassroots organized and run by Wet’suwet’en Tribal members, primarily of the Unis’to’ten Clan. For more information visit unistotencamp.com

During my studies and reflections on allyship, solidarity, and settlers on stolen land, decolonization has become a process I now define very differently, but a process of application that seems much more complicated. For the purpose of this essay I choose to define ‘decolonization’ as Tuck and Yang do: Decolonization must involve the repatriation of land as well as the recognition of how land and relations to land were, and continue to be, differently understood and enacted. Decolonization requires physical repatriation; symbolic recognition is not enough.

As one can imagine, this is a shaking consideration for settlers who have developed notions of ownership, sentiment, and relationships with the land they occupy. Scott Morgensen discusses settler desires for Indigenous land and culture in his article *Unsettling Settler Desires*. He argues that engaging in critical reflection about these desires is absolutely necessary for settlers who wish to ally with Indigenous decolonization struggles. The acceptance of uncertain settler futurity, (in contrast to a guaranteed home in the Americas) is central to true solidarity work, otherwise settlers are not actually working toward decolonization. “If settler radicals challenge their desires to live on Indigenous land, they also challenge their desires to study, practice, or feel in any way linked to Indigenous culture” (emphasis added). This makes sense to me, as being able to consider an uncertain future is the result of other important unlearning already being processed, such as accepting one’s positionality as occupier, acknowledging the damaging effects of “going native”, and relinquishing privileges in order to empower and support Indigenous peoples’ decolonization movements.

---

Morgensens’ examples of harmful settler desires include communalism and counterculturism in communes, permaculture, squatting, hoboing, foraging, and neopagan, earth-based, and New Age spirituality, where “appreciating” native cultures has been confused as being anti-colonial, rather than what it really is; appropriation and recolonization. Although the complexities of appropriation are not central to this essay, Morgensen offers a cautionary critique of how settler desires to feel ‘linked’ to the land can translate into appropriation of Indigenous cultures, especially for environmental activists and allies working on the front lines with Indigenous resistance movements.

What I appreciate about these authors is their insistence on the importance of land physically, spiritually, and legally to decolonization efforts. Symbolically recognizing the continued occupation of Indigenous land is not nearly enough. Tuck and Yang write, “Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth...Land is what is valuable, contested, required. This is both because the settler make Indigenous land their new home and resource capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound epistemic, ontological, and cosmological violence”. This definition of land, as I learned from the Unis’to’ten blockaders, includes the mountains, the sky, the animals, the medicines, the rivers, the living humans, and the spiritual ancestors--and acknowledges the interconnectivity of those relationships.

---

5 Although covered minimally in this essay, more information on the significance of land to decolonization movements can be found in Damien Lees’ *Placing Knowledge as Resurgence* and Glen Couthards’ *Place Against Empire*.

The significance of land is indisputable. Yet these arguments leave me with two large questions: If the long-term goal is for settlers to repatriate all land to native peoples before returning to their own ancestral lands, how should settlers engage with land in the meantime? And if repatriation were possible in the near future, might the destructive, consumptive culture present among the majority of Americas’ settlers follow them back to their ancestral lands? No matter where these people were located, wouldn’t these behaviors continue to make the planet less inhabitable? Climate change is a haunting reminder that no continent, country, or forest can purge itself of the environmental choices made by other humans. I wonder if focusing on the violence associated with settler presence is a distraction from the necessary transformation of settler behavior.\(^7\)

The catastrophic impacts of consumptive cultures, (and the racially determined distribution of these impacts) are terrifying. Alarms are surfacing around the globe from people of all walks of life. In response to such culture in the Americas, several Indigenous theorists have critiqued the capitalist, exploitative, and individualistic aspects of settler society. Reflecting on Silko’s *Ceremony*, writer David A. Rice proposes a treatment for the colonial framework responsible for what he calls, ‘a sickness’ within the people: “A rootedness in communal awareness of the self in relationship to the land and others is necessary to properly acclimate oneself to the witchery (the colonial framework) that encourages us to believe only in the self, in progress, and in expansive

\(^7\) I recognize that not being accountable to settler communities, whether in the Americas or not, is part of Tuck and Yang’s decolonization argument. It would be interesting to think about what this would look like for the many people of mixed heritage and how Tribes would determine ‘nativeness’. See Kim TallBears’ *DNA, Blood, and Racializing the Tribe*. 
dominion over the earth”. Toghestiy, hereditary chief of the Liksamisyu Clan and blockader at the Unis’to’ten camp makes a similar diagnosis in an interview for the film *Resist*:

> We’re past that tipping point. That tipping point’s come and gone. And we’re in a downward spiral and everyone is just sitting back....people can sense what’s really happening, but they don’t know what to do. And those of us who woke ourselves up are actually doing something about it. We are reaching out to everybody out there to say....realize what it is you’ve been missing. Because this is what sustains us as humanity. And just because we’re stuck in four doors, or four walls, and under fluorescent lights for most of our lives...doesn't mean that we’re that disconnected. We still have that opportunity to realize the earth that all of our ancestors embraced at one time. If we don't (protect her), she’s going to slip out of grip and she’s going to let us go. She has no mercy. She’ll let us go, and she’ll be brutal about it.

I hear this as a call for, as writer and activist Naisargi N. Dave names, “An ethics not wholly governed by humanism”. A call to dissolve the dominant ways of knowing that create exactly the disconnect from the non-human world that many activists and environmentalists desire to overcome. The ‘back to the land’ movement is a great example of this desire in settlers. The reestablishment of connections to the non-human world, whether as an instigator-for or product-of sustainable behaviors, is essential not just for individual and community wellness, but for the survival of the planet. For most settlers, a land-based ethic would need to be either adopted, remembered, or created;

---


10 Later work of mine will investigate more deeply what connection to the non-human world means and why these connections make us more whole. For the scope of this paper, I am assuming that they do so.
all three possibilities with their own problems. To investigate these options is to accept uncomfortable historical and present truths, to consider the incommensurability around ways of knowing land, and to admit that Indigenous communities are not the only communities who need to heal from the impacts of colonialism. How healing will come into being is a much more difficult question. Healing will need to reflect the many different Indigenous and settler communities with their differing needs. To understand how to coexist across cultures, (even if just temporarily) will require the rebuilding of respectful relationships both within and across species. I suggest the practice of ceremony might provide personal, private, cross-cultural, and inter-species healing through the space it creates. The following will explore ceremonial space as it blurs categories of knowing and dissolves notions of ‘you’ versus ‘me’, allowing participants to sit with difference and build relational interconnectivity.

Ceremony:

“The first step is to recognize that the world is more than one socionatural formation; the second is to interconnect such plurality without making the diverse worlds commensurable.”

Marisol De La Cadena

I came to ceremony through an introduction to the term becoming. Although I will explain their relationship in more detail shortly, it may be helpful to first think about what ceremony is, (or could be) in the context of landscape. Ceremony is a term that may not have a clear definition, and maybe a term that shouldn’t. I struggle with the expansive possibilities to its meaning and significance, but also because I feel speaking about

---

certainly may not be my place. Raised without an awareness of how I was impacted
by ceremony as a part of my daily life, I wonder if my attempts to understand it are
shallow, misguided, or even offensive. In contrast, as someone arguing that ceremony
is in fact a solution to these massive problems, I may be intimately positioned to do this
work.

Most of my experience with ceremony has been through observation. At Unis’to’ten
camp, ceremony was practiced both in large groups and in intensely personal and
segregated rituals. Most of these ceremonies seemed to be passed down from
generations soaked in tradition, while others appeared to be created and used only
within one individual’s lifetime. I wonder if ceremony can be thought of as a type of
transitional space; a space that is vulnerable, where senses may be heightened, where
introductions and encounters are made, or maybe where old friends are visited and
remembered. Ultimately, I wonder if ceremony creates a space to sit with difference in a
way that facilitates becoming, understood as a new negotiation of being. Within
ceremony, the land itself as the contested, yet shared entity between cultures and
beings provides what writer Marisol De La Cadena calls the ‘partial connections’. I
believe these connections are necessary to address incommensurability, or the idea
that world views cannot be agreed upon because they have no common basis; that at a
certain point, no further movement forward is possible because visions are so different.
Ceremony around land might temporarily dissolve incommensurables, while
simultaneously preventing equivocations. Using Eduardo Viveiros de Castros’ definition,
De La Cadena defines equivocation as, “...not a simple failure to understand, but ‘a
failure to understand that understandings are necessarily not the same, and that they are not related to imaginary ways of seeing the world but to the real worlds that are being seen”. She continues, “As mode of communication, equivocations emerge when different perspectival positions--views from different worlds, rather than perspectives about the same world--use homonymical terms to refer to things that are not the same”. Equivocation is usually created during the process of translation, and can be damaging in its ‘blanding’ or ‘cropping’ of meaning. By creating a space to sit with difference, (ceremony dissolving incommensurables) equivocations may be avoidable. Instead, “circuits between partially connected worlds” are formed. These circuits of partial connection would exceed those normally accessible outside of the created space. But we could also consider ceremony as an equivocation in and of itself.

As De La Cadena explains, the “one definition fits all” nature of equivocation points out the very involvement of peoples from different “worlds” and the spaces in which they are already partially connected. For example, between the Unis’to’ten clan and the dominant Canadian world-view, physical land is the shared entity previously equivocated where the use of the word ‘land’ means different things to either group. Land, now reappearing from the Unis’to’ten world view, enters the scene unequivocated, complicating the equivocation itself. The previously created equivocation ends up holding stakeholders ‘hostage’ to the complication created by this reappearance. In other words, equivocations bring differing world views together, and if intervention proceeds, the nature of the space itself facilitates cross-cultural communication. Within ceremony, equivocation becomes the transitional stage to new
connections, from incommensurability to unpredictable articulation. But how does ceremony move participants through the new connections made, and how do participants emerge altered?

**Ceremony as Becoming:**

Victor Turner’s concept of liminality may be helpful in visualizing the space that ceremony might create, and how it moves actors to new connection. “Liminality is the realm of primitive hypothesis, where there is a certain freedom to juggle with the factors of existence. As in the works of Rabelais, there is a promiscuous intermingling and juxtaposing of the categories of events, experience, and knowledge, with a pedagogic intention”.¹² Here ceremony might provide an environment of liminality, where one is “neither this nor that, yet both”. This is a similar to Marilyn Stratherns’ concept of “partial connection” De La Cadena borrows which, “refers to a relationship composing an aggregate that is ‘neither singular nor plural, neither one nor many, a circuit of connections rather than joint parts’. Partial connections create no single entity; the entity that results is more than one, yet less than two”. Turner’s liminality and Strathern’s “more than one, yet less than two” offer this conversation insight into a possible space where categories are disrupted and difference is less abrasive because expectations have been altered. When difference is less abrasive, and we fear it less, sitting with it becomes easier and participants are braver. Turner goes on to discuss the participants in such a space. “This liminal group is a community or comity of comrades and not a structure of hierarchically arrayed positions. This comradeship transcends distinctions of

---

rank, age, kinship position, and, in some kinds of cultic group, even sex”. He explains that this transcendence from hierarchical distinctions allows for shared ontological transformations. Whether the situation Turner describes is applicable to all ceremony is doubtful, but I’m interested in these shared ontological transformations as being types of becoming.

My understanding of becomings are indebted to writers Donna Haraway and Harlan Weaver. Weaver describes becomings as a space where, “Each of us shapes who the other is. This enmeshment of our identities exemplifies what I term ‘becoming in kind.’ Becoming in kind signals the deep imbrications of identity and being that many relationships between humans and nonhuman animals entail."¹³ This type of becoming may not seem relatable because it is between two animals, one human and one not. But I propose that the possibilities remain the same whether crossing cultural or species borders during ceremony, particularly when ceremony around land would inherently involve all of the beings of that land. Weaver continues,

‘Becoming’ indicates the nonstatic, processual nature of these relationships, a sense of negotiating togetherness as an ongoing process, a becoming like that described by Rosi Braidotti as ‘an affect that flows, . . . a composition, a location that needs to be constructed together with, that is to say in the encounter with, others. Becoming in kind speaks to the joint building of a sense of togetherness, a we, and the kind of beings we become.

When I read Weaver, I find myself wondering about the degree of intimacy he envisions within his description of negotiating and building a sense of togetherness. I want to clarify the ways in which I see the idea of becoming being useful, maybe even necessary within this discussion. The intimacy of becoming does not result in the ‘becoming one’ or ‘equal’. These ideals have proved to be catastrophic to cultural revitalization and autonomy, damaging and distracting at least.  But what I see Weaver doing is exploring a space where negotiations of me versus you, or me versus land, have a significantly larger array of possibilities than they would outside of that space. When he ponders the ‘beings we would become’, I don’t see this as the one being we would all become together, but that each being would become in a way that opened them up to more relations, or as Haraway explains, as a process of encountering in which witnesses become, “jointly available” where each emerges changed.  

Deleuze and Guattari famously describe becoming as, “connections with others produced not by resemblance or filiation but by alliance. These becomings are ways of being that bring into doubt individual subjectivities through relatedness without descent, kinship despite kind”. Weaver critiques this interpretation as “miss(ing) the ways that ontologies and identities are often mixed”. He therefore urges the pairing of ‘becoming’ and ‘kind’ to connect to identity categories of larger social worlds. “The ‘kind’ of


becoming in kind indexes the role of these identity categories in relationships between humans and nonhuman animals”. Again, the fact that Weaver is primarily talking about inter-species becoming does not detract from its usefulness here. The “kind” is essential to seeing becoming as a tool for cross-cultural relations as it embraces where someone is coming from in terms of race, class, gender, sexuality, and species, while also acknowledging that these identities feed one another. Although Deleuze and Guattari’s becoming embraces difference, Weaver is arguing for a kinship in kind rather than despite kind. Here, identities do not merge into one, but each identity partially defines what the other identity is. This distinction is important considering the complex identity politics involved in Indigenous revitalization, autonomy, and decolonization. Like the interconnected relations of the land, recognizing the different actors is incomplete without recognizing their impacts on one another.

**Ceremony as Healing: Stepping Both Away and Toward the Other as an Act of Love**

“Are there ways to be in the world that undo—or at least contend with—the logic of this and that, the logic of differentiation that produces the abyss in which we are all precarious, scrambling to demonstrate our human worth?”

Naisargi N. Dave

Weaver explains love as being a part of becoming because trust between participants is necessary for beings to make themselves available to one another. Dave offers another way of approaching the stakes of becoming: “Can we become animal, become other, in a way that is disruptive rather than productive of anthropocentric humanism...It would be to feel more ourselves, and yet be ever less certain, and more curious, about what that
even means”.¹⁷ I think this act of ‘becoming other’ that Dave is exploring is another way of approaching ceremony. In this act, participants are stepping away from themselves in order to create space to build relations with the other, human or not. But in building these relations a truer, or maybe just different “self” is encountered. Again the self is not forgotten, but redefined or alternatively experienced. Becoming through ceremony around land would necessarily disrupt anthropocentric humanism by the before mentioned dissolving of “me” versus “you” versus “land”. Like Weaver, Dave warns that intimacy requires surrender to obligation and responsibility, and becoming is absolutely intimate work. When we become, we step away from our preconceived notions, we commit to our relations, accept our influential identity, and web connections across difference we previously hadn't imagined possible. This obligation and responsibility to relations is exactly the connection with land that the Gitskan, Wet’suwet’en, and Unis’to’ten Chiefs are insisting is the solution to the many problems facing the world. It is what they claim is required of the people.¹⁸

Ceremony as Relational Remembering:

“I also believe knowledge was put back into Creation through ceremony, with ceremonies acting to hold knowledge in much the same way as scrolls or pictographs. Gaps in knowledge are not permanent losses of knowledge as much as they are symptoms of the colonial project in Canada. Such “gaps” might be understood instead as silent resistances, temporary mutings of knowledges that await being (re)found by someone in a dream.”

Damien Lee¹⁹

“There is no site-specific sacred spot. This whole world is sacred.”

“First and foremost, everything that we do, and everything that we say, the way we pray, the way we feel, the way we envision our future has to be based on this deep, rich understanding of what responsibilities are. And those responsibilities like you said are based on natural law. This idea of responsibilities is really based on a deep understanding of what respect is.”

Toghestiy

The importance of land spiritually, as political power, and as a source of knowledge and resources is often remembered through the act of ceremony, as ceremony was probably developed in response to observing phenomena and developing a relation to the observed for future communication. In this way, I see ceremony as a ‘means to’, or a ‘confirmation of’ certain relationships of significance with other beings through reconnection with land. Becoming makes us accessible to those moments of connection.

The need to connect and embed ourselves in land is not just a necessity of Americas’ Indigenous peoples, it is a human necessity. Referring to reconnecting with the non-human world, theorist David Abram considers it, “(t)he work of recuperation that needs to be done before addressing the social or political spheres of the other and all the relations”.

He continues to say that encounters with the other are an, “(a)wakening to citizenship in the broader commonwealth, (which) has real ramifications for how we humans get along with one another. It carries substantial consequences for the way a genuine democracy shapes itself - for the way that our body politic breathes”. Ceremony may be a catalyst to a broader commonwealth, but I also have concerns.

---


Problems with Settler Ceremony:

In her book *Ceremony*, Leslie Marman Silko implies that updating tradition to work in the modern world does not make it less powerful, political, or genuine if it remains grounded in the individual decolonization efforts and larger context of indigenous resistance. Yet with traditional updates across cultures comes the possible hazards of assumed equality, homogeny, multiculturalism or countercultural under an umbrella of an environmental movement. Keeping Indigenous leadership central to practices on ancestral lands will help prevent these corruptions, but what about ceremonies practiced in separate Indigenous and settler caucuses?

Because of the considerable time passed since Europeans left their own indigenous lifestyles, white settlers practicing ceremony will require either adoption from Indigenous peoples, research and remember their own ancestral practices from Europe, or create new ceremonies through interactions with the land they occupy. And although the majority of this essay is exploring shared ceremony as a tool for healing cross culturally, not all healing should be done together. White settlers need to develop means to confront themselves as colonizer and colonized that is not at the expense of Indigenous communities. Indigenous peoples need to focus their time, resources, and energy on the healing themselves and cannot be expected to teach settlers how to be better

---

22 For this essay I chose to focus on white settler culture as a primary concern because A. it is the culture I am personally most familiar with and I do not feel comfortable speaking for other settler communities I am not a part of, and B. because white settlers as colonizers with the dominant control over government and resources are the main problem. I do not assume that destructive behaviors never move between cultures, but I also do not assume that all settlers have the same power sources as Europeans. It is important to note that P.O.C settler communities have their own histories of colonization that are different from both white settler and Indigenous communities, yet histories that are also complexly intertwined.
humans. Yet how settler will begin ceremony is still unclear. Adoption of ceremonial practices around land from Indigenous peoples would be appropriative and violent. I have heard suggested that settlers should search back into their own heritage and practice ceremony that was traditional within those cultures. This seems like a decent possibility, yet I wonder how effective it will be for healing and developing relationships with the land settlers are currently on, (North and South America) when those ceremonies were developed on different lands from different relationships. Being connected and responsible to a landscape requires observation. I worry such a removed practice in both time and space would not do the actual deep healing required. But if settlers were, in contrast, to observe the land they occupy and build relationships with new ceremony, how would those practices be in conversation with ancient ceremonies of native peoples? If they were in contradiction, what would that mean? Wouldn't settlers be considered “incorrect” or even disrespectful? As Dian Million reminded me, white people may desire to go back to the land, but their individualistic frameworks often prevent success. They need to learn how to be a tribe.

Rethinking Our Relations:

“At one time, the ceremonies as they had been performed were enough for the way the world was then. But after the white people came, elements in this world began to shift; and it became necessary to create new ceremonies...Otherwise we wont make it. We wont survive. That’s what the witchery is counting on: that we will cling to the ceremonies the way they were, and then their power will triumph, and the people will be no more”.

Leslie Marman Silko, Ceremony

“...(A)narchists must seek to connect to Indigenous peoples’ struggles through and in place rather than through community solidarity and affinity-group building. This is the first

23 For more information, see Unsettling Minnesota Unsettling Ourselves: Reflections and Resources for Deconstructing Colonial Mentality and Leanne Simpsons’ Anticolonial TEK.
24 Conversations with Dian Million, AIS professor UW. July 2014.
step to approaching alliances with Indigenous peoples in a respectful way: on their
ground and in their time, something that so many activists have failed or been unable to
do.”

Scott Morgensen

“How will we take care of one another, and take care of what takes care of us?”
Dian Million

During the 1984 suit filed in the British Colombia Supreme Court on behalf of the
Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en Houses, Chiefs Gisday Wa and Delgam Uukw requested
recognition from the province of the existing titles to traditional territories occupied by
these nations for thousands of years. When speaking of his role as a Gitksan Chief,
Delgam Uukw explained, “For us, the ownership of territory is a marriage of the Chief
and the land. Each Chief has an ancestor who encountered and acknowledged the life
of the land. From such encounters come power. The land, the plants, the animals and
the people all have a spirit - they all must be shown respect. That is the basis of our
law”...The Western world-view sees the essential and primary interactions as being
those between human beings. To the Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en, human beings are part
of an interacting continuum which includes animals and spirits”.

Thirty years ago these Chiefs stood up to the Canadian government to protect their relations, and still today
these violences continue. Although I occupy stolen land, as a young woman of the
planet I am one of the many who, as Weaver expresses, “are concerned with how we
might inherit the intertwined violences that have shaped our more-than-human worlds”.

Among these impossibly tangled, difficult, and unanswerable questions, I can’t help but
see ceremony as at least a place to start. Commenting on the power of oral traditions

25 Wa, Gisday and Delgam Uukw “The Spirit in the Land” Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en Hereditary Chiefs
August 2014.
like ceremony, Abrams considers their purpose as not to “re-present the world around us, but to call ourselves into the vital presence of that world-and into deep and attentive presence with one another”. Ceremony brings beings together. At a time when colonialism and racism still negatively impact so many lives, and when trust has been severely betrayed, I hear, “start moving” despite, and maybe in obligation to, the tangles.