

solidarity and alliance gets co-opted in these ways, as ‘magic words’ to state and dispense with complexity, not understanding why they are said or what responsibility and action they might entail. We state these words as a contestation of colonial logic that, as Andrea Smith (2006) notes, “holds that Indigenous people must disappear. In fact, they must *always* be disappearing, in order to allow non-Indigenous peoples rightful claim over the land” (p. 68). The history of settler colonialism is one of displacement and replacement and we are each implicated in this. We state these words in recognition of the Anishinaabeg peoples’ continued right to this land, to sovereignty, and indeed, their right to exist beyond the often fetishized historical memory of settler colonialism. We do not need to state this to make it true, it simply is.

It is important to recognize this particular history of colonialism, and subsequent (temporary) interruption of sovereignty, because it affects each of us. There is no escaping complicity within a settler colonial state, especially for those of us who have settled here, though complic

!#"

"

added). Indigenous knowledges are the starting point for resurgence and decolonization, are the medium through which we engage in the present, and are the possibility of an Indigenous future. Without this power base, decolonization becomes a domesticated industry of ideas. Decolonization is not always about the co-existence of knowledges, nor knowledge synthesis, which inevitably centers colonial logic. Whiteness does not 'play well with others' but, rather, fragments and marginalizes - so it must be asked: Co-existence at what cost and for whose benefit? Decolonization necessarily unsettles. In the face of the beast of colonialism, thirsty for

!

down to the difference between the politic

#!"

"

future? While, obviously, there are vast differences in how Indigeneity is lived, as well as how it responds to colonial intrusion, how can we understand similarities in experiences, in epistemologies, and in resisting continued colonial intrusion? Tuck and Wang (in this issue) begin exploring the incommensurability of decolonization with other movements around the world, but where do differences end and similarities begin? This is not a search for a pan-Indigenous identity but for relationships and alliances that can strengthen local decolonization movements.

23%), *!" &)-. "%' , 4*

As mentioned earlier, often the decolonizing project has had to, out of necessity, focus on reclaiming or restating the humanity of colonized peoples. Colonization has been determined to stand as the final arbiter of who is human. Integral to this process is the delegitimization of Indigenous humanity a (rbi)2 (y) -96.7 (a) 0.23 [(s) -ar

!

difference between subject races and subject ethnicities. While both were colonized, the subject ethnicities were considered Indigenous and the subject races were considered non Indigenous, immigrants (ex: the Tutsi of Rwanda and Burundi). In the case of Rwanda, despite the social revolution that led to independence, the imposed racial and ethnic categories of colonial rule stayed intact and intensified the economic and political tensions, which eventually slid towards the 1990 genocide. Mamdani (2001) argues that though “we turned the colonial world upside down, we didn't change it“ (p. 9).

This understanding of ethnicity is not without its problems though. The use of ethnicity continues to sever, interrupt and re-name Indigenous identities. In Rwanda and Burundi, for example, the categories of Hutu and Tutsi did not exist prior to the eighteenth century, when colonial anthropologists divided local peoples by physical traits and lines of work. Some even going as far as measuring noses and cranium sizes to ‘discover’ biological differences that denoted a lesser humanity (Mamdani, 2002, p. 44). Little has changed since then. “Ethnicity” is often a residual of colonialism; it remains a measuring stick that exists as part of the state’s vocabulary to measure, contain and control colonized peoples, and it remains a dehistoricized stand-in for Indigeneity. Alfred (2009a) draws similarities between the concepts of Third World “ethnicity” and “Aboriginalism”, saying that both are part of “assimilation’s end-game, the terminological and psychic displacement of authentic Indigenous identities, beliefs and behaviors...Aboriginalism obscures everything that is historically true and meaningful about Onkwehonwe” (p. 126-127). In interrogating colonial markers of identity we must ask: How does Indigeneity get ‘captured’ and domesticated by colonial states, both here and abroad? How do state frameworks for recognition render some constitutionally Indigenous - and because of this, visible - while others are not?

In Canada, as in other Western settler-colonial contexts, discourses of multiculturalism have tried to place Indigenous peoples within a community of ethnic groups. As Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández (this issue) rightly critiques multiculturalism, its project of ethnicity and culture is one of containment and empty signifiers, stripping culture of any power in order to fit it within a colonial paradigm. Even further, Indigenous peoples, who have occupied their lands since time immemorial become expelled by and then invited back into the settler nation-

#!!!"

"

of self-proclamation far too dangerous? Relatedly, how is it that some geographies are considered to house Indigenous knowledges but not Indigenous people? Few scholars - including ourselves - have noticed that Indigenous discussions happening across borders too often only include Turtle Island scholars in dialogue with the South Pacific. W

!

(1967) clear

\$'''

"

protest and organize but it comes as a shock when they enter the hallowed halls of academia, the place where theory is reported to live. Academics, such as Ali Abdi among many others, have worked to dispel the myth that Indigenous cultures are devoid of philosophy and 'high theory' but, to a great degree, Indigenous knowledges are seen as fictive, mythological, and grounded in opinion rather than fact. To gain legitimation in the academy requires, at minimum, recognition of the European theorists to legitimate Indigenous theories. There is work to be done here.

!

deepens and contextualizes theory, teaches humility and cooperation, and brings a sense of immediacy and materiality to theoretical work. Mariolga Reyes Cruz (this issue) speaks of living in these contestations when she describes navigating her role as a ‘reluctant academic’, living “neither with god nor the devil,” in a space of contradiction and contestation.

We must recognize that theory is created on a daily basis in our communities, at the kitchen tables of our houses, in the forests, and on the fields of the land. Jeff Corntassel (this issue) speaks about the ‘everyday acts of Indigenous resurgence’ and this is the ‘our way’ that Taiaiake Alfred gestures to when he states, “We must do it [decolonize] *our* way, or risk being

<http://racismandnationalconsciousnessresources.files.wordpress.com/2008/11/bonitalawrence-decolonizing-anti-racism.pdf>

Little Bear, L. (2009). Foreword. In T. Alfred, *Wasáse: Indigenous pathways of action and freedom* (pp. 9-12). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Mamdani, M. (2001). Beyond settler and Native as political identities: Overcoming the political legacy of colonialism. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 43(4), 651-664.

Mamdani, M. (2002). When victims become killers: Colonialism, nativism, and the genocide in Rwanda. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Mihesuah, D.A. & Waziyatawin (Eds.). (2004). *Indigenizing the academy: Transforming*