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Abstract

In this thesis I argue that anarchism, as a political philosophy and social movement practice committed to resisting all forms of oppression and domination, needs to place colonialism more clearly and consistently at the centre of its analysis of interlocking systems of oppression. I argue that colonialism has largely been absent as a system of domination and oppression within anarchist theory and practice, with the exception of a small number of theorists and activist groups. My contention is that an anti-colonial orientation needs to be further encompassed in part because of anarchism’s commitment to resisting all forms of oppression and domination, but also because anarchist movements carry out and theorize resistance against the backdrop of settler colonial realities and on Indigenous lands. This thesis contributes to these aims by seeking to expand and push further work done on anarcha-Indigenism that examines the possible points of contact and resonance between anarchist and Indigenous politics, philosophy and action.

I conceptualize anarcha-Indigenism first as a ‘third space’, following post-colonial theorists, and extend this concept towards an ‘n-dimensional’ space of meeting, where theoretical perspectives can come to engage with one another. This space consists of points of contact and resonance chiefly between Indigenist, anarchist and feminist theory and practice, but also extends to any perspective that might meet the core commitments of anarcha-Indigenism, namely resistance to all forms of oppression and domination. Within the ‘n-dimensional’ space of anarcha-Indigenism I examine the possibilities of anti-colonial research methodology, solidarity relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples, engagements between anarchist and Indigenous feminisms and contemporary manifestations of anti-colonial anarchist resistance against the 2010 Vancouver Olympics and the Toronto G20. These successive chapters seek to make anti-colonial interventions into anarchist theory and practice as well as further develop the richness of anarcha-Indigenism and its complexities. Overall, I argue that anarcha-Indigenism, as an ‘n-dimensional’ space of meeting can further resistance to all forms of oppression and domination, and has the ability to make anti-colonial interventions into anarchist theory and practice specifically.
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Decolonizing Anarchism: Expanding Anarcha-Indigenism in Theory and Practice

By Adam Lewis

Chapter 1

Introduction

Anarchism is a political philosophy and practice that aims to resist and remove all forms of oppression and domination, coupled with anti-state and anti-capitalist politics. Often derided in historical representations and contemporary media accounts as an extremist ideology premised on violence, anarchism has begun to come to the fore in current social movements and political practice. Emma Goldman, one of the primary historical theorists of anarchism and of an anarchist orientation to feminist concerns, suggests in her book *Anarchism and Other Essays* the following definition of anarchism as a project committed to the destruction of all forms of oppression and domination:

Anarchism, then, really stands for the liberation of the human mind from the dominion of religion; the liberation of the human body from the dominion of property; liberation from the shackles and restraint of government. Anarchism stands for a social order based on the free grouping of individuals for the purpose of producing real social wealth; an order that will guarantee every human being free access to the earth and the full enjoyment of the necessities of life, according to individual desires, tastes, inclinations (Goldman, 1969 [1917], 62).

With swirling talk of Occupy movements, anti-globalization protests, Olympic and G8/G20 resistance and global movements on the rise, talk and engagement with anarchism seems to be on the increase throughout the world. Randal Amster (2012), David Graeber (2009), Richard Day (2005) and Uri Gordon (2008) (amongst others) have all pointed to the

---

1 Sections of this chapter, and an edited version of Chapter 3, were published as Lewis (2012). Thanks are due to the helpful editors at Social Movement Studies for their comments and suggestions.
contemporary resonance of anarchism within broader social movements and point to its contributions in both theory and practice.

This increasing interest in anarchism has led to further work on a variety of aspects of anarchism and its relationships to other political and theoretical projects. This work has challenged a variety of aspects of anarchism and sought to hold anarchism to its commitment to resisting all forms of oppression and domination that manifest in society while seeking to construct alternatives to the current dominant order.

Indigenous theory and practice\(^2\)–including but not limited to Indigenous feminisms, cultural resurgence, political theory, anti-colonialism and decolonization–has been largely ignored by anarchists, save a small number of theorists and those on-the-ground movements that are creating specific types of relationships with Indigenous peoples and communities. Further, anti-colonialist calls for decolonization directed to settlers (an understanding of which I offer later in this chapter) have largely gone unheeded by anarchists or at the very minimum have not garnered widespread attention and development, especially within more academic streams of anarchist theory. This is, therefore, a particular gap that might be

---

\(^2\) Although this is the shorthand terminology that I use to indicate my attention to the diverse Indigenous understandings of political theory, direct action, community resistance, feminism, epistemology, research methodology etc. it is important to note, following Simpson (2008, 44, note 39) that ‘The term “Indigenous theory” or “Indigenous Thought” is problematic because it reinforces an artificial division between thought and embodiment. For Indigenous Peoples, thought is fully integrated into living, being and performance of our traditions’. I use such a term here with the understanding that Indigenous thought is specifically connected to Indigenous communities, traditions, epistemologies and relationships to land. Settlers do not have such holistic connections to this land, lacking a grounding in the interrelation of animate, inanimate and spiritual beings, having lost such connections when we left our original landbases. This is not to say that settlers cannot develop any relationships, but suggests that the relationship is located within a different grounding than that of Indigenous peoples, who have been connected to these lands since time immemorial via oral histories, traditions, ceremonies and cultural knowledges (see for ex. Atleo, 2004). Thus the term Indigenous thought or Indigenous political theory encompasses a much deeper connection and form of integration than Western or anarchist theory, and suggests that there will continue to be elements that are unknowable and inappropriate for settlers to ‘know’ or ‘understand’ (see Haig-Brown, 2010).
identified in anarchist theory most specifically, and within large anarchist currents more broadly (see for example Ramnath 2011).

This thesis is an attempt to expand anarchist theory and practice in relation to colonial histories and contemporary manifestations and anti-colonial, decolonizing and unsettling (Regan 2010) work that has been taken up by Indigenous communities and their settler allies, in part under the banner of anarcha-Indigenism. My aim is to develop and expand anarcha-Indigenism in order to push anarchism further to respond to the work of Indigenous peoples on colonization and decolonization and develop anarchism's own perspective and commitment to anti-colonial resistance and solidarity with Indigenous struggles of resurgence and resistance. I focus on contemporary theoretical and activist works, most of which date within the last 20 years or so, to give context to the more contemporary articulations of both anarchist and Indigenous theory and practice. This thesis, therefore, does not perform a grand historical survey of all the potential engagements that anarchist theory has had with either anti-colonialism or Indigenous peoples. Nor is it exhaustive in examining any of the many themes in the following chapters. This is beyond the scope and length of the current work here, though more in-depth treatments are to be taken up in my later doctoral work.

Geographically, my work is located nearly exclusively within North America (or Turtle Island, Anowarakowa Kawennote as termed by Haudenosaunee peoples (Alfred, 2005, 287) and in Nishnaabeg communities (Simpson, 2011, 65)) and even more so within the colonial states of ‘Canada’ and the ‘United States’ (though the anarchist theory I engage does come from the ‘Western’ world more broadly, including Western Europe). In part this focus comes from my own participation in movements that exist in these two countries and that frequently cross or seek to destroy the borders that exist between them. Indigenous peoples
often refuse colonial borders all together, asserting the connections between Indigenous nations that cross state-imposed borders. Although the term ‘Indigenous’ carries a far-reaching definition, which I discuss in more detail below, I conceive of the term in reference to the original peoples that continue to reside on Turtle Island, in territories claimed by the Canadian and US colonial states. I have deliberately excluded Indigenous peoples in the Mexican state on account of differing colonial histories and differing relationships to what are admittedly largely white anarchist movements in North America. My focus is also pragmatic in the sense that I am connected to Canadian and US anarchist movements, not those within the Mexican state. My theoretical work here occurs within an entirely English theoretical field, based on my own limitations and thus has centred on specific aspects of North American anarchist and Indigenous theory and practice. This is not to say that there aren’t useful and urgent questions or examinations elsewhere however, such an analysis is beyond the scope and possibility of my current work.

Specifically, I frame the work of this thesis through anarcha-Indigenism, as a meeting point developed between anarchism, Indigenous political theory and feminism, and seek to expand the understanding and richness of this term and politics. Each of the subsequent chapters interrogates specific aspects that meet under an anarcha-Indigenist commitment to theory and action that can hopefully push anarchism to further its engagement with anti-colonialism and decolonization.

With this general outline of the main themes and discussions of this thesis I now turn to some of the considerations of why I have chosen to take up this work. I aim to situate myself within the fields of anarchist and Indigenous political theory before discussing the terminology of ‘colonialism’, ‘post-colonialism’, ‘anti-colonialism’, ‘settler’ and ‘Indigenous’ and presenting a more detailed outline of the chapters to come.
Where I am Coming From

I am a settler born and raised in ‘Canada’ of English, Scottish, Welsh and Irish descent. I am a white, heterosexual male who comes from a relatively stable and privileged middle-class economic background. I grew up in a household that was politically liberal, where the equality between all peoples was variously upheld as an ethical basis. Growing up in a rural area, in Neutral/Huron/Wendat territory, and with a childhood filled with outdoor activities and heavy involvement in Scouts Canada, I gained a grand respect for the natural world, with environmental concerns perhaps the first outlet for my political activity. Although I was developing a social justice and “left-wing” political consciousness, it wasn’t until my undergraduate years that an interest and obligation towards a decolonizing politics began to form. My interest in Indigenous struggles of resistance was ignited upon my viewing of Alanis Obomsawin’s *Kanehsatake: 270 Years of Resistance*, and my co-founding and involvement in a Rainforest Action Network-affiliated student activist group called AW@L. AW@L has organized around a number of issues and campaigns, but primarily focused its efforts on solidarity work with both the Haudenosaunee community of Six Nations of the Grand River (located near Brantford Ontario) and the Anishinaabe community Asubpeeschoseewagong (Grassy Narrows, located near Kenora Ontario) and on building resistance to both the 2010 Olympics (as part of the Olympic Resistance Network-Ontario) and the G8/G20 meetings. I also began to read and engage with Indigenous theorists such as Taiaiake Alfred, Glen Coulthard, Andrea Smith and Leanne Simpson on the resurgence and liberation of Indigenous nations.
Alongside my exposure to understandings and debates around settler identity (which I discuss in detail below) and a desire to support Indigenous struggles of resistance, I soon developed a frustration with state-focused and reformist forms of social change. From here my headlong dive into anarchist theory and writing began, first with Emma Goldman’s seminal text *Anarchism and Other Essays* and the work of Murray Bookchin. As I worked through my undergraduate degree I began to think through the possibilities of anarchist-Indigenous alliances, most specifically with activism against the 2010 Olympics (discussed later on in Chapter 6), which brought together a broad coalition of settler and Indigenous activists around an ‘anti-capitalist and anti-colonial’ orientation of resistance. This activism further reinforced my understanding of the need for settlers to develop a critical anti-colonial analysis of our place and obligations living on stolen Indigenous lands. Through my own personal genealogy of activism and radicalization I now find myself interested in the possibilities of allied actions and resistance to state, capital and colonial forms of domination and oppression between settler and Indigenous peoples.

More recently I was arrested for anarchist organizing with Southern Ontario Anarchist Resistance (SOAR) against the G20 leaders’ summit in Toronto in 2010. I was charged with several counts of conspiracy, denied bail for 16 days, placed on restrictive house arrest for 7 months and unable to talk to many of my close friends because of non-association conditions. Part-way through my preliminary hearing in fall 2011, 16 co-accused and myself accepted a plea deal that involved 6 of us pleading guilty to a lesser charge of counseling mischief over $5000. I served 70 days in a provincial jail and got out in February 2012. This has been the backdrop to my thesis work and one that has profoundly influenced my own politics. It has been two years of trying times, frustration, state repression and challenges to my anarchist politics. If anything, however, it has affirmed my desire to
continue to cultivate communities of resistance and engage in academic work that provides possibilities or ‘gifts’ (Graeber, 2004) to movements. This thesis work was one of the few semi-political projects I could actually work on throughout the last two years, as I also had a bail condition that prevented my participation in any form of protest or demonstration. The work here, therefore, is significant: not necessarily for its theoretical content (I will let others and movements be the judge of that) but for the role it has played in my life and for the feeling of connection to anarchist and decolonization movements it has allowed. I hope in some way that it is a testament to the spirit of resistance that I have encountered over these last two years.

**Why Take Up This Work?**

So why have I come to engage with Indigenous theory and practice and the possible relationships and exchanges of knowledge that might occur with anarchism? What is my motivation for this project? What business does a settler anarchist have reading and citing Indigenous theorists and activists?

First of all, as is perhaps already apparent, I have identified a gap within anarchist theory and practice that has largely failed to account for colonialism and our participation in it. Seeing this gap in recent academic works by anarchists, as well as many segments of the various articulations of anarchist movements, based on my own experience, it seems that there is a very real need for anarchists to engage and take seriously the critiques and challenges put forth by Indigenous peoples. Andrea Smith makes a similar observation, in terms of “left” social movements, suggesting that there is a general dismissal of Indigenous theory and politics due to a perception that it is endlessly caught up in identity politics or cultural considerations. She argues that Native women’s organizing has been ignored on
account of the perception that Indigenous peoples, and especially Indigenous women, ‘have nothing to contribute to social justice activism or theory in general…our struggles have no relationship to political economy’ (Smith, 2008a, xi). This has led, she concludes, to a general under-theorizing of Indigenous activism and resistance and little discussion of its possible contributions to social movement theory and practice more broadly.

Leanne Simpson (2011), in her book on resurgence and resistance from a Nishnaabeg perspective, argues similarly, suggesting that even if Western theory has been able to consider the particularities of colonialism and how it might operate, such work has been wholly inadequate in finding resonance with Indigenous peoples. She argues that ‘western-based social movement theory has failed to recognize the broader contextualizations of resistance within Indigenous thought, while also ignoring the contestation of colonialism as a starting point’ (Simpson, 2011, 31). Western theory thus needs a reorientation towards the complexities of colonialism and the specific efforts of Indigenous peoples to resist its contemporary manifestations. Colonialism, it must be noted, is the historical and ongoing process that structures relationships, power dynamics and social stratification in settler societies like ‘Canada’ and the ‘US’. Colonialism is what, at the most basic level, defines the contexts in which we operate, based upon dispossession and violence for the benefit of settlers (see Morgensen, 2011). Colonialism is therefore the logic that underwrites all of the political work, the theory and practice, that we might seek to implement towards creating cultures of resistance. All forms of Western theory and action are underwritten by it. Therefore, one step forward might be for Western theory as a whole, and Western anarchist theory in particular, to take Indigenous theory and practice seriously, paying attention to its own challenges as a Western theoretical paradigm, no matter how liberatory or radical. Further, as Mohanty (2003) and Smith (2005) point out, white-
dominated Western feminism has largely dismissed or ignored the work, struggle, theoretical contributions and critiques of women of colour. Western feminism, and Western theory more broadly, has been fashioned into a white-dominated product of white supremacy, colonialism and the exclusion of women of colour. Anarchism and anarcha-feminism have been no better in their attention to criticism and critique emanating from the lived experiences, struggles, resistance and theoretical development of women of colour. This thesis turns to these critiques and criticisms in an attempt to understand their relevance to anarchist theory and seek to answer their challenge of white supremacy and colonialism in all forms of Western theory.

Smith (2008, xv) argues not for a simple inclusion of Indigenous theoretical perspectives into other disciplines, but rather for a recentring of Indigenous perspectives within other disciplines. This, she argues, requires identifying Indigenous theory and practice as examples that might benefit many others and their work. This potential recentring has the possibility for profound transformations in broader theory and practice. In this thesis I aim to take up this challenge by reading Indigenous theorists and considering the anti-colonial and decolonizing potentials that might be taken up within anarchism and become a core component underlining anarchy-Indigenism. I ask how Indigenous theory and practice can disrupt the theoretical and practical assumptions or stalemates within anarchism, as well as shed light on the colonial elephant in the room that has been relatively neglected within anarchist contexts.

Similarly to the challenges expressed above, local movements in which I have participated have been challenged on their racism and colonial privileges by individuals from a number of Indigenous communities. A challenge to take decolonization seriously and work on deconstructing colonial systems and privileges in our communities has been issued to
settlers. It is towards this criticism, in part, that I offer this thesis, in the hopes that looking at, engaging with, and responding to Indigenous theory and practice might shift social movement and anarchist work more in the direction of anti-colonial politics and decolonizing commitments. I hope that this work succeeds in responding in some small way to this challenge and inspires other settlers and anarchists to begin thinking about decolonization and unsettling work as it relates to the contexts in which they find themselves and the lands on which they live.

Part of this response to the challenges set out above requires that we, as settlers (the definitional complexity of which I discuss below), own up to the settler contexts that we find ourselves in. Plainly, we need to accept our settler status as it now stands for the purposes of understanding histories of continued colonization and the privileges that we continue to accumulate through the dispossession of Indigenous peoples in a colonial, white supremacist and heteropatriarchal society. Indigenous peoples have long understood the complexities of colonial forms of oppression and domination and it is high time that settlers and most certainly anarchists were attentive to these understandings and theorizations. The complexity of contemporary and historical forms of colonialism is something that settlers can seek to understand first by reading and engaging Indigenous theory and action, and then by bringing this theory to their own privileged contexts to think about the possibilities for decolonization and anti-colonial resistance. We might learn from Indigenous theorists, but we need to do specific work in our own communities, oriented towards settler decolonization. We need to begin conversations and dialogues on what we can do to move forward. I offer this thesis towards this continuing conversation with the hope of revealing our anarchist settler selves and unsettling the privileged positions that we have in social movements. Further, I hope to unsettle the anarchist righteousness or high-mindedness that often seems to accompany a
political context that in theory purports to resist all forms of oppression and domination but often fails on many accounts in practice. Resisting colonialism, as a core source of oppression and domination within the Canadian and US American states, has been a profound failure on our part. Further developing anarcha-Indigenism is one way that perhaps anarchism can shift its analysis and practice towards living up to an opposition to all forms of oppression and domination.

I also take up this work as an exercise in challenging my own personal politics. I have continually been pushed to learn about the realities of colonialism by the Indigenous theorists that I have been introduced to from a variety of sources and the Indigenous peoples I have worked with politically. Having desired to learn more and work against the existence of colonialism, and seeking to ally with Indigenous land defense struggles, continuing this work in an academic capacity seems essential to assist in challenging myself, those participating in social movements, and the anarchist principles that guide theory and practice.

I endeavor to see the realization of anarchism in theory and practice, with the hope of moving towards a better world free from oppression and domination, the state, capitalism, heteropatriarchy and white supremacy. To ignore colonialism as a core logic informing state formation, capitalist expansion and the development of white supremacy would be to leave a massive gap in my theoretical and practical understanding of oppression and would limit the possibilities of anarchist resistance to (hopefully) some day realize a new world. In this way this project is self-interested: I want to create the best anarchism possible, one that accounts for the intersectional lived experiences of a variety of peoples in this world and presents useful understandings of domination and the potential of resistance. I understand intersectionality in the sense put forth by Shannon and Rogue (2009), who draw
from the work of feminists of colour such as bell hooks and Patricia Hill Collins, as positing ‘that our social locations in terms of race, class, gender, sexuality, nation of origin, ability, age, etc. are not easily parsed out one from the other’ and interact to inform the daily experiences of all people (7). Intersectionality in this sense calls for removing the hierarchies created between different forms of oppression and domination and argues that all such forms need to be challenged and recognized as contributing, sustaining and feeding off one another. Without incorporating colonialism into anarchist work, we will continue to be missing an understanding of a key source of power for the state, capital, heteropatriarchy and white supremacy. Allowing this gap to continue unfilled both ignores the challenges of Indigenous theory and practice and ensures anarchism's irrelevance to many people engaged in resistance.

So I come to this work with the hope of making anarchism better: to attend to the criticisms of settlers and our movements by Indigenous peoples; to be attentive to Indigenous critiques of Western hegemony, colonialism, the state, capitalism and heteropatriarchy; to work on my own personal politics and continue to think through what decolonization means; to continue to unsettle myself when my knowledge starts to become comfortable. I hope this work helps others to think about colonialism and decolonization and I hope it pushes anarchism just that little bit further. Finally, I hope this work adds to anarcha-Indigenism as a continually-developing possibility for resistance. Before I can continue there are some clarifications that need to be offered with regard to the terms ‘colonialism’, ‘post-colonialism’, ‘anti-colonialism’, ‘settler’ and ‘Indigenous’.

Colonialism, Post-Colonialism and Anti-Colonialism
The following discussion is certainly not exhaustive of the complexities of colonialism, but I think offers a beginning for understanding some of its complexities within anarcha-Indigenism and ought to prompt further specific work in this regard. These definitions and understandings of colonialism, post-colonialism and anti-colonialism inform anarcha-Indigenism in theory and practice as a whole, as well as the individual chapters that seek to add further depth to the term, most specifically the anti-colonial research methodology I discuss in Chapter 3.

Colonialism has been generally defined as ‘direct territorial appropriation of another geo-political entity, combined forthright exploitation of its resources and labour, and systematic interference in the capacity of the appropriated culture … to organize its dispensations of power’. The persistence of colonialism after ‘independence’ struggles can continue as ‘internal colonialism’ where the dominant continue a similar administration of power over other groups (McClintock, 1992, 88). The North American colonial context might be termed ‘breakaway settler colonies’, characterized by ‘formal independence from the founding metropolitan country [i.e. Britain], along with continued control over the appropriated colony (thus displacing colonial control from the metropolis to the colony itself)’ (McClintock, 1992, 89). The colonial dynamic is therefore maintained with a transfer of power from the imperial power to the settler population. With the attainment of independence by Canada and the US, Walsh argues, ‘coloniality is a model of power that continues’ (2007, 229). The specificity of settler colonialism deserves a greater in-depth discussion, as some have undertaken (see Veracini, 2010 or Morgensen, 2011) and continues be expanded within the field of settler colonial studies. This literature is beyond the scope of my current work here, not for its lack of relevance, but on account of the focus of my work on the relationships between anarchists/anarchism and Indigenous resistance/political
theory in contemporary contexts. I am admittedly not completing a genealogical examination of the historical relationships and dynamics that exist between Indigenous peoples, anarchism and settler colonialism within North America. This historical examination will form a large component of my future PhD work that will build upon the work undertaken here. The core aspect of colonialism that must be highlighted is the often violent maintenance of ‘structural domination and a suppression…of the heterogeneity of the subjects in question’ (Mohanty, 2003, 18). Mohanty’s definition begins the move towards colonialism incorporating intersecting systems of oppression, beyond only a historical designation. Further, neo-colonialism points to the creation of new forms of colonialism and domination (Kempf, 2010b).

In part, colonialism has been historicized through the work of ‘post-colonialism’. This body of theory points to the violence that occurs as a result of the categories, boundaries and borders created by colonialism. As Kevin Bruyneel argues, in relation to his work on the legal positioning of Indigenous peoples in relation to the US, ‘a post-colonial perspective contests the idea that American boundaries are coherent, impermeable colonial impositions on indigenous people while acknowledging and shedding light on the repressive practices and consequences of the persistent American effort to impose colonial rule’ (2007, xviii). Post-colonialism, then, can reveal colonialism as a ‘counter-history’ to the dominant narratives of history within Western states (Bhabha, 1990, 218 cited in Haig-Brown, 2008a, 253). Further, post-colonial theoretical work examines the spaces that exist in-between or on the borders of culture, politics and identity and can be employed to see boundaries as ‘more than just barriers’ and as reflective of the interactions that occur between cultures, peoples and politics in these spaces (Bruyneel, 2007, xix). Post-colonial theory is, therefore, far from irrelevant to anti-colonial struggles, even if some see it as a misleading term, an
‘unrealistic rupture, a break, a move away from one condition to another’ (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001, p. 304), a term promoting a hierarchy of historical epochs that centres colonialism and its European lineage as the referent period, or ‘prematurely celebratory’ given the persistence of colonial dynamics (McClintock, 1992, 87).

The ‘post’ in post-colonialism is not meant to suggest that colonialism is over, done or complete but rather seeks to look at particular elements of colonial violence. Colonialism is based on the myriad dynamics of power and oppression, and thus needs to be engaged from a variety of angles and locations. Post-colonialism, if we must take it literally as occurring after colonialism, might then be better situated as an aspiration, a hope for a non-colonial future (Battiste, 2002). But post-colonial theory must be engaged for its own contributions to understanding colonial violence. To this end, I draw inspiration from others who have taken up post-colonial theoretical work in relation to Indigenous peoples in North America (see for ex. Bruyneel, 2007; Haig-Brown, 2008a), and engage the concept of ‘third space’ in Chapter 2 to suggest conceiving anarcha-Indigenism as a meeting point between feminism, anarchism and Indigenous political theory in a time when colonialism continually structures settler society. Colonialism, therefore, needs to be regarded as a ‘transhistorical’ phenomenon, continuing in contemporary societies, not relegated to a former past (Kempf, 2010b, 2006). Colonialism has not disappeared, and therefore it is to anti-colonialism that we must turn (Smith, 2002). Activists and researchers need to take stock of the continued presence of colonialism and the many dynamics that it employs and orient theoretical work towards challenging colonial dynamics and colonial privilege. To do otherwise would be to ignore the specific forms of colonial oppression and domination and maintain them with our silence.
An anti-colonial orientation, therefore, might be articulated as one means of engaging in resistance to colonialism, following Dei (2006, 2) as an ‘approach to theorizing colonial and re-colonial relations and the implications of imperial structures on the processes of knowledge production and validation, the understanding of indigeneity, and the pursuit of agency, resistance and subjective politics’. Anti-colonialism is both a critique of colonial structures and processes, and a means by which to resist them (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001). Anti-colonialism, in the sense discussed here, promotes resistance to all aspects of oppression and domination, and as such is a holistic approach to resistance (Kempf, 2010a), which is more generally applicable as a strategy of resistance than approaches that focus on a single axis of oppression (i.e. class) (Dei, 2010; Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001). This is not to suggest that all anti-colonial theory takes up an intersectional understanding of oppression, but suggests that an ethically grounded anti-colonial theory would take up intersectionality to recognize the complexity of oppression and domination that occurs under colonial conditions (see Barker, 2010 and Cannella & Manuelito, 2008 below). This intersectional analysis of colonialism and its manifestations clearly finds resonance with the anarchist and anarcha-Indigenist commitments that I outline in Chapter 2.

Fundamentally, an anti-colonial orientation theorizes colonialism through the lens of Indigenous knowledges, epistemologies and histories of resistance in everyday life (Dei, 2006). It is an ‘epistemology of the oppressed’, based in localized knowledges and processes (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001, 300; also Dei, 2010). It locates dominant ideologies and

---

3 While Dei and Kempf’s work provides a useful framework for anti-colonialism, there is a tendency in defining colonialism as anything that might be dominating (Dei, 2006, 3) that empties out its historical specificity. Such a broad a definition loses the contexts in which colonialism was erected and its specific impacts. If anything colonialism needs to be appropriately contextualized clarify the specificities of oppression, domination and resistance that have occurred. This is a point Kempf (2010, 18) acknowledges, while contradictorily holding to the broad understanding above – a contradiction which cannot be further elaborated here. Ultimately, what is needed is a historically specific understanding of colonialism alongside an intersectional understanding of oppression.
methodologies within racially-based epistemologies bound up in European dominance (Hales, 2006), and takes a holistic approach, identifying spirituality and the connection of all things within relationships (Dei, 2006; Atleo, 2004). Cannella and Manuelito (2008, 56) summarize anti-colonialism to:

a) reveal and actively challenge social systems, discourses and institutions that are oppressive and that perpetuate injustice…and explore ways of making these systems obviously visible in society; b) support knowledges that have been discredited by dominant power orientations in ways that are transformative … and c) construct activist conceptualizations of research that are critical and multiple in ways that are transparent, reflexive and collaborative.

An anti-colonial orientation stands as a holistic framework, taking into account previous and continued colonial relations, and centres Indigenous knowledges as its epistemological foundation for resistance within areas of continued colonization. It centres oppositional frameworks to resist dominant European conceptions that continue to uphold colonial and dominating relations. It moves beyond assertions of ‘impartiality, non-partisanship and indifference’ within academia and maintains that discursive practices can never be apolitical (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001, 318). It points to the standpoints and contexts that we hold as academics and activists, and calls for us to put them into question, to assess the privileges that we have. Epistemologically, anti-colonialism is grounded in the knowledge held by the oppressed and the drive to hold colonizers and settlers accountable to their histories and privileges accruing from colonial processes. From an axiological standpoint, it focuses on articulating strategies for resistance and social transformation. Ontologically, it recognizes change not only as desirable, but as possible, and rooted in the resistance of oppressed peoples (Kempf, 2010b). Anti-colonialism is a specifically political project aimed at resistance to domination and oppression, that has much to contribute toward specifying anarcha-Indigenisms desire to resist colonialism in all its manifestations.
As this discussion suggests, there is relevance of both post-colonial and anti-colonial theoretical work to efforts of resisting colonialism. My project, although seeking to establish a firm anti-colonial orientation within anarchism and anarcha-Indigenism, has much to gain from post-colonial theory. In particular, I engage with the post-colonial concept of ‘third space’ in the next chapter as a way of thinking about the contribution of different theoretical perspectives to improving and expanding anarcha-Indigenism in theory and practice.

‘Indigenous’ and Settler*: Understanding the Complexities of Definition

There is a wide range of terms used to refer to Indigenous peoples: Native, Indian, Aboriginal, First Nations etc., which are variously employed by theorists and institutions in variety of contexts. Tracing the specificity of each of these terms is beyond the scope of this thesis; however, I do want to discuss ‘Indigenous’ as the term I employ, along with many other theorists, because of its indication of connection to place. Given that I am speaking of relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples broadly, and not focusing on the relations between specific settlers and Indigenous nations, I use the term Indigenous for its broad application, but also its focus on Indigenous peoples’ connection to place and their landbases. Alfred and Corntassel (2005, 597) suggest the following understanding of Indigenous peoples:

The communities, clans, nations and tribes we call Indigenous peoples are just that: Indigenous to the lands they inhabit, in contrast to and in contention with the colonial societies and states that have spread out from Europe and other centers of empire. It is this place-based existence, along with the consciousness of being in struggle against the dispossessing and demeaning fact of colonization by foreign peoples, that fundamentally distinguishes Indigenous peoples from other peoples of the world.

---

4 For a critique of these sorts of labels/definitions see Alfred (2005, 126). Alfred suggests the use of Onkwehonwe, meaning ‘original peoples’ (Alfred, 2005, 288) in the Mohawk language as it is rooted in his specific context writing as a Mohawk scholar.
This definition of Indigenous is not the only one and I do not suggest that such a term is employed without debate and contestation. For my purposes here, as stated above, I use it for its broadness and its importance in connecting Indigenous peoples to their specific landbases. This definition also specifically recognizes the colonial relationships that settler populations from Europe have with Indigenous peoples, and suggests active resistance to colonialism by Indigenous peoples.

I understand the term settler to encompass, following the work of Bonita Lawrence, all of those who are not Indigenous peoples (see Lawrence and Dua, 2005 and Amadahy and Lawrence, 2010); however, I do address those with anarchist or anarchistic politics who are predominantly white as the focus of this thesis. This is the context in which I find myself and undertake the challenge by Indigenous peoples and others to first work within my own community in order to move towards decolonization and the unsettling of colonial residues.

In terms of defining settlers more complexly, Mar and Edmonds locate that ‘[i]n simplest terms, settler colonists went, and go, to new lands to appropriate them and to establish new and improved replicas of the societies they left. As a result Indigenous peoples have found an ever-decreasing space for themselves in settler colonies as changing demographics enabled ever more extensive dispossession. Settlers, in the end, tended not to assimilate into Indigenous societies, but rather emigrated to replace them’ (2010, 2). This dynamic marks the specificity of settler forms of colonialism that have occurred within North America (in addition to other locales such as Palestine etc.). This specific form of colonialism is different from others that have not employed the use of settling of populations from the colonial home states and have engaged their projects via economic, military or other colonialism as I discussed above. I therefore, turn to some of the dynamics of settler identity that affect the contemporary reality of settler/Indigenous relationships.
Barker (2009) argues for the specificity of ‘settler’ as a descriptive term to recognize ‘the historical and contemporary realities of imperialism that very clearly separate the lives of Indigenous peoples from the lives of late-comers’ (329) with the fundamental attribute of settlers being their receipt of colonial privileges. Settlers are, most plainly, those that are ‘meant to replace’ Indigenous populations via colonial violence, past and present. Settlers and Indigenous peoples might seem as opposites in a binary, but the asymmetrical power relations point to the construction of each position as an element of colonialism (Morgensen, 2011, 22). These accounts of settler colonialism point to its focus on dispossession and the removal of Indigenous peoples from their lands. They centre colonialism as a continuing act.

In two articles coauthored first with Enaski Dua and then with Zainab Amadahy, Bonita Lawrence seeks to add nuance and increased specificity to the understanding of the term settler. In ‘Decolonizing Antiracism,’ Lawrence and Dua argue for an anti-colonial orientation within anti-racist theory in order to recognize the complicity of settler populations, and to some degree anti-racism, in the continued colonization of Indigenous peoples. They argue that those working within an anti-racist context on the lands of Indigenous peoples need to take up an anti-colonial analysis. They state: ‘If they are truly progressive, antiracist theorists must begin to think about their personal stake in this struggle [against colonization by Indigenous peoples], and about where they are going to situate themselves’ (Lawrence and Dua, 2005, 126). They argue that anti-racist scholars, and I would add many of those activists and theorists committed to social change including anarchists, have failed to take up an understanding of land as a contested space as result of colonization. They argue that to ‘acknowledge that we all share the same land base and yet to question the differential terms on which it is occupied is to become aware of the colonial project that is
taking place around us’ (Lawrence and Dua, 2005, 126). Their call is ultimately one to settlers
to wake up and recognize their role in the continued colonization of Indigenous peoples.

Important in Lawrence and Dua’s work is the argument that people of colour too are
settlers because they ‘live on land that is appropriated and contested, where Aboriginal
peoples are denied nationhood and access to their own lands’ (2005, 134). Although they
acknowledge that the history of slavery should not be forgotten as one of immense
oppression and domination, they argue that theorists and activists committed to anti-racist
politics and resistance to oppression and domination need to recognize that the settlement
of former slaves in North America was facilitated with the theft of Indigenous lands. People
of colour, they argue, although themselves marginalized by white settlers, have been invited
by white settlers to participate in the continued colonization of Indigenous peoples
(Lawrence and Dua, 2005, 133). The fact that people of colour have accepted, however
unknowingly, this invitation by white settlers requires that they be understood as settlers as
well. White settlers need to understand the dynamics of settler identity and history to further
take stock of white supremacy’s perpetration of domination and oppression over various
populations and its forced use of ‘othered’ bodies in the furtherance of colonial domination.
Understanding the complexities of settler identity and definition may also serve as a means
of displacing the unmarked whiteness that continues as a result of colonialism. White settlers
might begin to understand both their history as one of colonization of Indigenous lands, but
also the forced settlement of people of colour.

Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright, in an article entitled ‘Decolonizing Resistance,
Challenging Colonial States’ (2008-9), seek to respond to the arguments put forth by
Lawrence and Dua. They contend that Lawrence and Dua’s opening up of the category of
settler to include all non-Indigenous peoples has arisen alongside the rise of ‘neo-racist’
ideologies and the neoliberalism of the 1980s that presents ‘incommensurable “differences” among “cultures” imagined as separate and distinct’ (122). They say that they reject the ‘delinking’ of anti-racism and anti-colonialism that Lawrence and Dua perform and their conflation with migration as a process of colonization. They reject a politics that is based on locating Indigeneity in place and the struggle for independence of Indigenous nations based on a rhetoric of nationalism. They argue that arguments of ‘historical continuity of title’ fall into the ‘neo-racist’ ideologies and thus efforts of resistance need to be refocused. They want to refocus decolonization to the liberation of peoples, in order to move from the erection of a hierarchy of oppression with Indigenous peoples at the top. Instead they argue for conceptualizing relationships in the form of the ‘commons’:

By understanding colonialism as the theft of the commons, the agents of decolonization as the commoners, and decolonization as the gaining of a global commons, we will gain a clearer sense of when we were colonized, who colonized us, and how to decolonize ourselves and our relationships (Sharma and Wright, 2008-9, 133).

Sharma and Wright’s work, although calling for Lawrence and Dua to add specificity to their understanding of all non-Indigenous people as settlers, seems to misread what Lawrence and Dua argue for. Lawrence and Dua do not want to ‘delink’ anti-racism and anti-colonialism, but have rather sought to bring an anti-colonial analysis into anti-racism where it has been previously lacking. Lawrence and Dua are arguing that the struggles of Indigenous peoples against colonialism have been marginalized within the broader anti-racism movement, and by extension larger struggles for social change including within anarchism. Sharma and Wright seem to suggest that Lawrence and Dua’s project plays into the logics of ‘neo-racism’ and casts Indigenous peoples as the most oppressed peoples and therefore their concerns should be observed as primary. I don’t think that Lawrence and Dua are interested in erecting the hierarchy of oppressions that Sharma and Wright charge; rather they have
recognized that the struggles and concerns and analyses put forth by Indigenous peoples have been ignored by wider movements for social justice. Lawrence and Dua argue for those interested in resistance to recognize the struggles of Indigenous peoples and seek for broader social movements to take up an analysis of colonialism within their own work. Lawrence and Dua recognize that processes of migration have been tied up in the history of settler colonialism and that migrant populations have taken up colonizing processes rather than seeking to resist colonialism alongside Indigenous peoples.

Sharma and Wright’s proposal to reorient decolonizing work within a framework of ‘the commons’ seems to further collapse the categories of settler and Indigenous into one another. Their use of ‘we’ and ‘our’ suggest a uniform process of colonization that entirely negates the specific struggles of Indigenous peoples and the privileges that all settlers accrue from the colonization and displacement of Indigenous peoples. Sharma and Wright’s proposal performs the exact sorts of negation that Lawrence and Dua seek to contest in the anti-racism movement. Sharma and Wright flatten settler colonialism to a generic understanding of colonialism, one that removes the specific histories of Indigenous peoples, the history of slavery and migration that was tied up in the settler colonial project and the privileges that settlers continue to hold under settler colonialism and white supremacy. Sharma and Wright, therefore, fail to understand the need for a greater anti-colonial analysis that Lawrence and Dua argue for and instead put forth a project of decolonization that empties colonialism of is historically specific understanding.

Although not directly in response, Lawrence, writing with Zainab Amadahy (2010), puts forth a more nuanced understanding of people of colour as settlers. The above understanding of people of colour as settlers suggested that all peoples who are not Indigenous, regardless of their origins and histories of migration, are settlers. They state
more specifically: “The reality then is that Black peoples have not been quintessential “settlers” in the White supremacist nature of the word; nevertheless, they have, as free people, been involved in some form of settlement process’ (Lawrence and Amadahy, 2010, 107). This understanding agrees with the understanding of settler colonialism advanced by Mar and Edmonds above, where people of colour continue to assist in acts of dispossession of Indigenous lands and the replacement of Indigenous populations with ‘immigrant’ settler populations. It also specifies the white supremacist nature of settler colonialism. From the work of Lawrence and her co-writers the general definition of a settler may be defined as any person or group that is not-Indigenous, while taking into account the contextual complexities of people of colour’s various positionings to white settler supremacy. The nuanced understanding of people of colour as settlers, but still under the domination of white supremacy, indicates the hierarchical nature of settler colonialism.

Lawrence and Amadahy (2010, 107), while recognizing the complexities and nuances of settler and Indigenous identities, ultimately point to the need to move beyond reducing these issues/identities to semantics and rather suggest the greater importance that lies in what sorts of relationships people of colour and Indigenous peoples may be able to create across the bounds of difference to foster resistance against colonialism. This is not to suggest a removal of the specificities and histories that make up one’s identity, but to recognize that one means of working towards decolonizing histories is through the creation of relationships in the contemporary moment. In the case of we who are white settlers seeking to stand in solidarity with Indigenous peoples, as well as people of colour, we need to recognize the complexities that occur in such relationships. While people of colour are settlers, they are not ‘like us’ in the sense of carrying the history and privileges of white supremacy. White settlers alone carry this weight, and as such must recognize that part of
our task is to decolonize white supremacist histories, dynamics, attitudes and actions with Indigenous peoples and peoples of colour. The processes, because of the specific histories and contexts, will not and cannot be identical. White settlers need to begin to think through how to construct relations of solidarity with people of colour as settlers and with Indigenous peoples. Part of the creation of such relationships involves confronting our own legacies of white supremacy head-on, and critiquing the privileges we have received from systems of slavery, colonialism, oppression and domination. We cannot negate the specificities of different identities, but at the same time we need to start thinking about how we as white settlers can begin to create meaningful, decolonizing relationships with people of colour and Indigenous peoples towards social justice and against oppression and domination.

Adam Barker (2010) makes a similar conclusion when he argues that what is important is not whether or not settlers have been unsettled and made aware of colonialism and their relationship to it, but rather what then the settler decides to do – whether they will seek to resist colonialism as an ally to Indigenous peoples or whether they will choose to do nothing. The only contention I have with Barker is his assertion that we must respect those who choose to do nothing once they are made aware of their colonial privileges (Barker, 2010, 323). Rather, I would argue, being made aware of privilege indicates the point in time where an individual has an obligation to work against such privileges and commit to a politics of decolonization. We cannot, as white settlers and peoples committed to alliances to resist colonialism, let others go on and continue colonial dynamics. Understanding our positions as white settlers requires us to take action and commit to a decolonizing and unsettling framework. It recognizes that ‘colonialism is a narrative in which the Settler’s power is the fundamental reference and assumption, inherently limiting Indigenous freedom and imposing a view of the world that is but an outcome or perspective on that power’
(Alfred and Corntassel, 2005, 601). Again, our identities as white settlers are important, but what is more important is what we do with that understating and the privileges we have, both in terms of colonization and the legacy of white supremacy. Located in the need to act once colonial privileges are identified is the question of how alliances and relations of solidarity may be created and fostered between settlers and Indigenous peoples.

This thesis will necessarily focus on possibilities for solidarity and engagement by white (anarchist) settlers with Indigenous theory and practice under the heading of anarcha-Indigenism. That is the context that I myself am familiar with and can relate to directly. This is not to suggest that relationships among people of colour and Indigenous peoples might not find some resonance with the ideas explored herein, however, there are specific histories, previous alliances, contexts, implications etc. that exist among these diverse groups of peoples. I, as a white settler, have no place dictating the terms of Indigenous-people of colour relationships. Solidarity must be constructed within a community’s own terms, and it is for this reason that this thesis focuses on how white settlers, and more specifically white settler anarchists, might imagine solidarity relationships and political work with Indigenous peoples. I therefore direct this work primarily to white anarchist settlers like myself who benefit explicitly from white supremacy and colonialism, and who maintain hegemony within a North American anarchist movement, as delineated above within the United States and Canada, that is constructed around white-dominated anarchist space. White anarchists have been challenged in a variety of public forums (bookfairs, speaking events etc.) to recognize the white privilege that operates within the contemporary anarchist movement to silence people of colour and render anarchist spaces as white spaces by default. I want to take stock of these dynamics and the reality of white-dominated anarchist space and ask how we, as
white anarchists, go about resisting colonialism and moving towards decolonization in our theory and practice as part of a broader politics of anarchy-Indigenism.

**Conceiving and Expanding Anarcha-Indigenism**

In Chapter 2 I review the current work on anarcha-Indigenism (which brings together anarchism, feminism and Indigenous political theory), arguing that this initial work presents a significant example of beginning to orient anarchism to Indigenous resistance, anti-colonialism and decolonization. I argue specifically that anarcha-Indigenism might be understood as a space of meeting to develop anarchist theory and practice. I draw from theoretical work on ‘third space’ to argue for anarcha-Indigenism as an ‘n-dimensional’ (Day, 2005, 182; 2008, 20) space of theoretical development, action and resistance.

As Jacqueline Lasky notes, anarcha-Indigenism finds its history in the traditional political systems and relationships of Indigenous societies – including egalitarian, non-hierarchical, consensus oriented, autonomous and non-coercive forms (Lasky, 2011, 10). I turn to Indigenous political theory, feminisms, research methodology, resistance and resurgence to further explore the complexities of anarcha-Indigenism in each of the successive chapters and seek to respond to the challenges that Indigenous theorists have directed towards white-dominated social movements such as anarchism. I focus on points of engagement between anarchist, Indigenous and feminist theory to develop specific aspects of anarcha-Indigenism and suggest ways of moving anarchism towards more nuanced and comprehensive anti-colonial and decolonizing commitments. In Chapter 3 I explore the development of an anti-colonial ethical standpoint for social movement research. I draw from anarchist research methodology and practice to suggest some aspects of ethical and
social movement grounded research. From here I examine Indigenous research methodologies to suggest a means of challenging the colonial aspects of Western research perspectives and move towards anti-colonial orientations within research. These aspects of anti-colonial research are what I have aimed to consider and incorporate within my own work on these subjects.

Chapter 4 examines the specifics of Indigenous/settler relationships of solidarity as a fundamental part of anarcha-Indigenism. I begin by engaging with theorizations of solidarity by feminists of colour to illustrate some of the previous complexities of solidarity between disparate groups, especially between women of colour feminists and white feminists. This work is some of the most comprehensive in its examination of solidarity as a theoretical concept and suggests broader considerations for solidarity relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples. With these complexities in mind I examine political solidarity (Scholz 2009) as a base for thinking about the relations that might be (re)constructed between Indigenous peoples and (anarchist) settlers. Political solidarity accounts for the commitment to resistance and social justice that is reflected in such relationships, and often forms the basis of them. I then look to work on the Two Row Wampum as a specific model for settler/Indigenous solidarity. Taking this model further I argue that it might be considered, similarly to anarcha-Indigenism itself, as an ‘n-dimensional’ set of relationships that align and disalign according to particular contexts to reflect the construction and dynamic nature of a potential meeting place under anarcha-Indigenism. I end with some considerations of solidarity as a form of methodology.

Following my examination of relations of solidarity (which I think can be applied to the relationships that exist in practice and engagement with Indigenous and anarchist theory), I turn to anarchist and Indigenous feminisms to draw out commonalities as well as
challenges and potentials that each might offer the other. Chapter 5 charts the general traits of anarchist and Indigenous feminisms and suggests that the anarchist critique of the state might assist in the development of the anti-state impulses of Indigenous feminisms, while Indigenous feminist analyses of the connections between colonialism and heteropatriarchy have much to add to anarchist theory and practice and the displacement of the hegemony of Western-centred feminisms.

Having explored some of the theoretical components of anarchy-Indigenism, I then turn to some of the practical examples of anarchist interactions with anti-colonialism, as an example of some of the instances where the sorts of anarchy-Indigenist commitments I highlight have begun to be put into practice. I look at organizing against both the 2010 Vancouver Olympics and the G20 leaders summit in Toronto in 2010. While in both cases the organizing I examine is not specifically or entirely anarchist, many with self-defined anarchist politics were involved and certainly contributed to an anarchist analysis of power and injustice. Furthermore, significant solidarity links with Indigenous communities were established contributing to an overall analysis that was anti-capitalist and anti-colonial. Although anti-colonial analysis and resistance has been present alongside the participation of Indigenous peoples and communities in broader social movements, the resistance to the Olympics and G20 represents instances where a general analysis and resistance to colonialism was at the forefront of resistance efforts, including in anarchist resistance and organization. These examples perhaps signal an emerging analysis that is drawing anarchism, anti-capitalism and anti-colonialism together.

Chapter 7 concludes this thesis by suggesting some reoccurring questions that need to be continually considered when taking up solidarity and decolonization within the continued development of anarchy-Indigenist theory and practice. I reiterate the need for
this work to continue and expand within white-dominated anarchist and settler communities
writ large to take up a commitment to anti-colonial work and decolonization. I end by
suggesting some further potential directions for this work to expand anarcha-Indigenism and
consider some of these for my doctoral work to begin in September 2012.
Chapter 2

Anarcha-Indigenism as an ‘N-dimensional’ Space of Meeting

Recently, a body of work has emerged with the aim of drawing connections and resonances between anarchist, Indigenous and feminist bodies of theory, practice and resistance. Anarcha-Indigenism seeks to bring forth the intersections of anti-state, decentralized and anti-oppressive elements within such theoretical perspectives in order to imagine the possibilities for new practices of resistance. In this chapter I aim to set the stage for examining, in greater detail, some of the possible interactions between anarchist theory and practice, and Indigenous thought and action – with the overall aim to begin to imagine what an anti-colonial anarchism might begin to look like.

In the following chapter I hope to sketch out some of the existing theoretical perspectives on anarchy-Indigenism. I suggest that the work of anarchy-Indigenism carries specific considerations and interventions that ought to find resonance in broader segments of anarchist theory and practice. I consider this a particularly necessary point given that the bulk of current anarchist theory and practice occurs on the lands of Indigenous peoples, and therefore benefits from settler-colonial privileges and colonial histories. Further, in the case of Europe, contemporary anarchist theory emerges from the colonial centres of empire, from within states that built their Western hegemony by exporting colonialism and creating colonies in other locales. This is not to discount the wide spectrum of anarchist (or anarchistic) theory and practice that occurs in nearly all regions of the globe, but seeks to acknowledge a specific Eurocentric tendency within anarchism that locates Western Europe and North America as centres of theoretical and practical interventions and activities, where the anarchist movement is dominated by white anarchists. These constructed centres are the focal points of my own engagements with anarchism and the areas of anarchist theory that I
draw most heavily from. They are also the sections of anarchist theory and practice that are perhaps in the greatest need of unsettling, decolonization and resistance to white supremacy. It is here that I think anarcha-Indigenism carries a distinct possibility for anti-colonial interventions within anarchism.

I begin by tracing out the current work that has been done on anarcha-Indigenism. I trace its conceptual origins and then seek to present its core elements in both theory and practice. Having completed a general overview of the current state of anarcha-Indigenism, I look at the relationship that anarcha-Indigenism might create among Indigenous, anarchist and feminist theory and practice. Here I suggest that anarcha-Indigenism is a specific point of meeting between chiefly between anarchism and Indigenous theory and practice, but also among other important potential contributors such as feminism, conceptions of solidarity and alliance politics, research methodology and social movement engagements with contemporary anti-colonialism. To examine some of the complexities of conceiving of such a meeting point, I draw from post-colonial work with the term ‘third space’. These are certainly not all the points of engagement and fruitful conversation that might occur, but they are some that I take up in the later chapters of this thesis. I examine here some of the visions of a future society articulated by Indigenous and anarchist theorists with an eye towards creating autonomous communities of resistance. There are certainly other possibilities for engagement that might be considered in the future, such as queer theory, oral history, economics or critical race theory/anti-racism – some of which I hope to engage in my future work.
In order to think through anarcha-Indigenism as a potential space of meeting for anarchism, Indigenous political theory, feminism and other potential contributors, I consider several theoretical conceptions including ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1994; Anzaldúa, 2007; Haig-Brown 2008a), ‘contact zones’ (Pratt, 1992) and ‘border work’ (Haig-Brown, 2008a, 2008b; Anzaldúa, 2007) put forth those theorists who have engaged with post-colonialism. Although this thesis does not permit a full examination of each of these possible ways of thinking about meeting or engagement or their location within post-colonial theory more broadly, I aim to begin to tease out what might be some of the more appropriate or more useful understandings for the multiple engagements that might occur within anarcha-Indigenism suggested above. My hope is that it might suggest a means of beginning to conceptualize anarcha-Indigenism in both theory and practice, as well as expand its boundaries and the boundaries of anarchism itself. Finally, I suggest, that anarcha-Indigenism might find its clearest articulation as an ‘n-dimensional’ space for theory and action: one that is not finite, rigid or static, but dynamic, expanding and constantly engaging in new possibilities for resistance. I return to the concept of ‘n-dimensional’ space later in this thesis with regard to relations of solidarity between settlers and Indigenous peoples, but in this chapter I suggest it as a potential modification theoretical work on third space – most specifically the work of Celia Haig-Brown (2008a).

**Anarcha-Indigenism**

To begin thinking about anarcha-Indigenism as an emerging political standpoint that brings Indigenous, anarchist and feminist perspectives together as a meeting point of theory,
action and solidarity, a general definition or outline of the term needs to be considered. This concept finds one of its first articulations in the work of Taiaiake Alfred from his 2005 book *Wasasê*, as anarcho-Indigenism. In this book Alfred argues for a politics of resurgence and resistance within Indigenous communities – reconnecting to traditional governance structures and lifeways, as well as taking stock of current colonial realities and terrain of resistance. He argues for a militant warrior ethic of Indigenous resistance outside the state, with an aim of creating autonomous self-determining spaces for Indigenous communities. At this point he suggests that militancy must necessarily operate within the realm of non-violence, not because of some sort of moral superiority but in part because the forces of the Canadian state are still vast compared to the ever-growing strength of Indigenous communities. Part of resistance efforts, therefore, must be to seek to begin to build strong autonomous communities of resurgence and resistance outside the state. Alfred (2005, 45) summarizes his project early on in the book as anarcho-Indigenism.

I might suggest, as a starting point, conceptualizing *anarcho-indigenism*. Why? And why this term? Conveyance of the indigenous warrior ethic will require its codification in some form—a creed and an ethical framework for thinking through challenges. To take root in people’s minds the new ethic will have to capture the spirit of a warrior in battle and bring it to politics. How might this spirit be described in contemporary terms related to political though and movement? The two elements that come to my mind are *indigenous*, evoking cultural and spiritual rootedness in this land and the Onkwehonwe⁷ struggle for justice and freedom, and the political philosophy and movement that is fundamentally anti-institutional, radically democratic, and committed to taking action to force change: *anarchism*.

Alfred goes onto detail further points of resistance under anarcho-Indigenism with a focus on decentralization, direct democracy and several other commonalities between anarchist and Indigenous philosophies namely:

---

⁷ Alfred (2005, 288) offers the following as a definition of Onkwehonwe in the Mohawk language: ‘“the original people”… referring to the First Peoples of North America.’
A rejection of alliances with legalized systems of oppression, non-participation in the institutions that structure the colonial relationship and a belief in bringing about change through direct action, physical resistance, and confrontations with state power (Alfred, 2005, 46).

Alfred continues to argue that there have already been alliances forming between Indigenous peoples and anarchists in terms of direct action struggles to defend land and assert autonomy against colonial states. Alfred continues in his book to detail how Indigenous communities might move towards this sort of anti-state and anti-colonial politics by engaging with Indigenous theorists. He confronts some of the debates that come up within such a politics by speaking and detailing his conversations with Indigenous peoples themselves. In this way Alfred’s book is a key source in beginning to image what an anarcho-Indigenist politics might look like from the standpoint of Indigenous communities, and while interesting and necessary to read and engage, settler anarchists must start to think about an anti-state and anti-colonial politics from their own context – on the privileged end of colonialism.

From Alfred’s 2005 book comes a greater interest in thinking through anarchist and Indigenous engagements with anarcho-Indigenism. Despite renewed engagements, anarcho-Indigenism is still young in its overall development in terms of naming this sort of politics in this specific way. First, however, it must be noted that the term anarcho-Indigenism in Alfred’s work has undergone a slight modification to anarcha-Indigenism to further recognize the necessity of feminist intersections with anarchism and Indigenism. This modification in later work (see for example Day 2008; Lasky 2011) highlights the feminist intersectional intervention that is taken up by anarcha-Indigenism, towards further developing a comprehensive politics of resistance in colonial contexts. It seeks to improve on Alfred’s project to expand integration of feminist intersections with anarchism and Indigenous political theory.
So what are some of the key aspects of anarchy-Indigenism? At its base level anarchy-Indigenism seeks to bring Indigenous, anarchist, and feminist political and theoretical perspectives together. It acts as a sort of meeting point, as I develop later, for articulating anti-colonial anarchist practices for settlers, and anti-state or anti-authoritarian possibilities for Indigenous peoples. Day (2003) draws from the work of Marie Smallface Marule, Patricia Monture-Angus and Taiaiake Alfred, in conjunction with anarchist theorists, to suggest a convergence of values that see organization as occurring outside state forms – away from hierarchical relations towards non-coercive direct democratic forms of decision making and organization. Here Day argues that there are similarities, or more properly-termed, *affinities*, between some aspects of Indigenous political theory and anarchism. This convergence sets the initial points of contact for constructing anarchy-Indigenism.

By looking to Indigenous political theory, Day (2003) argues, we can see other descriptions of alternatives to the global dominant order of capitalist, colonial states beginning to take shape. Part of this resistance is directed against the ‘gifts’ of liberal multiculturalism and state sanctioned forms of self determination that the Canadian state has used as an attempt to assimilate Indigenous communities into the broader dominant order and to remove any impetus for resistance. Rather, Day (2001) argues, a new form of engagement needs to be taken up with Indigenous communities, embodied by the Two Row Wampum (to which I return in detail in Chapter 4). Here, the Two Row can be seen as a guide for conversations between Indigenous and Western political theory, most particularly with anarchist theorists (like Proudhon) who argue for decentralized and federated communities that maintain individual autonomy. As such, there is space for conversation and engagement across Indigenous and settler/Western political theory, but a new basis for relationship is required. This I think represents an early necessary commitment within
anarcha-Indigenism, that relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples become fundamentally altered within a space of mutual engagement, thereby subverting colonial hierarchies of domination. From this point there might exist a potential to tease out some of the affinities between Indigenous and Western political theory, as Day (2001) argues, but more specifically between militant, direct action-oriented Indigenous peoples and anarchists.

So what is anarcha-Indigenism? ‘If anarcha-Indigenism “is” anything,’ Richard Day (2008, 3) argues, ‘it is a meeting place, a site of possibilities, a potential for mutual aid in common projects within, outside, and against the dominant order. It is not an ideology or a party,’ he continues, ‘but an emergent and ever-changing network of autonomous subjects, organizations, and institutions: a meeting point of “anarchisms, indigenisms and feminisms”, not some form of rigid, limited or homogenous set of political possibilities, but something broadly defined, dynamic and evolving (Day, 2008, 3). Day argues that although each of the perspectives that might come to offer possibilities to anarcha-Indigenism comes from specific standpoints and traditions, there is point of intersection that exists between these diverse perspectives that might continue to be developed as anarcha-Indigenism. It is to this point of intersection that I examine the concept of ‘third space’ from post-colonial theory and suggest a move to ‘n-dimensional space’8 for anarcha-Indigenism.

Day offers the following comprehensive summary of some of the theoretical commitments and projects of anarcha-Indigenism that merits quoting at length:

an anarcha-indigenist perspective is based on an interlocking analysis of oppression, which includes every site that has been raised as an antagonism, and privileges none over the others, in terms of their importance, intensity, or the order in which they are addressed in any work involving social change. This means, at this point in our understanding, that we must struggle against, and create alternatives to, ableism, ageism, capitalism, colonialism, heterosexism, patriarchy, racism/ethnocentrism, and

8 I take the basis for this theoretical model from the suggestion by Richard Day and its further elaboration discussed between Day, Auden Neuman and myself in SOCY 911: Societies of Control/Communities of Resistance masters level seminar.
religious and state domination. Since as all beings are interrelated and dependent upon the earth, we must also work to minimize the human domination of nature and ensure that our practices are ecologically sustainable in the short, medium, and long terms, both locally and globally. This work needs to be carried out within and against the dominant order, and within our own communities. It needs to operate both at a structural level, and at the level of daily practice (Day, 2008, 19).

The work of anarcha-Indigenism, therefore, requires a commitment to root out injustice, oppression and domination at all of the levels of our lives, whether within our bodies and minds, in the dynamics of the political groups that we engage in resistance with, in the broader cultures of resistance that we seek to cultivate or in the larger macro-political and economic structures that we struggle against. It is a relational possibility of resistance that carries different meanings depending on the context of the place, the particular people who seek to actualized it and the time when it occurs. ‘It is,’ as Jacqueline Lasky (2011, 7) argues, ‘relational…plural, multiple, contingent, transient, indeterminate and thoroughly unfixed’.

Lasky argues that this sort of relationality is represented in the following quotation of Subcomandante Marcos of the Zapatistas:

Marcos is gay in San Francisco, black in South America, an Asian in Europe, a Chicano in San Ysidro, an anarchist in Spain, a Palestinian in Israel, a Mayan Indian in the streets of San Cristobal, a Jew in Germany, a Gypsy in Poland, a Mohawk in Quebec, a pacifist in Bosnia, a single woman on the Metro at 10 p.m., a peasant without land, a gang member in the slums, an unemployed worker, an unhappy student, and, of course, a Zapatista in the mountains (cited in Lasky 2011, 8).

Anarcha-Indigenism, therefore seeks to draw from multiple perspectives, while recognizing the individual contexts in which all people resist. It is a commitment to resistance, decolonization and the creation of alternative possibilities in all aspects of our being. It is, as well, about creating ‘openings’ within a dominant order of state, capitalism, heteropatriarchy, white supremacy and colonialism with which to resist (Day, 2008), to find the gaps, the

---

9 For more on anarcha-Indigenism and the Zapatista struggle specifically see Khasnabish (2011).
possibilities, the moments of play, joy, destruction and creation. It is certainly utopian in this respect but it aims to ground itself in the lived struggles of resistance of Indigenous peoples and those that seek to support such struggles.

**Anarcha-Indigenism Alive**

The ‘on-the-ground’ goal of anarcha-Indigenism might be summarized as the creation of autonomous alternative communities or communities of resistance that are based in anti-authoritarian relationships, the sharing of power and empowerment of all people, and the creation of networks of mutual aid that prioritize the health of communities, the land and the earth. This might take many forms, such as Proudhonian inspired federalism (Day, 2003), or Taro farming practices in Hawai‘i (Goodyear-Kapua, 2008), Asian settler movements towards decolonization (Fujikane, 2010), anarchist solidarity with Indigenous land defence struggles (Day and Haberle, 2006) or Indigenous movements of revitalization and resurgence (Simpson, 2011, 2008; Alfred 2008, 2005; Monture-Angus 2007). It probably encompasses these examples and many more yet to arrive. Here I look at the work of Indigenous scholars Taiaiake Alfred, Leanne Simpson and Bonita Lawrence for some possible ideas as to what an anarcha-Indigenist practice might require from the standpoint of Indigenous peoples and how these ideas might resonate with anarchist understandings of creating autonomous communities of resistance through transfer cultures (Ehrlich 1996a) that begin to enact alternative political practices and systems now in preparation for a move towards decentralized and non-statist communities. These possibilities are perhaps the utopian visions of anarcha-Indigenism in practice.

Leanne Simpson frames the resistance of Indigenous peoples not in terms of ‘dissent’, as is a frequent parlance in Western-dominated, colonially privileged social
movements, but of resurgence. She states: ‘From an Indigenous perspective we are not dissenting, mobilizing, resisting or creating controversy to “win” superiority or to dominate settler society. We are advocating and building a resurgence in order to provide the best political and cultural context for the lives of our people to flourish’ (Simpson, 2011, 86). She argues further that this sort of resurgence relies on a restoration of balance in all the relations of Indigenous communities and a ‘disruption of the capitalist industrial complex and the colonial gender system…within settler nations by challenging the very foundation of the nation-state and its relationships to the land and Indigenous nations’ (Simpson, 2011, 87). This challenge allows for the creation of self-determining and autonomous Indigenous spaces that allow for resurgence and a return to ‘nonhierarchical, non-authoritarian and non-coercive’ relationships and ways of organizing society (Simpson, 2011, 53). Drawing from traditional teachings, philosophies and lifeways, some of which have been maintained throughout history, is an important step for the imagining of new kinds of Indigenous relations outside of colonial and statist forms of governance.

In his book *Peace, Power, Righteousness* (2008, see also Alfred 2005), Taiaiake Alfred points as well to a need for Indigenous peoples to return to traditional value systems as a means to strengthen their communities and empower resistance to state-imposed colonialism and colonial structures. He traces an aspect of the current problems facing Indigenous peoples as a result of the imposition of liberal democratic forms of statist governance, which has forced Indigenous leaders to act as Western politicians –focused on the manipulation of power for selfish aims rather than the common good. Governance has become disconnected from Indigenous communities (Alfred, 2008, 69). The answer, he suggests, is a return to traditional values and systems of governance that are modified to fit the contemporary context.
The resurgence of Indigenous nationhood is the primary articulation of traditional
Indigenous values and forms of governance and is the means with which to assert
Indigenous control over lands and lifeways. The current limits of resistance, Alfred argues,
have been placed within the context of the Canadian state, which only allows for modest and
limited reforms, resulting in the prolonging of the hegemony of the Canadian state without
directly challenging its power. He argues, therefore, that Indigenous peoples must
‘deconstruct the notion of state power to allow people to see that the settler state has no
right to determine indigenous futures’ (Alfred, 2008, 71). He asserts that agitating within the
parameters of state power only reinforces the state’s assertions of sovereignty and its
domination of Indigenous peoples. Rather, a traditional orientation suggests ‘focusing not on
opposing external power, but on actualizing [Indigenous people’s] own power and
preserving their intellectual independence’, empowering Indigenous peoples and moving
beyond relations of coercion and contract (Alfred, 2008, 72). A traditional perspective
advocates moving beyond a whole-scale revolution against the state towards creating
relationships of autonomy, self-determination and independence, as indicated by the Two
Row Wampum (discussed in Chapter 4), and engaging with settler society on the basis of
federalism. This recognizes the mutual dependence of settler and Indigenous nations with a
commitment to cooperation and peaceful coexistence, which is impossible, Alfred argues,
when still working within the parameters of state-centric sovereignty (Alfred, 2008, 77).

Ultimately, Alfred advocates the creation of Indigenous nationhood beyond statist
conceptions of power and sovereignty with ‘no absolute authority, no coercive enforcement
of decisions, no hierarchy and no separate ruling entity’ (Alfred, 2008, 80). Working towards
this sort of possibility of nationhood does not mean that reforming the state should be
abandoned outright, but the state itself and its systems must be recognized as being
fundamentally opposed to freedom. The overall goal, therefore, must be to stop the dominating engine of the state (Alfred, 2008, 80). Institutions have been created by humans; they are socially created, and therefore they can be changed by humans. They can be made to focus on values such as respect (Alfred, 2008, 86). What must be realized, Alfred argues, is that ‘[t]he mythology of the state is hegemonic, and the struggle for justice would be better served by undermining the myth of state sovereignty than by carving out a small and dependent space for indigenous peoples within it’ (2008, 82). Resistance, therefore, must seek to transcend the state form, to move outside of its parameters with the establishment and revitalization of Indigenous nations.

In a similar fashion, Bonita Lawrence (2004), in her extensive study of the dynamics of Indigenous identity as structured by the Indian Act and the divisions between urban and reserve-based populations, points to historic confederacy structures (such as the Blackfoot or Iroquois confederacies) as a means to respond to the weaknesses that have been created as a result of colonization and the Indian Act system. She suggests confederacy structures, in addition to the ongoing maintenance and revitalization of reserve-based communities, to make links between urban Indigenous and reserve populations towards a stronger base of resistance for Indigenous peoples. In particular she suggests: ‘The confederacies present a way out of the deadlock of fragmentation and division that Native people have been sealed into by the Indian Act for two reasons –they not only present the possibility of renegotiating the boundaries that have currently been erected around different categories of Indigeneity, but they envision a potentially sufficient landbase to do so’ (Lawrence, 2004, 242). She continues by asserting that if Indigenous peoples want to transcend the divisiveness of the current state system then they must be cognizant not to replicate these systems (Ibid.). She argues that due to continued government attacks on Indigenous communities, there is a need
for resistance to the policies and actions of the state, but that without a move to reinvigorate traditional governance structures (such as those suggested by Alfred above) efforts to resist colonialism will become increasingly difficult (Lawrence, 2004, 244). Like Alfred, Lawrence points to a politics of resistance and resurgence outside of the dominant state form of governance, moving towards traditional forms and the possibilities of confederations of Indigenous nations allied in resistance to colonialism.\(^\text{10}\)

Finally, it must be understood that Indigenous peoples have a large degree of internal work to do within their own communities. This work is to be undertaken by the communities themselves, and cannot be infringed upon by settler perspectives or actions. This is one theme that runs through Simpson, Alfred and Lawrence and needs to be highlighted. Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel argue for the need for Indigenous communities to create ‘zones of refuge’ as a means to resist continued colonization and to ‘begin to achieve the re-strengthening of our people as individuals so that these spaces can be occupied by decolonized people leading authentic lives’ (2005, 605). Some of this healing work and community-based resurgence needs to occur within Indigenous communities themselves, perhaps before any further relationships can be considered.

**Anarchist Alternatives to the State**

Anarchists have long been wary of hierarchical, reformist or state-orchestrated means of changing or altering society. Anarchists ask explicitly how an alternative society might arise without the intervention of the state and seek to transcend the state form. As Jeff Shantz (2010) and Cindy Milstein (2009) suggest, contemporary anarchism, far from seeking only revolution and an overthrow of the state, has been focused on the creation of change\(^\text{10}\) See also Smith (2005) and (2008) and in Chapter 5 when I discuss Indigenous feminist resistance to the state.
and alternatives in the here and now. Day (2005) further argues that the ‘newest social
movements’ have sought to move beyond achieving hegemonic conquest of the state
towards anarchist-inspired autonomous communities of resistance. Constructing a new
society, therefore, doesn’t have to wait for some revolution before being built, but can begin
to be constructed now. As Milstein suggests, anarchists take up the notion of prefiguration
to put possible futures in place now (see also Graeber, 2009). Anarchists might reorient
themselves away from building revolution as one event, and instead build towards
insurrection, which denotes an immediate need for action (Shantz, 2010, 153). Rather than a
violent overthrow of the state, anarchists might consider working towards making the state
obsolete, by erasing all forms of dependence on state instructions and systems (Shantz, 2010,
154). Here, Shantz (2010) suggests the possibilities of creating what he calls ‘infrastructures
of resistance’ and ‘anarchist transfer cultures’.

Infrastructures of resistance might be termed the ‘rudimentary infrastructure of
alternative ways of being, an alternative future in the present’ (Shantz, 2010, 154). They are
the ‘means by which people can sustain radical social change both before, during and after
insurrectionary periods’ (Shantz, 2010, 172). They are, therefore, a sort of base from which
to both imagine alternatives and launch moments of contestation against the state. A core
component of such infrastructures will be the creation of ‘anarchist transfer culture’ a
concept Shantz (2010, 154) cites to Ehrlich (1996a, 329) explaining that a ‘transfer culture is
the agglomeration of ideas and practices that guide people in making the trip from the
society here to the society there in the future’. Shantz suggests that transfer cultures are to be
put in place so that when moments of change occur or contestation arises with the state,
people will be ready, will know how to act, and will have networks and supports in place.
Specifically, he argues that transfer cultures aim to prevent the rise of a vanguardist
leadership that might capitalize on moments of unpreparedness to assert themselves (Shantz, 156). Transfer cultures, therefore, suggest a means to build capacity for social change, by having some elements and supports in place and working to build alternatives rather than by waiting for some sort of post-revolutionary period to sit down and figure out what to do. By coupling transfer cultures and infrastructures for resistance, Shantz argues, in the shorter term we can work towards opposing the dominating systems of the state and capitalism with a long-term view to replace them with alternatives, so that perhaps some day we can attain a ‘critical mass’ with which to contest the state or render its operation redundant (2010, 173-174). While we build, we must also aim to destroy systems of domination and oppression.

Finally, anarchist infrastructures of resistance and transfer cultures must put the construction of alternative values at the centre of their work. This includes principles of mutual aid, political confederation, direct democracy (Milstein, 2009) or more specifically consensus-based decision-making and gift economies (Shantz, 2010, see 158-164). These sorts of values, as well as the construction of specific political, alternative, free or autonomous spaces here and now, suggest a pressing need to get to work right away. Part of the work that needs to begin now is advancing a critique of all forms of oppression and domination, including the relative gap in engaging with colonialism as a core system of oppression and domination that structures contemporary settler societies. Anarchists argue that we cannot and should not wait for some glorified single revolutionary moment, and instead turn towards building alternative systems and new forms of relationships here and now in the present. It is within this strain of anarchist practice of theorizing alternatives beyond the state form that has lacked recognition of settler colonialism, its integration with the state form and the imperative of resistance and decolonization if alternative systems are to be created.
While recognizing the need for separation and autonomy and anarchism's inattentiveness to realities of settler colonialism, points that I return to repeatedly in this thesis, how might we think about the similarities between anarchist settler and Indigenous constructions of alternatives to the dominant statist order that might inform anarcha-Indigenism? The work of Richard Day is instructive in this regard, with his critique of hegemony and location of the logics of affinity. In the article ‘From Hegemony to Affinity: The Political Logic of the Newest Social Movements’ (2004), Day argues that the contemporary period of activism and resistance has given rise to what he calls the ‘newest social movements’ as distinct from old social movements and the more recent new social movements. He suggests that both old and new social movements, despite their differences, share a common orientation towards a hegemonic conception of social change – through appealing to state power in the new sense, or seeking to take state power in the old sense. The newest social movements, he argues, have sought to undermine such a hegemonic focus and move beyond appealing to the state for change. Such movements are more closely aligned with an anarchistic logic of affinity with ‘a desire to create alternative to state and corporate forms of social organization, working “alongside” the existing institutions; proceeding in this via disengagement and reconstruction rather than by reform or revolution; with the end of creating not a new knowable totality (counter-hegemony), but of enabling experiments and the emergence of new forms of subjectivity’ (Day, 2004, 740). This logic of affinity is what, I think, unites the anarchist and Indigenous projects of resistance and resurgence highlighted above towards imagining the practical implementation of anarcha-Indigenism.

Day argues that a logic of affinity involves engaging in solidarity with others who are engaged in similar or common forms of resistance, but also actively working against
negatively opposed practices of oppression and domination. Necessary for engaging in any
degree of common struggle is the development and commitment to ‘shared ethico-political
commitments that allow us to achieve engaged solidarity to effectively create sustainable
alternatives’ (Day, 2005, 186). This is the task that I think is worthwhile taking up between
anarchist settlers and Indigenous peoples, though considerations of the Two Row, as I will
show, are a necessary component in the context of continued colonialism. Day points out
that it is in fact Indigenous peoples who, around the world, are leading the charge to
construct alternatives to the dominant order and notes the resonance with Alfred’s
conception of traditional values and governance structures with anarchist forms of
federalism. Importantly, he notes that it is not Indigenous peoples who have drawn from
anarchist forms of organization, but rather the other way around, with major anarchist
theorists drawing from the historic Iroquois confederacy and the modern struggles of the
Zapatistas, for example (Day, 2005, 196).

There is a clear resonance between anarchist infrastructures of resistance and the
means put forth to promote Indigenous resurgence suggested by Simpson, Alfred and
Lawrence. Both anarchists and those committed to Indigenous resurgence have an
orientation toward working outside the state structure in the long-term, while resisting state
encroachment and policies of domination on a day-to-day basis. Here I think anarcha-
Indigenism might serve as a specific point of meeting from which settler and Indigenous
communities might draw inspiration, one that might allow for autonomous communities to
engage with one another in the spirit of constructing a more just world. As Day suggests, the
approach here cannot be one of reform or revolution, but one that seeks the construction of
autonomous, self-empowering and ‘free’ alternatives. Indigenous peoples are perhaps ahead,
in some regards, with their active commitment to restore traditional forms of governance
within reserve-based communities, such as the Confederacy Council at Six Nations. Reserve communities are already somewhat outside the purview of the state, although there is much to do, as Alfred identifies. For instance it would be foolhardy to hold up the reserve system as a blueprint for creating anarchist autonomous zones given the history of colonization and fracturing of communities that still permeates the reserve system. Even so, the creation of confederacies between urban and reserve-based populations seems to be a means for moving towards a critical mass that can challenge the state via alternative structures. Anarchists have been less successful in terms of actually moving towards such sorts of constructions. Thus, they would do well to look for inspiration in the relationships that are forming between urban and reserve-based Indigenous communities, and they might consider how to begin to expand anarchist resonance into smaller rural settings. Importantly, anarchists need to begin to think about how they might ally with the Indigenous communities upon whose lands they work and resist. There need to be actual efforts at building links between communities and a move away from blockade-hopping or only engaging when resistance breaks out. Anarchists need to consider how to build links that are focused towards long-term alliances and relationships that go beyond pragmatic temporary relationships when the resistance is fashionable or high profile. As I argue below, anarcha-Indigenism is one place of meeting with which to begin to enhance these links and relationships. The creation of alternatives to statist, capitalist, patriarchal and colonial systems must therefore be one of the primary tasks of anarcha-Indigenism, one that finds possibilities in both anarchist and Indigenous alternatives.
Questions of Land

The discussion above of creating alternatives to the dominant order of oppression, as a core aspect of seeking to actualize anarcha-Indigenism in practice, requires that anarchists begin to take seriously questions of land: land where we find ourselves engaging resistance, and perhaps more importantly, land that carries a history of colonization, dispossession and theft. The actualization of anarchist and anarcha-Indigenist politics in practice requires an analysis of what ‘ground’ means when we talk about politics and resistance ‘on-the-ground’ and upon whose traditional landbases we continue to construct our resistance.

As Aragorn! (2009) argues, to begin to conceive of an Indigenous anarchism, anarcha-Indigenism, or any coming-together of anarchist and Indigenous theory and practice, there needs to be a recognition of the historical and contemporary understandings of place and the need for connection to it. He argues that an Indigenous anarchism is one of place (2009, 5), firmly rooted within a specific landbase or geographic area and with a specific set of relations to that land. These relations argue for the living nature of all things in the world and their interconnection and reliance on one another. As Richard Atleo (2004) argues, ‘everything is one’ within the world, including between physical and spiritual realms that are deeply connected to the ancestral and ceremonial lands of Indigenous peoples. Indigenous epistemologies and research perspectives, as I examine in Chapter 3, focus on the interconnected relationships of all beings in the world, a perspective that runs through Indigenous political theory as well with the connection of all the relations of the environment (see LaDuke, 1999 and Coulthard, 2010 for example). This is one of the connections that anarchist settlers and settlers more generally have lost, and it is one of the primary differences between worldviews, philosophies and political theories of settlers and Indigenous peoples.
Paula Sherman cites the specific settler myths of *terra nullius* or ‘empty land’ that structured European colonial exploration and settlement within the Americas. It constructed Europeans as civilized and Indigenous peoples as uncivilized, as subhuman. Settlers conceived of Indigenous peoples and their lands as wild, chaotic and lacking order and thus in need of domestication and control, whether by the decimation of landbases, the destruction of cultures or the assimilation/removal of populations. Further, the liberal democratic traditions of settlers promoted an enclosure and domestication of land for the purposes of creating social relations based on private property. It was this relationship of domination that Sherman suggests began the disconnection of settler societies from their own lands and relationships to the natural world (2010, 117). Indigenous peoples, on the other hand, have maintained their relationships to land and the natural world as central to their epistemologies (Battiste, 2002). Settlers currently lack such a specific relationship that would understand themselves as being intimately part of ‘all of the relations’ of living and non-living beings that make up the world. Instead they have sought to hierarchically dominate all spheres of society and the environment for the purposes of economic development and progress. A holistic physical and spiritual relationship to the natural world, like that of Indigenous peoples has not been cultivated on account of settlers having lost previous connections to the lands of their original continents (Sehdev, 2010, 108). If settlers are ever to move towards decolonization and interrogate how the occupation of land is connected to colonial domination and colonial privilege the current disconnection from land needs to be examined.

Day further characterizes the settler disconnection as follows: ‘What we have a hard time doing, we settlers, is living, here and now, as though we know where we are, where we have come from, and where we might be going - or at least wanting to go. We have, quite
simply, lost our way’ (Day, 2010, 262). In order for settlers to reorient themselves and ‘find our way’ we must recognize the histories of the lands that we continue to occupy.\footnote{This point came to the fore recently in relation to the Occupy Wall Street movement that had spread throughout the globe. Indigenous peoples and their settler allies were quick to point out the colonial occupation of land and the contradictions inherent in a movement calling for ‘occupation’. This inattention and ignorance of colonial realities is perhaps indicative of a broader ignorance within social movement and anarchist theory and practice. (See for example Barker 2012; Kilibarda, 2012)} We must recognize that we are here as a result of bloody forms of colonization and displacement - processes of domination that continue under the government of Canada. We must, as Gruner suggests, develop a ‘felt history’ that is grounded in our relations to others and the land. It is a history that is alive, not relegated to the past: a history that is more about relations than the chronological ordering of events (Gruner, 2010, 93).

Relationships to land are connections that settlers have lost when they left the lands where they were originally ‘indigenous’ to take part in the colonial project, and connections that settlers have continued to lose as a result of the colonial domination that they still participate in, hold up and accrue privilege from (see my discussion of settler identity in Chapter 1). Settlers are thus profoundly disconnected from the natural world and the understanding that human beings are but a small part of the interconnected relationships that make up ‘all of the relations’ of the world, a state of being that certainly affects how land is treated and how relationships to land are understood. Further, Glen Coulthard cites Vine Deloria Jr., arguing that the fundamental difference between settlers and Indigenous peoples comes from the philosophical emphasis that Indigenous peoples place on land. ‘American Indians,’ Deloria argues, ‘hold their lands –places –as having the highest possible meaning, and all their statements are made with this reference point in mind’ (1992, 62). Coulthard goes on to argue that while Indigenous peoples derive meaning from the places and landbases they inhabit, settlers have replaced these sorts of relationships with linear
conceptions of time (2010, 79). These are connections that settlers might perhaps seek to re-establish. From an anarcha-Indigenist perspective, the reconnection to land, as the basis for all other forms of relating and as that which sustains communities, is important to ground our struggles in the intimate contexts of where we are. Reconnecting to land also means a move away from the commodification of land and private property relationships predicated on the supremacy of hierarchical economic relationships mediated by the state.

Coulthard (2010) suggests approaching the question of land and place from an ethical standpoint to move towards an Indigenous oriented anti-colonialism. He argues that ‘Place is a way of knowing, experiencing, and relating to the world – and these ways of knowing guide forms of resistance to power relations that threaten to erase or destroy [Indigenous peoples] senses of place’ (Coulthard, 2010, 79). Reconnecting with place and landbases and renewing ethical obligations to living in relation to the land might form an initial step in the revitalization and resurgence of Indigenous communities. For settlers there is much more work to do, as our connection to land and place has been severed so much further back in history. It is a question that has not received adequate attention and one that I think we need to continue to mull over. Developing relationships with the Indigenous communities whose territory we are living and working on is one logical step to begin to imagine what a new, ethical and renewed relationship to land and place might look like. As Richard Day argues, we need to listen and learn from Indigenous peoples who suggest that in order to live justly, peacefully and in harmony we need to reconnect with the land that sustains us and listen to the land itself to guide our actions and relationships (2010, 262).

Critically engaging with land and place also means that we need to be attentive to the colonial histories of the lands that we are on. In my case, writing primarily from Kitchener-Waterloo, this requires that I consider the history of theft, dispossession,
dishonoured treaties and colonization that has occurred on this land, that of the Haudenosaunee peoples of Six Nations. Settlers need to learn the history of the land on which they live and contextualize that colonial history within the current social movements and efforts at resistance. How can we begin to move towards an anti-colonial history of the land that acknowledges how it was possessed by settlers, how those injustices continued to affect Indigenous communities from the past into the present and how new relationships can be built? One option might be to actually return lands to Indigenous peoples in our local areas in order to begin to live beside one another with a new basis of relationships and relating to one another. This may seem like a rather unlikely option, given the sorts of colonial privilege and entitlement that we inherit as settlers in a colonial society, but it might be one of the more decolonial options. As Day argues, as soon as we begin to purchase and accumulate land on which to set up our own autonomous alternatives outside the state, as soon as we begin to create physical infrastructures of resistance we begin to repeat the logics of colonialism. He summarizes that ‘it would appear that the resurgence of settler autonomy, our escape from the tyrannies we have foisted on ourselves, once again can only come on the backs of Indigenous peoples’ (2010, 268). Our experiments continue to be predicated on land that was accrued through theft, violence, dispossession, and colonialism. Settlers thus need to move towards the decolonization of themselves (a point I return to in detail later) and the decolonization of their relationships to land. Decolonization might mean creating new forms of relationships with Indigenous peoples, but it also would need to recognize that colonialism functions at a multiplicity of levels – within ourselves, our communities, our economic relations, our governance structures, our education systems and so forth. In short we need to consider, as anarchists on stolen lands, how we might ‘[work] on all these levels
in addition to (but not instead of) tackling capitalism and the state, without reducing the struggle to either the material or ideological/discursive plane’ (Ramnath, 2011, 27).

I cannot claim to have specific answers to these questions, and part of seeking to respond involves creating relationships with local Indigenous communities to engage with these questions. Anarcha-Indigenism, by drawing anarchist settlers and Indigenous peoples together, is one means of beginning to rethink our relationships to land and how questions of land might affect the possibility of anarcha-Indigenism being a meeting place for anarchism, Indigenous political theory and feminism. In the following chapters I aim to take up some of these questions of what decolonization and new forms of relating might look like in a variety of contexts related to anarchism, and how we might work towards an anarchist anti-colonialism or anarcha-Indigenism in theory and practice.

**Anarcha-Indigenism as ‘Third Space’ and Expanding Towards ‘N-Dimensional’**

**Space**

How might we think about then, the meeting of different forms of theory and practice under the outline of anarcha-Indigenism presented above? In this section I look at the possibilities of conceiving of anarcha-Indigenism as a theoretical space of meeting. I turn first to those who engage already with anarcha-Indigenism and examine the initial conceptions of anarcha-Indigenism as a space of meeting. In order to expand these engagements I then look to conceptions of ‘third space’ (Bhabha, 1994; Anzaldúa, 2007; Haig-Brown 2008a), ‘contact zones’ (Pratt, 1992), and ‘border work’ (Haig-Brown, 2008a, 2008b; Anzaldúa, 2007) within post-colonial theory for suggestions on how to think about the coming together of perspectives under anarcha-Indigenism. I read the dynamics of settler/Indigenous exchanges within anarcha-Indigenism through the post-colonial meeting
places that emanate from the lived experiences of colonial violence and domination in order to seek out a possible politics of resistance that is attentive to colonialism. I aim not to provide a genealogy of post-colonial thought, but rather gesture towards those conceptions that have been employed already within the realm of settler and Indigenous relationships, particularly in the work of Celia Haig-Brown (2008a). By further orienting these post-colonial understandings towards the specific context of my project of anarcha-Indigenism here I suggest that anarcha-Indigenism as a meeting place might find the most useful expression in ‘n-dimensional’ possibilities of intersection, where an increasing multiplicity of perspectives might come together to inform theory and practice.

So how has anarcha-Indigenism been conceived thus far as an intersectional theoretical project? As has already been stated, the aim of anarcha-Indigenism is to draw from a range of theory and practice to take up an intersectional analysis of all forms of oppression and domination – to recognize how they have developed, fed off one another and sustained the dominant order of the state, capitalism, colonialism, heteropatriarchy and white supremacy. Further, anarcha-Indigenism draws from the politics of solidarity between settlers and Indigenous peoples to orient how relationships and possibilities are imagined and how we might engage with different types of theory and practice. These relations and considerations determine how we respond to and take up critiques of colonialism and how settlers engage in solidarity by Indigenous peoples. This point deserves a much more specific and sustained examination and thus I will forgo it here in favour of a more extensive examination in Chapter 4.

One way of thinking about anarcha-Indigenism might be in terms of a ‘lateral encounter’ or through horizontal planes of relation between various theoretical perspectives. As Kathy Ferguson argues, the point in bringing Indigenous thought, feminism and
anarchism together is ‘not to draw two of them under the umbrella of a more powerful third [i.e. most frequently anarchism], but to value them all for their resistance to territorialization.’

The aim of anarcha-Indigenism, which takes up this project between Indigenous thought, feminism and anarchism, might be to enhance each of the disparate perspectives that come to meet as anarcha-Indigenism by ‘cultivating lines of flight among them’ (Ferguson, 2011, 97). Ferguson (2011, 99) uses the work of Deleuze and Guattari via Goulimari to suggest the ‘minoritarian’ potentials of Indigenous thought, anarchism and feminism to create ‘lines of escape’ between the ‘fixed territories’ that constrain our thought and possibilities. Part of the aim of this project, which I think is most important for any type of intersectional politics, is a specific resistance to fixed structures and toward a politics of movement. Here we might think of anarcha-Indigenism, beyond just an intersectional political project, as one that is constantly on the move, seeking out new perspectives to inform its theory and practice.

There are common themes that persist, commitments that continue (i.e. resistance to the state, capitalism, colonialism, heteropatriarchy and white supremacy) but also a resistance to rigid and restrictive ideological perspectives that constrain future possibilities.

Finally, Ferguson (2011, 102) points to the concept of ‘connectors’ as the ‘special terms’, from Deleuze and Guatarri, that can bring anarchism, feminism and Indigenous thought together. These connectors might be conceived of as the reoccurring elements, the overlapping similarities/potentials or the broad themes that link different contributions to anarcha-Indigenism. In this way, if I read Ferguson’s interpretation of Deleuze and Guattari correctly, connectors are the base that brings different contributors to anarcha-Indigenism together, the glue that provides a degree of constancy, while the overall possibility of what anarcha-Indigenism ‘might be’ or what direction it ‘might take’ is not fixed but malleable and open to further interventions to inform its potentials. The importance here, I think, is to
suggest that anarcha-Indigenism cannot be pinned down entirely, at any one point. It is constantly under development and open to new forms of intervention from a wide variety of theoretical and activist contexts. It is in this spirit that I hope my work contributes to pushing anarcha-Indigenism outwards, expanding its\textsuperscript{12} possibilities even the slightest.

In the article ‘Anarch@-Zapatismo: Anti-Capitalism, Anti-Power and the Insurgent Imagination,’ Alex Khasnabish examines the broad resonance of the Zapatista struggle with ‘anarchistic’ communities in North America. He suggests that Anarch@-Zapatismo be considered an ‘insurgent imagination’ that emerges from a specific Indigenous context, but also one that has found resonance much more broadly. His work suggests a means of thinking about the possible resonance of anarcha-Indigenism within other contexts. The important consideration in the case of the Zapatistas, he argues, is that the activists in Canada and the United States that sought to draw from their struggle did so by seeking to understand how Zapatismo might make sense in their own particular context (Khasnabish, 2011, 71). The point was not to take the Zapatistas as a directly liftable set of blueprints for action, but to accept the challenges and innovations that Zapatismo might make in theory and practice and think about how they might contribute to expanding possibilities for politics and resistance in other activist contexts.

Khasnabish (2011, 72) suggests that imagination, as understood in this case, denotes a ‘terrain of possibility’ as well as a ‘space of encounter’ where diverse groups ‘do not need to share an identity in order to articulate affinity’. He goes on to argue that an insurgent

\textsuperscript{12} It sounds odd to phrase anarcha-Indigenism as having possibilities, in terms of a sort of personal possession, when I have just argued that such a term, as a meeting place for theory and action, cannot be tied down to any specific formulation beyond the ‘connectors,’ or base points of unity if you will. My point here is that anarcha-Indigenism serves as a potential for linking different possibilities of theory and action together, and it is these links and what they amount to that informs what anarcha-Indigenism is at any one point in a certain context. Its expression will therefore be different for different individuals or groups in different contexts.
orientation towards political imagination carries four key elements: an understanding that political resistance must be directed from below rather than hierarchically from above, that political and social change must be a dynamic and multiply-understood force unencumbered by rigid ideological baggage, that a revolutionary political aim is sought rather than incremental reform and that by speaking of these different forms of imagination we cannot expect them to serve as ready blueprints that can be easily transferred or copied beyond the specifics of their particular contexts. He argues, therefore that anarch@-Zapatismo is one example of an insurgent political imagination that has been able to gain resonance in broader transnational contexts. Khasnabish’s conception of insurgent political imagination is useful for anarcha-Indigenism more broadly because it sheds some possible light on how anarcha-Indigenism has come to be taken up in a variety of contexts and struggles and suggests how it may be continually developed within those specific contexts and beyond.

**Third Space and Other Potentials**

I have examined above two possible ways in which anarcha-Indigenism has been conceptualized as a potential space of meeting along feminism, anarchism and Indigenous thought in theory and practice, but many more perspectives may be useful in further developing anarcha-Indigenism. In the following section I look briefly at the post-colonial theory around ‘third space’ as a concept, as well as border work and contact zones, to suggest other potential ways of thinking about anarcha-Indigenism. I cannot hope to provide an exhaustive overview of any of these perspectives, and a further developed examination needs to take place in future work. My aim, here, is to draw out some basic possibilities that might be considered and further developed. I see this as the beginning of possible work that can hopefully expand how anarcha-Indigenism is conceived.
There is a wide variety of work that has occurred within post-colonial theory related to the term ‘third space’ as a potential way of thinking about hybridity, identity, theory and practice. Each occurs within the context of specific subjects first and foremost, rather than seeking to articulate third space in a general, more widely applicable sense. Homi Bhabha’s widely engaged work *The Location of Culture* is cited by Haig-Brown (2008a) as one of the attempts to consider ‘third space’ as a form of hybridity, resulting from colonization with a post-colonial subject, that carries the potential of creating new forms of knowledge through the regeneration of older ones. Colonization has brought knowledges and cultures together, often in relations of oppression and domination of one by the other, but there is a potential to take up these forms of engagement to reorient theory and practice towards anti-colonial ends, to begin to subvert the violence of colonialism. There is the potential for new forms of ‘cultural knowledge, research and identities’ (Bhabha, 1994, 37, in Manathunga, 2009, 168) to be created and developed within the ‘third space’. Bhabha explains it thus:

> It is that Third Space though unrepresentable in itself, which constitutes the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixicity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew (1994, 37, cited in Haig-Brown, 2008a, 257).

The symbols, cultures and knowledges that we come to know can therefore be reworked, or reconceived within the ‘third space’. It is a space that points to the flexible or malleable sense of knowledge ‘reciprocally influencing and influenced by its context’ whether ‘land, spirit, mind, emotion’ (Haig-Brown, 2008a, 257). The question that must be answered is how such a space can be conceived as a site of resistance to push against the violence of colonialism when colonialism has created such a space in the first place. Third space presents an opportunity for engaging across the colonial divide to take up those knowledges, epistemologies and perspectives that might present opportunities for decolonization. Thus
imagined, it would be a project actively undertaken, rather than imposed. This conception, very basically considered, points to an idea, a theoretical space where knowledges, meanings, and cultures meet and interact, weaving in and out of one another, perhaps being altered, changed and remade, while also affecting those that they encounter. In this sense I think there is a potential for perspectives coming from different contexts to come together and engage if only in fleeting moments.

Bhabha’s conception of ‘third space’, certainly inadequately considered here for brevity, emerges from the real lived relations of violence, pain and struggle of colonialism that Gloria Anzaldúa also discussed in her significant work Borderlands/La Frontera (2007). Anzaldúa speaks of the ‘unnatural’ status of the borderland, one that has been created and one that is bound up in relationships and interactions with very real consequences. It is a colonial creation, manufactured by the physical borderlines of colonialism and the emotional and psychological violence of colonialism and oppression. She is primarily speaking, in physical geographical terms, of the Mexican/U.S. border that draws a line across Indigenous peoples as a result of the takeover of parts of Mexico by the U.S. during the Mexico-U.S. War in 1846. The borderland is therefore a space between those on the U.S. and those on the Mexican sides, at the same time that it is a space definitive of Chicanas/os in the US, whom Anzaldúa argues exist in the zone of a border that fails to explain or contain them in full. ‘In fact,’ Anzaldúa says, ‘the Borderlands are physically present wherever two or more cultures edge each other, where people of different races occupy the same territory, where under, lower, middle and upper classes touch, where the space between two individuals shrinks with intimacy’ (Anzaldúa, 2007, 19). The borderland here thus seems broadly construed, a place of meeting between different groups, or contexts.
But the borderland is also a personal space of meeting, in the case of Anzaldúa’s own body, as a Chicana women with Indigenous and Spanish heritage who is further situated within the bounds of US and Mexican physical borders. The body is perhaps the most personal of borderlands, where those of mixed-race, or mestizo heritage stand, different than both of the histories that make them up. Here I am less interested in these intimate personal borderlands, as my work primarily looks at the relationships and engagements between anarchist settlers and Indigenous peoples in theory and practice. I have, however, discussed the complexities of settler identity in Chapter 1 which points to a more nuanced reality of the widely diverse experiences of oppression, domination and privilege that exist for both settlers and Indigenous peoples. While I later suggest that anarcha-Indigenism might be thought of as third space or borderland where two (or more) forms of theory and practice meet and influence/are influenced by one another, this sort of engagement seems admittedly different than the type which Anzaldúa discusses. It is far less personal, and in many ways it is a chosen path, not one that one is born into, in Anzaldúa’s case. It is not the ‘intimate terrorism’ that Anzaldúa (2007) discusses and the ‘dilemma of the mixed breed’ to have to choose a sort of allegiance to one history. The borderland and third space for Anzaldúa are a lived reality of violence, not a strategic alliance or desired possibility for new forms of resistance, theory and practice. In this sense Anzaldúa’s work occurs in a very different context and carries a very different set of consequences than the theoretical meeting under anarcha-Indigenism that I am considering here.

There is one aspect of Anzaldúa’s that seems relevant, however, in addition to her general definition of third space/borderland cited above. She speaks of taking a counterstance against the oppressive culture of white patriarchy, where one chooses to be resistant and in opposition. This resistant stand against authority, she argues, is one of the
possible steps towards ‘liberation from cultural domination’ but is not a way to actually carry forward and live. One cannot continually orient oneself towards reacting against that which is oppressive. This focus requires that one is always reactive to the authority that one is trying to challenge. A defiant politics, certainly, but hardly a way to live and experience life, she says. Rather there are a number of further options that might be considered – where the space between oppressed and oppressor might become healed rather than continually resisted. One might seek to move to a ‘wholly new and separate territory’, standing on both sides, or disengaging from dominant patriarchal/colonial cultures. The point, she says, is that one starts to ‘act and not react’ (Anzaldúa, 2007, 100-101). I think recognizing that these sorts of options exist – reaction and resistance to oppression, disengagement from oppressive systems and the creation of alternatives, etc. – gives those of us in colonized/colonizer scenarios some options to consider. My suggestion is that anarcha-Indigenism might be one option of seeking to heal relations between some segments of settlers and Indigenous peoples – bringing the two sides together towards liberation, and attempting the risky work of making this a way of life (which Anzaldúa warns against), as well as seeking to resist, through new relationships and theoretical possibilities, the continuing systems of colonialism that exist – pushing towards a new form of society, one based around anarchist visions and Indigenous resurgence. Drawing from the work of Anzaldúa, and recognizing the personal and specific context in which her work occurs, anarcha-Indigenism might be understood as a borderland where anarchist and indigenous theory and action meet – among other possibilities – to begin to imagine new relationships, to create a counterstance to colonial systems and to begin to move forward. Anarcha-Indigenism might consider the possibilities that Anzaldúa presents, within its own context of meeting and power relations.
Another strand of theory that looks at the possibilities and experiences of border work is that which conceptualizes a place or space of meeting as a ‘contact zone’. This writing emerges initially from the work of Mary Louise Pratt in her introduction to *Imperial Eyes: Travel/Writing and Transculturation* (1992). Pratt identifies the contact zone as the ‘social spaces where disparate cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in highly asymmetrical relations of domination and subordination –like colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out across the globe today’ (1992, 4). She argues that the contact zone is a sort of colonial frontier where different languages, as well as cultures, knowledges and contexts, meet and engage. Specifically, marginal groups ‘select and invent’ from the interactions that they have with the dominant culture via the process of transculturation – deciding how the information of the dominant culture is put to use. This process suggests that colonial understandings can be taken up as part of a politics of resistance. Part of this work, although it occurs through asymmetrical power relations, requires a dominant form of communication, dictated by colonialism, in order to enable any degree of understanding that might lead to translation.

Here, I think, is one of the difficulties in conceiving of anarcha-Indigenism as a contact zone, with little possibility for engagement between different theoretical perspectives that have their own forms of language, thought and culture. The explicitly asymmetrical set of power relations that Pratt identifies certainly needs to be seriously considered with any and all potential engagements between settlers and Indigenous peoples, and between anarchism, feminism and Indigenous thought. They are what make up the realities of colonial oppression and privilege and the contact zone. Parts of these inequitable relations occur across the differences in control of land, sovereignty and self-determination that exist between settlers and Indigenous peoples (Haig-Brown and Archibald, 1996, 250). As Pratt
argues, the contact zone is indeed a space of ‘colonial encounters, the space in which peoples
geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish
ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, racial inequality and intractable
conflict’ (Pratt, 1992, 6). It is inherently colonial, although she acknowledges that there is the
possibility for useful tools of resistance to arise from it, created by Indigenous peoples who
exist in the colonial reality of the contact zone. Anarcha-Indigenism itself, as traced to the
work of Taiaiake Alfred explored earlier in this chapter, might itself be the product of a
contact zone where colonialism is still very much alive, but where Indigenous peoples have
taken and adapted possibilities for resistance from the reality of colonialism. The greater
possibility for anarcha-Indigenism might be to recognize the existence of contact zones, with
asymmetrical colonial dynamics, and seek to enact strategies to move forward towards new
forms of relations and out of the contact zone and into a potential third space, which I
discuss in relation to the settler/Indigenous context below following Haig-Brown.

If anarcha-Indigenism is to be a sort of meeting place between different forms of
theory and practice, from specific contexts influenced by historical and contemporary
colonial relations, as well as a space of resistance and a new concept of relations/society that
moves beyond the asymmetrical realities of colonialism, how might this meeting be
conceived? First it might be considered as a sort of ‘conceptual place’ which Larsen and
Johnson (2012) identify as one of the possible ‘place-based transformations’ presented by
Indigenous research methodology (in addition to existential and social places). They argue
that a conceptual space occurs where ‘practitioners draw from Western and Indigenous
philosophies in the co-production of knowledge’ and ‘discover hybridized understandings of
place that enhance the meaning and purpose of human life in this world’ (Larsen and
Johnson 2012, 5). This conceptual space suggests a possibility of meeting –drawing from
both Indigenous and Western possibilities. As per my brief overview of anarcha-Indigenism highlighted above, Taiaiake Alfred’s description is pretty clear in its influences from both more Western forms of anarchism and the traditional philosophies and practices of Indigenous communities. This is perhaps an example of the conceptual space suggested here. Larsen and Johnson are primarily talking about the use of Western perspectives in Indigenous research, but I think their contribution of conceptual space provides a possibility of meeting between Indigenous, anarchist, etc. perspectives under anarcha-Indigenous – provided of course that the core elements of resisting capitalism, the state, hierarchy, heteropatriarchy, white supremacy and colonialism are maintained.

Further, Celia Haig-Brown’s work on the potentialities of third space for settler and Indigenous engagements in theory and practice takes into account some of the theoretical perspectives I have briefly discussed above (third space, contact zones, border work/borderlands) and presents a detailed possibility for anarcha-Indigenism. Haig-Brown, before delving into her own discussion of third space, asks the following question that gestures to the context that she finds herself embedded within: ‘What are the role and responsibility of the professor of European ancestry who has also battled for legitimizing Indigenous epistemologies and educational considerations in academe in working with students who take up the challenges of this scholarship?’ (2008a, 258). This question highlights that the context in which settlers engaging with Indigenous epistemologies, theories and practices find themselves is one that is complex and requires a number of considerations. There is a specific danger of appropriation and a potential for over-identification with Indigenous theory and action. The tendency for anarchists to want to make Indigenous struggles ‘their own’ is one that we need to be keenly aware of. What then might be one way of thinking about engaging with Indigenous theory and action, while also
still being firmly embedded in our settler contexts – a modification of Haig-Brown’s question linked more closely to my own position and context. Here Haig-Brown argues that we might look to the Kaswentha (Two Row Wampum) as a source of inspiration and as a guide to consider how knowledges, theories, epistemologies and practice might engage.

The Haudenosaunee Confederacy describes the Two Row Wampum\(^{13}\) as two purple rows on a white background that ‘symbolize two paths or two vessels, travelling down the same rivers together. One, a birch bark canoe, will be for the Indian people, their laws, their customs and their ways. The other, a ship, will be for the white people and their laws…We shall each travel the river together, side by side, but in our own boat. Neither of us will try and steer the other’s vessel’ (Mitchell 1989, 109-10 in Day, 2005, 194). The white rows were to symbolize peace, respect, trust and friendship that kept the two vessels together as opposed to apart (Hill, 2008, 30). The Two Row Wampum is thus a relationship that indicates how settler and Indigenous societies might engage, while preserving the autonomy of each. Haig-Brown refers to the Two Row, recognizing the need for autonomy, but also suggests that we might consider what occurs across the difference and spaces between the canoe and ship. She suggests that ‘In each exists a potential for unpredictable, sporadic, and complex encounters of knowledges, of contestation and of constant tension, a space for learning and changing’ (Haig-Brown, 2008a, 260). As we gaze across the space between the two vessels, she argues, we might be informed by what we see/hear or have our own knowledge and understanding altered. The rows do not, then, represent rigid, walled off boundaries with closed opportunities, but possible spaces of what Kevin Bruyneel (2007,

\(^{13}\) I discuss the Two Row in greater detail in Chapter 4 when I detail some of the considerations for relationships and solidarity between settlers and Indigenous peoples. However, for the purposes of this current discussion the following summary is necessary.
xix) calls ‘sites of co-constitutive interactions’ where each party affects and is affected. The important consideration is that the two vessels must continue forward, still separated.

There is a chance, of course, that very little, perhaps nothing, will occur. The vessels might still continue forward with little interaction or influence in the short term. It is the longer engagements, over time, that might show the depth of encounters within, following Bhabha, these ‘third spaces’ that Haig-Brown identifies between the two vessels. These third spaces would be indicative of the transfer, interaction, or engagement between knowledges that exist in each of the vessels. Travelling apart does not mean that one vessel cannot see, hear, read or understand what is going on in the other. There may even be specific events or instances where translation occurs between the two, while still maintaining their autonomy and separateness. Even if we attempt to avoid such sorts of encounters, it is still possible to imagine those ‘inescap[able] encounter[s]’ within the third space that shift the knowledge within each of the vessels. Change occurs even in instances of separateness and the interventions that occur across the vessels are reciprocal, and ‘subvert in both directions’ Haig-Brown argues; not in the sense of equality, but in the sense of a hybridization where each vessel takes up aspects from the other (Haig-Brown, 2008a, 261). These possible exchanges between the vessels, each influencing and influenced by the other, might create overlaps in theory, thought and action. Certainly, however, colonialism as a mediating factor (among many other variously oppressive factors) has an effect on how and what knowledges are glimpsed in this third space between the two vessels. There have been, and will continue to be, asymmetrical interactions and influences that occur between the vessels, this much seems inevitable. The question that I think deserves further attention, however, is how we might facilitate positive forms of influence and interaction, while still maintaining autonomy.
Here, I think anarcha-Indigenism has the potential of serving as a third space between settler and Indigenous forms of thought and action, one that we might work to create as a space of meeting and a space of resistance. It is intentional in its focus on resistance to all forms of oppression, in the reimagining of new forms of relationships and in seeking out other theoretical perspectives to continually expand and deepen theory and practice. As per Ferguson (2011) and Khasnabish (2011) above, it cannot be pinned down to a rigid set of perspectives but is constantly developing as space of encounter. Anarcha-Indigenism brings both settler and Indigenous perspectives together, but seeks not to subsume one under the other, or to negate all those perspectives that it might draw from, as some sort of superior articulation of politics. There are still important differences and contexts that exist between settlers and Indigenous peoples, no matter the similarity in politics. Colonialism is still a force that fundamentally separates us and casts settlers in the role of privileged recipients. The aim, therefore, must be to begin to reimagine how we engage with knowledges, epistemologies, theories and practices – how we might maintain our parallel paths and avoid the annihilation of one of more of the rows (Haig-Brown, 2008a, 261). I propose, therefore, that anarcha-Indigenism might serve as a third space for interactions between settler and Indigenous perspectives broadly construed.

Anarcha-Indigenism as a third space will certainly look differently from varying vantage points, and will incorporate different aspects of the theoretical perspectives that come to influence and expand its possibilities while discarding others. One interpretation might follow the work of Kevin Bruyneel (2007), who suggests that Indigenous peoples create a third space when they push back against and resist colonial boundaries\(^\text{14}\), creating a

\(^{14}\) Bruyneel (2007) speaks mostly on administrative and political boundaries created by states, which in the US, because of the legal definition of Indigenous peoples, leads to an existence of Indigenous nationhood outside of the liberal democratic bounds of the nation-state.
third space outside of statist liberal democratic frameworks. Settlers often refuse to acknowledge these contestations of the state itself because they do not fit within liberal democratic understandings (217). He traces the turn of Indigenous theorists against the state form within the legally contested terms of Indigenous sovereignty, because of their search for autonomy outside settler colonial frameworks, which gestures towards a rejection of the implied continued existence of the state by liberal democracy. The state, here, is essentially part of liberal democratic settler colonialism and cannot be the basis of new forms of Indigenous political organization (as was touched on above in the section on anarchist and Indigenous organization outside the state). Anarcha-Indigenism I think occupies a potentially similar position outside of the bounds of the nation-state (although beyond the legally defined parameters of Indigenous sovereignty that Bruyneel focuses on) in light of its engagement, incorporation and affirmation of Indigenous political theory and practice and similarly refuses the statist choices generally offered by settler society as being the best option for political/community organization (Bruyneel, 2007, 218). The imagining of alternative ‘political geographies’ by Indigenous peoples (and anarcha-Indigenism), suggests a broader rejection of the settler colonial and statist conceptions of what sovereignty and autonomy might encompass (Bruyneel, 2007, 221-2). Here then, anarcha-Indigenism as a potential practical articulation of third space is reflected in the ‘antistatist autonomy’ that Bruyneel discusses. It is a space of anti-statist resistance outside of the general terms of the settler colonial state.

This leads me to Haig-Brown’s suggestion of the Two Row Wampum as a starting point or guide for thinking about the metrics of third space in theory and some of the limitations that are necessary (i.e. respect for autonomy, maintaining the separation of the vessels paths) in order for this potential for knowledge sharing and engagement to continue.
For anarcha-Indigenism I think the settler/Indigenous separation is still crucial given the colonial dynamics that persist at the root of settler societies and those who reside in them. It is certainly the primary set of contexts mediating any potential relationships. The difference I see is that anarcha-Indigenism has the potential for many more than two sets of knowledge coming together within the ‘third space’ to inform theory and action.

Already anarchism, Indigenous thought and feminism have been suggested as three key interventions that make up anarcha-Indigenism. I think we need not be limited to these three perspectives – for example queer critiques that take up a specific analysis of colonialism (see for example Morgensen, 2011) and efforts to queer anarchist theory (Shannon and Willis, 2010) continue to make interventions in both Indigenous and anarchist perspectives and have much to contribute to anarcha-Indigenism. Rather than as a third space, which denotes a borderland or meeting point between two other possibilities/vessels/perspectives etc. the concept of ‘n-dimensional’ space presents a broader and less fixed possibility for thinking about anarcha-Indigenism. Richard Day (2008, 20) suggests an ‘n-row’ model as a possibility for anarchists, feminists and Indigenous peoples to work together under anarcha-Indigenism– a generalization of the Two Row to allow for the addition of more rows and parties of interaction (which I discuss specific in terms of settler/Indigenous relationships in Chapter 4). Drawing from Richard Day (2005), moving to an ‘n-dimensional’ understanding suggests, ‘Rather than longing for total communion, we must understand communities’ [knowledges or theoretical perspectives] as multiplicities that cannot be totalized, as n-dimensional networks of networks that spread out infinitely and are infinitely connected’ (182). An ‘n-dimensional space, following this understanding, suggests that the possibility of interaction between theoretical perspectives

15 I delve deeper into some of parameters of n-dimensional relations in Chapter 4, my aim here has been a general suggestion of the possibilities of an n-dimensional conception of anarcha-Indigenism.
cannot be limited to two disparate perspectives engaging with one another. It suggests a multitude of perspectives coming together, still under the asymmetrical power relations of colonialism highlighted above, to offer certain aspects up to each other and to a potential larger project. I have conceived of anarcha-Indigenism as this larger project, a space where an ‘n-dimensional’ number of perspectives come to engage, but also as an overarching commitment, based in anarchist, Indigenous and feminist thought, and open to further theoretical modification and improvement. We might consider anarcha-Indigenism as a selective space of engagement, where specific aspects of different perspectives are considered for their challenges to theory and practice and their resonance with the general commitments of anarcha-Indigenism that I detailed at the outset of this chapter. The underlying sense of relationship for engagement would still be, however, premised on peace, respect, friendship and autonomy following the Two Row Wampum (Haig-Brown, 2008a, 264) where understanding would be promoted with an eye towards the bettering of anarcha-Indigenist theory and practice and maintaining a commitment to decolonization.

Therefore, it is Haig-Brown’s suggestion of a third space via the Two Row Wampum, further generalized towards an n-dimensional possibility and building on the conceptualizations of anarcha-Indigenism as a meeting place or space of encounter a la Ferguson and Khasnabish, that is one means of conceptualizing anarcha-Indigenism. It allows for a wide range of perspectives to come together and acknowledge their contexts, acknowledge that each one stands autonomous from the other, but influences and is influenced by each of the others – though often in asymmetrical ways. Anarcha-Indigenism as an n-dimensional space of meeting leaves broader anarcha-Indigenist theory and practice that I have discussed above open to critique, modification and development, while also
promoting similar exchanges between the theoretical perspectives that come to meet at the base of anarcha-Indigenism.

In this chapter I have aimed to draw out some of the key elements that make up anarcha-Indigenism in both theory and practice. I have aimed to trace the core feminist, anarchist and Indigenous elements that have come together to formulate a politics that resists all forms of oppression, seeks new relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples and aims to construct alternatives to the dominant statist, colonial, capitalist, white supremacist and heteropatriarchal dominant order. Anarcha-Indigenism, I think, makes important interventions within all of the theoretical possibilities that contribute to its development. In particular, anarcha-Indigenism intervenes in anarchist theory and practice to argue for increased attention and resistance to colonialism broadly and colonial dynamics that persist within anarchism itself. It also suggests possible practical forms of resistance that draw from anarchist and Indigenous perspectives. Finally, I have examined some of the conceptions of third space, border work and contact zones to suggest ways that anarcha-Indigenism might be conceived as a meeting place for theory and action for a variety of perspectives that can contribute to the politics of resistance detailed above. I have argued that although there are a number of different conceptions of how to think about spaces of meeting, expanding Celia Haig-Brown’s work on third space to reflect an n-dimensional space allows for a conception of anarcha-Indigenism that engages theoretical considerations beyond anarchism, feminism and Indigenous thought. Although these perspectives might form the core or the beginning of anarcha-Indigenism, theory and practice needs to remain open to further forms of intervention. With this understanding of anarcha-Indigenism as an n-dimensional meeting place I now turn to several aspects that arise out of engaging in this space of meeting in hopes of developing them in greater detail and expanding both the
understanding of their contributions to anarcha-Indigenism (and the individual perspectives that make it up) and how anarcha-Indigenism can continue to be developed and expanded in theory and action.
Chapter 3

Finding Resonance: Indigenous and Anti-Colonial Research Methodology and Anarchism

In this chapter I demonstrate how an anti-colonial ethic can be centred and further developed as part of anarchist social movement research that is embedded, participatory and active within social movements themselves. This is the sort of research that might be suggested under the framework of anarchy-Indigenism, with the aim of expanding critical work on colonialism. I argued above, following the work of Indigenous and anti-colonial theorists, that colonialism is not only a historical relationship, but rather an ongoing process of intersecting domination and oppression that needs to be opposed, resisted and transformed now (in Canada see Alfred & Corntassel, 2005; Barker, 2009). This examination of anti-colonialism sets the stage for the later chapters in this thesis that suggest some of the possibilities of developing anti-colonial perspectives within anarchism and anarchy-Indigenism. From this assertion of colonialism as a continuing process I argue that anarchists, as academics and activists committed to social justice, need to incorporate and further develop an anti-colonial analysis to expand our ethical research considerations. This is especially true for those of us who continue to do our academic and activist work on Indigenous lands (Kempf, 2010a), in centres of power and privilege that benefit from processes of colonization and who seek to stand with Indigenous peoples in solidarity against colonialism and all forms of oppression and domination.

My aim is to create a dialogue between anarchist and militant forms of social movement research alongside anti-colonial and Indigenous theory and practice following the

---

16 I think of the term ethical here in term of matching anarchist theoretical commitments to resisting all forms of oppression and domination to how we engage in practice. Decolonizing and moving towards anti-colonial commitments in how we carry out research is but one step in this process of reorienting anarchism towards the colonial realities that continue to exist.
parameters of the n-dimensional space of anarchy-Indigenism discussed above—to recognize
the anti-colonial gap that exists in social movement research and anarchism more broadly.
Indigenous theorists and activists have called for an analysis of colonialism by non-
Indigenous peoples (Wilson, 2008; Smith, 2005a) and thus this chapter seeks to take up the
call for anti-colonialism on the part of anarchist settlers engaged in social movement
research. This chapter argues for anti-colonialism as a component of social movement
research that must be specified and committed to for an ethical activist research process,
with an analysis of history, research, method, positionality, continued oppression and a
commitment to ending all forms of oppression. As I explore below, anarchist and militant
forms of social movement research serve as a starting point for theorizing ethically oriented
and embedded social movement research. I then build upon them using anti-colonial theory
and critical perspectives within Indigenous research frameworks to inform a specifically anti-
colonial orientation toward anarchism and activist research. By attending to research
methodology itself I hope to begin to sow the anti-colonial seeds within the processes we
might use to think about anarchism and anarchy-Indigenism, in the hopes that this anti-
colonial work will continue into our broader theory and practice. The understandings of anti-
colonialism and decolonization discussed in this chapter in relation to research methodology
should also be considered general guiding principles for developing anarchist theory and
practice under anarchy-Indigenism.

**Social Movement Research: Social Change and Resistance**

In this section I turn briefly to recent literature on social movement and activist
research that begins to inform an ethical activist research process and can be enhanced
through an anti-colonial orientation. Specifically, I look at those perspectives that make a
commitment to resisting all forms of oppression and domination, alongside embedded and reflexive practices, (i.e. in institutional ethnography Frampton et al., 2006; Kinsman, 2006, militant research Graeber & Shukaitis, 2007 and anarchist investigations Amster et al. 2009) as a starting point for developing an ethical orientation towards activist research. These perspectives are perhaps one route to develop anarchist and social movement research possibilities more broadly and shift them in an ethical direction that takes on anti-colonial commitments.

Activist forms of social movement research, following Charles R. Hale (2006, 97), can be defined as a:

method through which we affirm a political alignment with an organized group of people in struggle and allow dialogue with them to shape each phase of the process, from conception of the research topic to data collection to verification and dissemination of results.

Activist research is firmly political in its orientation and has embedded within it relationships based on dialogue with participants. Research militancy is a current within activist research, explored by Graeber and Shukaitis (2007), who argue for a research practice that embeds the researcher/academic within social movements, and centres research as a continuous engagement of relationships and resistance. They locate social movements and their actions as ‘incubators of new knowledge’ (Graeber & Shukaitis, 2007, 11), asking how research improves the possibilities of political action. Militant research focuses on how political organization and militant action

---

17 I have selected these perspectives because, a) they explicitly centre research as a political project allied in struggles against oppression and domination, and b) they argue for embedded research, seeking to break down the activist/academic division. This is not to say that these are the only such perspectives doing so, however I turn to these perspectives for their emphasis and their explicitly activist and action-oriented commitments.

18 There are certainly more broad definitions; however I find Hale’s definition attractive for its specific orientation to activism.
can help to understand and interpret the world. It points to the ‘uniquely self-reflexive’ nature of social movements, with their internal ability for critique, analysis and the distribution of perspectives (Juris, 2007). Activists are themselves creators of knowledge. Militant research, therefore, articulates the political nature of activist research. It reinforces the need for long-term and collaborative relationships, echoing Hale’s definition above. The core of a militant research methodology is direct participation within social movements which allows for the cultivation of necessary long-term relationships. The embedded nature of militant research opens the potential for an understanding of the complexities and logics of social movements, allowing interventions into movement debates (Casas-Cortés & Cobarrubias, 2007; Gordon, 2007; Juris, 2007). Militant research locates the context of learning in the street, in the heart of action itself, with individuals taking action creating theory and knowledge themselves (Latif & Jeppesen, 2007). Militant research, therefore, suggests the formation of relationships that are essential for an ethical research practice.

Where militant investigation locates the political and resistant nature of activist research, anarchist methods share similar political orientations to methods of inquiry with an overt commitment to research in the furtherance of social justice with specific attention to structures of authority and the state (Fernandez, 2009; Routledge, 2009; see others from Deleon et al., 2009). Anarchist methods noted here illuminate two additional aspects required for setting the foundation of an ethical, and later anti-colonial, conception of activist research.

First, Fernandez (2009) points to a reflexive research process as a core component of an ethical research practice. Reflexivity, he suggests, is ‘the ability of a person to stand back and assess the aspects of her own behavior, society, power and culture in relation to such factors as motivation and meaning’ (Steir 1991 in Fernandez, 2009, 99). This requires the
questioning of objectivity and the separation between researcher and subject frequently found in dominant Western conceptions of research. ‘Reflexivity’, therefore, ‘signals the understanding that an observer is just as much a part of the social setting, context and culture that she is trying to understand’ and embraces participation and involvement in activism as one researches. It allows researchers a closeness to their ‘subjects’ and engages directly with their feelings, hopes and rationales for action (Fernandez, 2009, 99).19

Similarly, Routledge (2009) argues for a relational ethics of struggle in order to foreground subject positions and the important aspects of our dual roles as activist and academic. An ethical relational positionality, he argues, calls for ‘dignity, self-determination and empowerment, while acknowledging that any collaborative “we” constitutes the performance of multiple lived worlds and an entangled web of power relations’ (88-89). In order to engage in such an ethical relation, activist researchers must embrace affinity – the sharing of common ground for struggle, and solidarity and support for those who resist. This leads ultimately, Routledge argues, to an activist academic practice that ‘prioritizes grounded, embodied political action, the role of theory being to contribute to, be informed by, and be grounded in such action, in order to create and nurture mutual solidarity and collective action – yielding in the end a liberatory politics of affinity’ (2009, 90-91). Both Routledge and Fernandez highlight crucial aspects that must be considered when attempting to formulate an ethical research practice. We must have a commitment to others we research with, as well as a commitment to act against oppression and domination and for social change.

Finally, an activist research methodology requires the realization that the structures of the academy must also be sites of struggle and resistance. The university, Casas-Cortés

19 This reflexive focus draws from and is located in anti-racist (Dei and Johal, 2005) and feminist methods (Mohanty, 2003).
and Cobarrubias (2007) argue, is part of the neoliberal (and colonial, as highlighted by Indigenous theorists below) order and reproduces elements activists seek to fight against. We must see the university as seeking to ‘categorize and classify’ in the maintenance of power and domination (Graeber and Shukaitis, 2007). We can take up institutional ethnographic (IE) methods to reveal the institutional constructions of power, social relations and administrative regimes, making visible their contradictions and weak points to make activism within them more effective (see Frampton et al., 2006). IE is employed to map social relations in order to produce knowledge to change the world (Kinsman, 2006). We thus have an obligation, as activist academics, to facilitate resistance in these spaces. As Casas-Cortés and Cobarrubias argue (2007, 124), the ivory towers of academia must be a space of our resistance: ‘They must be laid siege to, they must be infiltrated’.

By looking at movement literature that puts forth an explicitly political project and embedded research focus, I have traced some of the basic aspects of what ethical activist research might encompass. Embeddedness, self-reflexivity, affinity, the cultivation of relationships and resistance within the academy itself are all aspects that need to be considered for the foundation of ethical activist research.

**Embedded Organic Intellectuals**

The role of the theorist in activist research still raises some concerns and I point to, briefly, the Gramscian ‘organic intellectual’ as one possible orientation for activist research. The role of the intellectual within social movements, as has been already argued, is that of critique, interpretation, theoretical expansion and elaboration of what may be called the ‘collective theorizations’ (Graeber and Shukaitis, 2007) of social movements. The role of intellectuals explored here presents possibilities for an ethical orientation of activist research.
that remains committed to social movements themselves, rather than strictly academic work, and resisting all forms of oppression and domination. Gramsci’s organic intellectual elaborates the role of intellectuals in social movement-based research and reinforces the potential for the intellectual to be an embedded component to aid activist movements (Gordon, 2007). This embeddedness presents a model for activist research, noted by several theorists who draw from Gramsci: intellectuals as facilitators and clarifiers of movement strategy (Gordon, 2007), as ‘movement intellectuals’ (Haluza-Delay, 2003) similarly embedded and aligned with movements and ‘committed intellectuals’ focused on the struggle to end all forms of exploitation (Fischman & McLaren, 2005).

Uri Gordon (2007) suggests the role of the intellectual as a facilitator for movement theory, debate and action, as well as taking up the role of revealing assumptions and contractions. The embedded intellectual looks at the internal dynamics of the movement and seeks to theorize and clarify to provide further tools for struggle – to focus on the agency and ‘unofficial thought’ of activist theory formed in the context of struggle (Cox & Barker, 2002). The role of the intellectual is to analyze social relations and assist in the articulation of resistance strategy (Haluza-Delay, 2003), and to mobilize/radicalize movement participants and outsiders (Cox & Barker, 2002). The activist intellectual then might offer their conclusions, observations and theorizations back to movements, ‘not as prescriptions’, Graeber argues (2004, 10-12), ‘but as contributions, possibilities – as gifts.’ Movement activists, therefore, can fulfill a role of being organic intellectuals within their own movements (Kinsman, 2006), with theory rising from activism.

Gramsci’s organic intellectual is one means of theorizing how intellectuals and academics might become embedded and linked in explicitly political ways to social movement struggles. These links and relationships form the base of ethical research within
social movements committed to resistance against domination and oppression, moving academic work from mere theory to a tool for action. This conception, however, does not address the possibilities of solidarity-based relationships between Indigenous peoples and settlers that will be necessary for resisting colonialism. I take up this work in the following chapter.

**Centring Indigenous Knowledges and Research**

An anti-colonial analysis, as I examined in Chapter 1, allows for a more specific ethical research orientation that takes stock of the activism and research that continues to occur on the lands of Indigenous peoples, as well as the lands of powers that reap the benefits of continued colonialism and between Indigenous and non-Indigenous/settler peoples. This research is firmly centred within the epistemologies, worldviews and perspectives of Indigenous peoples, calls for an examination of colonial privilege and points to a need to engage with Indigenous research methodology to contest the hegemony of Western theoretical perspectives and modes of inquiry.

I now turn to Indigenous knowledges and worldviews, primarily centred, though not exclusively so, in the context of Turtle Island (North America), to ground an anti-colonial perspective. I cannot claim to adequately articulate the complexity of Indigenous worldviews (nor would it be appropriate for me to do so), but rather I aim to present some common threads, drawing from recent works by Indigenous theorists on Indigenous research methodology and critiques of dominant Western forms of research (i.e. Denzin, Lincoln & Smith, 2008; Kovach, 2009; Wilson, 2008). I argue that it is these Indigenous-oriented perspectives that must inform an anti-colonial articulation of social movement and anarchist research.
Indigenous worldviews and epistemologies are what fundamentally inform Indigenous research methodologies. Indigenous epistemologies are, in a general sense, encompassing of a holistic and dynamic approach to the world, ecologically centred in connections to land and place and fundamentally focused on interrelated relationships between all living things (Battiste, 2002; Getty, 2010; Kovach, 2009; Little Bear, 2002). An Indigenous research methodology, therefore, follows from an Indigenous epistemology and is centred in relational accountability or, following Wilson (2008), being accountable to all one’s relations and one’s community. Community accountability means, in this sense, that the community directs research, and the researcher seeks to privilege community needs and values over their own (see also Kovach, 2009). Research is not located as extractive, in comparison to Western ‘smash and grab’ practices (Smith, 2004), but as belonging to the community. The community ‘owns’ the knowledge and maintains control over the research processes, publication and reporting (Louis, 2007).

It must be noted, however, that an Indigenous epistemology, although possessing some general tenets, stems from a specific place-based context. Place maintains the connection between the past and present and situates the particular knowledges of specific Indigenous peoples that cannot be universalized. It is a connection to land based on ‘collective responsibility and stewardship’ (Kovach, 2009, p. 63). Indigenous knowledges and research are then firmly rooted within Indigenous communities, based on relationships of respect and accountability (Battiste, 2002; Kovach, 2005; Wilson, 2008).

Language is intimately connected to place and forms a core component of Indigenous epistemology and methodology. Languages are fluid in their ability to articulate relationships (Kovach, 2009), taking on a verb-focused, as opposed to subject-focused, framework reaffirming the active nature of relationships (Little Bear, 2002). Language
emphasizes oral forms of communication and transfer of knowledge. Storytelling is emphasized as a means to hold and transfer knowledges and maintain their continuity from the past into the future (Kovach, 2009). It situates community members with their historical lineage and validates the lives of the people (Thomas, 2005). It is also a means to articulate multiple truths with regard to history and events, where every member of the community is a part of the larger articulation of histories and collective memory (Smith, 2004).

As this brief overview of Indigenous epistemology suggests, epistemological groundings cannot be separated from elements of research methodology. Indigenous research methodology is firmly grounded in cultural understandings and histories. It is, as Wilson (2008, 11) affirms, a ‘ceremony’ based on the desire to build stronger relationships and raise consciousness. An Indigenous research paradigm must employ values and beliefs that are valid to Indigenous communities and not necessarily valid to Western institutions or systems of thought. This does not require that an Indigenous paradigm be insulated from broader critical research perspectives, but rather recognizes that the primary aim of research is to benefit the community and contribute to resisting colonialism.

An Indigenous research methodology is, as a result, open-ended and is not necessarily constrained by a specific set of methodological prescriptions. An Indigenous methodology focuses on the importance of the journey in creating and conducting research as much as the importance of results, conclusions and publications (Kovach, 2005). It is also explicitly tied to Indigenous knowledges and their maintenance and revival as a means of resistance (Doxtater, 2004; Simpson 2004). Louis (2007, 133) summarizes the four commonalities of Indigenous methodologies as follows: ‘relational accountability’ (recognizing dependence on all of ones relations), ‘respectful representation’ (how the researcher presents themselves and their research), ‘reciprocal appropriation’ (how one is invested in the landscape and how
landscape is incorporated into experience) and ‘rights and regulation’ (research driven by community protocols).

Coming from a specific epistemological context, Indigenous research methodology comes into conflict with Westernized assumptions present within research and advances a specific critique of the colonial residues within Western paradigms. Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s *Decolonizing Methodologies* (2004) critiques the imperial and colonial histories/contexts and impacts that Western research and methodologies have had on Indigenous peoples. She locates Western epistemologies as based in a view of history as a totalizing, singular, universal, and linear narrative, constructed as innocent, depoliticized. Research, therefore, is constructed ‘through imperial eyes’:

which assumes that Western ideas about the most fundamental things are the only ideas possible to hold, certainly the only rational ideas, and the only ideas which can make sense of the world, of reality, of social life and of human beings (Smith, 2004, 56).

An Indigenous research paradigm seeks to resist the persistence of Western hegemony in research, to resist the ‘jagged worldviews’ that have been internalized by Indigenous peoples as a result of colonization (Little Bear, 2002). Previous Western research within Indigenous communities is identified with a lack of relevance and accountability to communities (Wilson, 2008). Although attempting to resist all forms of oppression and domination from an intersectional perspective, anarchists have still bought into these Western aspects of research and we still need to work to decolonize the ways in which we conduct research and think about the world. Indigenous methodologies, therefore, might aid, in part, the disruption of the Western homogenization of research.

Graham H. Smith (2002) argues that Indigenous research and methodologies should be open to any theoretical perspective that can assist in the struggle against colonialism,
while recognizing, as suggested above, that any methods used must maintain their relevance to Indigenous communities and their struggles against colonialism. Indigenous peoples need not outright reject the possibilities of resistance and participation in the academy but aim to seek out allies and theoretical paradigms that will assist in their struggles. Theory is a tool, a means to ‘write back’ against the dominant narratives and constrictions of history and society (Smith 2004). Kovach (2009, 26) locates an Indigenous methodological affinity with qualitative methods and draws from Denzin and Lincoln (2003, 13) stressing ‘the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry.’ Similar affinities can be observed with social movement research perspectives outlined earlier in this chapter with regard to relationships and embeddedness. Qualitative research poses a similar emphasis on reflexivity and self-location within research as an inclusive process acknowledging multiple truths (Kovach, 2009). In particular participatory critical theory, when grounded in local community contexts and knowledges, has the potential to be used as a tool in struggles against colonialism (Absolon & Willet 2005; Denzin et al. 2008; Grande 2008; Kovach, 2009; Smith 2004; Smith 2002) and an anti-colonial social movement ethic. Anarchist research orientations, as outlined briefly above, might also contribute to Indigenous research methodology as well, specifically in terms of the possibilities for tying research and resistance together. There is a potential, therefore, for exchanges between and across anarchist and Indigenous research methodologies, while still considering the colonial aspects of anarchism as a part of the Western construction of research. For the employment of other research perspectives any research related to Indigenous peoples, their histories and experiences must be compatible with an Indigenous epistemology and centre Indigenous voices (Smith 2004;
Wilson, 2008). The caution that must be given to any degree of borrowing or synthesis is the recognition of the colonial history within which research is embedded (Kovach, 2009).

If we are to suggest an Indigenous perspective for social movement research we must consider the implications. Kovach (2009, 30) suggests that the introduction of an Indigenous perspective into any other discourse ‘must ethically include the influence of the colonial relationships, thereby introducing a decolonizing perspective to a critical paradigm’. Kovach centralizes the decolonizing nature of an Indigenous perspective on research as a means to centre an Indigenous cultural grounding for research, decentering a focus on settlers and problematizing the colonial relationship. A decolonization agenda must be part of Indigenous research, and, as I argue, social movement and anarchist research and practice, because of colonialism’s continued influence. Research methodology is perhaps one part of the larger need for decolonization and anti-colonial development within anarchism, one that might be considered under the meeting place of anarcha-Indigenism.

Decolonization serves as a means to unify Indigenous people into a common struggle, aims to centre voice and representation, identify colonial residues and promote change and transformation. Decolonization marks its focus on the contradictory experiences that have occurred under colonialism and the struggle to reclaim culture, knowledge and community (Smith, 2004). For settlers and those seeking to ally with Indigenous peoples, the project of decolonization must be a ‘long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial power’ (Smith, 2004, 98). It must be one where settlers recognize their privilege and power, derived from the continuation of a colonial system, and actively undertake a process of ‘unsettling’ (Regan, 2010) within their own communities. Decolonization is more than simply the elevation of previously colonized populations to places of power. Rather, it requires the ‘reevaluation of the political, social,
economic and judicial structures themselves and the development, if appropriate, of new structures that can hold and house the values and aspirations of the colonized’ (Laenui, 2002, 155). Alongside the theoretical work of anti-colonialism cited above, Indigenous research promotes a decolonizing perspective, embedded locally in communities, that warrants attention from social movement researchers.

As anarchist social movement researchers and activists committed to social justice and transformative change, and often working for such goals in colonized lands and spaces, a strategy for resisting colonial realities must be part of our theory and practice. An anti-colonial analysis names colonialism as a system of oppression that must be opposed and recognizes that the work that occurs on Indigenous lands occurs within the context of colonial privilege and domination. An anti-colonial analysis asks social movement actors, committed to removing all forms of oppression and domination, to look at their own privileges and take up a politics of solidarity with Indigenous peoples. I examine anti-colonial work in practice in greater detail in the next chapter where I consider the possibilities for solidarity between anarchists and Indigenous peoples. I specifically discuss how new sorts of relations might be established that take on an anti-colonial and decolonizing perspective.

In general, understanding our position as settlers requires us to take action and commit to a decolonizing and unsettling framework. It recognizes that ‘colonialism is a narrative in which the Settler’s power is the fundamental reference and assumption, inherently limiting Indigenous freedom and imposing a view of the world that is but an outcome or perspective on that power’ (Alfred and Corntassel, 2005, 601). Part of our work as researchers and activists must be taking up unsettling and decolonizing work once we recognize colonialism. An ethical orientation to activist research must therefore be one that recognizes colonialism as a force of oppression and domination to be resisted, one that takes
concretes steps to subvert colonial privileges and ally with Indigenous peoples in resistance through research and action and one that must form the core means of inquiry within anarcha-Indigenism.

Indigenous research paradigms present a means to resist colonial realities, ask us to look at the academy and educational institutions as sources of privilege and power, and ask how we might act ethically in these systems of colonialism (Battiste, 2002; Kovach, 2009). They ask us to consider whether or not we might be taking or making space for alternative critical research paradigms (Kovach, 2009), how we might learn from Others, as opposed to about them, and how we might acknowledge privileges, histories and differences and work across them (Jones & Jenkins, 2008). They forcefully align, according to Denzin and Lincoln (2008, 15), ‘the ethics of research with a politics of the oppressed, with a politics of resistance, hope and freedom’.

Indigenous methodologies are not alone in attempting to disrupt homogenous constructions of research. Critical social movement research methods and specifically anarchist research methods, among others, have attempted similar disruptions. The key difference within an Indigenous methodology, grounded in localized communities and knowledges, is the explicit recognition and commitment to resist the residues of colonialism that continue to be present in research practice. This is a commitment that must be taken up by activists and activist intellectuals who continue to struggle for social change on colonized lands, and in centres of power that benefit from colonial processes. It is a commitment that calls for a process of unsettling within ourselves, our communities, our research and our practice, while standing in solidarity with Indigenous peoples.
Conclusion

Following the above discussion of social movement, anarchist, anti-colonial and Indigenous research methods and theory, an anti-colonial ethic for research can be further enhanced as a part of social movement research broadly and within anarcha-Indigenism specifically. The anti-colonial ethic must emerge as a requirement for social movements, theorists and activists who struggle against oppression and domination on Indigenous lands or who continue to reap the benefits from systems of colonization. Indigenous theory points to place, and our relationships that emanate from land bases, as a means to locally ground our theories and actions and to recognize and challenge the colonization of land (Grande, 2008). We, speaking from a settler anarchist standpoint, need to consider such connections, and how we are bound up within systems of colonialism. We must continue our ethical research work, maintaining embedded relationships, reflexivity and a commitment to resist oppression and domination, all aspects that resonate with Indigenous and anti-colonial articulations. But we must go further. We must recognize the persistence of colonialism in intersecting systems of oppression and domination and seek to include such an ethical understanding into our research practice. We must recognize ourselves as allies in solidarity with Indigenous and anti-colonial struggles (Max, 2005), with the imperative to unsettle and decolonize within our own communities and selves. We must rethink our collaborations, our contexts, our privileges and our practices and conceive of them ethically in anti-colonial terms as a process that is never complete. ‘Anti-colonialism’, in the words of George J.S. Dei (2010, 255), ‘must be articulated in the interests of all who struggle against colonialism, racism, myriad oppression, capitalist imperialism, and other antihuman systems’. Anti-colonialism, to borrow from bell hooks, must be for everyone. The n-dimensional space of anarcha-Indigenism allows for a meeting of anarchist and Indigenous research perspectives,
informed by anti-colonial theory, towards attending to the colonial residues that persist in Western-dominated modes of inquiry and examination. I take up this means of engaging different theoretical perspectives and employ it in the following chapters that begin to detail some further anti-colonial and decolonizing possibilities for anarchy-Indigenism in theory and practice, starting with the possibilities for solidarity between settler anarchists and Indigenous peoples.
Chapter 4
Solidarity as Methodology: Recognizing the Imperative of Anti-Colonial Resistance

For those interested in creating networks of resistance against processes of domination and oppression and seeking to transcend the state form and capitalism under anarcha-Indigenism, Indigenous resistance struggles have become a focus for solidarity work and the construction of alliances. Since the so-called ‘Oka Crisis’ in 1990 there has been a resurgence of Indigenous resistance to colonialism and increased efforts to assert Indigenous autonomy and self-determination. Some have argued that this event specifically called for a restructuring of the relations between settlers and Indigenous peoples (Sehdev, 2010, 106 see also generally Ladner and Simpson, 2010). There has been both a desire to support specific Indigenous struggles as well as to cultivate more commonly-oriented struggles against capitalism and the state form. The desire, in recent scholarly work, to examine the resonances and possible syntheses between Indigenous and anarchist perspectives requires further examination of the complexities of solidarity relationships that come about in the n-dimensional space of anarcha-Indigenism. While the concept of solidarity has been discussed in a variety of contexts, there is a need, because of the fact that struggles and resistances occur on colonized lands, to move towards a more specific understanding of Indigenous-settler solidarity relationships. It is these understandings that need to be considered foundational for the creation of relationships under anarcha-Indigenism.

This chapter begins with a critical overview of some of the key theorizations of solidarity within the context of resistance to capitalism, colonialism, heteropatriarchy, white supremacy and/or the state that arise from anarchist, women of colour feminist and activist orientations. Next, I seek to push general theorizations of solidarity further in order to capture and address the specific dynamics of Indigenous-settler solidarity and alliance.
Specifically, I focus on the elements within both communities that seek to engage in direct action resistance to the impositions of colonialism, capitalism and the state form. I will explore the possibilities of Indigenous-settler solidarity as it has so far been conceived and direct specific attention to the possibilities of imagining solidarity relationships using the Kaswenta (Two Row Wampum) as a conceptual model. This chapter hopes to push the possibilities of solidarity further with settler activists, and specifically anarchist settlers, further developing the anti-colonial orientation to praxis, resistance, decolonization and ‘unsettling’ as part of anarchy-Indigenism.

Further, I suggest broadly that solidarity may be employed as a unique methodology for scholarly and activist oriented work and praxis and aim to read across the theoretical divisions between settler and Indigenous articulations, seeking to break down the barriers between these bodies of academic and activist theory within the n-dimensional space of anarchy-Indigenism. Drawing from Andrea Smith (2010, xv), I aim to centre Indigenous understandings of solidarity work in order to challenge the relegation of Indigenous theory and practice as only useful to Indigenous communities themselves. Rather, I suggest a means dialogue between settler and Indigenous communities to further advance the possibility of solidarity and alliance against oppression and domination within all communities.

Solidarity understood broadly as an n-dimensional methodology suggests 1) a means with which to put texts, bodies of theory and political positions in conversation with one another to find points of contact and the potential for common struggle, while recognizing the specific contexts, histories and privileges that both separate and link settler-Indigenous partners; 2) a framework with which to work towards politics of alliance on-the-ground and in practice; and 3) a means to break down the ‘academic apartheid’ that centres and institutionalizes dominant Western knowledges to the exclusion of others. Such apartheid
maintains Western colonizing and dominating knowledges as the hegemonic centre of academic work and limits the theoretical discussions between knowledges and disciplines (Sandoval 2000). Solidarity as methodology suggests a need to move beyond the relegation of certain ideas, philosophies and modes of action to specific and closed off areas. It suggests a means to draw from a variety of perspectives to broaden the possibilities of developing theory and action. It is also, as will be argued later in this chapter, a means with which to begin a process of decolonization and unsettling. It is with this spirit of solidarity as methodology that I first undertake a general examination of theorizations of solidarity and critically engage in the work of major theorists. This work then permits a more specific examination of Indigenous-settler relations within larger movements of resistance against oppression and domination, and then reflects, by way of conclusion, on how such theorizations can be useful in a methodological sense. It is my hope that this chapter will serve to add to the conversation around solidarity in practice as well as its methodological possibilities within the n-dimensional meeting place of anarcha-Indigenism.

**Solidarity as Methodology: Envisioning Relationships of Alliance and Resistance**

Many methodological approaches emphasize the need for collaboration, collectivity, common struggle and lasting relationships as a means to foster an ethical relationship for research, social change and resistance, including anarchist and Indigenous methodologies discussed in Chapter 3. Solidarity can be taken up as a specific methodological standpoint with which to build alliances, coalitions and mutual struggles between groups and individuals that might otherwise seem to be separate by perceived, as well as crucial and necessarily identified, differences. Solidarity as a relationship and form of struggle has been variously theorized, and in terms of the activist and social change discourse in which I locate myself
and my research, it is a term often mentioned as a requirement for building networks of resistance—but one that is rarely fleshed out and complexly articulated.

I begin with the work of anarchist Peter Kropotkin and his concept of ‘mutual aid’ articulated in his 1902 work *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (2006), originally published in response to the application of Darwin’s evolutionary theories that suggested evolution occurred on the basis of survival of the fittest and competition. Kropotkin seeks to challenge this reduction of relations to those of competition by examining the relations within various species of animals, Indigenous peoples, members of medieval societies and finally members of society in the age of mass industrialization. His overall argument is that, within a species, processes of cooperation and mutual support are the basis of relations between individuals, and are what ensures the survival of the species at large.

Kropotkin describes the embedded instinct of humans, and animals as well, with the following example: ‘It is not love to my neighbour—whom I often do not know at all—which induces me to seize a pail of water and to rush towards his house when I see it on fire; it is a far wider, even though more vague feeling of instinct of human solidarity and sociability which moves me’ (Kropotkin, 2006, xv). He locates relations of solidarity and mutual aid to fellow members of the species as instinctual processes, embedded within humans, as well as animals. He argues that the existence of society as a whole, no matter what the size, arises from the general existence of human solidarity, with the existence of happiness for one based on the happiness of all members of society arising from mutual aid ‘and of the sense of justice or equity, which brings the individual to consider the rights of every other individual as equal to his [sic] own’ (Kropotkin, 2006, xvi). Mutual aid is the basis for society.

While Kropotkin does not deny the existence of conflicts and elements of competition within human and animal societies, he does, however, suggest that it is not the
core logic that drives evolutionary processes. He suggests that the ‘fittest’ of a species that survive are actually those that engage in cooperation and mutual aid to ensure mutual survival. They develop a communal sense of justice in order to survive and also find their intellectual and moral capacities enhance through mutual aid relations (Kropotkin, 2006, 47).

Kropotkin suggests as well that despite the incursions of the state, religion and authority into the lives of humans seeking to promote competition and an ‘everyone for themselves’ attitude, mutual aid as the underlying factor of human relations is maintained (Kropotkin, 2006, 94, 183). He traces the enclosure of communal lands and the centralization of human populations into cities as two factors that have led to the erosion of relations of mutual aid. He argues that the absorption of nearly all of the social functions between humans by centralized and coercive state power have served to promote, and at times require, ‘the development of an unbridled, narrow-minded individualism’ (Kropotkin, 2006, 187). Under the force of the state humans are no longer bound by obligations to one another, but are rather focused on their obligations to the state (Kropotkin, 2006, 188). Even so, Kropotkin argues, mutual aid relationships are maintained at the most basic level despite advances of the state.

Mutual aid is a relationship that is the base that leads to all of the other ethical relations within society:

In our mutual relations every one of us has moments of revolt against the fashionable individualistic creed of the day, and actions in which men [sic] are guided by their mutual aid –inclinations constitute so great a part of our daily intercourse that if a stop to such actions could be put all further ethical progress would be stopped at once (Kropotkin, 2006, 189).

Mutual aid is thus a basis with which to build ethical relations amongst ourselves. It develops from the daily face-to-face interactions allowing common interest between people whereas a lack of common interest only ‘nurture indifference’ (Kropotkin, 2006, 228). Developing
mutual aid, Kropotkin argues, is the best means with which to create progressive and ethical relations between people, and can be undertaken via social and political associations that coalesce around common interests (Kropotkin, 2006, 230).

Kropotkin’s articulation of mutual aid does suggest a very general base conception of solidarity, one that continues to influence contemporary anarchist theory and practice (see Milstein, 2010). However, his presentation of Indigenous peoples as ‘savages’ with an air of European superiority reveals the underlying process of evolutionary scientific thought that plagues his thinking and the colonial residues that exist and are even maintained within anarchist thought. He is still very much wedded to a scientific process that casts Indigenous peoples as lesser forms of humanity and although we might look to them for processes of mutual aid, his characterization does more harm than good. His attitudes towards Indigenous peoples reveal the imperialist and colonizing nature of Western discourses of science that provided the pretexts and justification for imperialism and colonialism. This sort of thinking cannot be taken up if solidarity is to be articulated as a methodological possibility for thinking about settler-Indigenous relations and resistance to colonialism. Anarchists would do well to problematize the connection between scientific thinking and processes of colonization, which I looked at briefly in the previous chapter on research methodology.

In the following sections I draw from the work of Chela Sandoval and Chandra Talpade Mohanty on coalition building and solidarity within women of colour feminist resistance and its challenges to the dominating currents of white feminism. Their work is one means of critiquing the disparity and hierarchical relations that might exist between those who are seeking to create relations of solidarity. These disparities need attention before a
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20 See for example Murray Bookchin’s (1986) portrayal of Indigenous peoples as ‘organic societies’ that seemingly essentializes historic indigenous societies, while giving little attention to contemporary Indigenous communities and resistance movements. See further Best (1998).
relationship of solidarity can even be attempted, and will likely continue even after a relationship is established. Anarchism, for all its invocation of resistance to all forms of oppression and domination, is still dominated by white people within North American contexts. Like the white feminism that both Sandoval and Mohanty critique, anarchism's positioning as a white-dominated movement requires a subversion of the colonial and white supremacist privileges that anarchism benefits from. Further, Sandoval and Mohanty articulate a nuanced and specific understating of solidarity and what might be encompassed within such an often loaded term. I refer to their work to illustrate the complexities of engaging in solidarity work and the continued contestation and development required for moving towards a greater understanding of what solidarity, as a term, might mean within the n-dimensional space of anarcha-Indigenism.

I draw from Chela Sandoval’s *Methodology of the Oppressed* (2000) as means to articulate how alliances and coalitions can be formed with particular attention to identity and difference. Sandoval, drawing from the work of postmodern theorists such as Jameson and Barthes and the theoretical interventions of women of colour, seeks to articulate a methodology of the oppressed. She points to Jameson’s work that argues that in the postmodern era concrete positions and identities have become decentred and fluid. If resistance is to be adequately articulated we must look to those who have had to contend with a fractured and decentred identity resultant from oppressive forces such as colonization. Women of colour in this sense are not mere activists but are actively creating theory, refusing the apartheid of locating theoretical work only in the academy, and are articulating the methodology of the oppressed.

Sandoval (2000, 27) suggests that the ‘survival skills’ of the oppressed are a means with which to engage in new processes of resistance that allow one to ‘move through society’
to manipulate ideology to fit the specific needs of specific contexts (Sandoval, 2000, 30). Under processes of postmodern neocolonial capitalism, all citizens come to feel as though they are experiencing a ‘democratization of oppression’ as a result of the decentring of identities. The oppressive and dominating classes, too, falsely interpret this feeling as a sort of marginalization, despite the power and privilege that they maintain. The employment of survival skills is a means of broadening the number of people who have the ability to resist and build a broader movement of resistance. Further, they suggest a fluidity required for what Sandoval calls ‘differential consciousness’ or ‘differential social movement’.

Sandoval points to the history of US third world feminism to show how different actors with different ideologies can meet and act together, forming coalitions of resistance. Differential consciousness arises from the lived experiences of women of colour and the critical theoretical interventions by feminist women of colour in developing survival skills in the face of oppression, to act strategically based on the changing nature of oppression at specific instances. This theoretical development allows the orientation of oneself to the specificities of particular situations and ideologies to break with the constraints of ideology, and mobilize it in fluid and decentred ways to unite movements and people that were previously divided (Sandoval, 2000, 44). It allows for engagement and disengagement with different forms of action (i.e. her equal rights, revolutionary, supremacist, separatists and differential forms, see pp. 55-58). Like the clutch of a car, Sandoval’s differential consciousness enables ‘movement “between and among” ideological positionings’ and transforms them into ‘tactical weaponry for intervening in shifting currents of power’ (Sandoval, 2000, 58). It is a process that internally, as Hurtado suggests, allows for third world feminists to employ the skills with which to resist state intervention and meet the daily demands of survival (Sandoval, 2000, 59). This use of differential consciousness in practice
thus allows for a shifting differential social movement to create alliances and coalitions of resistance.

A differential mode of alliances might be termed as a sort of ‘tactical essentialism’ following from Spivak’s strategic essentialism (Sandoval, 2000, 61-62), positing new forms of relations ‘when the affinities inside of difference attract, combine, and relate new constituencies into coalitions of resistance,’ bypassing previous possibilities defined by difference (Sandoval, 2000, 64). She argues that ‘global transcultural coalitions for egalitarian justice can only take place through the recognition and practice of this form of resistance that renegotiates technologies of power through an ethically guided, skilled and differential deployment’ (Sandoval, 2000, 64). Observing and understanding power in a model of multidimensional articulations (Sandoval, 2000, 77) suggests a need for differential consciousness and a fluid articulation of resistance that allows for a variety of coalitions based on specific aspects of one’s identity or struggles. Sandoval’s methodology of the oppressed, as put into practice with differential consciousness and social movement, suggests a means with which to engage in coalition politics across difference, while accounting for the fluid, multidimensional and intersectional realities of power and oppression, toward contextually specific efforts of resistance.

Sandoval’s methodology of the oppressed presents a new means of conceiving of alliance politics and therefore the politics of solidarity. By allowing for a fluid ‘tactical essentialism’, her methodology allows for cultivating solidarity between groups that cross major differences. It suggests a means to find common threads across differences and ensures that one’s identity and politics do not remain rigidly fixed. A differential consciousness allows for a fluid identity which suggests that different aspects of one’s politics and forms of resistance can be privileged or emphasized depending on the specific
contexts that one finds oneself in. A concrete example of this is articulated by the text on a poster entitled *Fight Where You Stand* by the anarchist collective CrimethInc: ‘We are anarcho-syndicalists on the shop floor, green anarchists in the woods, social anarchists in our communities, individualists when you catch us alone, anarcho-communists when there’s something to share, insurrectionists when we strike a blow’. ‘Anarchist’ might be the overall identity of an individual, but more specific articulations can be emphasized depending on the circumstances.

Anarcha-Indigenism, as an ‘n-dimensional’ space of meeting discussed above, might benefit from a similar sort of engagement. Given that I am speaking of anarcha-Indigenism as a meeting place for a minimum of anarchism, Indigenous political theory and feminism, there will certainly be times when theory and practice needs to attend to the specifics of a particular context. Employing differential consciousness will allow anarcha-Indigenism to highlight particular parts of its theoretical basis depending on the circumstance. For example, when engaging in solidarity relationships with Indigenous peoples, anarchists might do well to consider the primary importance of their status as settlers, and the attendant privileges, rather than asserting their ‘oppression’ by the state as anarchists. Sandoval’s differential orientation, therefore, allows a greater possibility for solidarity in circumstances of difference between groups and individuals. It is a means of overcoming appeals to either absolute sameness for solidarity as well as the perceived incompatibility of differences. It puts the solidarity activist in a ‘third space’ (Sandoval, 2000) where one is not entirely the same, nor entirely different. This has specific relevance for anarcha-Indigenism, which will attract a variety of actors from anarchist, Indigenous, feminist and other potential contexts.

I turn next to the work of Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2003) who defines solidarity in the sense of ‘mutuality, accountability, and the recognition of common interests as the basis
for relationships between diverse communities’ (7). Drawing from Dean’s (1996) conception of affective solidarity, Mohanty argues that solidarity occurs as an interaction between three parties. She quotes Dean (1996, 3) arguing that in an affective solidarity relationship ‘I ask you to stand by me over and against a third’. Mohanty suggests that this form of solidarity is necessarily praxis-oriented and political, transcending the construction of universal identities such as ‘sisterhood’ within feminism. ‘Rather than assuming an enforced commonality of oppression, the practice of solidarity foregrounds communities of people who have chosen to work and fight together’ (Mohanty, 2003, 7).

In her classic essay ‘Under Western Eyes’ (2003), originally published in 1986, Mohanty critiques various works that deal with ‘Third World Women’ as a homogeneous category and in effect ‘colonize [their] material and historical heterogeneities’ (19).21 Mohanty’s examination suggests the need for local and contextualized understandings of struggle and the required recognition of the multiplicity of oppressions if alliances are ever to be constructed or translated into effective political struggle. Her work suggests a need to decolonize the relationships that exist (in her case between women who have been constructed as ‘Third World’ and First World feminists who write about them) and break down the power structures and power of naming and describing that has characterized such relationships. Seeking to enact a methodology of solidarity requires unmasking and making visible the systems of power and oppression (like colonialism) that operate to construct identities and the creation of theoretical perspectives. This is an essential project for
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21 Mohanty’s critique ultimately argues for a focus on contextualization of specific struggles to remove the Western construction of third world women as apolitical victims and suggests a ‘common context of political struggle against class, race, gender and imperial hierarchies’ to transcend universalized conceptions (Mohanty, 2003, 26). Her argument rallies against essentialism that removes the specificities of oppression and ignores the possible subversive aspects of third world women’s struggle beyond the reduction to helpless or passive victims (Mohanty, 2003, 33-34).
examining the Western roots of anarchism and the white dominance of its theory and practice.

Mohanty expands on the work above in ‘Cartographies of Struggle’ (1991) by again asserting the need for attention to intersecting forms of oppression. She argues that the struggles of third world women can be conceived of as an ‘imagined community’, following Benedict Anderson. Mohanty explains that such a community is: ‘Imagined not because it is not “real” but because it suggests potential alliances and collaborations across divisive boundaries, and “community” because in spite of internal hierarchies within third world contexts’ there is still a possibility of ‘horizontal comradeship’. This conception of an ‘imagined community’ is useful, she argues, because it goes beyond the traps of essentialism highlighted in her other work above ‘suggesting political rather than biological or cultural bases for alliance’ (Mohanty, 1991, 4). She suggests the creation of an imagined community for solidarity between ‘third world women’ who are similarly situated and have horizontal relations between one another. She points to the political links between struggles as the basis for solidarity, while acknowledging different histories and contexts. The basis for solidarity must be a political desire to struggle against domination (Mohanty, 1991, 7). Following Sandoval above, the need to ground struggles within the ‘day-to-day struggles of survival’ of oppressed people is highlighted (Mohanty, 1991, 10). By looking at the day-to-day struggles of third world women the need for an intersectional understanding of oppression becomes paramount, allowing for a dynamic articulation of potential alliances (Mohanty, 1991, 30).

In order to put the above forms of critique and possibilities for alliance into practice, Mohanty and Alexander conceive of ‘feminist democracy’ as a means to articulate an ‘anticolonial, anticapitalist vision of feminist practice’ that is committed to ‘building actively anticolonialist relationships’ (Mohanty and Alexander, 1997, xxvii). This project
acknowledges the inadequacy of current forms of political organization and points to a political culture of decolonization in order to ‘think oneself out of the spaces of domination, but always within the context of a collective or communal process’ (Mohanty and Alexander, 1997, xxviii). Fundamentally, they locate the ‘transborder’ potential for solidarity between first world people of colour and third world women as one that must confront imperialism and colonization, seeing citizenship beyond the state form, and working towards a feminist conception of democracy (Mohanty and Alexander, 1997, xli). They locate the challenge of such a framework in an ‘ethical commitment to work to transform terror into engagement based on empathy and a vision of justice for everyone. After all, this is the heart of building solidarity across otherwise debilitating social, economic and psychic boundaries’ (Mohanty and Alexander, xlii). Feminist democracy, thus articulated, is one means of conceiving of broader understandings of democratic possibilities as a means to ground analysis, relationships and struggle in broad anti-colonial and anti-capitalist orientations.

Finally, ‘“Under Western Eyes” Revisited: Feminist Solidarity Through Anticapitalist Struggles’ (2003) reexamines some of Mohanty’s previous themes and to articulate a ‘Feminist Solidarity Model’ that recognizes differences and tensions in relations of ‘mutuality, co-responsibility and common interests’, maintaining the attention to the specificity of individual and collective oppressions (242). Mohanty argues that a feminist solidarity model sets up a ‘paradigm of historically and culturally specific “common differences” as the basis of analysis and solidarity’ (Mohanty, 2003, 244). She maintains that the use of universal categorizations, such as ‘women’, ignores simultaneous aspects of identity, thereby ‘circumscrib[ing] ideas about experience, agency and struggle’ and failing to note whose agency is being colonized or privileged (Mohanty, 2003, 248). The goal, therefore, must be to ‘forge informed, self-reflexive solidarities’ that recognize the interconnections, specific
contexts and important differences between communities as means to lead toward a meaningful practice of solidarity (Mohanty, 2003, 251).

By looking at various aspects of Mohanty’s work, common threads of recognizing the contextual specificity and multiple oppressions within communities struggling against injustice, and looking to political commonalities in struggles against colonialism and capitalism may be taken up as a basis for solidarity. Mohanty is primarily speaking of coalitions between first world people of colour and third world women, while critiquing hegemonic Western feminisms and gesturing towards the possibility of solidarity with white feminists. Even so, her work is applicable to the general dynamics present within societies based on hierarchy, oppression and domination from the state, capital, colonialism, heteropatriarchy and white supremacy. My project is one that operates between a hierarchal arrangement of identities and contexts, namely white settlers who hold privileges from white supremacy and colonialism and Indigenous peoples who have been on the opposite ends of colonialism and white supremacy. This is a relationship that reflects similar divisions based on systemic processes of oppression, domination and power that Mohanty highlights between third world women and white Western feminists.

To translate across the divide that exists between settlers and Indigenous peoples, there needs to be a concerted effort at personal decolonization on the part of settlers (a point I touch on in more detail later on in this chapter). There need to be actions taken by settlers and their movements to ‘unsettle’ the hierarchy, privilege and power that settlers have attained via colonization. The equalization of the relationship, so to speak, would need to occur, before aspects of Mohanty’s suggestions could even begin to be imagined. Mohanty’s work I think emphasizes the need to break down barriers that exist between actors in order to imagine relationships of solidarity. She discusses the hierarchical
relationship that exists between white feminists and women of colour feminists, highlighting the need to subvert this hierarchy, displacing the centrality of white feminism and creating new horizontal relationships. Creating new relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples has a similar requirement, where settlers still carry colonial and white privilege which needs to be subverted for an actual change in relationship to occur. This means breaking down the walls and fences that white settler colonialism has erected to insulate power and privilege for settlers. Mohanty’s work may be instructive here and suggests a possibility for beginning to engage in solidarity across such current divides within the n-dimensional meeting space of anarcha-Indigenism.

Specifically, in order for coalitions to occur between disparate groups there must be a multidimensional critique of oppression so as not to repeat or re-entrench oppressive practices within solidarity relationships. The danger of homogenization and essentialism are dangers that I think are probable for any sort of relationship where there are differential levels of privilege and power. Thus while Mohanty is focused within a specific set of communities of resistance, I think her work can find wider resonance. Commonalities of oppression are not what allow the possibility of solidarity, but rather a shared political commitment to anti-colonialism and anti-capitalism and an understanding of ‘common difference’. Mohanty is correct to locate colonialism and capitalism as forces of oppression that affect a wide spectrum of people in different ways. Her focus on similar political goals, rather than oppression, foregrounds a relationship geared towards resistance.

Mohanty importantly locates the political and feminist aspects required for a relationship of solidarity and Sally Scholz, who seeks to elaborate (feminist) political solidarity, can be observed to expand or complement various aspects of that work. Scholz begins by drawing a distinction between ‘political solidarity’, ‘social solidarity’ (based in
society on mutual identification between members of a group) and ‘civic solidarity’
(state/citizen relationship that accounts for welfare of individuals) (Scholz, 2008, 17-50). She
argues that political solidarity is unique in that it ‘unites individuals based on their shared
commitment to a political cause in the name of liberation or justice and in opposition to
oppression or injustice’ (Scholz, 2007, 38). Political solidarity is focused on a specific project
or goal, where those in solidarity might not themselves be directly affected by the issue at
hand, but can still be radically transformed through the relationship (Scholz, 2008, 57). As
per Mohanty above, political solidarity requires standing with one who is not ‘me’ against
oppression.

Scholz argues that political solidarity must be focused on mutuality (or ‘mutual aid’ as
per Kropotkin,) as a ‘reciprocity and equality between participants’ where a ‘fundamental
equality exists between those involved, giving them mutual right to expect help as it may be
required’ (Bayertz, 1999, 19 in Scholz, 2009, 213). This relationship of mutuality is one that is
not necessarily a given. It is one that we, as activists, must seek to create, while taking stock
of histories of oppression, privilege and power. As well, individuals involved may have
different specific goals or issues that they wish to focus on but there is the potential for one
particular overarching goal or issue to provide the possibility for a solidarity relationship
(Scholz, 2008, 191). As a result, Scholz (2009) argues that this work requires a framework
that epistemologically ‘acknowledges multiple, overlapping, and at times contradicting
knowledge claims’ and recognizes the need for constant renegotiation (213). From a social
justice standpoint political solidarity articulates two aims: 1) service and support to those
who struggle against oppression and 2) a commitment to confrontation with the institutions
and forces of oppression that create injustices (Scholz, 2008, 194). A commitment to
solidarity requires being attentive to the views of others in order to enhance relationships
(Scholz, 2009, 214) while committing to resistance and action. Political solidarity therefore has a firmly activist orientation, where ‘activism is the public side’ of confrontation with forces of oppression (Scholz, 2007, 45). Scholz’s work is firmly embedded within a social movement context and points to a general applicability for movements of social justice that seek to resist oppression and domination.

Political solidarity, using the words of Sally Scholz (2008), can be summarized as a:

committed unity of peoples on a range of interpersonal to social-political levels with a social justice goal of liberation of the oppressed, cessation of injustice, or protection against social vulnerabilities; it simultaneously fosters individual self-determination, empowerment, cooperative action, collective action, collective vision, and social criticism among those in solidarity (58).

Social criticism, more specifically, is used as an external means of critique, but also internally ‘to try to avoid reinscribing different forms of oppression while [seeking] social change’ (Scholz, 2009, 211). Political solidarity therefore seeks to stake out a comprehensive possibility for engaging in solidarity relationships. It is not a hegemonic or rigid conception, and allows for multiple articulations underneath a framework committed to social justice and resistance to oppression. It is a commitment to scrutinize one’s own participation in systems of oppression, the coordination of action with others in the pursuance of social justice and to enacting ‘all the possible means of resistance and activism’ (Scholz, 2009, 217). It is resistant to oppression both externally as well as internally, where recognizing the multidimensional aspects of oppression is crucial. Specifically I think her theory of political solidarity suggests a need to critique the hierarchal relationships that exist between Indigenous peoples and white settler activists who seek to work in solidarity with them.

Overall, I find Sally Scholz’s political solidarity a useful means of theorizing a methodology of solidarity. She specifically names resistance to oppression and injustice as the focus of solidarity within this framework and draws from activist theory and practice to
develop her theory. This is not to say that other motivating factors are not possible or useful to consider, but in terms of activist-oriented research and action this model for solidarity points to a means of effectively engaging relationships. There is a danger of focusing on the specifically political aspects of solidarity towards a perceived shared goal or ideal in that important differences and contextual specificities will be lost. Here Mohanty’s work to re-emphasize the importance of contextual differences and specificities, against the danger of essentialism, can serve as a corrective and complement. As well, Scholz’s emphasis on social criticism and continuing critique is one means to ward off the potential to over identify different struggles or groups with one another. Critique of systems of oppression and contextual standpoints of the actors involved must be considered before solidarity can even begin to take place. Specifically this calls for a decolonizing process by settlers within their own communities, in order to begin to work through colonial and white privileges. One thing that must be considered is that shared political goals are certainly necessary for solidarity as envisioned in this way; however, there needs to be some sort of focus on the cultivation of long-term personal relationships in order to continue struggles that may be occurring over a number of years or perhaps even lifetimes. This is raised by Abdou, Day, and Haberle (2009) and Montgomery (2009) and is something within Scholz’s conception of political solidarity that can be critiqued and improved. The existence of political as well as social motivating factors seems crucial for the maintenance of relations of solidarity that will be cultivated and sustained.

In this section I have endeavoured to examine a variety of currents related to theorizing a methodology of solidarity. All of the authors examined here are situated in a variety of different contexts and possibilities that must be considered before they can be generally employed. Each of their slightly different focuses suggest the possibility of bringing
them together to articulate a specific and nuanced methodology of solidarity—one that is politically committed, focused on mutual aid, recognizing the multiplicity of oppressions, contexts and histories and the myriad tactics that may be employed to enact and maintain solidarity between those who meet in the n-dimensional space of anarcha-Indigenism.

Kropotkin’s work establishes mutual aid as a significant process embedded within both human and animal relations, and must be firmly situated within a Western history of colonialism and seen to be maintaining of colonial logics of Western superiority. The resultant bias of his work makes its application to a resistant and anti-colonial understanding of solidarity difficult. Rather, his work perhaps points to the need for further decolonization with anarchist thought. Sandoval’s work highlights a tactical possibility with which to create and sustain alliances and coalitions via differential consciousness, and further asks us to consider the multiple dimensions of oppression and context within alliance work and how we orient ourselves to struggle. Her work is particularly useful in applying to anarcha-Indigenism. Mohanty's work puts forth an understanding solidarity practice in a political sense, locating the intersections and multiple dimensions of oppression that Sandoval touches on, and then finally putting forth both feminist democracy and solidarity as practical means to fight against oppression and engage in solidarity. Finally, the work of Sally Scholz allows for a specific articulation of political solidarity—focused on solidarity relationships seeking social change and against oppression and domination, while ensuring a self-critical activist practice. As per the work of Mohanty discussed above, Scholz’s work needs to ensure an analysis, as a first step, of power relations and their affects on the possibility of relations of solidarity. The works examined here provide a general context that can serve as a backdrop to more specifically theorizing solidarity relationships between Indigenous peoples.
and settler activists that occur within the proposed n-dimensional space of anarcha-Indigenism.

**Defining Solidarity**

The theoretical perspectives of Chandra Talpade Mohanty and Sally Scholz, previously discussed, are the most useful to employ in reference to solidarity in the settler-Indigenous context. Mohanty (2003) defines solidarity in the sense of ‘mutuality, accountability, and the recognition of common interests as the basis for relationships between diverse communities’ (7). Drawing from Dean’s (1996) conception of affective solidarity, Mohanty argues that solidarity occurs as an interaction between three parties. Quoting Dean (1996, 3) she argues that in an affective solidarity relationship ‘I ask you to stand by me over and against a third’. Mohanty suggests that this form of solidarity is necessarily praxis-oriented and political, transcending the construction of universal identities such as ‘sisterhood’ within the feminist movement to challenge the hegemony of white feminisms and imagine new sorts of relations between women of colour feminists and white feminists. ‘Rather than assuming an enforced commonality of oppression, the practice of solidarity foregrounds communities of people who have chosen to work and fight together’ (Mohanty, 2003, 7). Her work, at one level, seeks to create relations of solidarity between communities of women who share racialization by white supremacy and resistance as women to systems of heteropatriarchy, while also challenging white feminists to reorient their relationships to women of colour on the basis of solidarity. The specific context of Indigenous-settler relations involves creating relationships between those that hold privilege in a white supremacist society and those who been on the receiving end of histories of white supremacist colonization. This involves the creation of a relationship of solidarity that
attends to the realities of colonial privilege and white supremacy, in similar fashion to white
feminists seeking to subvert their hierarchical relations to women of colour within the
possibilities of solidarity.

Settlers carry the additional responsibility to work towards a process of
decolonization for themselves, an essential component of seeking to stand in solidarity with
Indigenous peoples. Indigenous-settler relations, therefore, have a very specific set of
histories related to colonization that complicate the relationship. Settlers must recognize the
work involved in seeking to dismantle the hierarchies created by colonialism. However, in
seeking to move towards possibilities for Indigenous-settler solidarity, Mohanty’s basic
formulation is useful for its positioning of three specific sets of actors: those who resist,
those who stand in solidarity with those who resist, and those (or the systems) who the other
two might be resisting. Certainly identities are not so easily reduced but Mohanty’s
understanding reinforces the role of the settler ally standing in solidarity.

Day and Haberle (2006, 27) draw from Mohanty in an Indigenous-settler context
arguing that ‘solidarity means that I stand with you, against another. On this definition, it is
very important to note, relations of solidarity can only exist between disparate identities — if
I am you, I cannot be in solidarity with you’ (Day and Haberle, 2006, 27). As per my
discussion of Mohanty above, her context of writing issues a challenge to white feminists
who have benefit from white supremacist and colonial privilege perhaps not unlike that of
settlers in relation to Indigenous peoples. Day and Haberle’s use of Mohanty seeks to
underline that there is still some context, however minor, that may separate those who are
resisting and those who aim to stand in solidarity, even if their identities might be similarly
defined or the terms of solidarity under consideration might be similar.
Solidarity is an act. It recognizes the need to support others. There is an idea of reciprocity, where those in solidarity stand with others that are confronted with oppression and injustice. Solidarity can occur at a variety of levels and understandings of identity and difference. The case of Indigenous-settler solidarity, for example, occurs at a larger group/community level, with one specific group perhaps not directly affected by injustice. Settlers are not Indigenous peoples, do not share the same contexts and histories and as such must be attentive that a relationship of solidarity does not become one of over-identification with the ‘other’, in this case Indigenous peoples. A relationship of solidarity, however, does allow for disparate communities to work together, potentially towards commonly articulated goals or against commonly identified forces of oppression and domination. Here, I think Scholz’s notion of political solidarity relates directly to the Indigenous-settler context.

Political solidarity, again, is unique in that it ‘unites individuals based on their shared commitment to a political cause in the name of liberation or justice and in opposition to oppression or injustice’ (Scholz, 2007, 38). Social criticism is used as an external means of critique, but also internally ‘to try to avoid reinscribing different forms of oppression while it seeks social change’ (Scholz, 2009, 211). Solidarity, in a political sense defined here, thus allows for a struggle between two (or more) different groups in opposition to oppression and injustice, where oppressions and injustices are variously defined, intersecting and contextually different for groups and individuals. Political solidarity, as theorized by Scholz, may identify part of the impetus for Indigenous-settler solidarity, where common resistance to colonialism, the nation-state and capitalism is recognized as a potential basis for solidarity, with the settler imperative for self-reflexive criticism and decolonization.
Settlers as Allies and the Complexities of Solidarity Work

The first step, however, might be for settlers to recognize that they stand on the side of oppression and domination and through solidarity seek to ally with those who resist such oppression and domination. The initial privileges that settlers hold need to be unsettled before solidarity based on any form of shared political commitments, as per Scholz, might be actualized. Kevin Fitzmaurice, drawing from the work of Albert Memmi, argues that the attempt to refuse the privileges of white supremacy and colonialism that we as settlers accrue ‘is to further mark one’s power and privilege to make such a choice’ (2010, 358). He explains more specifically:

To be white in Canada is to be implicitly the same [i.e. unmarked], and to be Aboriginal is to be different and therefore less than. White people, therefore, as an implicit function of being white in Canada, are unable to “refuse” these deeply embedded structural and material advantages of colonial power and “privilege” (358, see also Barker 2010).

The work of a settler ally that aims to stand in solidarity therefore must be to work against and seek to unsettle their privilege, not to reject, or pretend that it does not exist. An ally, from Bishop (2002, cited in Fitzmaurice, 2010, 353), might be understood as a ‘member of an oppressor group that works to end that form of oppression which gives him or her privilege’. Settler allies therefore carry the responsibility, first off, to resist and challenge their own privileges that come from living in a white supremacist colonial society. This sort of unsettling/decolonizing work, although important as an essential initial part of solidarity work, cannot be seen as one that will ever be ‘complete’. It must be an ‘open and dynamic concept, which is not “settled” now, and hopefully will never become “settled” ’ (Barker, 2010, 317). This settler process cannot be any simple task, it involves a conscious and determined commitment where
we must question literally everything we do, all of the assumptions which underpin our personal lives and larger societies, and the myths which inform our very identities. We must be prepared to face the fact that our comfortable lives, our “privileges”, exist because we are useful to imperialism, and that being an ally and confronting imperialism requires us to risk our comforts and to confront the entire imperial system (Barker, 2010, 321).

Where I disagree with Barker is where he suggests that once we, as settlers, are made aware of colonialism and the privileges that we accrue from its continued existence, that we are faced with a choice. We can continue to be colonial or seek to subvert colonialism and the privileges that we have as a result. Where I think he goes wrong is by suggesting that no matter which path a settler chooses their choice must be respected (Barker, 2010 323). I want to suggest that being made aware of colonialism and its continued perpetration requires that we take action to effectively resist its oppression and domination and the privileges such oppression and domination provide us. There is no room for respect for those that know injustice and continue to uphold it. To refuse to act is to reinforce ones privilege and firmly maintain a position of the side of the oppressor. To begin to resist is to seek to work against the status of an oppressor.

In their article genealogically analyzing some of the solidarity practices in the context of Canadian activism Abdou, Day and Haberle (2009) suggest that a specific tension exists between historic socialist forms of solidarity and those that might be defined as ‘inessential modes of solidarity’, a concept they borrow from Diane Davis (2003). They argue that the forms of solidarity present within the 19th and 20th century currents of socialism and anarchism have tended to focus on essentialist or universalizing categorizes that efface the specificity of differences between individuals and groups (a similar critique can be made of Kropotkin’s mutual aid). In the socialist vein solidarity has been reserved for relationships specifically between workers within the working class termed political solidarity by Abdou et
al., a definition of political solidarity that I think is much more specific and historically situated compared to the one put forth by Scholz above, which has a more general application that moves beyond rigid working class-based identities. In the anarchist vein it has employed a ‘universal humanism, rather than a class-based internationalism and a privileging of small-scale networks of community and individual mutual aid over relationships based on authoritarian and hierarchical institutions such as the nation-state’ (Abdou et al. 2009, 210). Mutual aid, drawing from Kropotkin (1902), is taken up as one of the core principles of anarchist social solidarity (one that I sought to problematize in the first part of this chapter) and Abdou et al. argue that both the anarchist and socialist forms are not something automatically attained or given, but rather something to strive for – a ‘possibility and impossibility, a necessity and an absolute luxury, a complex striving for a utopian horizon’ (Abdou et al., 2009, 211). This critique of social solidarity and its essentialist form resonates with Scholz’s (2007) understanding of social solidarity as based in society on mutual identification between members of a group, whereby the identities of those in the group are essentialized to allow for solidarity, while suggesting at the same time that this form of solidarity is not formulated to work across difference. The answer, Abdou et al. argue, lies in inessential forms of solidarity.

Inessential solidarity, Abdou et al. argue resonates with anti-racist feminist conceptions of solidarity, as articulated by Mohanty (2003) above. The main emphasis of this inessential framework is that solidarity works across identities of difference, beyond those that are identical, and grounds an intersectional analysis of oppression (Abdou et al, 2009, 211-212). Inessential solidarity, therefore, does not require a rigid commitment to only one particular struggle, but recognizes the many struggles that may overlap with one another, especially in the n-dimensional space of anarchy-Indigenism that I am proposing as a
meeting place between struggles and theoretical perspectives. To orient solidarity they suggest drawing from Emmanuela Levinas’ infinite responsibility, following Davis (2003). ‘[I]nfinite responsibility,’ they argue, ‘means that we must open ourselves to the possibility of all possibilities, strive to create spaces in which the same and Other – now less narrowly conceived –may engage in conversation, at least for a time’ (Abdou et al., 2009, 214). They suggest an allegory and a specificity of inessential solidarity for Indigenous/non-Indigenous relations:

The allegory begins with the face-to-face encounter, the point at which the same and Other symbolically engage gazes and acknowledge each other’s existence…both are simultaneously the Other and the same to each other, and this is precisely what must be acknowledged. With reference to indigenous/non-indigenous encounters, this is particularly difficult for the non-indigenous actor. While the indigenous actor is likely to be all too familiar with the existence of “their” other –the settler –due to the uncompromising genocide and continuing oppression perpetuated against him or her by the settler society, the non-indigenous actor is not similarly encumbered. Precisely as a result of colonial privilege, she or he is able to maintain a lack of understanding of the fact of colonialism. For the purposes of indigenous/non-indigenous inessential solidarity, then, the kind of recognition we are talking about requires that the settler disrupt his or her colonial (dis)orientation to the Other (Abdou et al., 2009, 215).

Face-to-face relations thus allow for a disruption of colonial positions and allow for an infinite responsibility to the Other in light of some degree of understating of the oppression that the Other intimately knows. These face-to-face encounters, it is argued, are what lead to continued conversations and a developed relation of friendship that begins to form stronger more permanent bonds for continued solidarity than those of a strictly political nature. In these engagements the settler becomes engaged in moments of ‘unsettling’ (Abdou et al., 2009, 217-218; see also Montgomery, 2009; Regan, 2010).

Importantly, this process of unsettling within infinite responsibility must be one that is continuous, never ending, and as Montgomery suggests, one that is representative of a horizon rather than a position that is finally and concretely attained (2009, 17). It will always
form a part of the commitments of anarchy-Indigenism. Day (2005, 200) captures the specificity of the continuity of a relation of infinite responsibility which:

means as individuals, as groups, we can never allow ourselves to think that we are ‘done, that we have identified all the sites, structures and processes of oppression ‘out there’ and, most crucially, ‘in here’, inside our own individual and group identities. Infinite responsibility means always being able to hear another other, a subject who by definition does not ‘exist’ indeed must not exist (be heard) if current relations of power are to be maintained. To respond means at least to have heard something—though one can never hear entirely ‘correctly’ or completely—and thus represents a crucial step on the way to avoiding the unconscious perpetration of systems of division.

For settlers engaged in solidarity this means ‘being willing to hear that you have not quite made it yet, that you still have something more to learn’ (Day, 2005, 201) – that in essence the process of standing in solidarity and learning/engaging/unsettling as a result of such a relationship will continue and in order to be ‘good’ allies we must be open to its continuance. Adam Barker (2010, 321) identifies a similar requirement where settlers must seek to constantly question their actions, ‘literally everything [they] do’, as part of the process of resisting colonialism and seeking to act as allies, recognizing that their work towards decolonization and unsettling is never complete, it is a continuous process.

Similarly, Montgomery (2009) points out the dangers of overly identifying with political sameness with regard to the struggle of Indigenous peoples because as soon as the solidarity relationship no longer serves the specific needs or goals of settlers their support will disappear. He also points out the dangers of using a political framework to judge which struggles settlers ought to choose to be in solidarity with. This, he argues, carries the potential to reinscribe colonial dynamics onto Indigenous-settler relations in a form of ‘settler vanguardism’ (Montgomery, 2009, 6). In order to act as a complement to the complexities of settlers engaging in infinite responsibility, Montgomery suggests a further concept of infinite possibility to remind settlers of ‘the need to think creatively and imagine
new possibilities for solidarity and unlearning colonialism’ and while infinite responsibility suggests the dangers of colonial power lying anywhere, infinite possibility is a means to recognize these instances of colonial power as possibilities of further resistance (Montgomery, 2009, 20). Infinite possibility is a continuous search for new formations of action, resistance and solidarity and where infinite responsibility ensures that our work in solidarity relationships and unsettling is never complete, infinite possibility suggests that ‘we’ll never be “done” feeling uncomfortable [in such situations and relationships] so we had better keep organizing, talking, asking questions and experimenting with solidarity in spite of our discomfort’ (Montgomery, 2009, 22).

The notions of infinite finite responsibility and infinite possibility offer powerful suggestions for those seeking to engage with solidarity relationships with Indigenous peoples. It should not be confused that the authors above do specifically orient their work within an anti-statist perspective of engaging in solidarity and thus their work ought to be specifically taken up by those settlers who share such politics. Those interested in other accounts of solidarity that might be more ‘mainstream’ or ‘liberal’ in nature will need to look elsewhere as my interest, as already stated, is with anarchist and anarchistically (non-state, non-hierarchal) inclined Indigenous-settler relationships. Montgomery, Day, and Abdou et al. provide a useful critique of the essentialist dangers of engaging in relationships of strictly political solidarity and its issue-oriented basis of relationships. Their critique looks towards Indigenous-settler relations in much the way that Mohanty (2003) critiques the dangers of essentialism constructed by (white) Western feminists toward ‘Third World Women’ as a homogenous category. These scholars’ work is essential for relations of solidarity in order to seek to limit the reinscription of colonial and dominating dynamics. They also point to the need for face-to-face and personal relationship based forms of maintaining solidarity so
solidarity relations do not simply fall apart once settlers’ ‘issues’ no longer align with those of Indigenous peoples.

While I think the above critique of political solidarity by Abdou et al. is useful and points to some of the dangers of over essentialization, especially given the degrees of privilege that white settlers hold within the context of Canadian colonization, I want to still affirm the political solidaristic requirement for these relations, at least at some stage of the solidarity relationship. I agree that political solidarity may not be the means with which to sustain solidarity over an extended long-term period, and especially in the face of changing circumstances or successful campaigns of resistance. But I want to ensure that political solidarity still serves as a recognizably important instigator for solidarity relationships.

Perhaps anarchist essentialization and over-identification with Indigenous struggles occurs at the initial stages of a solidarity relationship. This much might be true and must be critiqued for reinscribing processes of oppression, domination and colonial dynamics. But I think that this political instigator does get more and more people involved with Indigenous solidarity work. It serves the purposes of bringing anarchist settlers (in this case) to support Indigenous struggles of resistance, where personal relations do not yet exist. Relations of political solidarity bring unconnected people to demonstrations or actions in order to begin to make the kinds of connections that might arise from a logic of infinite responsibility and possibility. Political solidarity, I am suggesting, still serves the important instigating purpose of bringing previously unconnected peoples together so they may begin to forge long term and personal relations of solidarity.

A further aspect of solidarity worth mentioning briefly, that is closely tied to infinite responsibility and possibility, is the idea that solidarity may be approached from a ‘groundless’ positioning. Richard Day suggests ‘groundless solidarity’, drawing from Elam
(1994) as a politics of solidarity ‘not based on identity but on a suspicion of identity’ (quoted in Day, 2005, 188). Day explains further: ‘Groundless solidarity arises from a precarious “unity in diversity” of its own, a complex set of (partially) shared experiences of what it means to live under neoliberal hegemony, what it means to fight it—and to create alternatives to it’ (Day, 2005, 202). This conception of solidarity suggests a possibility for relations of solidarity based on a commitment to fight another’s oppression, to fight against aspects and axes of oppression that one might not entirely share in common with those they seek to stand in solidarity with. It suggests a fluidity of identity and identification in order to allow for solidarity with struggles that might be entirely different from one’s own. This sort of fluidity of identity, Day argues, is captured by the following quote by Subcommandante Marcos of the Zapatistas:

Yes Marcos is gay. Marcos is gay in San Francisco, Black in South Africa, an Asian in Europe, A Chicano in San Isidro, an anarchist in Spain […] a Mohawk in Quebec, a pacifist in Bosnia […] Marcos is all the exploited, marginalized oppressed minorities resisting and saying ‘Enough’. He is every minority who is now beginning to speak and every majority that must shut up and listen. (Marcos in People’s Global Action 2002, quoted in Day, 2005, 191).

Groundless solidarity suggests, therefore, a fluidity of identity in order to identify with other struggles, which are not one’s own, in order to struggle under a common banner of resistance to oppression and domination. This is a concept that seems to resonate with the methodology of the oppressed and differential conscious and social movement theorized by Chela Sandoval (2000) cited above, as a fluidity of ideological definition, as illustrated by the Crimethinc poster focusing on different orientations of anarchism. It further resonates with the n-dimensional conceptions of anarcha-Indigenism I have discussed in Chapter 2. The groundless sense of solidarity allows engagement and disengagement from different struggles based on the articulation of different identities and ideological orientations. In relation to
Indigenous-settler solidarity relationships, Barker argues: ‘Settler people must be willing to assist Indigenous peoples, groups and nations in the pursuit of their goals, regardless of whether or not these goals fit a settler individuals pre-existing idea of what form the struggle should take’ (2010, 324). Barker’s understanding of groundless solidarity suggests the possibility of creating relations of solidarity by seeking to assist another’s struggles through an identification with a broader commitment to resist oppression and domination, but not necessarily the specific aspects and forms of struggle undertaken by another group. It suggests that simply a commitment to broader understandings of oppression and domination might be necessary enough, to allow for relationships of solidarity, at least at an initial stage. The fact that Indigenous peoples are engaging in resistance and struggles against colonization, is worthwhile a struggle to demand settler solidarity. Groundless solidarity is thus a means to enact and continue alliances between Indigenous peoples and settlers, even when the interests, goals and actions of each group may not line up.

**Practical Considerations for Enacting Relations of Solidarity**

While political solidarity, infinite responsibility/possibility and groundless solidarity detail complex considerations for solidarity, it is important to assess some of the practical considerations of what settler solidarity might look like. There are two primary aspects of solidarity in practice that I want to engage with: 1) the idea that to be in solidarity involves taking direction of sorts from the community one is in solidarity with and 2) that solidarity can occur within the context of taking action within ones own community.

First of all, drawing on TV Reed and lessons learned from action in Seattle in 1999, is the recognition that those who seek to stand in solidarity with groups directly affected by oppression and injustice need to follow the lead and direction set out by those communities
themselves or otherwise risk a ‘movement cultural imperialism’ (2005, 284). This warning is intended to ward off the taking over of struggles by outsiders. Ontario Coalition Against Poverty member AJ Withers emphasizes, reflecting on his work with the community of Six Nations, that ‘we are doing solidarity work and that our need for leadership from the community not take up more space than is welcome or necessary. I do not think it is possible to do solidarity work…without constantly questioning your roles, tactics and actions’ (Withers et al. 2006, 160). He suggests that this form of work is ongoing and requires continuous evaluation and reevaluation of ones own position in relation to those they seek to stand in solidarity with. There are certainly many instances where solidarity activists might be required to take explicit direction from the communities they aim to stand in solidarity with. (ex. blockades at the Six Nations reclamation, where the action was clearly Indigenous led. See Skye 2006; Withers et al. 2006.) In such cases, there is clearly reason for settlers to take direction and follow the lead of such communities.

However, as Keefer (2007) argues, in specific response to the proposed need to take direction from Six Nations cited by Withers, Gude and Zucker, that perhaps the more important imperative for solidarity is to take action within ones own community. In this case, settlers need to promote decolonization and challenge anti-native backlash in their own communities. He suggests the dangers of reinforcing settler epistemic privilege if settlers are going to constantly wait around for direction from Indigenous communities rather than recognizing the colonial dynamics and systems of oppression within their own communities. In the Six Nations context Keefer points to the myriad actors that settler solidarity activists might appeal to for direction, from Band Council, to grassroots land defenders to the traditional Confederacy Council. He suggests that ‘any solidarity group claiming to “take leadership” from the community must (whether they admit it or not) first make the political
choice as to which element of the community they will take leadership from’ (Keefer, 2007, 112). The danger of this selection of direction, he warns, is that it can have an effect on the internal dynamics of the community one seeks to stand in solidarity with. Put bluntly, it carries a danger of settlers interfering in the internal dynamics of Indigenous communities.

In light of the dangers of interfering in Indigenous communities internal dynamics by focusing on the need to take direction, settler activists might better put their solidarity action to use by working within their own communities. While Indigenous struggles might be exciting for those of us on the radical left, igniting a feeling of revolution and resistance when we stand by the barricades, we cannot let that consume all of our energies and define us as opportunists to ‘stand in solidarity’ only when the action is heating up. There is more that we must consider if we want to build towards community resistance to colonialism. Political resistance is important and efforts to support direct action must continue; however, we must also further consider the social aspects of decolonization within ourselves and within our communities that need to be undertaken. We need to understand and learn from Indigenous critiques and struggles of resistance against settler colonialism. We need to apply these critiques to our own settler communities and demand action against colonialism by settlers. This is an essential part of working towards solidarity with Indigenous peoples and that means working to mobilize other settlers towards relations of solidarity and against colonialism with Indigenous critiques of colonialism as our guide.

Settlers need to take responsibility for their own communities. Keefer (2007, 122) explains: ‘Building radical organizations and combating white racism within predominantly white communities…will be particularly hard. But it remains the necessary task as a pre-condition to building meaningful solidarity with indigenous struggles…[W]e need to take the initiative in building that movement.’ While general support for specific protest sites and
actions undertaken by the communities we seek to stand in solidarity with are important and
cannot be ignored or absent from the work of settlers, ‘we should be wary of prioritizing
these efforts above the more politically difficult, but ultimately crucial, work of organizing
within settler communities’ (Keefer, 2006, 23). The more difficult imperative of settler
organizing to support Indigenous struggles must be within settler communities themselves.
For anarchist and radical left communities this means making colonialism and an anti-
colonial orientation part of the emphasis of our politics. As a publication of Root Force
highlights: ‘Perhaps the most neglected issue in progressive discourse [and anarchist
discourse as well, though this is beginning to change with anarcha-Indigenism] is that of
indigenous sovereignty. This is an inexusable oversight, for we will never be able to create a
just or sustainable world without addressing the ongoing colonialism, imperialism and
genocide inherent in denying indigenous people control over their lands and destinies’ (Root
Force, 2008). Taking up a commitment to organizing towards anti-colonial and decolonizing
consciousness within settler communities is thus one of the most required aspects of
engaging in solidarity work. It is not easy or temporary work, but a necessary long-term
commitment that successful resistance to all forms of domination and oppression will
require.

Keefer points to Carmichael and Hamilton’s Black Power: The Politics of Liberation in
America who observe that, in the context of Black Power struggles for liberation, ‘[o]ne of
the most disturbing things about almost all white supporters has been that they are reluctant
to go into their own communities –which is where the racism exists –and work to get rid of
it’ (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967, 81). The job of organizing white communities must
come from white supporters, especially as ‘this job cannot be left to the existing institutions
ad agencies, because those structures, for the most part, are reflections of institutional
racism’ (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967, 83) and oppression and injustice more broadly. This element of organizing within ones own community, Jeff Shantz suggests, allows non-native allies engaging in solidarity efforts to show that ‘indigenous struggles…are not a matter of conflict between native people and non-native people… Rather it must be shown that these conflicts are based on larger issues of human rights and social justice’ (2007, 47).

As per Carmichael and Hamilton, all settlers, and specifically in my context white anarchist settlers, must take up anti-colonial work in their own communities in order to build movements against oppression and injustice. We have a responsibility to do so if we are to engage in a meaningful practice of solidarity.

Settler-Indigenous Solidarity: Taking Up the Two Row Wampum

As was suggested above the Two Row Wampum or Kaswentha might be one means of thinking about relations between settler and Indigenous populations, which I consider below. The original agreement was signed in 1613 between the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois Confederacy) and Dutch settlers and later similarly affirmed by the British settlers in 1664. Susan Hill details how the Two Row was an agreement largely seen by the Dutch and British as a trading alliance, but the Haudenosaunee people saw the relationship as one of ‘family’ closely binding the two nations together. The relationship would ensure security for both parties and symbolize the ‘desire to be allies rather than to have one side be subjects of the other’ (Hill, 2008, 31). The ensuing history after the agreement of the Two Row Wampum is one that is far from one of alliance, fraught with domination, oppression and genocide of Indigenous peoples by settler populations. Paula Sherman argues that recent history shows that the agreements based on historic wampum belts and their understandings have failed. She suggests that Canada’s historical foundation is ‘shaky’ because ‘Canada is not the
ideological result of long-standing relationships going back thousands of years’. Rather
‘Canada is a result of settler societies establishment through conquest and the appropriation
of Indigenous lands and resources’ (Sherman, 2010, 116). The nation-to-nation agreements
that historically defined the relations between settler and Indigenous populations have been
broken, and it is settler society’s responsibility alone for their cessation. One of the reasons
cited for the breakdown of such relationships is based around the specific relationships that
settlers have had (or rather not had) to land. I discussed this loss of connection and
relationship in Chapter 1, but the need for settlers to engage and understand colonial history
cannot be overstated.

Recognizing our history as settlers, one bound up in colonization, is one of the first
steps that we can take. Part of this recognition of history is also recognizing our present
conditions: we live on lands that have been stolen from Indigenous peoples as a result of
colonization. Recognizing such current circumstances means, as Mar and Edmonds suggest,
that we must recognize that ‘[l]and and the organized spaces on it…narrate the stories of
colonization’ (2010, 2). Our current circumstances and our actions occur on colonized lands.
As a result we continue to profit and exact privilege via settler status based on the
dispossession of Indigenous peoples and continued state/corporate colonization. If, as
anarchists and others committed to social justice, we want to seek to eradicate all forms of
oppression and domination, we need to take stock of our ties to the colonial project. We
need to recognize that as long as we live on colonized lands and refuse to interrogate our
settler histories social justice cannot be achieved. By taking up our side of the Two Row
Wampum we might be able to start to work to developing an understanding of our histories
and the possibility of constructing renewed relations with Indigenous peoples.
Richard Day suggests that ‘in travelling the same rivers together, indigenous and non-indigenous peoples must be aware of their shared reliance upon the land and upon each other. But, in refraining from attempts to steer the other’s vessel, each acknowledges the right to maintain its particularity and difference’ (2005, 194). Mohawk scholar and activist Taiaiake Alfred goes further arguing that ‘[i]n this respectful (co-equal) friendship and alliance, any interference with the other partner’s autonomy, freedom or powers was expressly forbidden. So long as the principles were respected, the relationship would be peaceful, harmonious and just’ (2008, 77). In terms of respect, tied to the Two Row, Dale Turner argues that politically, ‘respecting another person’s intrinsic value means that you recognize that they have the right to speak their mind and to choose for themselves how to act in the world’ (2008, 49). The Two Row Wampum is one means to distinguish between the individual responsibilities andautonomies of Indigenous and settler societies. Settlers can take up the Two Row as a means to signify the requirement and responsibility to work within their own communities to combat colonialism and begin decolonization (see for example Barker, 2010).

Based on this understanding of relationships there would need to be a separation between Indigenous and settler communities. This does not mean that solidarity cannot occur between the two vessels as they travel down the river of life together, but rather that autonomy and self-determination within each community needs to be respected, as a means to move beyond current impositions of settler colonialism on Indigenous peoples. The Two Row suggests, therefore, a separation, at least in part, in order for Indigenous communities to work on their own resurgence without external interference, of which colonialism is perhaps the largest example. As Bonita Lawrence details with regard to the Indian Act, such forms of legislation resulting in the division of Indigenous communities, have had and
continue to have lasting effects (2004, 230). As her work suggests, Indigenous communities have a degree of their own work to do to work through issues of identity as part of a strategy of resistance, resurgence and decolonization (See also Alfred and Corntassel, 2008; Alfred 2008; 2005; Simpson, 2011).

The work of Indigenous resurgence cannot be the work of settlers. Settlers may stand as allies with Indigenous peoples, but to assume the direction of such work, even unconsciously, would be to reinscribe colonial dynamics. As Day (2005, 197-202) points out, there is a dangerous tendency within those white anarchists or other radicals on the left to think that, because of their politics, that they are somehow free of oppressive dynamics, while in fact maintaining such dynamics (197). This danger of reinscribing oppressive dynamics suggests, in part, the need for separation and defined autonomy for Indigenous communities. The Two Row Wampum is, therefore, important as a means to allow Indigenous communities to enable their own resurgence and to protect from further colonial impositions from potential allies. The Two Row Wampum also reinforces the need for settlers to take on the responsibility to resist settler colonialism, white supremacy and heteropatriarchy within their own communities. We have failed, as white settlers, with our obligations under the Two Row Wampum. We need to take up our side of the Indigenous-settler relationship and commit to the working within settler communities. Settlers also need to recognize that Indigenous communities have their own internal work to continue and that Indigenous peoples don’t need settlers help in the majority of this work. Settlers must be willing to assist when they are called upon, but must recognize that forcing ourselves onto Indigenous communities only serves to replicate colonial relationships.
Towards ‘N-Dimensional’ Networks of Relations?

What I want to suggest now is an alternative way to look at the Two Row Wampum that builds upon the n-dimensional meeting place of anarcha-Indigenism, from an anarchistically inclined position that aims to remove all forms of domination and oppression. I take up this work with the understanding that the Two Row Wampum comes from Haudenosaunee communities as means of recording the specific relationship with Dutch, and then British, settlers. It was created in an Indigenous context with settlers invited to participate in a specific relationship. Settlers have failed to uphold their end of this relationship. Our row has been off course for sometime. As a result, those engaged in solidarity relationships with Indigenous peoples have taken up the Two Row Wampum as a model for reinvigorating the core elements of the historical treaty and the separation of settler and Indigenous communities travelling down the same river. The important point that must be made, however, is that one of the rows is ‘ours’. We have a stake in this relationship, even if right now we receive the privileges of colonialism and white supremacy by breaking such a relationship. If we want to repair this relationship then we must understand that Two Row as ‘ours’, moving towards an equal partnership with Indigenous peoples.  

What I want to examine is whether or not the Two Row Wampum model as it stands allows for the critique of the Other, from vessel to vessel, in instances of social or other injustice within and/or between communities. The suggestion of this sort of critique seems to suggest an infringement of autonomy that is ‘expressly forbidden’ as per Alfred above. This also stands against the notion of respect a la the Two Row put forth by Turner. In this view settlers

22 The phrasing of ‘our’ is not meant to connote ownership, which would be a further act of settler theft of Indigenous knowledge. Rather, I use it to connote the intensity of the responsibility that settlers have failed to uphold their end of. As an Indigenous person at Six Nations once said to me ‘that flag [the Two Row] is just as much yours [as a settler] as it is ours [as Indigenous people]’. It is in this spirit that I seek to take up the Two Row and suggest an initial theoretical development that may be useful to creating better relations of solidarity and greater accountability to the core of the Two Row relationships on the part of settlers.
ought to keep themselves free from the affairs of Indigenous communities, as it is this sort of infringement that the Canadian government has undertaken with its continued colonization of Indigenous communities. The Two Row Wampum is a means to assert the autonomy of Indigenous communities as distinct and self-determining nations. Importantly, it recognizes the fact that Indigenous communities, while still strong and continuing nations, need to be strengthened and healed because of historic and continuing colonization (see Barker 2009, Alfred and Corntassel 2005, Alfred 2009). This involves, as Alfred argues, a return to traditional values and modes of governance, while recognizing that they must also be revised to fit the current context (Alfred, 2008, 2005, see also Simpson 2008). The Two Row Wampum, as a model for solidarity, respects the need for Indigenous communities to internally decolonize and resurge, as well as the settler need for decolonization.

But what of a broader desire for social justice across the two vessels that make up the Two Row relationship? Specifically I am interested in this line by Alfred: ‘So long as the principles were respected, the relationship would be peaceful, harmonious and just’ (2008, 77, emphasis mine). Are the prospects of social justice as part of an anarchistic conception possible while still respecting autonomy and respecting self-determination? Or might we ask: What happens when we are requested as settler allies to stand in solidarity with a specific part of an Indigenous community against other members of their Indigenous community who may be maintaining dominating or oppressive dynamics? What are we to do? Does the Two Row prevent us from challenging the dominating relations that might exist in Indigenous communities? Are we to keep quiet and carry on? Certainly we must recognize that both settler and Indigenous communities are extremely diverse, and while seeking direction or specific relations with all parts of the community might be an ideal as something to strive towards (Withers et al., 2006, 159-160), in practice this is near impossible. As Bryan
Skye suggests alliance building ought to occur between similar groups—grassroots settler activists with grassroots Indigenous activists (2007, 147). It is essentially impossible to interact with a large and diverse community as a whole, in order to take direction and satisfy the needs of the entire community. Let me furnish an example for clarification.

Suppose that a group of youth within an Indigenous community want to lobby and pressure the band council to put funds towards a new youth centre, citing concerns of lack of social and leisure opportunities and drug and alcohol use among youth. Suppose that this group of youth appeal to a network of settler allies that have done solidarity work supporting land reclamation efforts with the same Indigenous community that have been undertaken by the men’s wing of the traditional governance structure, which is separate from the band council. The network of settler allies have also collaborated with the youth group on several projects and social activities. What are the settlers to do in this case given the Two Row Wampum? Some argue that they ought to not get involved in internal debates within the community, as they are settlers, outsiders and bound by their side of the Two Row. They argue that taking sides is a violation of the obligations of settlers. Others might argue that their very network has chosen to work with specific aspects of the community in their support of land reclamations, which are not 100% supported by all members of the Indigenous community. It is argued that settlers engaged in solidarity work already ‘take sides’ and work with specific segments of the population. They choose to work with those Indigenous peoples who are actively resisting colonialism and challenging the Canadian state. What this example suggests is that any interaction that a settler might have with an Indigenous community will probably revolve around specific relationships and specific allies within the community. It reinforces the notion that communities are not homogeneous entities, they have various factions, constituencies, groups etc. If we want to recognize this
diversity within communities, to support our allies within the community in their struggles against another part of the community (i.e. direct action activists against the band council), how are we to engage? Are we prevented from such actions as a result of our desire to uphold our side of the Two Row Wampum?

Here I want to suggest a thought experiment using the forms of relating that the Two Row Wampum suggests in conjunction with the n-dimensional meeting place discussed for anarchy-Indigenism. I don’t want to do away with the historical and continued importance of the Two Row, but rather, following its parallel forms of relating suggest an expanded model of relationships that recognizes their fluid and evolving nature. Given the diversity present within both Indigenous and settlers communities, neither of which are as homogeneous as the two vessels of the Two Row suggest, we might suggest an ‘n-Row’ model of communities in solidarity. This model employs ‘n’ in the mathematical sense discussed in Chapter 2 to indicate an infinite number of possible permutations. In a Two Row model ‘n’ would stand is as an infinite number of vessels/communities that might be in solidarity but apart from one another. ‘N’ also suggests a fluid and potential ever-changing possibility for relations. Our vessels can align and realign as they need to for specific purposes of the solidarity relationship and in specific contexts. In this model, anarchist activists would align, upon request, with similarly minded Indigenous peoples against, for example the imposed authority of the band council, or social justice activists with a feminist consciousness would support Indigenous feminists in working towards ending patriarchy and ‘machismo’ dynamics. The number of purposes for alliances between various groups is perhaps endless in consideration. The ‘n’-Row from this understanding does allow for

---

23 I do not think of this as a means of replacing the Two Row Wampum as a model for Indigenous-settler solidarity, but rather as a means to think through some of the complexities of creating solidarities between dynamic communities.
‘interference’ in the form of criticism/critique or solidarity with specific allies within larger communities. It allows ‘interference’ for the purposes of the creation of just and non-dominating relations between all peoples. Or to put things another way, the ‘n’-Row suggests an infinite number of communities to the extent that communities are fluid and can be defined so that it is not a question of interference, but rather of who one is aligning with and who one finds as part of their community at a specific point in time. It asks us to commit to routing out injustice wherever it is manifested and recognizes that assertions of autonomy are insufficient if relations of dominance or oppression are being maintained.

Now some qualifiers with regard to this proposed model. We cannot and must not see this sort of ‘n’-Row as a means to displace the necessity of conceiving of our obligations under the Two Row Wampum and its specific historic context. The history of colonization requires this kind of separation both for the resurgence of Indigenous communities and in order for settlers to take responsibility for decolonization within their own communities. The Two Row is still immensely important for areas where separation and autonomy are essential for continued resistance. What the ‘n’-Row suggests is a means to work towards removing all forms of domination and oppression wherever they are manifest. This is its one and only purpose, to fulfill and maintain the just part of relations that Alfred identifies. The ‘n’-Row is not free range to interfere, take over and otherwise recolonize Indigenous communities. We as settlers still need to recognize the autonomy suggested by the Two Row. The ‘n’-Row aims to take up an intersectional understanding of oppression and domination and is the tool with which we might deal and work beyond such dynamics. It still carries with it the essential qualities of peace, respect, trust and friendship laid out by the Two Row. These principles, if we wish to frame them is such a way, are essential and non-negotiable. Rather the ‘n’-Row is a model with which to take these principles farther, to promote social justice and an anti-
oppression consciousness in all of our relations. If we as settlers might consider taking up an ‘n’-Row model that moves to account for the specific contexts of various aspects of communities we need to consider how to make specific connections between different communities within the larger macro-communities of settlers and Indigenous peoples. I think Robinder Kaur Sehdev’s application of the ‘bridge’ to Indigenous-settler relationships is instructive and I explore it below. Her work also leads, I think, into moving towards creating a ‘third space’ between settler and Indigenous communities with which to create a community of resistance. This community, I would argue, is represented by recent work on anarcha-Indigenism, which I discussed in Chapter 2. We also need to consider the potential impacts that this theoretical idea might have on Indigenous communities and the relationships between settlers and Indigenous peoples. We need to be open to hearing and responding to challenges of this proposed framework when they arise, with the ultimate goal to work towards being better allies. In this sense the suggestions I have made here is an initial attempt at putting forth one possible direction for thinking about solidarity from a settler standpoint.

Robinder Kaur Sehdev, in her article ‘Lessons From the Bridge: On the Possibilities of Anti-Racist Feminist Alliances in Indigenous Spaces’, suggests that anti-racist feminist alliances with Indigenous peoples, and specifically Indigenous women, need to go beyond simply incorporating Indigenous perspectives and contexts into anti-racist feminism. Rather she suggests that anti-racist feminists have much to learn from Indigenous peoples and points to the Two Row as a bridge, with peace, friendship and respect linking settler and Indigenous peoples. This bridging, she suggests reinforces ‘treaty’ as ‘not something to be agreed to and then forgotten about’ but something that must be renewed, ‘done and done repeatedly. In this sense, treaty is kinetic. Put another way, it is more verb than a noun, more
an action than a thing, and is always in the process of becoming’ (Sehdev, 2010, 112). Sehdev suggests ‘Third World Women’s’ feminist ‘bridge work’ as a means to span borders and ‘connect the edges of political action and cultural recognition’, an idea that resonates from Anzaldúa’s borderland to ‘span an otherwise uncrossable breach’. Such bridge work, as a model for solidarity, involves constant work, with ‘the constancy of stretching and grasping, the threat of slipping or crossing’ (117-118) are concerns of the bridge crosser. Sehdev points to the becoming of one’s identity and subjectivity through the contexts of power that we inhabit. These contexts affect how people relate to one another and how selfhood is constructed and can be either positive or exploitative in nature. If one can connect our selfhood to configurations of power, she argues, ‘[a] bridge crosser would recognize that while her specific family history might not be directly implicated in the appropriation of Indigenous land, she is nevertheless the beneficiary of this appropriation even if hers is a history of marginalization. There is no room for innocence on the bridge (Sehdev, 2010, 118). The bridge asks us to ‘spur questions of location and belonging, rather than settle them’ (Sehdev, 2010, 119). While Sehdev focuses on anti-racist feminists of colour, she asks all settlers to consider the possibilities of bridge work as part of the Two Row Wampum.

The bridge asks us who we are as settlers and ‘who we become in desiring to build these bridges?’ (119) It suggests the need to remember that our relations depend on peace, friendship and respect as part of the Two Row and that the Two Row is a ‘space of meeting’, for any settler seeking ‘an ethical belonging on this land’ (Sehdev, 2010, 121). The Two Row Wampum is thus a place to meet, connected to the n-dimensional space of anarcha-Indigenism, in order to begin to forge ethical relations between Indigenous peoples and

---

24 This conception of a place of meeting resonates as consideration for solidarity, but I think also adds to the previous discussion of anarcha-Indigenism in Chapter 2. The Two Row, as an important part of solidarity relations conceived of under anarcha-Indigenism, ought to inform anarcha-Indigenist practice more broadly.
settlers. The bridge shows the need for constant work and how that work can seek to transform subjectivities and relations. It points to the similar requirements of a settler ally indicated by Barker, previously discussed, who argues that settlers must be ready to take up the uncomfortable task of attempting to act as an ally and shake the very foundations of everything that we know (Barker, 2010, 321). The bridge is thus a means of understanding relationships that depend on one another, that are not separated, but are bound up with one another.

**Conclusion: Solidarity as Methodology**

Examining the possibilities of solidarity relationships between white settlers and Indigenous peoples has brought forth a number of key points of exploration. Recognizing settler positioning on the side of oppression and colonization and the need to take concerted action to decolonized and unsettle privilege is some of the most important work required of settlers. As settlers, it is my contention that looking to our understanding of solidarity relationships can be mobilized towards decolonizing and rethinking relationships, but also the academic or methodological considerations I discussed in Chapter 3.

Solidarity as methodology suggests that settler anarchists can engage with Indigenous theories and critiques in the spirit of solidarity. We can recognize that the histories of colonization are very much our histories as well and we must own up to them and the privileges that have come from the dispossession of Indigenous lands. We need to engage in a sort of solidarity work between theoretical paradigms within an n-dimensional space of meeting in order to further enhance work being done to challenge settler colonialism on all fronts. Western theoretical paradigms have occupied a dominant position that asserts an authoritative command over what knowledges are deemed important and legitimate.
Solidarity as methodology aims to contest this form of academic apartheid that silences alternative or minority knowledges by bringing dominant knowledges under critique, and by recognizing the power of other knowledges for theoretical elaboration, understanding and resistance. I developed some of these themes in Chapter 3 on research methodology.

I have aimed to put Indigenous and settler understandings of solidarity and relationships into conversation to articulate a nuanced conception of solidarity work, as well as a means to centre Indigenous critiques of colonialism that have been neglected by settler social movements of resistance. Part of this conception of solidarity as a methodology involves putting theoretical paradigms into conversation, recognizing the strengths and areas of improvement and dialogue between them. This can occur under the meeting space of anarcha-Indigenism. This will largely be the work of settlers understanding and attempting to utilize Indigenous critiques of settler colonialism and seeking to spark dialogue and conversation with the Indigenous communities and theorists whose work we aim to use to think about colonialism in our specific settler contexts. We can recognize the separate lineages of settler and Indigenous paradigms and seek to find points of contact and spaces of resonance when we can meet and learn as settlers to work towards our decolonization. A methodology of solidarity in this specific case demands that anarchism open itself up to critiques of settler colonialism and recognize that it must do so if it will ever hope to be an ally to Indigenous peoples and broader struggles against the settler colonial state form.

Solidarity as a methodological process is one, therefore, that recognizes and supports the power and legitimacy of Indigenous critiques of settler colonialism and the histories of Indigenous resistance. It recognizes that such a process first begins with the settler, in our efforts to decolonize our own research processes and agendas and recognizes there ties to systems of colonization. Solidarity recognizes research as a political act, one that mobilizes
ideas and affects the lives and struggles of people ‘on the ground’. It points to the need for settlers to work within their own theoretical communities first, by understanding Indigenous critiques of settler colonialism and work towards their own internal unsettling and decolonization. Solidarity as methodology recognizes that the Two Row Wampum is a model of peace, respect and friendship and recognizes the autonomy that might be necessary between researchers/theorists and communities they want to work with and learn from. Solidarity recognizes that the learning process is never complete. That our theoretical elaborations are not static, nor ever finally defined. It recognizes that a continued process of engagement between settler and Indigenous theorists is required, and that settlers are the ones with a great deal to learn and put to work. Solidarity as methodology is a means of putting diverse theoretical paradigms into conversation. To recognize the power and privilege that settler paradigms hold, even those that claim to take on a critique of all forms of oppression and domination like anarchism. Solidarity as methodology recognizes that we as settlers have a lot to learn and that we need to open ourselves up to begin such a learning and decolonizing process and that the n-dimensional space of anarcha-Indigenism is a starting point for this sort of engagement.
Chapter 5

Toward An Intersection of Feminist Resistance: Anarcha-Feminism, Indigenous Feminism and the Development of Anarcha-Indigenism

In the following chapter I aim to add theoretical depth to the possible resonances and connections between anarcha-feminism and Indigenous feminisms, that meet under the n-dimensional space of anarcha-Indigenism, and as essential projects of analysis that are occurring within anarchist and Indigenous communities of resistance. I place my examination of anarcha-feminism and Indigenous feminism as essential projects that need to be taken up within communities that are focused on resisting and removing all forms of oppression and domination both internally and externally. Feminist analysis of patriarchy, and more importantly heteropatriarchy as identified by Indigenous feminists (see Smith 2005a and below), ought to be an integral part of this project. Finally, I turn to some of the connections and resonances between these two feminist-oriented projects to suggest how anarchism might integrate a specific analysis of colonialism and how Indigenous feminism might benefit from anarchist analysis of the state form. This final section suggests looking to these bodies of feminist theory to further develop the potential of anarcha-Indigenism. My hope is that this chapter will add further depth to understandings of anarcha and Indigenous feminisms as integral parts of a commitment to end all forms of domination and oppression under anarcha-Indigenism.

25 I use the terms anarcha-feminism, feminist-anarchism and anarcho-feminism interchangeably within this chapter. All indicate a specific focus on resisting patriarchy and the state form as sources of oppression and domination.
Anarcha-Feminism: Recognizing the Imperative of Challenging Patriarchy

As I have argued in the introduction, the core tenets of anarchism are inclusive of an anti-state, anti-hierarchy and anti-capitalist stance against all forms of oppression and domination. These core tenets, from early articulations of the anarchist theory and practice in the 1860s following Goldman’s definition in Chapter 1, also included an understanding of patriarchy and male domination as equally part of the struggle as fighting capitalism or the state (McKay, 2007, 69). These early theorists included dominant male anarchist figures such as Kropotkin and Bakunin, as well as prominent female theorists such as Emma Goldman, Voltairine de Cleyre and Louis Michel. Anarchism, therefore, has had a historical focus on issues of patriarchy and sexual/gender domination that has paved the way to more contemporary articulations of anarcha-feminism.

Patriarchy as defined by anarchists may be understood as ‘the domination –by men– of the conduct, needs, and minds of women, or alternatively the domination by men of women regarded as things’ (Dupis-Deri, 2009, 42). Daniel Guerin further argues that ‘[p]atriarchal society, resting on the dual authority of the man over the woman and the father over the children, accords primacy to the attributes and modes of behaviour associated with virility. Homosexually [as well as non-binary practices of gender] is persecuted to the extent that it undermines this construction’ (Guerin, 2009 [2004], 483). A core part of patriarchy’s enforcement of norms is embedded in forms of gender violence that articulate relations of power and domination arising from feelings of entitlement and privilege by (largely) men who carry specific gendered expectations women, and who seek to ensure the enforcement of gender norms and punishment of those that might be seen to transgress them (Gaarder, 2009, 48). Patriarchy, therefore, is not just a ‘women’s issue’ but profoundly affects men as well within the anarchist movement, and society more broadly.
Anarcha-feminism seeks to combine anarchism, with the focus and analysis of patriarchy, sexism, gendered violence and women’s experiences, with feminism. It is different from conceptions of radical feminism (focused specifically on patriarchy as the primary force of domination) or socialist feminism (which seeks to bring more women into the state apparatus, within an anti-capitalist framework). Rather, as Howard Ehrlich argues, ‘[t]o anarchist feminists, the state and patriarchy are twin aberrations. Thus, to destroy the state is to destroy the major agent of institutionalized patriarchy; to abolish patriarchy is to abolish the state as it now exists’ (1996, 140; see also Leeder 2004 [1979], 256). It is anarcha-feminists who therefore take radical feminism and socialist feminism further in contesting the very legitimacy of the state itself with a commitment to destroying patriarchy. L. Susan Brown (1993, 142) links such articulations of anarcha-feminism as evolving from the work of 19th century anarchists like Goldman and de Cleyre, who maintained the need to attend to the oppressions and dominations affecting women, when she cites Marsh (1981, 19-20):

Anarchist-feminists made their most radical contribution by declaring that if gender ought not inhibit women from participating in the economic and political life of the society, neither were they valid in determining roles within our most intimate institutions. They maintained that if we are to ever to build an egalitarian society, differences in roles –whether in sexual relationships, childrearing, political life, or work –must be based on capacity and preference, not on gender.

Anarcha-feminism, therefore, is the orientation within anarchism that seeks to highlight personal and sexual forms of exploitation (Kurin, 2004, 261) that have been often forgotten or deemed unnecessary by the broader anarchist movement (a point to which I will return later). It brings forth an orientation to the state and patriarchy as deeply connected forms of oppression and domination that must be both opposed. As Peggy Kornegger argues, anarcha-feminism is a means for struggling for the broader goal of human liberation: ‘It is women who now hold to new conceptions of revolution, women who realize that revolution
can no longer mean the seizure of power or the domination of one group by another – under any circumstance for any length of time. It is domination itself that must be abolished’ (Kornegger, 2002, 25).

Anarcha-feminism, therefore, draws from both the feminist movement as well as the anarchist movement. It must be noted, however, that anarcha-feminism has primarily been developed within the white-dominated sectors of feminism, despite its commitment to resist all forms of oppression and domination. In this sense, anarcha-feminism needs to subjected to the kind of critique of white feminism that Mohanty undertakes, which I discussed in Chapter 4. Anarcha-feminism still does not have a specific critique of white supremacy or colonialism and as is dangerously close to repeating the sorts of essentialism that portray the term ‘feminism’ as a broad category but one only constituted by the perspectives of white feminists. Anarcha-feminism needs to attentive to this reality and attend to the critiques put forth by women of colour feminists, such as those I discussed in the previous chapter. In part anarcha-feminism might improve its theory and practice by responding to the Indigenous feminists I discuss below.

Anarcha-feminism presents a synthesis between the two in opposing both patriarchy and the state. Some theorists have noted the natural affinities between anarchism and feminism, with Lynne Farrow arguing that ‘feminism practices what anarchism preaches’ in terms of decentralized direct action (2002, 15) and Peggy Kornegger arguing that women are ‘intuitive anarchists’ that are prevented from such a realization by systems of patriarchy (2002, 27). I. Susan Brown, however, points out that such perspectives fail to account for the diversity within articulations of feminism, such as liberal, socialist or radical feminisms (1996, 152). She argues rather that anarchism adds to feminism a specific critique of the state, and more broadly hierarchy and power relations (Brown, 1996, 140). Anarcha-feminism,
therefore, seeks to stand against all forms of power relationships and does not believe that a feminization of the state, or more women being able to access and wield power would lead to a more just society, or an end to patriarchy. Anarcha-feminists critique socialist articulations of feminism for maintaining the state form, which they see as a specific articulation of power (C. Ehrlich, 1996, 174). In this way ‘[a]narchism transcends and contains feminism in its critique of power’ and remains flexible and broad in its contestation of all forms of oppression and domination (Brown, 1996, 153). Anarchism has the potential to resist all forms of oppression, while feminism has a tendency to focus on the specificity of women’s oppression.

Deric Shannon argues that while anarcha-feminism was previously predicated on a rejection of power, as suggested above, contemporary articulations of anarcha-feminism, in the wake of more complex understandings of power a la Michel Foucault, seek a more complex understanding of power. He suggests looking to Gordon (2008) with three different understandings of power: ‘1. Power-over as domination, 2. Power-to as capacity, and 3. Power-with as con-coercive influence’ (Shannon, 2009, 69). He argues that the contemporary anarcha-feminist project, therefore, must be one oriented to resisting domination in all its forms, rather than power as such. This commitment, he argues, requires an intersectional analysis of oppression (Shannon, 2009, 69), a commitment which finds its history in anti-racist work by feminists of colour such as bell hooks (see Mohanty, 2003). Shannon and Rogue point to the necessity of engaging with anti-racist women of colour feminisms who have specifically argued for intersectionality, against the sometimes narrow mainstream ‘white’ feminist focus on gender, as opposed to complexly examining the interplay of gender, race and class. It follows from this understanding of intersectionality that resistance to any form of domination is essential for moving towards a more just society and ‘[i]t is
unnecessary to create a totem pole of importance out of social struggles and suggest that some are “primary” while others are “secondary” or “peripheral” because of the complete ways they intersect and inform one another’ (Shannon and Rogue, 2009, 8).26

This commitment to intersectionality resonates with further feminist commitments to the ‘personal as political’, where personal acts of resistance may be seen as significant to fostering broader processes of resistance. This includes, importantly, the feminist history of consciousness raising groups (Ackelsberg, 2010, 110-111). Peggy Kornegger notes the anarchist tendencies of feminist consciousness raising groups that began in the 1960s. She notes the ‘emphasis on the small group as a basic organizational unit, on the personal and political, on anti-authoritarianism and on spontaneous direction as essentially anarchist’ elements within feminist consciousness raising (Kornegger, 2002, 27). Although prevalent within the 1960s, though less so of late, Cathy Levine (2002, 64) argues that consciousness raising is still an essential part of anarcha-feminism because the process is not yet finished. There needs to be work done to create alternative forms of culture in contest of patriarchy (an argument that resonates and ought to be taken up for perhaps both anarchist infrastructures of resistance and Indigenous calls for autonomy indicated above). Part of the anarcha-feminist commitment to resisting all forms of oppression and domination must focus on personal aspects of resistance, such as children, the family, and sexuality, a commitment that historical anarchist women have pushed as an addition to anarchist practice, occasionally against the established orthodoxy of anarchist theory at the time, and perhaps now as well (Leeder, 1996, 143). Marsha Hewitt credits the work of Emma

26 It must be pointed out that the use of the ‘totem pole’ as a theoretical symbol for the creation of hierarchies of oppression itself is inappropriate and indicates a lack of attention to the decolonization of language, even within an anarchist context of opposing all forms of oppression and domination. This indicates, as I will argue later in this chapter, the need for anarchism and anarcha-feminism to take up a commitment to anti-colonialism and critique of settler colonialism.
Goldman with pushing for recognizing that a revolution was also required in how we think and how we relate on the personal level. It was a push that ensured that revolution needed to occur both within the mind and within society at large and required a commitment to revolution in all aspects of life, including sexuality and intimate relationships (Hewitt, 1986, 170-171). Goldman argued for resistance to the ‘internal tyrants’ that operated at the psychic level to construct ethical and social norms, and specifically restricted and limited the lives of women and the possibility of autonomy and liberty (Goldman, 1969 [1917], 321).

The attainment of women’s emancipation therefore included both external forms of resistance as well as internal forms of resistance, which feminists in the 1960s took up under the framework of consciousness raising groups. Part of these personal forms of resistance pushed Goldman to critique women’s suffrage and marriage, critiques that still find resonance with anarcha-feminism today. She linked suffrage to a reformist tendency with the false belief that putting women into political positions would somehow alter the basic functioning of the state and capitalism (Goldman, 1969 [1917], 198). It was not that she was opposed to the equal right of women to have the same freedoms as men, but rather that she saw women’s suffrage as a continuation of the status quo of capitalism and the state. It would not bring revolutionary change. She argued that women ‘can give suffrage or the ballot no new quality, nor can she receive anything from it that will enhance her own quality. Her development, her freedom, her independence, must come from and through herself’ (Goldman, 1969 [1917], 210-211). It would be personal forms of resistance in the form of direct action that would be most effective in the attainment of women’s liberation.

Similarly, Goldman critiques marriage as an institution tied to the state and private property. She points out that private property lies at the very heart of the capitalist and wage system that bolsters the oppression and domination of the state (Goldman, 2005 [1897],
She likens marriage to a legal form of prostitution with the husbands’ domination of the women and her requirement to bow to his every need. She argues instead that what is needed is for women to have the freedom to be independent and act within the purview of their own decisions, just as men can within society. She states:

I demand the independence of women, her right to support herself; to live for herself; to love whomever she pleases, or as many as she pleases. I demand freedom for both sexes, freedom of action, freedom in love and freedom in motherhood. Do not tell me that all this can only be accomplished under Anarchy; this is entirely wrong. If we want to accomplish Anarchy, we must first have free women at least, those women who are just as independent as their brothers are, and unless we have free women, we cannot have free mothers, and if mothers are not free, we cannot expect the young generation to assist us in the accomplishment of our aim, that is the establishment of an anarchist society (Goldman, 2005 [1897], 249-250).

The above quotation highlights the core of Goldman’s thinking, that revolution is a personal process and that the emancipation of women needs to be attained within the revolution not after the revolution. Louis Michel highlights a similar understanding of women’s aims, alongside a damning charge towards men, with not a focus on getting exactly what men have but rather ‘knowledge, and education and liberty. We know what are rights are, and we demand them. Are we not standing next to you [men] fighting the supreme fight? Are you not strong enough, men, to make part of that supreme fight a struggle for the rights of women? And then men and women together will gain the rights of all humanity’ (2005 [1886], 242). These two quotations from two important anarchist feminist figures highlight an important point for those who might assert that anarcha-feminism is an unnecessary hyphenation of anarchism, given that anarchism is commitment to the destruction of all forms of oppression and domination.
“I’m an Anarchist, I Can’t be Sexist!?”

Although there have been many anarchists who have called for women’s liberation as part of the wider anarchist project (i.e. Bakunin and Kropotkin identified above), outside of anarchist women and those specifically committed to anarcha-feminism, there is a segment of the anarchist movement, dating to the sexism and misogynist beliefs of Pierre Proudhon which has carried forth an underlying sexism and diminishing of women’s struggles into the contemporary anarchist movement. The argument, so it goes, is that taking up a specific critique of patriarchy and what are deemed ‘women’s issues’ is unnecessary because they will be taken care of by anarchist revolution. This falls into the line of argument that states that because anarchism is committed to removing all forms of oppression and domination a specific anarcha-feminist orientation that specifically names patriarchy as a system of domination, is unnecessary, if not divisive. Similar arguments are often made regarding the relevance of women of colour and Indigenous feminist interventions. I aim to take stock of these sources of critique and criticism through the use of anarcha-Indigenism as an n-dimensional space of meeting in order to challenge the white-dominated aspects of anarchist theory and practice.

The argument in the form of anarcha-feminism being unnecessary has been recently repeated in the widely read and discussed Black Flame by Michael Schmidt and Lucien van der Walt who argue that ‘[t]he tendency of many writers to label women anarchists and syndicalists “anarchist-feminists” or “anarcha-feminists” is therefore problematic, as mentioned earlier, since both male and female anarchists and syndicalists generally advocated a feminist position’ (2009, 329). Certainly ascribing an anarcha-feminist label to women because they are women is a problematic move on the part of external observers. Their

27 An elaboration of Proudhon’s sexism and views towards women is beyond the scope of this chapter, but see for example, Gemie (1996) and generally Dupuis-Déri (2009).
point, as I have also pointed out above, is that beginning in the 1860s women’s issues were a principled commitment of the anarchist movement. This is certainly true and an important aspect of the historical anarchist movement that needs to be maintained. What they fail to recognize is that the label ‘anarcha-feminist’ exists for the specific reason. Although feminist analysis within anarchism has been a current since the 1860s, there has been sexism and misogyny within the anarchist movement that needs to be specifically addressed. Further, it may be argued that patriarchy is still relatively under theorized, in the sense of being widely analyzed within the anarchist movement in a broad sense. Anarcha-feminism exists as a specific tendency because this lack has been identified. It does not claim to carry greater analytical weight than other permutations of anarchism, and certainly has its own areas of improvement to consider, but it has specific commitments for the precise reason that they have received inadequate attention. Schmidt and van der Walt’s own book, although addressing issues of gender and anarchism, focuses explicitly on the subject for 50 pages in one chapter entitled “Anarchist Internationalism, and Race, Imperialism and Gender” in a near 400 page book. Similarly, Peter Marshall’s expansive volume *Demanding the Impossible* (2010), in its over 800 pages contains fewer than ten pages dedicated to the subject. These are but selective examples (and they cannot alone indicate the broader trends within anarchism), but anarcha-feminist orientations within anarchism are often dismissed as “problematic” while at the same time little attention is paid to the concerns that anarcha-feminism raises. The point is, if anarchism had paid sufficient attention to the concerns of women, feminism and patriarchal domination then perhaps there would be little need for explicit anarcha-feminism. The reality, however, suggests otherwise, and the continued need for anarcha-feminism.
To this effect Kornegger argues explicitly that ‘Anarchist men have been little better than males everywhere in their subjection of women. Thus the absolute necessity of feminist-anarchist revolution. Otherwise the very principles on which anarchism is based become utter hypocrisy’ (2002, 26). Alice Nutter as well locates a similar reality:

Revolutionary groups seldom address the day-to-day inequalities in their own kitchens. Issues around housework are seen as trivial. Twenty years ago the expression for it was “women’s work”. Lefty “man” may claim to be fighting for the freedom of mankind [sic], but that doesn’t means he wants his girlfriend to stop doing the washing (2002 [1997], 94).

She explains the lack of incentive for women to join revolutionary groups ‘when the general ethos is: you can fight our battles, but we’re not interested in yours’ (94). Sexism and dismissal are therefore realities that have been explicitly named within the anarchist movement, to which anarcha-feminism has aimed to respond. Dupuis-Déri notes that in the 2000s there was a general acknowledgment of the importance of patriarchy within anarchist statements from Europe and North America. He argues, however, that regular occurrences of sexual harassment, sexism and rape still occur even within anarchism. Anarchism, he states flatly, does not make sexism impossible (Dupuis-Déri, 2009, 48). Dupuis-Déri highlights five reasons/explanations for ‘anarchosexualism’: ‘(1) the effects of non-anarchist and patriarchal socialization; (2) the effects of sexist anarchist tradition; (3) anarchist machismo and anti-feminism; (4) strategic priority (anti-capitalism must come first); (5) the interests of men as a class’ (2009, 49). He argues that the existence of these sorts of dynamics and reasonings requires that anarchist men understand themselves as holding privilege where women are constructed as ‘the oppressed gender-based class (56). Anarchist men must therefore recognize the importance of feminism in the challenging of gender-based privilege and see the contradiction in arguing against the hierarchy of bosses and politicians while maintaining hierarchical attitudes towards women. He therefore calls for a
process of ‘disempowerment’ which requires ‘reducing the power we exert as men over women as individuals and as a group, and reducing the power that we draw from alliances with other men’ (Dupuis-Déri, 2009, 60).

Anarchists, therefore, can claim to be against all forms of oppression and domination, but unless our theory and practice is attentive to patriarchal, gender-based and sexuality-based forms of oppression and domination, then our theory will fall flat in practice (Gaarder, 2009, 46). Given that patriarchy is definitely still alive and well and many social indicators still detail the inequalities between men and women and the daily struggles that women must face against sexism and sexual violence have not disappeared, anarchism needs to take up a feminist analysis within its theory and practice. To do otherwise would be to fail to live up to a commitment to challenge all forms of oppression and domination. As the Anarchist Federation of Norway (ANORG) argues ‘anarchism must also be feminist, otherwise it is a question of patriarchal half-anarchism, and not real anarchism. It is the task of the anarcho-feminists to secure the feminist feature in anarchism. There will be no anarchism without feminism’ (cited in Hewitt, 1986, 168). I would add that the responsibility lies not just with self-defined anarcha-feminists, but with all anarchists to ensure committed resistance to patriarchy in all of its manifestations. Anarcha-feminism is not about erecting a hierarchy of oppression but rather recognizing ‘the element of anarchism that seems to need the most emphasis’ (Kurin, 2004, 261, see also Shannon, 2009). This should not mean that all anarchists suddenly become anarcha-feminists by self-definition, as there are a multitude of anarchisms (anarcho-syndicalism, -communism, -primitivism, -Indigenism etc.), but it

---

28 I have focused mostly in my discussion of anarcha-feminism on the relations between men and women, perhaps with an assumed heterosexual bias. There is an emerging literature on anarchism and queer theory that warrants discussion, but is beyond the scope of this chapter. Like feminism, this is a theoretical and practical area that anarchism needs to engage with on a much more dedicated basis. See, for example, Heckert, 2006 and the *Sexualities* Special Issue *August 2010; 13* (4), (Ken Plummer, ed.) and in relation to anarcha-feminism explicitly, see Shannon, 2009)
does mean that anarcha-feminism is an important part of anarchist theory and practice and needs to be understood and affirmed within anarcha-Indigenism as well.

We need to see challenging patriarchy broadly, as well as sexism, rape and gendered violence within social movements, as integral to seeking to enact anarchist theory in practice. We need to see that:

Both men and women are oppressed. Because anarchism provides a critical analysis of power, anarcha-feminism gives us the tools to address all forms of oppression and to act in solidarity with the oppressed, thus avoiding a reductionist understanding of power based on class or gender. It also enables us to work in solidarity and mutual aid despite our differences, for though our experiences of power might differ, illegitimate power is our common enemy (de Heredia, 2007, 56).

Anarcha-feminism thus provides tools of critique, analysis, action and resistance that are sorely needed within the anarchist movement and aims to push feminist discourse towards an anti-state orientation. If we are committed to ending all forms of oppression and domination and constructing alternative communities, we must seriously consider keeping the hyphen between anarchism and feminism, although as I argue next, this is not adequate enough when Indigenous feminist critiques are examined.

**Patriarchy and Colonization: The ‘Need’ For Indigenous Feminism**

Much like anarcha-feminism, Indigenous articulations of feminism have been met with a variety of reactions within Indigenous struggles for self-determination and freedom. Specifically, the term feminism has been met with a great deal of hostility, largely for its association with the white women’s movement and its inattention to colonialism and the particularity of Indigenous struggles and women’s issues (see specifically Jaimes, 1992; Grande, 2004; Trask, 1996). Jaimes (1992, 314) cites Lorlei Means, capturing the sentiment towards feminism expressed by some Indigenous women: ‘We are American Indian Women,
in that order. We are oppressed, first and foremost, as American Indians, as people colonized by the United States of America, not as women…’. Indigenous women’s identity as women, is therefore deemed to be secondary to broader and more general struggles for self-determination and against colonialism. It is argued that those Indigenous women who have taken up the label feminist have been among the ‘more assimilated’ and closely tied to the white women’s movement (Jaimes, 1992, 331).29

This section aims to look at theorists and activists that argue in favour of taking up feminism within Indigenous struggles, while taking account of the specificity and diversity of the movement, and Indigenous feminist critiques of mainstream feminisms. By exploring Indigenous women’s theorizations of (hetero)patriarchy’s explicit relationship to colonialism and the nation-state, I aim to suggest, following Indigenous feminists, critiques of colonialism as a necessary component of anarcha-Indigenist, anarcha-feminist, broad feminist, and a general activist practice.

Andrea Smith (2005a, 2005b, 2008a, 2008b, 2010a, 2010b; also Stevenson, 2011) makes explicit the link between colonialism and patriarchy. She identifies patriarchy as essential for the colonization of Indigenous communities through the creation of hierarchal relationships within generally egalitarian societies. She argues that hierarchy and misogyny needed to be naturalized in order for the colonial process to go forward. Patriarchy was a system that was forced onto Indigenous communities to inscribe them with hierarchy and domination (Smith, 2005a, 23). Smith points to heteropatriarchy as the core logic that has been imported from European societies and put in place in order to naturalize hierarchies within Indigenous communities:

29 Jaimes has recently altered her position on feminism arguing for a ‘Native Feminist Spirituality’ (Jaimes-Guerrero, 2003). This change is acknowledged by many other Indigenous women feminists, see for example Ramirez (2007).
Just as the patriarchs rule the family, the elites of the nation-state rule their citizens. Consequently, when colonists came to this land, they saw the necessity of instilling patriarchy in Native communities, because they realized that indigenous peoples would not accept colonial domination if their own indigenous societies were not structured on the basis of social hierarchy. Patriarchy in turn rests on a binary gender system; hence it is not a coincidence that colonizers also targeted indigenous peoples who did not fit within this binary model. In addition, gender violence is a primary tool of colonialism and white supremacy (Smith, 2008b).

Indigenous societies, and specifically the roles and positions of Indigenous women, were not, evidently, as the colonizers expected when compared to European society and thus the project of colonialism needed to twin racism with heteropatriarchy (Stevenson, 2011, 47).

Scott Morgensen, drawing from the work of Jasbir Puar on ‘homonationalism’ and the war on terror argues that Indigenous peoples who held roles that did not conform to Western binaries of gender were conceived of as queer and therefore ‘marked for death’. He argues that the processes of colonization created a ‘settler sexuality’ anchored in white heteronormativity that supplanted Indigenous sexualities with the ‘sexual modernity of settler subjects’ (Morgensen, 2010, 106). He argues further that modern understandings of sexuality have arisen within the specific context of settler colonialism. Within this context ‘[t]errorizing violence marked Native peoples as sexually deviant populations to be subjected to a colonial education of desire…Settlement and its naturalization then conditioned the emergence of modern queer formations, including their inheritance and sustaining of colonial biopolitics in the form of settler homonationalism’ (Morgensen, 2010, 110).

Morgensen is arguing that modern constructions of queer sexuality have arisen from the

---

30 A discussion of non-binary gender conceptions within Indigenous communities, and their relation to feminism, is beyond the scope of this chapter and this thesis more broadly. For discussion of this subject see for example Gilley (2006); Jacobs, Thomas and Lang (1997); and the special issue of the Journal of Gay and Lesbian Studies (16) 1-2: ‘Sexuality, Nationality, Indigeneity’. Justice, Rifkin and Schneider (eds.).
colonial process of settlement and that queer subjects’ participation within the settler colonial state serves to police and manage Indigenous populations (i.e. homonationalism). Settler colonialism, with settler sexuality as part of its force of oppression and domination, therefore needs to be challenged within both settler and Indigenous communities.

Part of the institutionalization of heteropatriarchy within Indigenous communities sought to construct Indigenous women as ‘dirty’ and less than human by employing a colonizing interpretation of the bible. In this view the ‘rape of bodies that are constructed as inherently impure or dirty simply does not count’ (Smith, 2005a, 10). The view that ‘Native bodies are inherently rapable’ is then further expanded using colonial logic to argue that ‘Native lands are also inherently violable’ (Smith, 2005a, 12). The institution of heteropatriarchy and the sanctioned rape of Indigenous bodies thus provided a pretext for expanded colonialism and the theft and destruction of Indigenous lands, a pretext that continues to be employed in contemporary discourses related to Indigenous women (see Smith 2005a).

Sarah Deer argues that rape is a deeply embedded part of the colonial project, with survivors of rape and colonization exhibiting similar symptoms such as self-blame, depression, etc. She argues that both rape and colonization are acts of violence in which the perpetrators thrive on the power and control that they hold over their victims (Deer, 2009, 150). Instances of rape, gendered violence and heteropatriarchy, have therefore profoundly affected Indigenous communities. Poupart (2003) links the continuation of these forces of domination and oppression to the existence of internalized oppression within Indigenous communities. She argues that Indigenous peoples have internalized the oppressive and dominating logics of the colonizer. She argues that through the ‘internaliz[ation of] the dominant subject position, we become our own oppressors as we carry our abjection within.
We view ourselves and other group(s) as essentially responsible for our political, economic, social and cultural disempowerment. The dominant culture no longer needs to overtly force, threaten, or coerce our disempowerment, for now we enforce it within ourselves and within our communities’ (Poupart, 2003, 90). She goes on to argue that Indigenous communities have internalized heteropatriarchy through destruction of their traditional cultures, with the positioning of women and children as subjects of male domination (Poupart, 2003, 91, see also Smith, 2005a, 13). Maracle (1988, 24, 114), among others, notes that the internalization of oppression has taken on the form of tradition. She suggests that understandings of tradition and Indigenous knowledges have themselves internalized oppression within Indigenous communities, and have served to maintain a hierarchy where men are above women. She points out how Indigenous womanhood has been devalued within Indigenous communities as below Indigenous masculinity, which itself is below white femininity, with white masculinity taking the seat at the top of the gender hierarchy.

A component of the process of internalization of oppression has occurred as a result of residential and boarding schools, with their legacies of physical, sexual and emotional abuse (see Smith, 2005a, 35-54). Part of the devaluation of womanhood has arisen as a result of internalized oppression where Indigenous women do not support one another and erase themselves. Maracle argues that Indigenous women have become ‘slaves with [their] own consent’ (1988, 21). The imperative to resist colonialism and heteropatriarchy must therefore be both a personal and collective process. It means therefore that family and gender violence are understood as ‘an operation of power within the white male-patriarchal structure, a structure that [Indigenous communities] were forced to accept and have now internalized’, a structure in which such violence is a form of genocide (Poupart, 2003, 95).

---

31 See also Guerrero, (1992) for specific examination of internalized oppression, sexism and the devaluation of women’s contributions in Indigenous activist movements.
Additionally, part of the internalization of heteropatriarchy and gender roles has led to homophobia within Indigenous communities. Lee Maracle (1988) points to part of the reason for homophobia as due to the fact that lesbianism, in particular, is threatening to Indigenous men because they find the potential that women could love other women to be threatening. This occurs under the widespread spousal and family violence that Maracle discusses throughout her book *I am Woman* (1988) (which is also detailed in Andrea Smith’s work and in Poupart, 2003). Indigenous men are threatened by the fact that, because they treat Indigenous women so poorly, they might seek love with other women instead. Maracle argues that if the brutal sex and rape that characterize Indigenous families is understood as ‘the best we can get, the norm, then, naturally, we are going to hate women who love women and don’t have to put up with the violence that degrades women in North America’ (Maracle, 1988, 31). Maracle ultimately traces the enforcement of gendered oppression and the removal of sexual autonomy to systemically ‘organized rape’ (Maracle, 1988, 31).

Patriarchy, twinned with colonialism, has therefore been a pervasive force of oppression and domination within Indigenous communities and specifically in terms of the lives of Indigenous women.

Heteropatriarchal domination within Indigenous communities has also been formally institutionalized within the context of law and government legislation. The Indian Act, passed in 1868 in Canada, and amended several times until its current form in 1985, was employed as a specific tool of the Canadian state to institute patriarchy within Indigenous

---

32 Clearly LGBTQQTS communities are not free from domestic and family forms of violence as it seems that Maracle suggests, and certainly such communities are on the receiving end of institutional forms of violence and oppression in a broader social context. The point in her argument is that homosexually is perceived as threat to masculinity within Indigenous communities and thus homophobia arises.
communities.\textsuperscript{33} The Indian Act institutionalized the superior status of men by legislating the parameters under which official ‘Indian Status’, determined by blood, could be passed down. It effectively, until changes in 1985, removed the status of Indigenous women who married non-Indigenous men and their children, while protecting the status of Indigenous men who married non-Indigenous women. The result, therefore, was the loss of status for tens of thousands of Indigenous people. It also focused the right over the family into the hands of exclusively Indigenous men. Joanne Barker points out that heterosexual men’s roles within Indigenous communities were ‘systemically elevated’ above those of Indigenous women via systems of Christianity, capitalism, sexism and homophobia and legislative impositions under the Indian Act (2008, 263). The loss of status under the Indian Act is but a further colonial process that specifically targeted Indigenous women, removed their status and internalized heteropatriarchy and women’s oppression.

As a result of the internalization of heteropatriarchy within Indigenous communities, and the continued oppression and domination of Indigenous women, it is argued that sexual violence and heteropatriarchy cannot be separated from Indigenous struggles for sovereignty and self-determination (Smith, 2005a, 137). Indigenous feminism, therefore, seeks to maintain an analysis of heteropatriarchy as essential to Indigenous struggles. Indigenous women, Guerrero argues, are faced with a ‘double burden’ because they must deal with both domination by racism and sexism as a result of ‘patriarchal colonialism’ that holds up a dominant European male subject (2003, 65). This process of ‘dual marginalization’ points to the need for taking up feminism within Indigenous communities (Huhndorf and Suzack, 2010, 8). These systems of heteropatriarchy and colonialism are not old or new, but have been maintained since the time of contact and thus need to be fought here and now (Barker,

\textsuperscript{33} For an extensive and detailed examination of the Indian Act and its affects on Indigenous identity see Lawrence (2004).
2008, 264). If the general characteristic of feminism ‘takes gender seriously as a social organizing process and, within the context of patriarchal societies, seeks to identify ways on which women are subordinated to men and how women can be emancipated from this subordination’ (Green, 2007, 21) then there is, as illustrated above, a need for feminist analysis within Indigenous communities. Hence, the imperative of Indigenous feminism that takes on both colonialism and heteropatriarchy, and anarchist attention to such critiques to decolonize its white-dominated theory and practice. Bringing Indigenous feminism to engage within the n-dimensional meeting place of anarcha-Indigenism might be one step towards this goal.

**Defining Indigenous Feminism**

The first point that must be clarified with regard to the aim of articulating an Indigenous feminism is the diversity that exists within both the feminist movement as well as within and between Indigenous communities. Smith (2005b, 118) argues that the issues facing Indigenous women, their understandings of feminism and their perspectives on what needs to be done within their communities are ‘complex and varied’ and cannot be subsumed under a monolithic definition of feminism (which Mohanty challenges and of which anarcha-feminism is connected to) or to the dichotomy that has been created between a feminist and nonfeminist perspective. Rather the diversity of feminism and Indigenous women’s interactions with it must be affirmed. The one common denominator that exists between Indigenous women, argue Huhndorf and Suzack (2010), is their experience with colonialism as a general system of oppression and domination. The diversity of women’s perspectives is further emphasized by the range of articles in Huhndorf and Suzack’s *Indigenous Women and Feminism: Politics, Activism, Culture* (2010) as well as Green’s *Making Space*
for Indigenous Feminism (2007). Again the diversity of Indigenous women’s specific experiences under patriarchy and colonialism cannot be deemphasized; however Indigenous women are linked in their similar position as Indigenous peoples and the overarching system of colonialism that has facilitated dispossession and domination. Indigenous women’s experiences are also different from those of other feminists as a result of their ties to nation-based struggles of self-determination.\(^{34}\)

It is also paramount to consider the resistance that has been taken up by Indigenous women since the first impositions of colonialism and heteropatriarchy. Indigenous women have not been simply passive recipients of oppression and domination, but have been at the centre of Indigenous struggles of resistance with the aim of preserving a future for coming generations (Guerrero, 1992, 314 and Guerrero, 1992; Maracle, 1988 generally). Indigenous women engaged in concerted acts of resistance against the attacks by heteropatriarchy and colonialism on their power and autonomy as part of diverse Indigenous communities. This resistance included resisting those attacks that would ultimately undermine Indigenous communities’ ‘socio-economic autonomy’ and ‘socio-cultural cohesion’ (Stevenson, 2011, 49). Indigenous communities, and specifically Indigenous women, sought to maintain their autonomy in all of its forms, as well as the freedoms and integral roles they held within Indigenous societies.

Historic understandings and representations of Indigenous societies as well must be accounted for their diversity. This includes the roles and positions fulfilled by women and non-binary gendered individuals. Although not a uniform history of female power and social egalitarianism, nor a history free of gendered violence, many pre-contact Indigenous societies have been viewed as much more egalitarian and respectful of women’s roles and duties to

\(^{34}\) For further discussion on Indigenous women and nationalism see Ramirez (2007) and Sunseri (2011)
the community. This is a current that is identified in the majority of Indigenous feminist writings examined in this chapter. Guerrero, for example, points to Haudenosaunee traditional societies with women as the clan mothers responsible for the selection of chiefs and with the right to remove poor leadership. She argues that many Indigenous societies functioned along matrilineal lines (Guerrero, 1992, 317-318), which indicates part of the reason why European settlers saw traditional Indigenous structures as a threat to their own systems of gendered domination and oppression (Smith, 2005a, 18). Some have even gone as far as to argue that feminism is rooted in the historical record of women’s positions in Indigenous societies (Paula Gunn Allen in Smith, 2005a, 24).

The historical record of more general widespread egalitarianism where women did hold some different roles than Indigenous men, is one that suggests a respect and affirmation of Indigenous women’s central role to Indigenous societies (see for example, Maracle, 1988). As such, there is a crucial difference in how feminism might be conceptualized between Indigenous and settler communities. As Andrea Smith points out, part of this difference lies in that Indigenous women, in many Indigenous societies, have experienced a loss of previously held traditional status and power, while settler feminist movements have focused on attaining a status for women that largely did not exist previously within the patriarchal European context (2008, 128).

The diversity of feminism in Indigenous communities and histories suggests, in opposition to those who would reject feminism as a white dominated theoretical perspective, that these are terms that are contested and complex. They need to be engaged to add further depth and understanding to how they are used and what they mean (Smith, 2008a, 121). For Indigenous women to disregard feminism as inherently colonial or accept the division between Indigeneity and feminism is to cede the discipline to the domination of white
feminists, rather than exploring how feminism might be useful for Indigenous communities (Altamirano-Jimenez 2010). Indigenous women therefore have the potential to inject an analysis of colonialism into feminism. As Maracle argues: ‘The women’s movement is all about the liberation of humanity from the yoke of domination. It is all about the fight against racism and sexism and its effects on our consciousness, no matter what colour you are. It is about the struggle for unity between oppressed women and men’ (1988, 181). Feminism, and Indigenous feminism as a part of such a dynamic movement, has broad implications for all people. To cede it to the concerns of only white mainstream feminists does little to advance the liberation and emancipation of all peoples. Rather white feminisms, such as anarcha-feminism, need to be subjected to the challenges and criticisms put forth by Indigenous and women of colour feminisms – an engagement that might occur in the n-dimensional meeting place of anarcha-Indigenism.

Deploying an Indigenous feminism, and drawing from the work done by other women of colour, suggests a need to understand race, gender, sexually, class and colonization as intersectional forces of oppression, that all must be challenged if freedom and justice are to be attained (Smith, 2005a, 15). As Altamirano-Jimenez (2010, 116) explains ‘Indigenous feminism is about engaging with the possibilities of decolonizing while not losing sight of the power relations that inform difference both internally and externally’, while employing a ‘material, multi-layer view of the power relations and practices affecting women’ (121). She links the need for a critique of power relations to how notions of ‘Indigeneity’ are constructed, how they can be exclusive, hierarchical and further embed gender and class relations of power (114). Part of this intersectional analysis requires linking processes of colonization and genocide with destruction of the environment (Jaimes-Guerrero, 2003, 68; Smith 2005a, 55-78). In this way Indigenous feminism takes on an anti-
oppressive analysis of power relations, which includes men and a critical view to how
tradition is remembered, practiced and employed (Green, 2007, 26-27). It advocates a move
towards an ‘inclusive feminism’ with the aim of resisting and disrupting unequal structures of
power (Stewart-Harawira, 2007, 128). Indigenous feminism aims to promote liberation for all
people, while looking at the experiences of Indigenous women in particular. As a result it
carries significance for others beyond both Native American studies and feminism (Smith,
2008b, 275). In its critique of colonialism that has taken place within Indigenous
communities, Indigenous feminism requires resistance to colonialism everywhere, in all
societies and the liberation of all peoples (Maracle, 1988, 160) through decolonization.

Lina Sunseri (2011, 158) defines decolonization as the ‘process by which the
longstanding colonial relations between Aboriginals and non-Aboriginals are abolished and
new relations formed. These relations will be based on principles of mutual respect, sharing
and recognition of the inherent rights of Aboriginal peoples to follow their traditional ways
of governance’. An understanding of colonialism and the imperative of decolonization,
therefore suggests that a specific critique of the nation-states that have benefited from and
continue to facilitate processes of colonization is required. It requires a critical view of state
power as a force of oppression within Indigenous communities and a barrier to revitalizing
autonomous, self-determining forms of traditional governance.

**Indigenous Feminisms Against the State**

Indigenous feminists have been at the forefront within Indigenous communities of
voicing critiques of the nation-state, state-based violence and reformist strategies for social
change. Andrea Smith, in particular, has been at the forefront of theorizing Indigenism
feminism outside and against the nation-state. She has presented a nuanced and specific
understanding of the nation-state as a force of oppression within Indigenous communities, that it warrants quoting her at length:

Putting Native women at the center of analysis compels us to look at the role of the state in perpetuating both race-based and gender-based violence. We cannot limit our conception of sexual violence to individual acts of rape – rather it encompasses a wide range of strategies designed not only to destroy peoples, but to destroy their sense of being a people (Smith, 2005a, 3).

She continues:

If we acknowledge the state as a perpetrator of violence against women (particularly indigenous women and women of colour) and as a perpetrator of genocide against indigenous peoples, we are challenged to imagine alternative forms of government that do not presume the continuing existence of the US in particular and the nation-state in general (Smith, 2005a, 5).

Smith therefore calls for a grounding, a specific analysis of the nation-state as a perpetrator of violence and previous and continued colonization of Indigenous peoples. She argues, in great detail and specificity in the book Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide (2005a), that strategies for resisting violence within Indigenous communities have been ineffective within the frameworks of the state. Criminal justice responses to sexual violence have served to further increase the incarceration of Indigenous peoples (already possessing the highest rates of incarceration, which she argues is a continuation of colonialism and attacks on Indigenous nations) and reliance on the courts/legal system fails to account for the role that the police have played in perpetuating state forms of violence within Indigenous communities (Smith, 2005a, 144). Sarah Deer (2009) points to adversarial nature of European systems of justice, as contrary to traditional forms of dispute resolution within Indigenous communities. She argues that there is little hope for Indigenous women to ‘find justice in a system that was designed to destroy them’ (Deer, 2009, 154). Because of the ties of sexual violence to colonization, she argues that similar strategies need to be developed to
combat both colonialism and sexual violence. A critique of the nation-state must also
necessarily involve looking at legislative forms of state violence, as indicated above in my
brief discussion of the Indian Act in Canada (Sunseri, 2011).

In order to resist the encroachment of the nation-state on Indigenous communities
and its perpetuation of violence, Smith argues, drawing from Sista II Sista, for a dual strategy
of resistance, with both the ‘making’ and ‘taking’ of power. She explains that ‘it is necessary
to engage in oppositional politics to corporate and state power (‘taking power’). However, if
we only engage in the politics of taking power, we will have a tendency to replicate the
hierarchical structures in our movements. Consequently, it is also important to “make
power” by creating those structures within our organizations, movements and communities
that model the world we are trying to create (Smith, 2005b, 130). She suggests the goal of
making power as the creation of ‘autonomous zones’ of resistance to state power that
expand (Smith, 2008b, 313) and aim to ‘squeeze out the state’ rather than take it over (Smith,
2010b). Both forms of resistance are necessary in order to both combat oppression and
domination here and now, as well as to begin to create a different world for the future.

A critique of the state also includes looking at those organizations and groups that
are funded and dependent on the state for their existence. Indigenous feminists put forth a
critique of what some have termed the ‘Non-Profit Industrial Complex’ where NGO groups
are wedded to the wishes of their funding organizations, foundations and governments and
prevented from advancing social change at an effective, wide reaching and intersectional
level (Smith, 2005a).35 These groups are prevented in working towards comprehensive
revolutionary change and are forced into accepting piecemeal and reformist modes of social
change activism. Indigenous feminists recognize that this mode of social change will do little

35 For an in-depth examination of the NGO Industrial Complex see Incite! Women of Colour (2007).
to remove institutionalized systems of oppression resulting from colonialism, patriarchy and the state, and thus advocate for grassroots, community-based resistance that aims to both make and take power.

Indigenous feminists, therefore, have put forth a comprehensive critique of the state as tied to heteropatriarchy, colonialism and the perpetration of violence within Indigenous communities. Feminism therefore has a lot it might learn from Indigenous feminists, but what might Indigenous feminists continue to take from feminism? What might the relationship of Indigenous feminism and the feminist movement broadly look like?

For feminism to find resonance and applicability within Indigenous communities, its associations with white women’s movements need to be recognized and critiqued, with a foregrounding of colonialism in relation to heteropatriarchy and the state. This means recognizing the privileges that white women carry as a result of colonialism and racism. Janet McCloud makes the following demand of white feminists and other progressives, which must be an imperative consideration for anarcha-feminism, against the cultural imperialism (cited in Guerrero, 1992, 333) that is often exercised over Indigenous movements:

You join us in liberating our land and lives. Lose the privilege you acquire at our expense by occupying our land. Make that your first priority for as long as it takes to make it happen. Then we’ll join you in fixing up whatever’s left of class and gender problems in your society, and our own, if need be. But if you’re not willing to do that, then don’t presume to tell us how we should go about our liberation…” (cited in Guerrero, 1992, 314).

Taking up feminism within Indigenous communities, at the same time requires that the broader feminist community take up a critique of colonialism, racism and the privileges that specific constituencies of feminists might accrue from such processes (Smith, 2005a, 8). It means that ‘land rights, self-determination and sovereignty are conceptualized as feminist
issues’ (Smith, 2008b, 130) and feminists understand the links of such issues to colonialism and racism.

Finally, by taking up an Indigenous feminist analysis, Indigenous communities will need to critically look at themselves, and the heteropatriarchal and colonial dynamics that have been perpetuated within them. Smith (2008, 158) summarizes the imperative of attending to the critiques brought forth by Indigenous feminists within Indigenous communities:

Regardless of the origins of sexism in Native communities it speaks with full force today and requires strategies that directly address it. Before Native peoples fight for the future of their nations, they must ask themselves who is included in the nation. It is often the case that gender justice is articulated as being separate from issues of survival for indigenous peoples. Such an understanding presupposes that we could actually decolonize without addressing sexism, which ignores the fact that it was precisely through gender violence that we lost our lands in the first place (A. Smith, 1999b).

Indigenous feminism is, therefore, an important field of critique that must be understood and considered by anarcha-Indigenism as it challenges other theoretical perspectives to challenge all systems of oppression and domination in the n-dimensional space of meeting. It breaks new ground by specifically paying close attention to the concerns and needs of Indigenous women. It grounds a critique of patriarchy and colonialism, as twin systems of oppression that feed off and reinforce one another. Indigenous feminism argues for the necessity of feminism because of the existence of patriarchy within Indigenous communities. Addressing sexism and gendered violence is not just an add-on to struggles for self-determination and autonomy. As such, Indigenous feminists take up an intersectional analysis of power dynamics and insist upon a broad outlook that seeks the liberation and freedom of all peoples. Indigenous feminists finally tie struggles against colonialism to resistance against and outside the state form. It is the state that has benefited from and
continued colonization and therefore it is a system that must be opposed, along with a
critique of those who might work within its boundaries but not question its existence in
violent oppression and domination. Indigenous feminism thus presents a comprehensive
critique of oppression and domination, focused on colonialism, the state and
heteropatriarchy that must be taken up by anarchy-Indigenism in theory and practice.

Conclusion: Toward an Anti-State and Anti-Colonial Feminism – Expanding
Anarcha-Indigenism

In this chapter I have aimed to locate anarcha-feminism and Indigenous feminism
within their specific literatures and as necessary considerations anarcha-Indigenism in theory
and practice. Here I look at some of the resonances between each of the perspectives and
suggest ways in which each might benefit from engagement with the other. As has been
argued above, anarcha-feminism has been identified as a necessary, but ultimately
incomplete, project given the existence of sexism and patriarchy within the anarchist
movement and society at large, as well as the lack of anti-state analysis within the broader
feminist movement. Anarcha-feminism’s inattention to colonialism, white supremacy and its
location within white-dominated feminism leaves it wanting and in need of expansion.
Indigenous feminism, and women of colour feminism discussed in previous chapters, has
been argued as necessary for Indigenous communities that have been simultaneously
oppressed by colonialism and heteropatriarchy as linked forms of domination.

The feminist perspectives discussed here identify looking inward at internal
processes of oppression and domination as a core commitment, and argue for increased
focus on gender and sexuality that have been treated as secondary to wider goals and
struggles. Rooting out internal forms of oppression and domination is an essential part of
the construction of alternative communities outside the state form. Anarcha-feminism and Indigenous feminism present some of the tools that are necessary for resisting oppression in and across social movements when engaged within the n-dimensional space of anarcha-Indigenism.

Both anarcha-feminism and Indigenous feminism are unique forms of feminism because they seek to push feminist analysis of all forms of oppression and domination further to address specific gaps that have been identified in feminist theory and practice. Anarcha-feminism has aimed to group feminist practice and analysis of patriarchy within a critique of the state form and reformist oriented forms of resistance that play into state forms of control. It does, however, need to commit to answering the challenges put forth by Indigenous and women of colour feminists with regard to white supremacy and colonialism. Indigenous feminism couples a feminist analysis of heteropatriarchy with colonialism and how these dynamics play into state forms of violence. Both feminist perspectives articulated here locate the need to push feminist analyses of power and intersectionality of oppression further, into a more comprehensive critique of society. They both suggest the imperative to be ‘feminists without apology’ (Smith, 2008a, 2005b) in social movements and maintain the importance of feminist work and analysis. Heteropatriarchy cannot be an afterthought of broader social change. In the case of my examinations in this thesis, heteropatriarchy and the analytical perspectives of anarchist and Indigenous feminists need to inform anarcha-Indigenism, by tying critique of the state, colonialism and heteropatriarchy together under the proposed n-dimensional space of meeting.

Despite the similarities that might exist between anarcha-feminism and Indigenous feminism, each carries a significant set of differences. First of all, the context in which each is articulated must be considered. Anarchism has largely been a white dominated movement,
at least within the contemporary North American context, and as such has specific privileges that are accrued from white supremacy, as well as settler colonialism. This is not to say that anarchists, who oppose all forms of oppression and domination, do not take on a self-critical analysis of white supremacy; however, the fact must be stated that for many anarchists white (and colonial) privilege exists and will continue to do so under the current regimes of power. Indigenous peoples, as suggested above, exist in a different context, on the opposite side of white supremacy and colonialism. They have been resisting since first contact the imposition of colonialism and European society onto their communities. Where anarchists have been able to integrate and enjoy privileges within the larger scope of society (though occasionally concealing their politics), Indigenous peoples have had to fight for inclusion, basic rights and the very status of being human.

The context of colonialism, therefore, presents a significant context of difference between anarchists and Indigenous peoples generally, while keeping in mind the breadth of difference and diversity within each movement. Recognizing these differences requires that anarchists (and other people) who amass privilege from racism and colonialism need to undertake a self critical process of ‘unsettling’ and decolonization if alliances and conversations between anarchists and Indigenous peoples are to take place without replicating systems of oppression (Day, 2008, 18; see Regan, 2010 generally). This process will be essential before any possibilities of mutual engagement can occur.

So what then does considering each of these perspectives present for the other? For anarchism an Indigenous feminist perspective grounds colonialism as a specific form of oppression and domination that needs to be considered along with heteropatriarchy, capitalism and the state. Smith (2008, xi) specially locates a lack of attention to Indigenous struggles and anti-colonial analysis within activist movements at large. She notes part of the
dynamics of progressive activist movements interacting with Indigenous peoples movements by paraphrasing Sharon Venne (1998, 24), in that ‘non-Native supposed allies pay lip service to supporting Native sovereignty struggles but continue to exercise paternalistic control over Native peoples within the context of coalitions through hoarding information, disrespecting the ability of indigenous peoples to make their own decisions and so on’ (Smith, 2008a, 222). Anarchists and activists in general need to begin to engage with anti-colonial critiques put forth by Indigenous peoples and specifically tied to heteropatriarchy by Indigenous women. Anarcha-feminists in particular, might have a particular affinity with Indigenous women with their focus on patriarchy and the state. Colonialism, therefore, ought to be seen as an ‘aberration’ to be resisted alongside patriarchy and the state.

Andrea Smith argues that Native Studies in general, and by extension Indigenous feminism in particular, has the potential to ‘inform and be informed by other intellectual approaches and methods’ (2008, xv). In this view Indigenous feminism can lend a critique of colonialism to anarcha-feminism (and anarchism and social justice movements broadly) and further develop the intersectional commitments of anarcha-Indigenism as an n-dimensional space of meeting. Anarchism might be able to complement the work being done within Indigenous feminism to critique the state and develop a more complex understanding of power (as per Gordon cited above). There is I think ground, therefore, for more fruitful discussion, debate and engagement between anarcha-feminism and Indigenous feminism. Similarities in focusing on critiques of the state, reformist political organizing, sexism within social movements and an intersectional analysis of all forms of oppression and domination suggest the possibility of engagement and cross pollination between anarcha-feminism and Indigenous feminism. Anarcha-feminism, to take its claims of intersectionality seriously, needs to commit to a critique of colonialism and white supremacy in its theory and practice.
Anarcha-Indigenism, as an emerging theoretical perspective has begun to take up some of this work and I hope that the material discussed in this chapter and thesis expands the possibilities within anarchist theory and practice to focus on fighting against all forms of oppression. Feminist analyses, whether from anarchist, Indigenous, or people of colour feminism will be essential in order to maintain a critique of internal and external forms of oppression as they manifest themselves within struggles of resistance. As long as anarchists claim a lack of need for explicit feminist analysis, and as long as they ignore colonialism and the struggles of Indigenous peoples, the hope of a movement committed to resisting all forms of oppression and domination will be limited and the construction of alternatives will carry the potential to be mired by internal forms of oppression. It is my hope that anarcha-Indigenism presents one possibility to attending colonial realities within anarchism, feminism and Indigenous political theory, and beyond.
Chapter 6

Anarchism, Anti-Colonialism and Riot 2010: Anti-Colonial Resistance to the

Vancouver 2010 Olympics and the G20 Summit in Toronto

Two thousand and ten was dubbed ‘Riot 2010’ by anarchists and militant radicals of a variety of stripes due to the large number of capitalist oriented mega-events occurring throughout the year (PGA Montreal, 2008; Anarchist Resistance n.d.). Three events in particular were on the radar to be resisted by activists: the 2010 Winter Olympics taking place in Vancouver and Whistler BC in February, the G20 and G8 Leaders Summits taking place in Toronto and Huntsville in June and initially a meeting of state in North America and key corporate allies as part of the Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP). The SPP meeting never materialized and those working on the project declared that it was over, though forms of integration and cooperation have continued between Canada, the US and Mexico since under other names and mandates. Both the Olympics and G20 were to be major convergences of resistance movements in 2010.

So far in this thesis I have discussed some of the theoretical possibilities of moving towards an anarchism that is oriented towards anti-colonial theory and practice, as well as one that considers the possibility and necessity of engaging in solidarity with Indigenous theory, thought and action. I have argued that anarcha-Indigenism as a meeting place between anarchism, Indigenous political theory and feminism can draw from these perspectives in a theoretical sense to further develop its own engagement with research methodology and solidarity, as well as what exchanges might occur across those perspectives that make it up. My other aim has been to suggest anarcha-Indigenism as point of intervention to move anarchism towards greater engagement with the realities of colonialism. In this chapter I look at some of the recent anarchist anti-colonial interventions and
instances of action to assess the current state of such engagements and point to further places where anarcha-Indigenism might intervene in anarchist practice. In this chapter I draw from movement literatures and publications, as well as my own personal experiences, in engaging in anarchist or anarchist-inspired resistance to both the 2010 Vancouver Olympics and the G20 Summit in Toronto, also in 2010.

I look first at the broader framework, rooted in anti-colonialism and anti-capitalism, used to mobilize against the Olympics, how this commitment was actualized in practice and how anarchists specifically incorporated anti-colonialism alongside anti-capitalist and anti-state politics. Next, I consider how movements against the G20 drew from anti-Olympic organizing to also incorporate anti-colonialism into broad messaging, analysis and opposition. In each example I discuss the synthesis between anti-capitalist and anti-colonial standpoints of resistance and specific anarchist articulations towards anti-colonialism by looking at the actions, analysis and reflections of those involved. Further, in the third section of this chapter, I link each of these instances of opposition to continued resistance work at the local level and the move away from ‘summit hopping’ to linking bigger events with local struggles that are sustained long after summits have come and gone. In particular this localization presents specific possibilities for anti-colonial orientations to continue to be taken up within local (anarchist) struggles long after the larger events themselves have ended. Overall, I aim to present key examples of anarchists and those with a specific critique of the Canadian state taking up anti-colonial struggles and seeking to ally with Indigenous movements of resistance, as concrete starting points for beginning to operationalize some of the as potential aspects of anarcha-Indigenism I have discussed in the preceding chapters.
The Olympics

Organizing against the Olympics began before the official bid was awarded in 2003, selecting Vancouver and Whistler as the official host locations. In general, opposition to the Olympics stemmed from a broad analysis of a number of issues affecting people living in Vancouver, Whistler and neighboring areas in BC. Opponents pointed to the increasing rates of homelessness, the loss of affordable housing, destruction of the environment for building Olympic venues and related infrastructure, overspending and cost overruns and the increase in security and surveillance. In particular activists and opponents sought to centre the fact that BC’s land is largely unceded – referring to the lack of treaties made between settler societies or governments and Indigenous peoples. There are only treaties signed with regard to a small number of areas in BC, which do not include Vancouver or Whistler, the primary locations for the 2010 Olympics (Peterson 2009). The slogan ‘No Olympics on Stolen Native Land’ came to dominate the messaging around resistance to the Olympics, a point to which I will return later.

A primary push to resist the games came from Indigenous representatives present at an intercontinental Indigenous gathering of peoples from North and South America that took place in Vicam Mexico in 2007. Indigenous resistance was widely discussed as well as resisting the Olympics in 2010 specifically. Resistance to the destructive realities of the Olympics was identified as an ‘international objective’ given the continued impact of Olympic events on Indigenous peoples (Intercontinental Anti-2010, 2007). Closer to the homesite of the Olympics themselves, the Olympic Resistance Network (ORN) was created in Vancouver, Coast Salish Territories with a similar network of resistance groups creating

---

36 For more in-depth perspectives and history regarding resistance to the bid process and resistance in the lead up to the games themselves see Shaw 2008. Lenskyj 2000, 2008 has also written more generally about the ‘Olympic industry’ and its various impacts on host communities. This more general situation of Olympic resistance is beyond the scope of the examination undertaken here.
the Olympic Resistance Network-Ontario (ORN-O) (both in 2008) to coordinate solidarity actions with those resisting in BC, to organize resistance to the Olympic Spirit Train and Torch relay and to help facilitate the travel of opponents to attend the anti-Olympic convergence called to take place February 10-15\textsuperscript{th} 2010. Notably, the group No One Is Illegal\textsuperscript{37} and its members played a significant in organizing both ORN and ORN-O.

A variety of forms of resistance to the Olympics themselves, as well as lead up events such as the Spirit Train and Torch Relay, took place throughout the bid process and the 2-3 year lead up to the games. This resistance included marches and rallies, rail blockades to halt the Spirit Train, squats and housing occupations to draw attention to the loss of social housing in Vancouver's Downtown East Side, disruption of official Olympic events by the Native Youth Movement, marches and blockades of the Torch Relay and autonomous actions undertaken by anarchists throughout Canada in the form of property damage and sabotage (see ‘Riot 2010’, 2010 and ‘Anarchist Resistance’ for further details on the variety of actions that took place).

**The G8/G20**

Organizing against the G8 and G20 began tentatively in 2009 and took off in force after resistance to the Olympics finished in February 2010. The G8 Summit was held in Huntsville, located in a relatively remote area 3 hours north of Toronto. The inaccessibility of the G8 Summit, and the location of the larger G20 meeting in Toronto just after, resulted

\textsuperscript{37} NOII is one group that has specifically foregrounded an analysis of colonialism and the state in its work on migrant justice. They list ‘recognition of indigenous sovereignty’ (NOII-Toronto, ‘We Demand’) as one of their core demands and point to the illegality of ‘Canada’ as existing on stolen Indigenous land. This is one group in which further examination could occur, along the lines of interviews with its members on the intersections of anti-colonialism, anti-capitalism and anti-state resistance. This, unfortunately, is beyond the scope of this current chapter, but will likely figure into my later doctoral work which seeks to extend aspects of this thesis.
in the focus of resistance being on the G20 in Toronto. The G20 is a meeting of the top 20 richest heads of state and/or finance ministers in the world to set the terms of global economic policy and response. Large summits such as the G20 are regularly met with large protest convergences, as can be observed in the history of resistance to the WTO meetings in Seattle in 1999, the Summit of the Americas in Quebec City in 2001 and recent G20 Summits in Pittsburg and London, England.

In order to coordinate resistance efforts to the G20 in Toronto a number of groups came together to create the Toronto Community Mobilization Network (TCMN). In the words of the TCMN:

The network is a collection of Toronto-based organizers and allies, that will use the fleeting moment of the G8/G20 meetings in Toronto in June 2010 in Ontario to come together and share the work that we do every other day of the year. We will build the momentum for a movement for Indigenous Sovereignty and Self-Determination, Environmental and Climate Justice, Migrant Justice and an End to War and Occupation, Income Equity and Community Control over Resources, Gender Justice and Queer and disAbility rights. (About Us, n.d.)

The TCMN was designed to facilitate the planning of protests and resistance events. It did not specifically plan any actions itself, but rather focused on logistical or infrastructure aspects of resistance such as a convergence space, coordinating a schedule of protests, billeting for out of town activists, propaganda and promotion of protests and events, as well as first aid and legal support for demonstrations. In the wake of the largest mass arrest in Canadian history with over 1000 arrested, the TCMN morphed into the Community Support Network (CSN) to provide legal support and fundraising for those who were arrested.

Using the TCMN infrastructure, many other groups called for actions against the G20 in a week of Days of Action and a weekend of resistance. Each day focused on a different set of issues that resonated both in the local Toronto context as well as in opposition to the elite agenda of the G20. The range of issues included migrant rights and
economic justice; queer and gender resistance; an environmental day of action; self-determination and justice for Indigenous peoples; a Justice for Our Communities march; a People First march with large union participation and a weekend of resistance actions called by Southern Ontario Anarchist Resistance. As is readily apparent there was a large diversity in the type and focus of the actions that occurred to resist the G20.

‘No Olympics on Stolen Native Land!’

Above I have attempted to briefly sketch the background of resistance to the 2010 Olympics and the G20. There are several points that arise out of the mobilizations that are worth considering and which point towards a synthesis of anarchist critiques of the state and capitalism and a broader orientation towards anti-colonialism and solidarity with Indigenous peoples. First of all, I examine the framing of resistance to both these events as an example of emerging anti-colonial analysis by radical and anarchist groups.

Jane Kirby, in her in-depth examination of activist solidarity with Indigenous peoples during the Olympics, points to the ‘radical’ orientation of activists that she interviewed. She interviewed a number of people who may be called core organizers from a variety of areas and issue focal points. She observes that this sample of those active within the anti-Olympics movement were all committed to a broadly anti-capitalist analysis with many identifying explicitly as anarchists or anti-authoritarians (Kirby, 2009, 14). She goes on to detail the move beyond social democratic political orientations within the anti-Olympics movement, partially because so called left leaning parties (such as the NDP) supported the bid for the games, towards a rejection of state-based politics in general. Specifically she argues the rejection of state-based politics carried specific relevance with Indigenous communities who have been on the receiving end of the dominating politics of the state (Ibid. 16). Although
this does not, and cannot, mean that Indigenous peoples ought to be considered anarchists or that the anti-Olympics movement itself is anarchist in any specific or hegemonic way, there is certainly an anti-state discourse that is part of the movement and informs its politics. It is this critique of state-based politics that has come to be coupled with anti-capitalist and anti-colonial commitments of resistance.

As stated above, the slogan ‘No Olympics on Stolen Native Land’ came to dominate the messaging of opposition to the Vancouver 2010 Olympics. The centralizing of this discourse and its link to on-the-ground Indigenous struggles helped to frame the Olympics from a specific standpoint of anti-colonialism. Activist Harsha Walia, a member of the ORN, as well as NOII-Vancouver, argues that such a slogan and grounding of resistance comes from the ‘legal reality’ that the Indigenous territories on which the Olympics are occurring are unsurrendered and without treaties. She argues that the term ‘[s]tolen is a much more popular term’, suggesting ‘that all of Canada is stolen land and we all reside on occupied indigenous territories’ (Walia in Scott, 2010). James Louie of the St’at’imc nation located in Whistler where a variety of Olympic events occurred says, ‘Because we have no treaty with Canada, the imposition and encroachment of Whistler – their hydro lines, their highways, their railroad, in fact all infrastructure development for the 2010 Games – in our territory is illegal’ (Quoted in Abbs, Frampton, Peart, 2009, 141). Land taken over by Settlers in BC can, therefore, be considered stolen and their settlements illegal from the standpoint of having never signed treaties or agreements with the Indigenous peoples who lived there traditionally.

Similar arguments are presented throughout other ORN and Olympic resistance literature, confirming that the understanding of stolen land is one that has been at the forefront of Olympic resistance. No One Is Illegal-Vancouver argues that framing resistance
under the banner of ‘No Olympics on Stolen Native Land’ took stock of the fact that Indigenous people in the areas where the Olympics occurred have had their lands invaded and degraded to build various parts of infrastructure to service the Olympics.

Many Indigenous peoples, as a result of the lack of opportunities on reserves and in communities, have been forced to migrate to Vancouver’s Downtown East Side, which is one of the most impoverished neighbourhoods in Canada. Indigenous peoples are the most impacted as a result of the games so it is imperative to centre Indigenous struggles of resistance in this particular case (NOII-Van, 2010). The central messaging behind ‘No Olympics on Stolen Native Land’ therefore suggests an anti-colonial imperative to resisting the Olympics, as well as a recognition and support of Indigenous struggles of resistance. It is, as Harsha Walia suggests (in Abbs, Frampton, Peart, 2009, 144), a ‘foundation’ for further forms of resistance, not simply an add-on to a list of other issues and concerns. It is also a framing that begins to centre Indigenous struggles within dominant anti-globalization or alter-globalization movements beyond traditionally class-based frames of resistance (Kirby, 2009, 52).

Locally, AW@L (formerly Anti-War @ Laurier), a direct action group I helped found, engaged in a variety of educational and informational events to raise awareness of the impacts of the Olympics, stood in solidarity with allies from Six Nations to block the Spirit Train, mobilized opposition to the Torch Relay in both the Kitchener-Waterloo and Toronto areas and supported members of Six Nations in their own blockade of the Torch Relay. AW@L began as a student group at Wilfrid Laurier University under the Laurier Students Public Interest Research Group but quickly expanded its work into the broader networks of resistance and organizing with Southern Ontario, largely around Indigenous solidarity.
AW@L’s Declaration (2009) highlights colonialism as a core target of resistance, based around a commitment to solidarity, creativity and action:

We are here to recognize that war and colonialism are destructive and un-ethical forces, to encourage others and raise awareness, to challenge ideas and perspectives, to confront systems of domination and oppression, to take responsibility (especially for our privilege), and to utilize our collective power to effect change. We approach our actions and the basis for all our relationships as being defined by solidarity.

This was a starting point that led to more nuanced analysis by AW@L with regard to colonialism, capitalism and the state.

Although AW@L is not specifically anarchist in orientation and self-definition, there are many members of the group who do identify personally as anarchists. As a result, the analysis that has been undertaken by AW@L presents an interesting synthesis of critiques of capitalism, the state and colonialism which warrants examination with regard to the Olympics and G8/G20. Although not explicitly anarchist, an example of AW@L’s analysis may be illustrated as follows:

We like the ideologies of our members in the same fashion as our tactics – diverse: we have members whose views represent a wide range on the ideological spectrum of social justice. One tactic of the state and the police is to publically demonize our members who identify as anarchists, calling them violent people engaging in “non-political thuggery”. We understand anarchy as a political theory vastly different than the current dominant political system, different than the one that puts an oppressive few in a privileged position. Anarchy puts at risk the privilege and power that these few hold over others; anarchy empowers the communities based not in domination and hierarchal systems, but autonomy and equality (AW@L Statement on Targeted Policing, 2010).

So, although AW@L is not an explicitly anarchist group, we had taken up an analysis of the state, colonialism and capitalism, which greatly influenced the tone and content of our resistance against the Olympics.

AW@L’s resistance to the Olympic focused on foregrounding anti-colonial resistance and the slogan ‘No Olympics on Stolen Native Land’, in particular at large public
demonstration against the torch relay. Our goal was a visual disruption of the ceremony in addition to a classic rally and march. We displayed 10 large banners on stilts that focused on various impacts on Indigenous communities and handed out flyers that specifically addressed Canada’s history of colonialism in relation to the games. This angle was picked up, at least in brief, in media reports (CBC, Dec 27, 2009; Davis, December 27, 2009; Pender, November 3, 2009) with the local KW Record reporting:

‘Holding banners, banging drums and chanting “No Olympics on stolen Native land,” a large group of protesters converged on the celebration in Kitchener after gathering in Victoria Park.

“The (International Olympic Committee and Vancouver organizers) are trying to use the Olympics as a way of white-washing the colonial image of Canada,” said Mark Corbiere of Kitchener, a member of the Olympics Resistance Network Ontario and himself an aboriginal.

“The issues of Native poverty haven’t been dealt with.” ’ (Davis, December 27, 2009).

Anti-colonialism was a core component of our campaign as well as part of a more general focus with regard to Olympic resistance. As ORN-O (n.d.) states in a flyer detailing reasons for local actions to oppose the Olympics: ‘The slogan “No Olympics on Stolen Native Land” is a way to raise anti-colonial consciousness about the true history of BC’, and Canada more broadly. I would add that this framing carries the potential for embedding anti-colonial analysis in social movement theory and practice beyond Olympic resistance and sets the stage for later anti-colonial interventions.

The ORN, as the main conduit for resistance against the Olympics, specifically takes ‘No Olympics on Stolen Native Land’ as its starting point, while recognizing that a variety of groups and other issues will also come together under a more general banner of resistance. The ORN identifies the commonality of all forms of resistance to the Olympics as being
rooted in ‘an anti-colonial and anti-capitalist analysis’ in addition to a ‘respect for diversity of tactics and strategies; an anti-oppression understanding and solidarity with those most directly affected; and organizational philosophy based on decentralization and autonomy within a coordinated and accountable structure’ (ORN, 2008). The commitment to both anti-colonial and anti-capitalist resistance can be seen as a significant turn in social movement organizing in the Canadian context and perhaps found some resonance in later organizing that occurred against the G20.

**Anarchist Organizing and Olympics**

Anarchists in particular took up a commitment to anti-colonialism and anti-capitalism as evidenced firstly in broad anarchist participation in anti-Olympic campaigns and groups (groups like AW@L, ORN, ORN-O etc.) as well as in anarchist publications announcing resistance to the Olympics in the lead up. The anarchist publication ‘Why do We Hate The Olympics’, distributed online and in print, included the following statement as a preface to broader calls for resistance and a report on action already taken:

> We want to express our solidarity with native 2010 resistance, and with the many autonomous individuals and groups who have engaged in attacks and disruptions in relation to the 2010 Winter Olympics. Indigenous people, refugees, exploited and excluded workers, and the unemployed all face common enemies: The ruling class and the police. As anarchists, we wish to see an escalated social war against the ruling order that will not stop with 2010, but will continue to expand and multiply until colonialism, capitalism, industrialism and the state are completely destroyed (Why Do We Hate, 2008)

The publication ‘Resistance 2010’ put out by People’s Global Action Montreal contains similar sentiments related to anarchist politics and a specific commitment to anti-colonialism. AW@L, as evidenced above on our action against the torch relay, also sought to foreground anti-colonialism. We specifically connected the resistance to the Olympics to our duties as
settlers under the Two Row Wampum (discussed in Chapter 4). We sought to underline our efforts of resistance to the Olympics within an anti-colonial framework tied to decolonization and local resistance struggles (AW@L, 2009). Part of this commitment is shown in our work with land defenders from Six Nations opposing the torch relay passing through their community, a commitment that required taking specific direction38.

Anarchists have made specific links between anti-capitalist and anti-state struggles and those of Indigenous peoples. This is highlighted in the publication ‘Anarchist Resistance and Indigenous Struggle Against the 2010 Olympics in Vancouver Canada’ which suggests that anarchist and Indigenous struggles can be observed as parallel to one another. They ‘run alongside one another but are not the same’ and seek to reject the homogenizing of settlers as ‘evil’ and Indigenous peoples as ‘victims’ and to recognize the ‘common class enemy between anarchists and natives. The native struggle is a class struggle’ (Anarchist Resistance, n.d.). There is a danger in this sort of rhetoric and identification of removing the specificities of both anarchist and Indigenous struggles. Recognition also needs to be more forcefully given to the privileges that settler anarchists accrued by living in a colonial and white supremacist society. This point needs to be more fully developed as part of thinking about possibilities of resistance between anarchists and Indigenous peoples, something I hope I have been able to address in the preceding chapters in this thesis, while gesturing to some possible paths towards anarcha-Indigenism and decolonizing anarchism. While class struggle might be a cause around which Indigenous peoples and anarchists can unite, it is perhaps but one small possible meeting point. Broader networks of solidarity and alliance need to be cultivated. Anarchist commitments to anti-colonial analysis and resistance that have arisen

---

out of the Olympics are perhaps one example of some of these possibilities and a significant step towards further development.

Anarchist’s commitments in practice, as one of the many diverse groups resisting the Olympics, have largely followed the messaging and forms of resistance called for by the Indigenous No 2010 campaign. Central to this is messaging (as per the slogan of ‘No Olympics on Stolen Native Land’ above) as well as analysis stemming from the broad callouts from 2007 previously mentioned. Anarchist organizing has followed the lead of these Indigenous resistance efforts, while combining an orientation towards anti-colonialism with broader anti-state and anti-capitalist critique. One on-the-ground example of this is evident in anarchist participation in various actions against the Olympics during the convergence itself.

As one action report back on anti-Olympic resistance suggests:

This was not “just another summit”—this was the culmination of several years of direct action by indigenous people, anarchists, anti-poverty activists, environmentalists, and others against the 2010 Olympics. One of the most inspiring aspects of this convergence was the framework that created it. Unlike many summits, which lack an anti-racist and anti-colonial analysis, indigenous sovereignty and decolonization was front-and-center this time. Indigenous people called upon their allies to help defend their territory against further colonization, and solidarity activists answered that call. An anti-capitalist analysis permeated the entire movement and it was a radicalizing force among the broader activist community (Riot 2010, 2010).

These anonymous authors clearly place anarchist support of a border network of resistance at the centre of their retrospective. They also point to several instances of anarchists taking direction from the broader movement and Indigenous people themselves. In the ‘Take Back Our City Mass Mobilization,’ they detail how an anarchist black bloc was present and participated in the march but respected the family friendly tone of the action. Indeed, they suggest that a high amount of communication between groups allowed for a variety of actors
to participate in this action, without imposing a rigid set of norms or rules for action. They
go on to detail how the black bloc was asked to move to the front of the demonstration to
help protect Indigenous elders from police harassment. Further, they observe that there was
a large amount of support for the later action called the ‘Heart Attack’ (where a considerable
amount of property damage was done to the ‘corporate heart’ of downtown Vancouver).
They argue that the ‘Heart Attack’ specifically avoided damaging independent buildings
connected to the neighbourhood in the Lower East Side and received the ‘popular support’
of many of the residents (Riot 2010, 2010). Further, Stella August, an Indigenous elder, a
resident of the Downtown East Side and organizer with the Downtown Eastside Power of
Women Group, defended the actions of the black bloc. She was reported in the mainstream
media, arguing that ‘They're angry because of the rich people bringing the Olympics into our
country when it wasn't needed. It wasn't needed here. Those kids were not bad. They were
only angry because of what they bring to our country – big time poverty’ (Burritt, 2010).

Anarchists also participated significantly in a Tent City that rose up two days after
the Heart Attack march to both draw attention to homelessness in the Downtown East Side
and retake space for the community. This action, according to activist report backs, has been
significant in building connections between groups to resist gentrification and the
criminalization of homelessness. Anarchists have been particularly involved while it is argued
that those who were quick to criticize the actions of the black bloc in the Heart Attack
march have largely stayed away. Further, anarchists were involved alongside other
community members and groups in the march for missing and murdered Indigenous
movement (Hundert, 2010). These are but a few examples of how anarchist resistance was
embedded in localized forms of organizing against the Olympics and how they sought to
work with other groups and stand in solidarity with local Indigenous peoples at the forefront of the resistance.

Although a comprehensive overview and analysis of the resistance to the Olympics and anarchist involvement is beyond the scope of this chapter I hope to have at least been able to shed light on some of the interactions between anarchism and anti-colonial resistance. These interactions are a potential example for later struggles of resistance and an anti-colonial anarchist ethic more broadly. Along these very lines Mandy Hiscocks, reflecting on the resistance to the Olympics, suggests that the organizing for the Olympics carried particular relevance to upcoming protests against the G8/G20 in 2010. She argues that the starting point must be to ‘root the resistance in anti-colonialism. It wasn’t easy, in Vancouver, to make “No Olympics on Stolen Native Land” the focal point. Many people were confused about what Native land had to do with the Games. But a lot of people asked and that’s exactly why it was useful’ (Hiscocks, 2010, 22). Given this potential to bring anti-colonial analysis into other struggles via the n-dimensional meeting space of anarcha-Indigenism, I now turn to anarchist involvement in organizing against the G20 in Toronto.

‘No G20 on Stolen Native Land’

As noted above, the opposition to the G20 Summit in Toronto was comprised of a number of groups working around a diverse set of issues, coordinated largely by the Toronto Community Mobilization Network (TCMN). Leslie Wood, an organizer with the TCMN, details one of the goals of the TCMN as seeking to build connections between different social movements, to engage in more militant forms of struggle and to foster a commitment to anti-colonial and anti-capitalist resistance (Wood, 2010, 86). As the main overarching
organization helping to facilitate protests against the G20 the TCMN was able to influence the tone of the protests as well as what sorts of groups would become involved.

Organizing against the G20 thus took on a particular anti-capitalist and anti-colonial tone. Specifically there were large Indigenous-led actions that occurred throughout the week. The ‘Canada Can't Hide Genocide: Indigenous Day of Action’ saw large numbers of Indigenous peoples and non-Indigenous allies take to the streets. Many of the other days of action, and protests throughout the weekend, had large continents of Indigenous peoples – many who came for the duration of the week of resistance.

Hillary Bain Lindsay, in an article entitled ‘This Land is Still Stolen: The G20 and Aboriginal Rights’ (2010), points to the G20 as the second time that Indigenous rights and anti-colonial resistance were at the forefront of opposition, after the Olympics as discussed above. She notes that ‘No G20 on Stolen Native Land’ was a chant used ‘throughout the week of protests’ where ‘warrior flags were flying at all the marches –whether led by environmental justice advocates or anti-poverty organizers’. She argues that the ‘Canada Can’t Hide Genocide’ march was more than a protest against the G20, but rather sought to ‘reject it entirely’ – a sentiment echoed by Ben Powless (a Mohawk and organizer with Defenders of the Land): ‘These are the illegitimate organizations [the G8 and G20] of the colonial states that seek the further exploitations of our peoples’ (quoted in Lindsay, 2010).

The tone of Indigenous-led and supported protests largely focused on recognizing the colonial realities in Canada and their tie to the G8/G20 and further reinforced the anti-colonial and anti-capitalist tone (along with a critique of the state) taken up by the TCMN.

---

39 This is asserted as well by many of the contributors to the retrospective book on the subject that assesses G20 protests from a movement perspective ‘Whose Streets? The Toronto G20 and Challenges of Summit Protest’ (Malleson and Wachsmuth eds., 2011).
One of the groups calling for actions throughout the weekend of the summit, and who supported the other actions occurring in the week of lead up resistance, was SOAR – Southern Ontario Anarchist Resistance. A group of individuals from various cities in Southern Ontario, SOAR called for three anarchist-oriented actions: a Get Off The Fence march on June 26th – that would break away from the larger People First march and weave through the streets to confront the security apparatus; Saturday Night Fever –a roaming all night dance party to bring people into the streets as a show of creative resistance; and a day of Autonomous Actions on the 27th – which would allow space for groups and individuals to undertake their own actions that may not have fit within the other themes of the previous week.

In SOAR’s ‘Statement to The Mainstream Media’ they describe their outlook of resistance:

We are anti-capitalist, which means we reject an exploitation-based economy and the ability of the rich to control the things the poor need to survive. We are anti-colonial, which means we challenge the ongoing conquest and exploitation of this land and of its original inhabitants by the canadian government and corporations, and that we stand in solidarity with indigenous peoples against the many faces of colonialism and cultural genocide. We recognize colonialism not as a historical phenomenon, but as an ongoing process of the canadian state and corporate apparatus.

The canadian state was founded through acts of genocide, and can only continue to function with ever increasing amounts of violence. In Toronto and around the world, people find themselves in conflict with the canadian state just for standing up for their right to survive (SOAR, May 24 2010).

SOAR specifically grounds their resistance within an anti-capitalist and anti-colonial framework. On each day of protest they issued a statement on how the themed days fit into their vision of a new society and critique of the current one. Most of the statements, from environmental justice to community resistance, incorporate an analysis of colonialism. The statement released on the Indigenous Day of Action links resistance to colonialism with a
broader settler responsibility to support resistance by Indigenous communities. It also
discusses the need to take direction from organizing communities and affirms a commitment
to respecting the tone of action as set by the organizers (SOAR, June 24, 2010).

As is evident from examining these brief statements from SOAR, there is a particular
uptake in anti-colonial analysis by anarchist groups within resistance to the G20. SOAR is
but one example of how anarchists are beginning to incorporate an analysis of colonialism
into their broader work, messaging and solidarity politics. They link resistance to capitalism
with resisting colonialism, while bringing in an analysis of the state form (see for ex. SOAR,
June 23, 2010 ‘Statement on Environmental Just
ice’). There is also an affirmation of
solidarity with those who are most affected by capitalism, colonialism and the state (echoing
similar commitments by anti-Olympic movements).

‘As anarchists’, they say, ‘we stand in solidarity with those who are on the receiving
end of capitalist and colonial violence. For this reason, we too see ourselves as in direct
conflict with the canadian state. And we – along with oppressed people around the world –
refuse to be forever on the defensive, to fight simply to survive against the systemic violence.
The machinery of this system grinds on, and if we can't throw a wrench into it, someday we
will all feel its teeth as keenly as do oppressed and exploited people everywhere’ (SOAR, May
24, 2010). This final quotation from SOAR shows the connection to resistance struggles by
those most affected with the broader understanding that resistance is being carried out in
solidarity with all those who feel the pressure of the state in their lives.

SOAR, as the organizers and facilitators of the majority of the anarchist resistance to
the G20, have sought to foreground an anti-colonial commitment as part of their larger
project of resistance. This is certainly picking up on commitments and messaging from
mobilizations against the Olympics but is also indicative of a broader turn towards a deeper
understanding of oppression and domination in the Canadian context. Although the actions called by SOAR are still largely within the frame of counter summit protests, their messaging has the potential to influence future anarchist resistance.

Even so, it must be clarified that while taking up an analysis of colonialism and a general commitment to resisting it and standing in solidarity with Indigenous struggles, there still needs to be specific links made with Indigenous communities. Settler anarchists need to make connections to communities to foster broader networks of resistance and to put their stated solidarity into practice. Certainly this will be a complex process (as has been discussed in my earlier chapter on solidarity politics), but it is a very real effort and commitment that must be made. Decolonization in words, by tacking on a commitment to anti-colonialism, is insufficient in terms of actually winning victories in the broader struggles of resistance. It is my hope that by looking at some of the examples of anarchist commitments to anti-colonialism taken up here, that such commitments will expand and lead to specific actions that seek to counter colonial dynamics both within the state and within ourselves. Anarcha-Indigenism, as I have argued earlier in this thesis, might be a meeting point for a variety of perspectives from which to enact this sort of politics. At any rate, this is the beginning of a conversation, and a set of commitments, that is long overdue.

**Anti-Colonial Resistance and Local Struggle**

Part of the work towards developing anti-colonial struggles must exist within specific communities themselves. In the last section of this chapter I examine how organizing against both the Olympics and the G20 sought to transcend what some have referred to as ‘summit hopping’ or, more plainly, focusing on when the next mega event will occur and not linking in explicitly localized struggles. Beyond broader commitments this is one of the key
similarities between the two movements and I think it presents key considerations for anti-colonial work that needs to be grounded in local movements. In the case of both the Olympics and the G20 activists and resistance movements sought to foreground resistance within local contexts, linking up with local movements, groups and issues, and seeking to take direction from and foreground the struggles of those most marginalized and targeted by the state, capitalism and colonialism. The desire to expand and strengthen local social movements was also highlighted as a goal.

Resistance to the Olympics in 2010 and the lead up actions are one example of how a large mega event was opposed, while also foregrounding local struggles and local issues arising as a result of the Games. Part of this focus certainly draws from direct, localized impacts that arose from the Games themselves because of gentrification, environmental destruction, the criminalization of homelessness and continued colonization of Indigenous peoples. Many activists and social commentators, including in segments of the mainstream media, have made the local impacts of the Games relatively widely known (in general see Shaw, 2008). There is no question that the Games have had visible impacts at the local level. What also must be considered, however, are the specific steps that organizers of the anti-Olympic convergence took to ensure that local struggles were at the forefront of resistance efforts.

Part of the critique of large-scale convergences or summit protests suggests that the majority of those who are able to travel to such events tend to be white, middle-class activists. This critique has arisen in force in various demonstrations, convergences and summits since the high point in anti/alter-globalization movements in Seattle in 1999.  

---

40 In Seattle in 1999 there were large demonstrations against the World Trade Organization. Activists were able to shutdown the summit with the use of blockades and militant forms of direct action. This included non-violent forms of civil disobedience as well as one of the first major debuts of the black
There was an observed disconnect between Summit organizing that was temporary and other localized struggles that would continue to create resistance even after the Summit was over and outside activists had left.41

Organizing against the Olympics sought to move beyond the separation or perceived incompatibility of local organizing and summit convergences. As Kirby (2009) argues, organizing against the Olympics was framed as a convergence, where outsiders would attend, as well as a place where local struggles would be emphasized. Part of the enthusiasm around the lead up to the convergence, she argues, was a direct result of the grounding of broader efforts of resistance within local struggles (Kirby, 2009, 136).

The ORN in particular sought to centre anti-Olympic resistance within local struggles. As I have detailed above, this meant taking up an anti-colonial commitment to stand in solidarity with local Indigenous struggles in Vancouver and Whistler and specifically connected anti-Olympic resistance to the anti-poverty struggles within Vancouver’s Downtown East Side (ORN n.d.). The ORN and ORN-O sought to facilitate localized resistance to the Olympics throughout the country (ORN-O n.d.). This included supporting other groups and drawing connections to local struggles, even outside of BC. As a key member of ORN-O, AW@L specifically aimed to link anti-Olympic actions with local issues and concerns.

A major part of AW@L’s anti-Olympic resistance organized to oppose the Torch Relay in Kitchener-Waterloo. We aimed to draw connections to gentrification in the DTES and in Downtown Kitchener, to ecological destruction in Whistler and locally in Kitchener bloc tactic of militant confrontation and targeting of corporate property in North America. These sorts of actions were later criticized for their overwhelmingly white make up and their disconnection from local struggles that were affected long after the summit had passed.

41 For a review of these criticisms in social movements in general, see Kirby (2009, 132-143) and Wood and Stalker (2011).
with the Waterloo Moraine and the Grand River Watershed and to continued colonialism on unceded land in BC and in relation to the Haudenosaunee peoples of Six Nations, on whose traditional territory Kitchener is located. AW@L likened the Torch Relay to a ‘burning symbol of injustice’ that needed to be resisted. In particular, AW@L connected Olympic resistance to local struggles against colonization as part of the Two Row Wampum and the duty of settlers to uphold our side of the treaty. This means, therefore, standing with Indigenous peoples who resist (in this case the torch relay, as was done by the Men’s Fire, the Women’s Fire and Grand River Onkwehowe youth, see Declaration of the Onkwehowe of the Grand River Territory, 2009) and working to decolonize our own communities. AW@L argued that the torch was ‘being used to continue the project of colonization in Canada, as the Olympics are being held on unceded Native land in BC, and the torch is coming through the land of a sovereign Indigenous nation, right here on the Haldimand Tract [Six Nations Territory where Kitchener is located]’ (AW@L, Dec 13 2009). Both ORN and AW@L sought to locate resistance to the Olympics within local forms of organizing, finding relevance with local issues and struggles.

Kirby summarizes the connection between convergence or mega-event forms of resistance and local struggles as follows in the context of the 2010 Olympics:

The way locally-rooted struggles are being articulated with a larger alter-globalization agenda within anti-Olympics activism is opening up debates that are challenging and pushing the boundaries of organizing in a productive direction. The locally rooted nature of the struggle is allowing for concrete relationships to be built amongst a diverse group of activists, challenging cultures of organizing while at the same time promoting a holistic analysis wherein individual struggles inform and build on one another’(Kirby, 2009, 143).

Finally, by connecting broader Olympic resistance to local struggles, it is hoped that local movements will become stronger and more connected as a result, something that played out in the build up to the games (Gord Hill in Abbs, Frampton and Peart, 2009, 157) and after.
This is, perhaps, difficult to measure or observe but the framing of Olympic resistance with this goal in mind certainly has had an impact on how resistance was organized and what groups were involved. Harsha Walia, a member of NOII and the ORN, describes resistance to the Olympics ‘as a struggle that is going to continue beyond the Olympics. Homelessness will still be on our streets after the Games are gone. All the CCTV’s, closed circuit television cameras are going to be here when the Games are over’ (Walia in Scott, 2010). There is a clear observation that Olympic resistance does not stand alone – it is connected to other struggles that exist in the long term. The aim here, therefore, is to use resistance to the Olympics to build connections, to bring groups together and create a broader sense of solidarity between groups that have similar goals and analysis. NOII-Van makes a similar connection arguing for thinking in terms of ‘human connectedness rather than social and political isolation’ when thinking about ‘building long-term alliances to strengthen our shared struggles for justice, dignity and liberation’ (NOII-Van 2010). This commitment extends well beyond the lead up to the Olympics and the Games themselves. As will be argued in the next section, the connections to local struggles at the Olympics, in many ways, set the stage for later struggles against the G20 in Toronto.

Mandy Hiscocks, reflecting upon organizing against the Olympics, lays out a number of potential lessons for activists to consider in organizing against the G20. As well as a firm commitment to bring anti-colonial and anti-capitalist resistance together, she cites a key success in anti-Olympic organizing as stemming from connecting resistance to local struggles. She points to the Tent village (discussed briefly above) as one of the instances in which anarchists specifically worked on local struggles that opposed the Games and homelessness in the DTES more broadly. This action is an example of tying together local issues and broader themes of anti-Olympic resistance that might be considered for the G20
(Hiscocks, 2010, 22). Olympic organizing certainly provided some key examples that G20 resistance could draw from, in addition to the fact that many involved in later G20 organizing were also heavily involved in resistance to the Olympics.

Leslie Wood, in her retrospective article looking at G20 organizing, cites a commitment to linking with local struggles and strengthening resistance movements as a key focal point for G20 resistance. ‘Specifically, we wanted to this convergence [against the G20]’, she says, ‘to build stronger, more militant, and well connected movements that would be better equipped for anti-capitalist and anti-colonial struggle. In order to achieve these goals, and to build solidarity in the city, we needed a mobilization that would foreground local campaigns and organizations’ (Wood, 2010, 86; see also Wood and Stalker, 2011).

The organizational make up of the TCMN further reinforced direct links to local organizations that were the primary organizers of various actions opposing the summit. Organizations such as NOII, the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty, Jane and Finch Action, among others, were some of the most involved in action planning and in getting protest infrastructure up and running. As such, resistance to the summit was designed to be a ‘springboard’ for localized struggles, one that would keep local organizers working on their specific issues, while not taking energy and organizing out of local struggles in favour of organizing against only the G20 itself (Malleson, 2011, 28).

Wood explains the framing of resistance to the G20 in the form of a story – one that ‘used the tension between summit-hopping and local organizing to express our strategy and convince others about how the convergence should take place. We framed the movement in a way that we hoped would allow ordinary Torontonians to see themselves as part of the mobilization. In our story, the convergence was a place in which marginalized people would join together and win’ (2010, 88). In retrospect, as Wood explains, this was only partially
successful, but part of the success was reorienting the focus of convergence and summit resistance to the local level. ‘The story of a convergence of grassroots communities opposing the G20 allowed a new type of summit protest to emerge,’ Wood (2010, 96) argues, and is certainly a form of success— and a possible model for the future of organizing against large events or meetings.

The locally focused strategy of the opposition to the G20 seems to have been successful. Wood and Stalker (2011) report, based on a series of on-the-ground surveys and conversations with activists taking part in the G20 mobilizations, that the Toronto protests were more diverse than previous summits in terms of race, age and focus on local connections to issues than previous summits in Pittsburgh, Washington, Seattle or New York, where similar data was gathered and compared. Their insightful work reveals the emphasis that activists had on local forms of organizing and resistance, with 35% of respondents indicating local as their top priority, in comparison to an international focus at 33% and an even lower national focus coming in third. Wood and Stalker argue that these statistics, although only a brief glimpse of attitudes present in the G20 mobilizations, perhaps indicate the success of the TCMN’s strategy (2011, 183-4). They also note that the make-up of the Toronto mobilizations was much more locally focused with 67% being residents of the city, compared to Pittsburgh’s 58% in 2010 (Ibid. 185). While only measuring those from the cities themselves, they do not take into account those coming from nearby areas (as is my case living in Kitchener, ON), something that might affect a measure of ‘close by’ activists that have specific connections to Toronto and who are not simply repeating the oft-critiqued ‘summit hopping’ discussed above. At any rate the organizing focus on connecting to and energizing local struggles seems to have met success
in Toronto and is perhaps a focus of further organizing to continue to be considered for future mobilizations.

This is not to say that pulling off a massive convergence will not sap energy from local organizing, which it inevitably will in many regards according to Malleson (2011), but it can also help to fortify links between groups, such as those Southern Ontario communities closest to Toronto (Kitchener-Waterloo, Hamilton, Guelph, etc.). There is also the question of energy going to support for all those arrested in the wake of the summit, which draws resources from local organizing (Scott, 2011), but can also be another means of drawing organizations and individuals together in the spirit of solidarity against repression.\(^{42}\)

I have looked here at the connections large opposition convergences like the Olympics and the G20 share in seeking to change the nature of summit protests to reflect explicit connections to local struggles of resistance. I think these commonalities and alterations in social movement practice, when coupled with general anti-colonial orientations, carry a unique possibility to expand engagement with anti-colonial resistance as part of anarcha-Indigenism. Both resistance to the Olympics and the G20 was organized from its inception with anti-colonial and anti-capitalist commitments in mind. This framing set the stage for how other groups would come to engage in resistance, and represents a deepening of considerations of colonialism within social movements and resistance groups. The Olympics and G20 forced activists (and anarchists!) to think seriously about how even the most specific localized struggles might intersect with colonialism. They forced a consideration of developing an anti-colonial understanding of the lands that resistance takes place on, how we are involved and how different peoples, groups and struggles are linked together. Convergences of resistance have begun to add anti-colonialism to the core

\(^{42}\) For some specifics related to infiltration of anarchists and other groups see for ex. Groves (2011).
principles of resistance. They might be one example of a physical creation of a potential anarcha-Indigenist space of meeting, where many groups and perspectives come together and theory and action evolves. There is certainly more work to be done, some of which I have sought to detail in previous chapters. Anarchists in particular have the Olympics and the G20 as contemporary starting points for anti-colonial engagements in practice that have begun to trickle down to the local movements of resistance that persist long after the summits are gone. Maintaining these local connections will be crucial to continuing to build anti-colonial resistance, and thus warrant the examination undertaken here.

**Conclusion: Expanding Anti-colonial Resistance**

In the case of organizing and resisting the Vancouver 2010 Olympics and the G20 leader’s summit occurring the same year, it is evident that anti-colonial analysis and action has found a foothold in anarchist and broader social movement organizing. Anti-colonialism has been named as a key commitment of resistance alongside anti-capitalism, that anarchists have begun to take up. This is a welcome realization in the case of these two events. Part of the question that remains is to what degree anarchism will continue to have an analysis of colonialism and what new relationships might be sought with Indigenous communities to further expand anti-colonial resistance. Anarcha-Indigenism discussed above provides a means of further engaging anarchist theory with the realities of colonialism. The concept of n-dimensional space that I have put forth suggests a point of contact among anarchism, Indigenous resistance, feminism and social movement theory and practice that is enacted and produced at large resistance events such as Olympics and the G20. I have aimed to provide a brief sketch of the anti-colonial interventions undertaken in organizing against both of these events. This anti-colonial orientation underlined the fundamental principles
guiding resistance to these events, coupled with anti-capitalism as the primary focal points. Resistance, in both of these cases, connected anti-colonialism to a broad critique of the Olympics and G20, as well as local impacts. This is precisely the work that can be furthered under the banner of anarcha-Indigenism, as a theoretical perspective that can intervene within those theories that contribute to its own development (anarchism, Indigenous political theory, feminism) as well as by making interventions in broader contexts of resistance. Given that anti-colonialism was foregrounded in the examples detailed above, mostly on the basis of recognizing that colonialism continues to exist and structure relations within settler societies and that anti-colonial analysis needs to occur, there is much room for further interventions. Anarcha-Indigenism might suggest means to further the connections of solidarity between anarchist and Indigenous populations, and between those who organize large demonstrations in urban contexts and those who may be farther afield but bear the brunt of the policies, institutions and systems that are being resisted.

Local struggles were central to broader organized resistance and sought to foreground those who were most affected by policies, ecological destruction and social impacts. In both cases examined here, part of the aim was to move beyond historic critiques of summit hopping in order to have both a broader convergence of resistance and a commitment to local struggles. While in each case this was perhaps not 100% successful, there are now lasting links between groups and individuals involved. Further, despite repression and arrests, most significantly in the G20 example, processes are now underway to rebuild organizations and to further connections that may not have existed without the catalyst of a large summit. Hopefully this chapter sheds some light on possible anti-colonial orientations in broader anarchist and social movement organizing as a starting point for further interventions by anarcha-Indigenism and some of its aspects that were discussed in
previous chapters. Hopefully it sows some seeds that can expand further and be built upon for further large scale resistance efforts and everyday local contexts.

I will end with the following quotation by an activist involved in anti-Olympic resistance that I think captures the necessity of anti-colonial resistance underlining other struggles:

‘For anyone who wants to be holistic about it, challenge the whole system, and look at it historically and say where do these oppression and how far back do they go, you have to connect with native people, its unavoidable, otherwise your not really anti-colonial or anti-capitalist’ (Asad, 2008 cited in Kirby 2009, 53).

Or anarchist.
Chapter 7

Conclusion

In this thesis I have aimed to add depth to some of the core elements of anarcha-Indigenism. I have teased out a general understanding of how anarcha-Indigenism might be conceived in theory and in practice, what sort of a future society it might seek to articulate and some of the possible steps that might be taken to move towards such a future. Drawing from theoretical work of post-colonialism around third space, I have presented anarcha-Indigenism as a potential space of meeting between different theoretical and practical perspectives. In order to be attentive to constantly developing our theory and practice and the potential for other perspectives or emerging practices to contribute to anarcha-Indigenism, I have argued for an understanding of anarcha-Indigenism as an n-dimensional space of meeting, one that is not tied down to rigid or closed off sets of influences and open to the continual theoretical intervention of other perspectives. I have argued for an open and dynamic possibility, one that is firmly rooted in Indigenous thought and action, anarchism and feminism, that continues to draw from and develop other perspectives, while seeking to challenge the elements of colonialism, heteropatriarchy and white supremacy that often come with white-dominated Western perspectives. Anarchism, and anarcha-feminism in particular, need to be continually challenged for their investment in the privileges stemming from such dynamics of oppression and domination.

This work has largely sought to make interventions in anarchist settler theory and practice with the hope of moving towards decolonization and unsettling. This is the context that I find myself in and my writing and arguments reflect this perspective. It is where I have come to engage with colonization and decolonization and where I have noted that there is
room for improvement and intervention into anarchist politics. This is certainly the bias of this thesis and where it will likely find the most resonance. I am a white, anarchist settler who has had access to institutions of higher education, who also has participated in social movements for decolonization and resistance. There are many biases, privileges and colonial residues that are wrapped up in my context, which requires concerted attention. My hope is that this work has contributed to these goals and that this work will continue to push my own politics and shake up my own beliefs and perspectives. Engaging in this work is perhaps one step that can be taken towards broader goals of decolonization and unsettling in practice. Further, I hope that parts of this might make positive contributions to broader anarchist, Indigenous and feminist theory and beyond. I look forward to the further development of anti-colonial theory and practice and any challenges that are made to myself and this work with the hopes of making our theory and practice better.

In my later chapters I have sought to more specifically develop aspects of anarcha-Indigenism in order to gain a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the influences, connections, overlaps and interventions that anarchism, feminism and Indigenous political theory might offer to both anarcha-Indigenism and one another. Further, I have sought to bring in other theoretical work outside each of these influences to further expand anarcha-Indigenism’s potential for theory and action. These examinations have included research methodology, the politics of solidarity, women of colour feminism, Indigenous and anarcha feminisms and anti-colonial political development in contemporary social movements. Each of these previous chapters adds both depth to the work of anarcha-Indigenism, while further exploring possible connections between anarchism, Indigenous political theory and feminism and suggests some specific interactions that anarchism might take up with anti-colonial and decolonizing perspectives.
As I have argued, anarchism, with the exception of the small number of those working on anarcha-Indigenism, has been lacking in its theoretical attention to the questions and intersections of colonialism and white supremacy within social movement practice and how this might influence the perspectives we have as actors and the way resistance is framed. There has been little work done on questions of anarchist solidarity with Indigenous peoples or possible steps towards decolonization in both anarchist theory and practice. In the previous chapters I have attempted to shed light into some of these darker areas of anarchism with the hope of moving towards an anti-colonial and decolonizing anarchist theory and practice. Further, I hope to have added to anarcha-Indigenism as a n-dimensional meeting point for these types of theory and practice, that is continually developing.

So where do we go from here? What are the next steps for thinking about anarcha-Indigenism? What are some of the possibilities for enhancing our theory and practice? Where might a commitment to decolonizing and anti-colonial work take us? This is a series of questions, and rather than concrete actions or a roadmap for success, we as anarchists and settlers are left with more questions for us to consider, to engage, to seek out answers to, with the understanding that we will never find definite answers to any of them. The point is not to pin down answers to some definable end point, but to maintain our critical work and expansion of theory and practice, in the spirit of constant reevaluation and in response to challenges posed to us from others.

First of all, I think we need to situate ourselves in the communities and contexts that affect how we perceive the world and how we come to engage with it. Our perspectives are fundamentally shaped by the environments that we grow up and live in, and we need to think about how that affects how we engage with the world. Part of this work might begin to think about the land that we live on. What is its history? Whose traditional territory might it
be? What communities are close to where we live? Is this land under dispute? How can we connect struggles on this land to the other efforts of resistance that we are engaged in? How do our own lives profit from the continued colonization and dispossession of Indigenous peoples and the destruction of land bases? How have we contributed to these dynamics through our own attitudes and actions? These are big questions, some of which I have attempted to answer for myself related to this work in my introduction. Putting answers to paper is certainly a good initial step to begin to think about some of these questions, but we need to begin to take actual steps in our own lives.

Part of this work could be to continue our engagement with Indigenous thought and action, learning from the connections to land and earth that Indigenous peoples carry throughout all aspects of their lives. We might ask how we can be allies to Indigenous political theory, research methodology, epistemologies, life ways and belief systems, if any sort of alliance with us is desired. We cannot determine the grounds for such alliances but can be open to such requests from communities when the time comes. We might ask what we can learn from these perspectives and how they might influence how we see the world and engage with it. We might ask what it means for us, as settlers, to read and engage with the work of Indigenous peoples and communities. What is our stake in this work? Why are we interested? What do we hope to achieve? What has brought us here? What do we intend to do once we have read and tried to listen to Indigenous theorists and communities? Some of these questions point to possible alliances between settlers and Indigenous peoples and raise the question of creating ethical relationships that might occur under the work of anarcha-Indigenism that I have discussed above.

I have suggested that possibilities for alliances between anarchists and Indigenous peoples might stem from the resonance of perspectives and resistance outside the state, in
addition to resisting oppression and domination, creating autonomous and self-determining communities and a commitment to direct action and land defense. These are some possible points of meeting, and perhaps even agreement, where new relations can begin and stronger communities of resistance be created. Even so, the autonomy of both communities needs to be the primary aspect of any sort of relationship. We need to struggle within our own contexts and seek out our own answers to some of the questions above and decide what the appropriate forms of action might be. We also need to remain open, however, to challenges from those we seek to ally with. These moments of unsettling are opportunities for anarchists and settlers to ask further questions of ourselves and continue to work on the colonial residues that are embedded in our bodies, minds, and actions. These are moments of potential learning, but we need to take steps to decolonize and unsettle ourselves. This can’t and won’t be done by anyone but ourselves.

Anarchists have a lot of work to do. We have to begin to think intentionally about colonialism and colonial residues in our own theory and practice. We need to think about what we can begin to do to decolonize and unsettle ourselves. We need to continue this work indefinitely; it is a process, not a checklist of easily completed tasks. Anarcha-Indigenism, and some of the further potential aspects of its theory and practice suggested here, might be one starting point for moving towards anti-colonial and decolonizing work within anarchism. The work I have undertaken here is not the first work, nor will it be the last in these efforts to decolonize anarchism. It is, I hope, a useful contribution to expanding some of components of anarcha-Indigenism that we might consider and incorporate within our daily theory and action. There is much more work to do be done. I hope to begin to explore some of the further possibilities in my later doctoral work, while maintaining a focus
on moving towards an anti-colonial and decolonizing anarchism and anarchy-Indigenism as an n-dimensional space of meeting.

Critical race theory, anti-racist organizing, queer theory and ever-emerging contemporary anarchist theory are but some of the potential directions or contributions that anarchy-Indigenism can engage and respond to in an n-dimensional space of meeting. I hope the work I have engaged in here contributes to greater efforts of decolonization, unsettling and anti-colonial resistance.
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