

In and Against Canada

by

Phil Henderson

B.A., University of Western Ontario, 2014

M.A., University of Victoria, 2016

Graduate Certificate in Indigenous Nationhood, University of Victoria, 2018

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Department of Political Science

©Phil Henderson, 2022
University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This dissertation may not be reproduced in whole or in part,
by photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.

In and Against Canada

by

Phil Henderson

B.A., University of Western Ontario, 2014

M.A., University of Victoria, 2016

Graduate Certificate in Indigenous Nationhood, University of Victoria, 2018

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, Supervisor
Department of Political Science

Dr. Rita Kaur Dhamoon, Departmental Member
Department of Political Science

Dr. Michael Asch, Departmental Member
Department of Political Science

Dr. John Borrows, Outside Member
Faculty of Law

Abstract

This dissertation is an intervention aimed primarily at the field of Canadian Political Science, but informed by engagements with Indigenous Studies, literatures on racial capitalism, and Global Histories. The overarching aim of the project is to provide a theoretical framework by which to study multi-scalar struggles taking place within and against the Canadian state from an explicitly anti-imperialist perspective. The insights of this project should also be of interest to the broad left, both in Canada and beyond. The dissertation begins with a call to situate the Canadian state, and its practice of “settler imperialism” as part of multi-scalar system of global racial capitalism. Key to understanding this is the mobilization of Stuart Hall’s concept of the “historical bloc” as a tool to grasp political mediations, and to refuse the too-easy analytical reification of structures or their practices of difference making.

Part two of the dissertation interrogates the politics of solidarity “from below” by engaging “activist archives,” composed of “allyship toolkits,” zines, and pamphlets. These activist archives reveal two (at least analytically) distinct theories of change operating through the discourses of allyship and decolonization. While to differing degrees, they point to the work of politics below the state. In the case of “allyship” discourses this dissertation finds a normative individualism and an understanding of power as an object rather than something collectively exercised, leading to a charity model where solidarity is seen as an external relationship. In contrast, the decolonization literature understands how solidarity can proceed from an interested position towards building a relationship of shared concern, it substitutes a deference model for one defined by “relational autonomy” in the process of “worldmaking.” The final portion of this dissertation makes an in-depth case-study of Indigenous-led opposition to the Trans Mountain Expansion (TMX) pipeline project. Tracing out a number of strategies of hegemony, counter-hegemony, and grassroots struggles, the aim is to show a number of interrelated sites and tactics of anti-imperialist struggle grounded in a defence of both shared place and the self-determination of Indigenous nations.

Table of Contents

Supervisory Committee.....	ii
Abstract	iii
Table of Contents.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	v
Dedication	vii
Introduction: The Canadian Conjuncture.....	1
Section One	35
Chapter One: Two Faces of Canada, (Con)Testing Critical Approaches	36
Chapter Two: Canadian Settler Imperialism	79
Section Two.....	120
Interlude: A Monumental Task.....	121
Chapter Three: With Allies Like These... ..	132
Chapter Four: Who Needs Decolonization?.....	171
Section Three.....	210
Chapter Five: The Tiny House, In Common	211
Works Cited.....	249
Notes	286

Acknowledgements

Dissertations often appear in the world as if they're the sole product of some lone genius, nothing could be further from the truth. This dissertation is merely one expression of an enormous, generative network of social relations of which I've been a part over the course of my graduate work. I cannot possibly acknowledge everyone, as much of the labour that has made this dissertation possible is invisible to me too (an unsatisfactory form of acknowledgement is to thank all members of CUPE 917, 951, and 4163, as well as the PEA and the Faculty Association, as it's their labour that makes UVic). But here's a slightly longer, if still incomplete list of thanks.

The Department of Political Science at UVic would be *nothing* if it weren't for the incredible front-office staff who do all the heavy lifting, which includes lifting the spirits of often bedraggled grad students. Joanne, Joy, Rachel, Rosemary, and Tamaya have each, in their own ways, made possible every single degree that's been granted while I've been at UVic. Mine belongs to them just as much as to me.

Of course, anyone who knows the work of graduate studies knows that it's also very often unwaged work, and that precarity is the most frequent reality facing grad students. I've been particularly lucky to enjoy support from SSHRC, the President's Research-Enriched Teaching Fellowship, travel funds fought for by my union (CUPE 4163), and departmental support (with thanks to Matt and Feng as grad advisors who always dug as deep as possible to find money).

Political Science at UVic has long had a vibrant graduate community, and having spent two degrees over the better part of eight years there I've had the enormous privilege of learning with/from too many people to name each of them. My own PhD cohort, Can, Mehdi, Nicole, and Smith, have been wonderfully supportive and inspiring colleagues. As have office-mates like Guillaume, Joanna, Kelly, Marta, Matt, and Shianna. Getting to work on my PhD alongside other brilliant scholars like Alfie, Brydon, Craig, Dave, David, Dempsey, Janice, Jasmine, Jess, João, Katie, Kenya, Lacey, Lynn, Marta, Micheal, Morgan, Neil, Rachel, Ryan, Thea, Stacie, Stephen, and Zoe, has been nothing short of incredible. Old friends from a previous degree, including Sasha, Susan, and Will have remained vital intellectual and political inspirations to me.

Other campus groups have also been essential to shaping both my own thinking and this project. Leading among these is the Indigenous Research Workshop based at CIRCLE. Over the years countless colleagues from across campus have been involved in this group, but Heidi, Michael, and Rob each stand out as particularly committed and supportive senior scholars who each fostered this workshop as one of the most generative academic spaces I've participated in. Likewise, my two years on the executive of CUPE 4163 were of formative importance.

Some of the most important lessons and thinking I've gotten to do has been away from campus. In particular, working with/in community groups in Victoria/Metulia has been profoundly impactful. Much of the thinking, and a good portion of the early writing in this dissertation took place on occupied Lkwungen territories, where Canada has made no effort to provide even a thin legal justification for its claim to jurisdiction. The bulk of the writing, though, took place in Tkaronto/Toronto, which is Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabek territories. These nations have developed protocols of mutual self-determination within these territories through the Dish With One Spoon Treaty, and settler presence in the specific portion of the city in which I live is meant to be governed by Upper Canada Treaty 13 (1805).

The chapters that comprise this dissertation each have their own trajectories that helped to spur writing when it seemed impossible. Chapters One and Two are the (much) developed extension of arguments begun in Matt's POLI 616. Chapter Three and Four owe a considerable

debt to lessons I learned from my own students in POLI 263, but especially in POLI 363. Chapter Five began as a chapter written at Jim's invitation for a book on democratic theories, with thanks to Keith and Vanessa for their astute editorial work on those drafts.

The onset of the COVID-19 pandemic made for dramatic shifts in my own working conditions, which for more than a decade had been extremely campus-centric. Part of what made this transition tolerable was the emergence of a number of Zoom-based working groups. Stacie was one of the core instigators of this model of group work, and Bradley, Caolan, Dave, Lynn, Jess, Morgan, and Rachel made them so much isolation-busting fun. Beyond these sessions, Brydon, Corey, Daniel, John, Keith, Ryan, and Seb, have each provided significant assistance in the writing/thinking process.

My committee has been of fantastic support not only on this dissertation, but throughout my graduate studies (from comprehensive exams, to workshops, social lunches, and building up a community of supportive colleagues). Michael's intellectual breadth and rigour has deepened this project, and pushed it to think beyond the cul-de-sacs of one discipline. John's feedback has always been remarkably speedy, and even more remarkable for how considered, gentle, and generative it always is. Rita's unsurpassable clarity of thought, her care for exactitude in conceptual work, and her generosity has been both a driving engine behind this work and a model for scholarship/supervision. It would be almost unthinkable to have done my graduate work with any supervisor other than Heidi. Beyond being a brilliant and leading scholar whose work has shaped my own for years, she's also always been exemplary for the depth of support that she's provided in all aspects of my own scholarly and political development.

I would also be totally remiss if I didn't signal out Brydon, Ryan, Shianna, Stacie, Seb, and Rachel, as some of the people who have shown perhaps the most profound capacity to engage in scholarship and political work as always-already simultaneously care work. Each of them has not only made this dissertation intellectually possible in their own way, they also made sure that I was looked after while doing it too.

Beyond wonderful campus communities, I've benefited from extensive familial support. The entirety of this dissertation is dedicated to my paternal and maternal grandmothers, respectively; though neither are here to read it, in their own way they're both present on each and every page. The Vithiananthans and the Rajaratnams each have opened their homes and their hearts in ways that make the often indulgent work of doctoral studies seem possible and meaningful. Jeff and Ahila, Appa and Amma, have provided food, respite, and relief in ways too numerous to count. And the entire Henderson and Clarke families have also always been quiet champions of my work, and patient recipients of its many consequent rants/ramblings. Anna, Aileen, and Brett, especially, have also all been a much needed, indispensable, grounding throughout this process. Among the biggest gifts has been meeting new family members, and the desire to spend more time with Willow was one of the strongest motivating factors in getting this thing done.

Mom and Dad, beyond gently suggesting that it was time to stop paying tuition constantly, have been supportive in ways that I don't think I had any right to expect. They've been amongst my most consistent cheerleaders for years now, and have shown again and again how profoundly meaningful it is to have a family that offers unconditional love and support.

Finally, and most importantly, Aruna remains the sturdiest and surest rock, not only in my work (which she offers more support and insights on than she's ever prepared to admit) but in my life as a whole. There's no possible world in which this would have been achievable without her, and all the love, kindness, and wisdom she's lent to me over the years. She remains, now and always, my favourite thinker, my most cherished comrade, and my best friend.

Dedication

For Verna, in return for the love of letters and the skill to use them;
And, for Betty, in return for the lessons in how to be fully human and living well with others.

Introduction: The Canadian Conjuncture

This project sets out from a place that seeks to understand the intellectual contours of anti-colonial politics being adopted by parts of the broad political left organizing within Canada today, specifically in settler-Indigenous solidarity movements and anti-capitalist organizing, as well as within certain strains of Canadian Political Science. The central problématique of this dissertation is the Canadian state as a social formation that is produced in/through, and is itself reproductive of, multi-scalar and differentiated processes of expropriation, domination, and exploitation. As such, throughout this project I trace some of the decolonization struggles taking place within, and directing themselves against, the Canadian state. While a number of struggles are highlighted throughout this project—including labour struggles, struggles for racial justice, and abolitionist movements—I attempt to understand them in their interrelationship with one of the most enduring freedom struggles in and against Canada: the continued assertion by Indigenous nations of their rights to self-determination.

The aims, antinomies, and commitments of this dissertation might thus best be illustrated by a very brief journey through three vignettes. While each of these recent events may at first appear to be quite idiosyncratic and discrete in their relationship to the other two, when understood together they can offer insights into a number of important dynamics and contradictory processes that define the contemporary conjuncture confronting those who are interested in liberatory politics in (and, as I will suggest, *against*) Canada today. The political and social theorist Stuart Hall suggests that a “conjuncture is not a slice of time, but can only be defined by the accumulation/condensation of contradictions, the fusion or merger... of ‘different currents and circumstances,’” that are historically shaped and determined, but remain open to forms of contestation and struggles which are themselves historically shaped but potentiate new openings

or trajectories.¹ Conjunctures, then, are the quotidian spaces in which history is made, presents are contested, and a variety of futures become possible, albeit not under conditions wholly of anyone's own choosing. Conjunctural analysis points towards the necessity of thinking social totality, of seeing the sprawling, often obscured or naturalized interrelationships that contour any given moment of political struggle—even if such a totality cannot, by definition, be mapped.

Vignette 1:

In the brief lull between Ontario's second and third 'waves' of COVID-19 infections in July 2021, scores of officers from the Toronto Police Service were deployed by the City of Toronto to remove encampments of houseless people from a number of 'public' parks. These raids destroyed self-built shelters, dispersing the communities of solidarity being constructed and organized by some of the city's most marginalized residents—who are disproportionately Indigenous and/or racialized, disabled, and unemployed or working-poor.² Scenes of police brutality were captured live by reporters, as the officers used chemical weapons, truncheons, and bare knuckles against both houseless residents and the housed community-members who came out in scores to link arms and defend their neighbours. These state-authorized operations, which defied all sound public health advice recommending that houseless people *not* be displaced further for the duration of the pandemic, cost a small municipality's housing budget (as much as \$2 million) and involved extensive, intimate, and "dystopian" surveillance of houseless people.³ In order to destroy these communities, the City deployed a paramilitary force of police—many heavily armed with riot gear and several on horseback—most of whom are not themselves even likely to live in the city in which they patrol.⁴ They acted at the behest of a municipal government which (while claiming to be striving towards a 'safer' and more 'accessible' solution for houseless people and the city as a whole) sought to preserve a public order premised on the supremacy of private

property. As tenant's unionist Tracy Rosenthal argues, "Unhoused people's comfort is a moral hazard. If the state provided housing for all who needed it—permanent, unsurveilled, well-resourced public housing—it would undermine the capitalist dictate that you must work for a wage in order to pay for the basic human need of shelter."⁵ Policing, then, is among the weapons of last resort to enforce the otherwise ubiquitous and mute compulsion to participate within a social order in which one is only entitled to the survival that they can buy, a reality co-constituted through white supremacy, cisheteropatriarchy, (dis)ableism, and colonialism.⁶

Vignette 2:

Several months later on April 16th, 2022, and more than 8000kms away in Sanguie Province, Burkina Faso, flooding due to heavy rainfall forced the closure of the Perkoa Zinc Mine, which is operated by the Vancouver-based Trevali Mining Corporation. A hasty response to the torrent left eight workers—six Burkinabé, one Tanzanian, and one Zambian—trapped in the mine shaft, more than half a kilometre below the surface.⁷ Unable to save these workers from the facility in which they labour to extract nearly 2000 tonnes of material per day, it took Trevali more than a month to publicly confirm that all eight of the trapped miners were accounted for as deceased. The company's response was widely and soundly criticized by nearly everyone, from non-governmental industry watchdogs in Canada to the Burkinabé Prime Minister; the Government of Canada, however, remained largely silent. As the crisis unfolded many noted that Trevali's delayed response—which included a scramble to reappropriate water pumps from the company's other operations in western Africa—evinced that proper safety precautions were not in place at the Perkoa Mine. This cost-cutting on safety measures occurred in spite of the fact that a number of industry reports as recently as 2020 specifically highlight the risk to zinc mining operations in Burkina Faso due to climate change.⁸ While several company officials were briefly prevented from

leaving the country by the Burkinabé government, it is unlikely that they will face any long-term or meaningful accountability for their complicity in this social murder. This is because the Canadian government both exerts considerable economic leverage over Burkina Faso and, simultaneously, maintains some of the most paltry legal frameworks governing Canadian corporations' liability, especially for their operations abroad. Canada has become renowned for this legislative environment, as it is now home to more than 75% of global mining companies.⁹ Indeed, in her only comment on Twitter about the mine situation Lee-Anne Hermann, Canada's ambassador to Burkina Faso and Benin, acknowledged that while it was a “most difficult day *for [Canadian] mining companies,*” in the very same sentence she also expressed that she was nevertheless thrilled to be in conversation with the CEO of yet another large Canada-based mining corporation, supporting their operations in the region.¹⁰ The Canadian state's global role in structuring and regularizing the flows of both profit accumulation *and* the distribution of risk and death, specifically to those on the wrong side of the global colour line, are baldly on display here.

Vignette 3:

In early 2022, Justice Kent handed down a significant decision at the British Columbia Supreme Court. The case, *Thomas and Saik'uz First Nation v Rio Tinto Alcan Inc.*, involves a dispute over the viability of a tort suit launched initially by the Saik'uz First Nation and the Stellat'en First Nation (both are Dakelh communities in the northern interior of what is presently known as British Columbia), against the Québec-based Rio Tinto. In their initial civil filings, the First Nations claimed damages against Rio Tinto for the company's role in constructing and operating the Kenney Dam on the Nechako River. The Nations argued that since construction in the 1950s, the dam has done substantial harm to their fisheries. Controlled water flows are dramatically reducing both sockeye and chinook salmon runs, as well as leading to the wholesale

extirpation of river sturgeon. Their suit sought an injunction to restore water flows capable of preserving and restoring these fish populations. While the facts of the case, and the grounded struggle of these First Nations in solidarity with these more-than-human-beings, are fascinating in themselves, it is Justice Kent's decision itself that is of most interest here. Kent finds that while the Nations have established the constitutional continuity of their Aboriginal rights and titles, and while they have shown convincing evidence of the serious damages to those rights and titles consequent to the dam's operations, he is nevertheless compelled to rule *against* the viability of the Nations' tort claims. Kent's reasoning is that because Rio Tinto engaged in activities authorized and regulated by the Crown (in this case, both the Province of British Columbia and the Government Canada), and because the duty to uphold the "honour of the Crown" in its obligations towards Indigenous peoples within Canada is non-delegable, the corporation is "immunized by defences based on statutory authority" (*para* 661). As a consequence of this division in law between the state and the other corporate bodies that it delegates certain capacities towards—that is, because of the classic liberal contrivance of a division between social activities purported to be of either public or private character—Justice Kent's decision uses the Crown to shield corporate interests by authorizing the continued destruction of whole ecosystems, the extirpation of species with their biological origins in the Late Cretaceous period, and the continuation of more than a century of settler conquest over Dakelh governance systems.

Discussion:

Perhaps the most banal way to think of these three vignettes as conjunctural—that is, not as discrete *events* but as differentiated manifestations of a common set of *social relations* with historically determined, but never deterministic, outcomes—is simply to 'follow the flag.' That is, to point out that, whether it flapped over the BC courthouse, was painted on the gates of the mine

entrance in western Burkina Faso, or was sewn onto the swinging arms of the City of Toronto's finest, the red and white of the Canadian flag is a single common thread woven throughout each of these scenes. Even this relatively banal thread, however, is more than merely a matter of vexillological intrigue, as it evidences a shared conception of delegated 'legitimate' violence. Which is just to note that the authorized presence—often, even, the *required* presence—of the Canadian flag is a map by which to read how certain actors (individual and corporate) within each of these vignettes have had responsibility delegated to them, or have been deputized, to carry out some part of the work that both belongs to and itself (re)produces the social formation that gets called, as a matter of shorthand, the Canadian state.

But the deeper nature of this conjuncture has all also been implicitly theorized by Justice Kent himself—albeit in a manner that lacks a politicized understanding of the consequences of his own findings. In his decision in *Saik'uz v Rio Tinto*, Kent offers a lengthy and considered reflection on “Aboriginal Rights and Jurisprudence in Canada” (*paras* 171-213). Throughout this section of the decision Kent is clearly at pains to evidence a thorough and studied understanding of Aboriginal law, of the realities that Indigenous peoples face as a consequence of ongoing histories of colonization, and of the proliferation of critical scholarship on these matters. In short, Kent is clearly someone who has taken these matters quite seriously. Indeed, using language that is unusual to read from the bench, Kent writes: “Some argue, in my view correctly, that the whole construct [of the allodial nature of Crown sovereignty] is simply a legal fiction to justify the *de facto* seizure and control of the land and resources” of Indigenous peoples (*para* 198). Kent cites both historical and scholarly evidence to show the Christian and white supremacist logics animating this fiction. It is, nevertheless, a fiction that Kent ultimately finds he is bound to uphold

due to the principle of stare decisis and in the face of “certain harsh realities” (*para* 201); chief amongst those ‘realities’ being, in Kent’s estimation, that

the system of law and government imported by settlers into British Columbia and superimposed upon Indigenous peoples has become firmly and intractably entrenched. It is the foundation for Canadian society as it exists today. The laws of ownership of land are the basis of this country’s wealth and the very foundation for its economy. It is these same laws which provide legitimacy to this Court. As the Court noted in *Delgamuukw*, “we are all here to stay”, and while the legal justification for Crown sovereignty may well be debatable, its existence is undeniable and its continuation is certain. (*paras* 202-203)

This passage reveals a number of striking equivalencies and elisions that are worth unpacking. For instance, Kent’s assertion that the laws enforcing “ownership of land are the basis of this country’s wealth,” may be jarring when read in the light of the vignette with which I opened this discussion. Kent’s analysis here *depends* upon the rhetoric of nationalism. It is only by taking the ‘country’ as an undifferentiated whole that the supposed social good of property laws can elide the fact that they structure social relations that produce, amongst other things, houselessness. For the houseless communities and their supporters in Toronto who were set upon by armed agents of the state, the private ownership of land is a source of destitution—secured by direct violence—rather than of prosperity. Moreover, the experience of houselessness represents merely the limit-case, differing only in its *degree* of precarity, social alienation, and exposure to unmediated forms of violence. For the masses of people in Canada who may at present be housed but do not own their places of shelter, their very security of person is assured only insofar as they are able to remain a reliable site for value extraction by the propertied. If this system of exclusionary proprietorship is the source of the Court’s legitimacy in Kent’s view, it may reveal something about for whom the very concept of legitimacy is actually of political salience—it is certainly a group more narrow than the ‘country’ as a whole.

Kent's decision also reveals an extremely *reified* understanding of what are in fact contingent forms of collective organization and modes of *social relations*. This is made apparent in the all too easy slippage that occurs between his discussion of particular forms of property and his invocation that 'we are all here to stay.' Kent conflates *Delgamuukw*'s assertion that the embodied mass of settlers is unlikely to leave the territories of Indigenous nations with his own presumption about the continuity of presently dominant social forms, most explicitly private property rooted in Crown title. If 'we are all here to stay' is a claim that fixes in place not just actual people but also presently dominant modes of social relations, the implied corollary becomes something like 'and we will be living in almost precisely the same manner in which we have up until this point.' Put plainly, when Kent suggests that Crown sovereignty and its derivative systems of private property are "intractably entrenched," foundational, and "certain" in their future continuation, he transforms them from what they are, historically derived but mutable forms of relating between and among people and more-than-human-beings, into *objective* things that appear as if they have a natural existence of their own. That he does so with the full weight of the judiciary and the state's capacity to direct or delegate organized violence against those who dissent—in this case, the plaintiff First Nations—is what truly gives Kent's reification its alchemical heft. Moreover, where the 'here' is in which these forms of social relations have put down their roots, is a far less bounded matter than Kent's decision would seem to countenance. For, as I alluded to above and discuss at some length in Chapters One and Two, the fact that mining corporations that are 'housed' in Canada can engage in processes to extract and concentrate wealth through immense ecological destruction and human suffering, largely with impunity on a *global* scale, is a right delegated to them and defended by the Canadian state, which seeks to ensure enormous prosperity for some.

What is revealed by the logic undergirding Kent's decision as quoted above, ultimately, is a commitment to the court's role in reproducing presently dominant social relations.¹¹ Kent's findings in *Saik'uz v Rio Tinto* are an important reminder that these relations are both multidirectional and co-constitutive, and that when certain portions of civil society tremble—whether that's dam-operators in British Columbia, real estate speculators in Toronto, or Canada's extractive industrialists in Burkina Faso or elsewhere—the Canadian state and its many sometimes contradictorily articulating apparatuses (including coercive organs, courts, and legislatures) stand behind them and their interests, often *against* far more general interests.

From a theoretical perspective, what is also revealed here is that the court, as an apparatus of the state, carries within it an implicit understanding of its particular role in (re)producing and securing a social *totality*. That is to say that while Kent's findings show a reified understanding (again, that is a fixed or objectified view of that which is non-objective) of the social relations that presently define the settler order of Canada and the world system it maintains, his findings are nevertheless important for social and political critics or analysts to take seriously because they evidence an understanding of the non-incidental, co-constitutive interrelationships between and among seemingly discrete social forces. In other words, Kent's decision is contoured by an implied understanding of social totality. Whereas the First Nations made a tort claim seeking resolution on what they were prepared to treat as a relatively discrete matter, Rio Tinto, the BC Supreme Court, the province, and the federal government responded in manner that (re)asserted a defence of the social totality at stake in any such claim.

In short, if the state's various apparatuses are prepared to intervene, often but not exclusively with direct or delegated violence, to preserve the particular form of presently dominant social relations, then it seems that social critics must adopt methodologies of inquiry and, likewise,

that social actors need to organize for liberatory struggles that are similarly capacious in the work which they engage and the horizon to which they move. In other words, whereas there are often good analytical and political reasons for attempting to isolate particular issues, movements, or struggles in order to understand them in their specificity and in the hopes of advancing them in times of political closure, those who strive towards a liberatory vision should also constantly be attentive to Stuart Hall's rejoinder: "what does this have to do with everything else?" We ought to attend to this if for no other reason than because a flimsy and uncritical endorsement of 'everything else' is amongst the most common rhetorical cudgels used against liberatory and even reformist movements—as seen in Justice Kent's decision. But, on a more politically salient level, we ought to concern ourselves with the question of social totality because it appears increasingly that, in the words of Leanne Betasamosake Simpson: "We live in a time of global rebellion" against the prevailing world system, in which the Canadian state is a key actor and therefore a primary target of struggle.¹² This invites—perhaps demands—that we who are situated *within* Canada seek to understand the complex, sometimes contradictory, interrelations between and among liberatory struggles against Canada in Toronto, Burkina Faso, Dakelh territories, and in countless other places the world-over.

It is this comportment towards analyzing a social totality that I strive for throughout this dissertation, even as I am primarily attentive to the more specific theoretical and conceptual problems stymying the scholarly study of, and activist interventions within and against, Canadian politics today. My line of inquiry takes me to a number of places different than might be considered typical for many who share this launch point—I will outline this more in the chapter summary section below—however, much of what is to follow is presaged by these opening vignettes, though only thematically as I move through a number of other examples and cases in each chapter. Perhaps

the most overarching themes present in each vignette and woven throughout this project as whole are those of the *state*, *struggle*, and *scale*—especially in terms of how operating presumptions about each have constricted both political activity and Canadian Political Science’s tools of inquiry. As such, I draw on a number of expansive approaches and methods developed within such scholarly fields as Indigenous Studies, the literature on racial capitalism, and Global Histories.

Approaches and Literature Review:

The state:

There's nothing particularly novel about a political scientist with an interest in the state; indeed, this focus is generally considered to be the *raison d'être* of the discipline.¹³ However, in spite of this, political scientists have tended en masse to presume rather than interrogate the existence and persistence of this mode of collective organization. That is, we have sought to study the *processes* and *effects* of states rather than the state-form itself. As many have noted, Political Science is more often than not itself an ideological apparatus of statecraft, because it sets out from epistemological premises that commit its adherents to seeing, re-presenting, and subsequently acting upon/in the world ‘like a state.’¹⁴ The sort of ‘politics’ that interests much of the discipline is thus often largely restricted to the activities of and between those who hold various offices within state apparatuses or, perhaps, those who seek to appeal to people in such positions. Regardless, the state is given primacy, whether perceived as good or ill, in terms of conceptualizing the location and aims of political activity. This has meant, ironically enough, that the knowledge produced by mainstream Political Science has been of relatively modest use-value for non-elite actors and, in a more ideologically charged vein, it has presented an image of ‘the political’ which largely excludes the collectively organized self-activity of ordinary (ie. non-elite) people. Political Science has thus also largely precluded the political activities of entire nations without recognized states, amongst

whom Indigenous peoples stand as one of the most globally significant examples because of how so much of the contemporary state system has been constructed not only *on* their exclusion but in order to *enable* it.¹⁵

Against this, I adopt an approach to the study of specifically the *Canadian* state that is informed by Philip Abrams' assertions—writing as a sociologist within the imperial husk of Britain—that that which is called at present 'the state' is merely the manifestation of certain *social relations* that strive to (re)produce the *ideological* and *material* conditions necessary in order “to elicit support for and tolerance of the insupportable and intolerable by presenting them as something other than themselves, namely, legitimate, disinterested domination.”¹⁶ The brutalization of houseless people, the social murder of African mine workers, and the extirpation of whole species along with modes of Dakelh governance, names just a few such intolerable acts legitimized by the Canadian state that come readily to mind.

As Abrams details, this approach to the state not as a *thing* but as a *mode of relations* is also helpful for clarifying the existence of apparently contradictory impulses and interests subtended within/through the state as a whole, as well as within each of its particular apparatuses. An inquiry that begins not with the presumption of the state as a *fait accompli* but by studying interrelated—though differentiated and often conflictual—contemporary *social forces* (eg. land lords, mining executives, utility companies, but also tenants' unions or the police, workers' movements or the Canadian embassy, and Indigenous nations or the Supreme Court of BC) has as its foundational premise the “actual disunity of political power” for which the state is merely the “unified symbol of an actual disunity.”¹⁷ The apparent unification of these otherwise potentially contradictory social forces manifests through the attempt to mediate or in Stuart Hall's language

(which will be central to this project) to *articulate* often ill-fitting social forces into non-incidentally but historically contingent alignment to one another.¹⁸

Chapter Two offers an historically-informed theory of the Canadian state as itself an imperial formation predicated on the articulation of otherwise disparate settler nationhoods (ie anglophone and francophone) through what I am calling the ‘constitutionalization of whiteness.’ In that chapter I suggest that this articulation was central to the state’s continental conquest of northern North America. But the work of (re)producing the social relations that manifest as/through the Canadian state, what Ktunaxa/Cree scholar Joyce Green calls “Project Canada,” also draws into articulation and seeks to territorialize a number of global regimes of power that function co-constitutively with/in Canada.¹⁹ Perhaps most apparent, in the context of this dissertation’s main focus is the historical and ongoing foundation of Project Canada in the genocidal dispossession of lands from Indigenous peoples. As many have noted, though, this expropriation became the site of enormous surplus-value production in large part only through its articulation with global regimes of white supremacy that construct hyper-exploitable pools of labour by differentially racializing and then destabilizing communities of people around the world.²⁰ Moreover, as Robin DG Kelley notes, when understood in their social totality, these are *not* separate processes; rather, the expropriated Indigenous peoples of one territory are more often than not forced into the role of racialized labourers in another place through the global circuits of empire that Canada helps to structure and maintain.²¹

Policing and incarceration have also been fundamental technologies by which these articulations are maintained against internal contradiction and external challenge through resort to violence or the threat of violence. As Robyn Maynard explains “Canada’s history as a white-dominated, Anglo-Saxon state was not a natural evolution but required careful, indeed brutal,

engineering” in which the policing of Indigenous and racialized peoples was central.²² Heidi Kiiwentinepinesiik Stark makes a similar note, while also drawing crucial attention to the gendered dimensions of how policing, as an international technology of empire, both produces and attaches a criminalized form of masculinity to particular modes of Indigenous governance, while simultaneously producing and surveilling a domesticated/depoliticized sphere that encloses other forms of social life as ‘merely’ feminized reproductive labour obscuring its actual function as a mode of governance. Policing, thus, constitutes the Canadian social order *through* the cisheteropatriarchal structure of settler law.²³ This both extends and contours the hyper-exploitation of the (reproductive) labour of persons typically read as women or femme, which is a cornerstone of global political-economy.²⁴ These, and myriad other forms of exploitation and domination, are linked with one another—articulated—in non-incidentally but historically contingent ways that are nevertheless necessary to the relatively smooth reproduction of dominant social relations with/in Canada.

Struggles:

The possibility of such articulations—which again, in Hall’s account, are the durable linkings of social forces without fully synthesizing them—is itself non-deterministically determined as a matter of ongoing historical *struggles*. The state is at once a manifestation of ongoing struggles which have produced a presently dominant historic bloc of articulated interests and forces, it is also an aggregation of apparatuses that are wielded in efforts to reproduce the stability of said historic bloc in the face of both its own internal contradictions and exogenous challenges. *Importantly*, though, the state is also itself a delimited and semi-permeable terrain of ongoing struggles in and against which contemporary social forces attempt to remake social relations. This is all to say that, just as an historically informed study of the interrelations between

municipal governments, the police, and real estate interests will show that the deployment of organized state violence against houseless people is non-incidental—it has occurred again and again—it remains contingent to the degree that decisions continue to be made even as those who make them are confronted by the reality that they could have decided otherwise. That is, were it not for the overwhelming often mute compulsion of accumulated history and organized social forces that continue to incentivize those within dominant institutions to prioritize the reproduction of the historic bloc of articulated interests through/in which they are presently empowered—in short, prioritizing profit over people.

Indeed, as evidenced by those who linked arms *against* the police, or those who used the skills for which their labour is exploited to try to save their trapped comrades or others who sought to use the Burkinabé government to discipline Trevali's executives, or those who attempted to leverage the contradictory space of the Canadian judiciary against the ecocidal and colonial nexus of state and corporate interests, different decisions *are* in fact constantly being made by masses of mobilized and organized people. This, too, represents the nature of political struggle as always-already engaged through processes of articulation all the way down—through the building and nurturing of relationships between and among distinct but interrelated social forces. It's in these linkages, in their durability over time, and in the exercise of their combined capacities that *power* is collectively produced to create, sustain, unmake, and (re)create again the particular ways in which people and more-than-human-beings relate to one another, for good or for ill. Moreover, as alluded to above, when this work of 'worldmaking' is engaged through both counter-hegemonic and grassroots strategies (as I will discuss in Chapter Four and Five), it seeks to eschew or evade the tired, reductive attempts to divide the animating forces of struggle between idealist and materialist accounts.

The point of view from which I seek to understand contemporary anti-colonialisms and the possibilities of anti-imperialist worldmaking relies upon Cedric Robinson's invitation to think social relations in their *ontological totality*.²⁵ That is, to understand what gets described as the ideational, the concrete, and (most bedeviling for many post-Enlightenment thinkers) the spiritual, not as divided or stadially organized, but as inextricable and co-constitutive. And as scholars like Glen Coulthard and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson have both noted, an appreciation of ontological totality necessarily includes accounting for distinct notions/practices of "grounded normativities," or the form of relations between humans and the more-than-human-beings whose interrelations precede and enable human life as such.²⁶ That is, as an ontological totality. This perspective also informs the constant methodological toggling throughout this dissertation between my analysis of social movements striving with/against one another 'on-the-ground,' so to speak, and my interest in interrogating a number of texts produced in/through some of those same movements—especially those that aim at decolonization. Just as these movements produce visions of an otherwise, such visions produce movements; there is no necessary mechanistic or deterministic relationship, and causality is not nearly as temporally linear as dominant political theory canons would like to believe.²⁷

In this way, I attempt to evidence that this "Robinsonian method" of being attentive to the ontological totality of social life as a generative engine of struggle is, in HLT Quan's words, a way to "de-authorize and destabilize dominant modes of social research [in order] to recover the meanings, presence and analytical potential of the ungovernable... This subversive methodology, with its explicit intent to disorder and share knowledge... is both democratic and anarchic."²⁸ What Quan accounts for as the democratically anarchic disposition of this methodology should not be read in the *negationary* vein through which much of what she and Robinson call "Western

Anarchism” has operated. Instead of plotting bomb-throwers, this method asks that we be primarily attentive to the living reality—contra the claims of political and economic elites—of ordinary people’s capacity for, and indeed their extant exercise of, self-determination. This disposition, which shapes my dissertation, has also been aphorized by one of Robinson’s primary intellectual antecedents, the Trinidadian anti-colonial philosopher and historian CLR James, in his assertion that “every cook can govern.”²⁹ Throughout this project, I strive to take these authors seriously, by seeking to analyze the conditions under which a thorough-going sense of self-determination as the basis of mutualist social relations, that are not limited to particular groups (eg. white settlers) or particular spheres of life (eg. the public or ‘political’), not only becomes possible to imagine but is actively being sought through and built within struggles that travel under the name of decolonization. In this way, the Indigenous-led struggles in and against Canada represent both a leading edge of assertions for self-determination—as they strike at some of the core points of articulation within the world system—and an enduring infrastructure of solidarity with/through which many struggles for self-determination have become articulated.³⁰

Multi-scalar Analyses:

Much of the work central to this dissertation has consequently necessitated a theoretical shift on my part away from the received concepts of scale that shape presumptions within Canadian Politics, as well as amongst many activists, about the nature, location, and direction of political struggles. On the whole, these have tended to begin from an assumption of methodological nationalism—that the state is *the* a priori scale of analysis and struggle. For myself, I begin instead from the observation offered by a number of important critical scholars that, in the 21st Century, we are compelled to operate within and against a *global* system. This encompasses the state system that both Makere Stewart-Harawira and Adom Getachew note has been so adept at producing the

conditions for both uneven integration that enables domination to persist in spite of a rhetoric of sovereign equality, and to maintain the wholesale exclusion of many peoples and nations from the ‘international community.’³¹ Likewise, it encompasses a global political-economy built over the course of several centuries that, as Lisa Lowe, Moon-Ho Jung, and George Manuel and Michael Posluns each note from their distinct vantage points, has enabled the extraction of people and more-than-human-beings from their own ontological totalities in order to press them, in differentiated ways, into processes for the production and concentration of value that accrues elsewhere.³²

Importantly, though, this attention to the global is not meant to collapse my analysis into, or overdetermine, a monistic vision of the world; this global system is rife with—indeed, produced and defined by—internal differentiations and contradictions, and it also has not yet totally subsumed the entirety of planetary life. These are very often the spaces and social forces to which my analysis is drawn. The significance of beginning from the perspective of a global system is twofold: in the first instance, it enables a multi-scalar analysis capable of responding to Hall’s inciting query “what does this have to do with everything else?” Against a common view that presumes atomistic and discrete social objects (eg. states), beginning my analysis from the historically situated observation of a global system facilitates an appreciation of the ways in which distinctions—between, for instance, imperial cores and their peripheries, or consequently overdeveloped and over-exploited regions—are not a priori facts, but rather the processual consequences of differentially shared social relations that necessitate and produce such uneven relations of expropriation, domination, and exploitation; and that also produce their own particular epistemic lenses by which to make inquiries about relations of power.

Which leads directly to the second important reason for beginning from this global perspective: it more accurately reflects the historical processes that made, continue to reproduce, and also shape challenges to the contemporary composition of social relations within what is presently known as Canada. As Olúfẹ́mi Táíwò notes, while we often think and speak of the world system as comprised of apparently discrete and seemingly fixed states, or relations of wealth and poverty, the processes by which this world system came into being and has been reproduced over time are neither neatly bounded nor are they merely *externally* related to one another. Instead, in Táíwò's words, taken in their totality, even in their spatially and temporally uneven differentiations, the co-constitutive regimes of white supremacy, cisheteropatriarchy, (dis)ableism, capitalism, and statism constitute "the politico-economic system of the world as something like a water management system, a web of aqueducts that spans the globe, channeling, instead of water, advantages and disadvantages from one place to another" along cavities worn smooth to the point of often seeming natural to those who anticipate receiving their benefits.³³

Moreover, as Táíwò suggests—following in a lineage of thought associated with the abolitionist geographer Ruth Wilson Gilmore—the question of scale is never reducible to a matter of discrete 'levels of analysis.' Thus, multi-scalar analyses (such as that which this dissertation strives towards) are not achieved by simply stacking the body, the household, the civic, the region, the nation, and the international on top of one another or by presuming mechanistic relations *between* any of these things. Rather, scales are "nested," interrelated, and co-constitutive.³⁴ The body is made and contested at a global scale through regimes that channel social power towards those recognized in their claim to be white, male, or able-bodied, just as much as the state is produced and challenged on a micro-scale through performative embodiments of citizenship such as showing deference to officers of the state, through households that produce citizens eager for

‘national service,’ or through cities that understand their governing authority as derived from the Crown rather than from the Indigenous nations on whose territories they are situated.

This notion of multi-scalar analysis is, I think, an important methodological commitment that I attempt to carry throughout this dissertation, especially as it becomes increasingly interested with the role of settlers and other non-Indigenous people acting in solidarity with Indigenous-led decolonization struggles that centre around land/water defence. As a consequence of both the fact that the ontological totalities—the variegated ideational, material, and spiritual modes of ordering relations—of many Indigenous nations are developed in deep learned reciprocity with the lands, waters, and more-than-human-beings in relation with whom each nation emerged, *and* due to the pivot of many settler states towards fostering aggressively extractivist economies that are by necessity quite ecologically destructive, many of the anti-colonial struggles of many Indigenous nations have expressed themselves as a defence of *place*. Indigenous thinkers and scholars have repeatedly shown and theorized this conjuncture.³⁵ Interestingly though, in secondary treatments of this mode of struggle, there is a frequent tendency—perhaps induced by transits through the notion of *locality*—for some scholars or activists to re-present place as the terrain of struggle by relying on a language about the *local*. In such secondary treatments, more often than not, this translation of place redounds to something roughly synonymous with a veneration of localism, smallness, regionalism, or the micro-scalar, and that often seems to be enabled by an imagination of a place or places as discrete, enclosed, or radically autonomous in some way.³⁶

But this feels like a far-cry from the view of place as multi-scalar, and the concomitantly expansive commitment in terms of what it therefore means to struggle in defence of place, that tends to be advanced by many Indigenous land/water defenders. For instance, as a leading Anishinaabe opponent of Enbridge’s Line 3 and Line 5 projects—pipelines to carry tar sands

bitumen across the headwaters of Lake Superior and the Straits of Mackinaw, respectively—Winona LaDuke speaks not just in terms of the extreme *local* ecological destruction experienced by her community at the hands of this industry, but also of the ways in which her community’s struggle is always-already about a simultaneous defence of and solidarity with all those who are ‘downstream’ of such projects.³⁷ The struggle by the White Earth Nation against Line 3 foresees and seeks to forestall the inevitable disaster of a spill not only for their own people, but for Anishinaabek on the north shore of Superior, the Haudenosaunee on Lake Ontario, the Abenaki on the Gulf of St. Lawrence, and for all the settlers, other non-Indigenous people, and the more-than-human beings who depend upon the Great Lakes Basin for their water—which is to say, for life itself.

This expansive understanding echoes the mode of struggle deployed by land/water defenders organizing against the Trans Mountain Expansion project who I discuss in Chapter Five, and it shows a conception of place that is defined not through enclosure but through relationality. It moves the struggle from what could have been (and often is, in the hands of some ‘environmentalists’) the parochialism of not-in-my-back-yard, to one of not-on-this-planet. These struggles engage in defences of place in a manner that understands any *particular* place in its interrelated totality with *all* places. Moreover, as LaDuke and Deborah Cowen explain, Indigenous place-based struggles are strategically vital in disrupting presently dominant modes of social relations, because they strike at the “Achilles heel” that is the so-called critical infrastructure enabling, extending, and energizing the historic bloc of the settler state and the heavy industry of racial capitalism.³⁸ They see and contest the totality of settler imperialism’s world system in the otherwise mystified form of a single infrastructure project.

The Canada Problem, Or Canada as the Problem:

Among the ways in which the operations of these multi-scalar relations of both domination and resistance are obscured is through the overwhelming commitment to *methodological nationalism* in both scholarship and as the presumed scale of political life and struggle. This is a tendency that I trace out in Chapter One as it pertains specifically to both scholarly and popular thought on much of the broad left in Canada today, and so I do not belabour it here. But this methodological nationalism is also—perhaps unsurprisingly—a defining approach within my own academic subfield of Canadian Politics. Recently, influential scholars have felt compelled to launch defences of the subfield of Canadian Politics as an explicitly *national* endeavour against the broader demands impressing themselves on the academy as a whole to pursue research models that yield greater global ‘impact’ or that generate scholarly material that is more easily abstracted and generalized outside its initial context. Against this Alain Noël, in his 2014 Presidential address to the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA), has argued vigorously that such imperatives disarticulate Canadianists from our civic function. He describes our collective role as being “to develop ‘usable knowledge,’ knowledge that can enlighten and contribute to public debates, over real, important issues” *within* Canada’s “national conversations.”³⁹ This, Noël asserts somewhat grandiosely, is a “noble objective, about which we do not need to apologize,” as it situates Canadianists as civically-minded and publicly necessary scholars “engaging in the social and political life of our own society.”⁴⁰

While I find relatively little to quibble with in Noël’s central contention that Political Science scholarship ought to be ‘usable,’ it is in his apparent presumption that its use-value is to be appropriable by a national community constituted within and through the state that I find troubling given my preceding discussion. In short, it is the question of for *whom* and to *what ends* our scholarship ought to be of use that continues to bedevil. Just as Noël rightly critiques the

neoliberal academy for its obsession with the production of knowledge from/for nowhere in particular, I want to suggest that presuming that the study *of* Canada must necessarily redound to a scholarship that is *for* Canada—or for a society that sees itself as necessarily constituted *through* the Canadian state, as he seems to imply—is just as untenable. As Yasmeen Abu-Laban’s 2017 Presidential address to the CPSA makes clear, Noël’s model of Canadianists as “citizen scholars” is actually largely congruent with the whole history of the discipline. Indeed, the only distinguishing feature that seems to be at question in the mainstream of Canadian Political Science is whether Canadianists are merely laudatory in their comportment towards their object of study, or whether they see their obligation as providing palliative insights that might in some way improve the Canadian condition.⁴¹ For his part, Noël clearly signals through his closing comments that he is firmly of the latter persuasion, suggesting that political scientists—like medical doctors—spend most of our time seeking to “help people live with their condition, [and to] manage the problem they have.”⁴² Though, a fair assessment of Noël’s address in its entirety may trouble the precise scale on which he sees himself operating, as state and society become slippery in places throughout. Noël crucially acknowledges that the position of Québec, in particular, has left Canada “unachieved” in the specific sense that there are major seemingly irresolvable contradictions within Project Canada’s state-building enterprise that continue to produce social forces and movements that fundamentally challenge the state-form itself.⁴³

This almost passing admission on Noël’s part has been expressed by others who study Canadian Politics, and in terms that are far more resolved in their conclusions than is Noël. These studies are often conducted ‘at the margins’ of the discipline so-to-speak, or else at its intersections with other disciplines and subfields, but they strike at the heart of how Canada is understood and towards what ends scholarship is striving. Scholars trained in Political Science and Indigenous

Studies, like Kevin Bruyneel, Glen Coulthard, Shiri Pasternak, and Gina Starblanket have continually troubled the Crown's claims to territorial jurisdiction, just as they challenge the state's post-colonial narratives emerging from its so-called reconciliation project.⁴⁴ Likewise, numerous political scientists, such as Rita Kaur Dhamoon, Nisha Nath, Owen Toews, and Ethel Tungohan have worked to show the continuity of Canada's white supremacist power structures, in spite of the overwhelming deluge of official 'post-racial' and 'multicultural' rhetoric.⁴⁵ Many, though not all, of these latter scholars are deeply informed by theories of racial capitalism or critical race theory.

I take it as a given that none of the above scholars is naïve in their anticipation that the Canadian state, and the social relations of which it is a manifestation, are likely to be overcome overnight—especially in light of the fact that an entrenched power elite clearly views such social relations as 'intractable' and 'certain' in their continuation. Nevertheless, what I find compelling about the mode in which they approach their specific areas of inquiry and in their relationship to the Canadian Politics discipline as whole is that, in spite of Canada's seemingly fixed existence, they eschew any normative capitulation to the state-form as such. Which is to say, that just as much as they recognize that their work as political scientists is ongoing *in* and *about* Canada, this necessitates no particular acceptance of Canada. They engage Canadian Politics as a subfield the unifying object of which—that is, the Canadian state—is no more essentially or transhistorically fixed or immutable than any other particular elements of study. Indeed, more often than not, I read these authors and their respective schools of thought as both learning from and then attempting to co-develop 'usable' forms of knowledge alongside communities whose political horizon is either explicitly or implicitly *against* the Canadian state. This dissertation was written in the hopes of making a similar contribution.

Chapter Breakdown and Methods:

I have structured this dissertation into three sections that, while interrelated, take up distinct 'points of view' in the hopes that a variety of angles will better inform the overall conjunctural analysis I aim at in this project. Section breaks should be read as indicating the chapters that are most closely related to one another. For instance, Section One, which contains Chapters One and Two, begins from a perspective that is likely to feel most familiar to others disciplined within the mainstream of Political Science, as its point of view is situated 'from above'—amidst presently dominant elite power structures. As a whole, Section One is interested in responding to my central problématique, by seeking a better understanding how the Canadian state both manifests and reproduces presently dominant social relations on a multi-scalar level, and as such this section begins by engaging a number of critical approaches to state theory.

In Chapter One, "Two Faces of Canada, (Con)Testing Critical Approaches," I provide a deconstructive survey and critical analysis of two theoretical schools of thought—settler colonial studies and marxist anti-imperialism—that shape both political discourse and praxis on the broad left in Canada, *and* that have considerable purchase within scholarly circles as well. While these are both critical approaches, and therefore tend to exist towards the margins of scholarly debates, I take them both up because they appear as increasingly predominant framings within the left's activist and academic circles (two groups which, as my discussion of *Canadian Dimension* in this chapter outlines, are far from discrete). As I note in Chapter One, while the common-sense understanding of colonialism and imperialism as deeply interrelated phenomenon might suggest that these framings are likely to work in complimentary or co-productive ways, what I find in my analysis is a strange posture of silence towards one another. The reason for this, my deconstructive reading ultimately suggests, is more than merely incidental. Rather, I argue that *both* literatures

begin from statist presumptions, they are each epistemologically founded in an uninterrogated methodological nationalism—albeit in quite distinct ways.

In the case of settler colonial studies, the analytical reach of this framing is circumscribed to a domestic sphere largely disconnected from the rest of the world. Inversely, the marxist anti-imperialists with whom I engage tend to eschew interrogating the domestic, focusing instead on the realm of the international. For the former school of thought colonialism occurs ‘at home,’ whereas for the latter imperialism always begins ‘abroad.’ In this way, I note that each framing produces an analytical aporia in the precise shape of the state-form and that by foreclosing analytical attention to the social totality that moves through and across state borders, these frames serve ultimately to reify the Canadian state from distinct directions. Settler colonial studies largely ignores the global circuits of power that produce and enable Canada’s colonial project, and these marxist anti-imperialists miss the centrality of colonization in both constituting the Canadian state as an always-already imperial formation and providing the infrastructure to project its power globally. I conclude this chapter by suggesting an alternative framing, outlining Cedric Robinson’s account of racial capitalism. In concurrence with Nick Estes and Manu Karuka, I see this an approach that offers a more compelling, historically grounded theory by which to interrogate the *social relations* of expropriation, domination, and exploitation that the Canadian state manifests and reproduces, without getting trapped within the analytical mystifications of the state-form that stymie these two critical schools informing much of the left in Canada today.⁴⁶

Chapter Two, “Canadian Settler Imperialism,” maintains the overall perspective of Section One, continuing to concern itself with state theory and politics ‘from above.’ In this chapter, however, I build on the account of racial capitalism in Chapter One, while also drawing from both Indigenous Studies and Global Histories to develop a theoretical lens that can denaturalize the

state-form, in order to explore Canada's always-already imperial character. The concept of "settler imperialism" is one that I glean from engagements with scholars who are largely focused on America. While some of these scholars have adopted this framing because of presumptions that America's imperial character is exceptional amongst settler states, I show that a careful study of both the concept itself and the history of Canadian state-building reveals a far more generalizable theory. Moreover, as I strive to make clear, this account of the settler state's imperial character *derives from* attention to the fact that it manifests and maintains an imperial mode of living—in short, being attentive to how Canada functions as an imperial project is a way to *avoid* reification by studying imperialism as a mode of social relations.

As such, it is in this chapter that I pick up most fully Philip Abrams' contention that one "plausible alternative... to taking the state for granted is to understand it as historically constructed."⁴⁷ The methods of historical institutionalism have long shaped Canadian Political Science, but their predominance has waned in recent decades. Given this, it is perhaps unsurprising that historical institutionalist methods have tended to be rather obtuse on matters of colonialism and white supremacy in their efforts to explain Canadian state-building.⁴⁸ Turning to Hansard records of constitutional debates in the Province of Canada, the Imperial Parliament in London, and the Dominion Parliament in Ottawa as my primary source material, I show the development of the Canadian state's institutions to be a largely self-conscious project of empire-building, through the deliberate devolution of responsibility for, and control of, continental conquest from London to a settler population 'on-the-ground.' This devolution, I argue, was made possible through the federal arrangement's articulation of anglophone and francophone settlers' interests in advancing a continental conquest against Indigenous nations. Institutionally, this required the coagulation of what I call constitutional whiteness in the British North America Act, as a primary

binding agent of the Canadian state. I conclude this chapter by suggesting that it may be the Canadian model of settler imperialism, rather than the American, that proved to be the predominating example of imperial recomposition into the 20th Century.

Section Two, which also contains Chapters Three and Four, begins with a short Interlude, “A Monumental Task.” This is simply meant to thematize the dissertation’s perspectival shift, from a predominating disciplinary outlook on the political as constituted by/through the state and situated ‘from above,’ to the politics ‘from below’ that will animate much of the rest of this project. In the interlude, I draw attention to concerns expressed by elite political actors—of all (non-)partisan stripes—that mass direct action in the name of decolonization, such as the toppling of statues, risks further souring relations between Indigenous peoples and settlers. I suggest that these sentiments work to obscure the relational work ongoing in sites of political contestation from below. Moreover, I also draw attention to the potential of other more liberatory relations that are sustained through circuits of political solidarity and the nascent internationalisms glimpsed in the memetic transits of people on the move in mass direct actions on a global scale. Subsequently, Chapters Three and Four engage different theories of settler-Indigenous relations, some emerging within scholarly literatures, but the bulk of which are derived from what I call activist archives—that is, toolkits, pamphlets, zines, and transcribed speeches that circulate in and amongst organizations and movements striving towards a horizon of more just relations between settlers and Indigenous peoples variously described as reconciliation or decolonization. This choice of sources is meant to also advance the overall perspectival shift of the dissertation, as it engages these texts not merely as primary documents, but simultaneously as the political theory and approaches produced by non-elite actors. I argue that part of shifting to a Political Science beyond methodological nationalism and ‘from below’ requires taking the self-activity of non-elite actors

seriously and approaching their intellectual work as that of people who are political theorists in their own right.

My account of settler imperialism outlined in Section One establishes a theory of the Canada state not as a fixed or stable object but as a social relation (re)produced through ongoing and recomposing attempts to articulate a variety of interrelated social forces into an historic bloc that exerts itself on/through nested global scales. Chapter Three, “With Allies Like These...” takes up the dialectical inversion of this account by suggesting that if Canadian settler imperialism is made through articulation, it can be unmade through *disarticulation*—that is, through social forces breaking away from or turning against the historic bloc of which they have been a part. Drawing from an emerging scholarly literature on policing in Canada, I suggest that this is more than a merely theoretical claim. The fact that the Canadian state’s security apparatuses spend enormous resources attempting to disrupt and intervene against the networks of solidarity that Indigenous movements are building with settlers and other non-Indigenous peoples evidences a fear within the state of just such disarticulations occurring. Building from this, I investigate one of the leading rhetorical and theoretical framings used to describe political relations forged across social difference generally, and increasingly used to characterize the politics of building better settler-Indigenous relations specifically: that is, allyship. Beginning with an analysis of the growing scholarly literatures on “alliances” I suggest that while this analysis has been vital for engendering a shift in the study of Canadian colonialism that decentres the state, revealing a number of multidirectional tendencies within settler-Indigenous relations, it has also increasingly focused on pathologized and depoliticized theories of subjectivity.

Seeking a more tangibly political theory of allyship, I turn in the latter portion of Chapter Three to six “ally toolkits,” that purport to offer practical steps by which settlers can act as allies

to Indigenous peoples. Each of these toolkits was selected based on their wide circulation, having been both shared publicly by numerous civil society organizations as well as within a number of grassroots social movement spaces of which I have been a part. As such, there's no claim towards either comprehensiveness or finality in the analysis of allyship that I derive of these specific toolkits, given that their coherence as an activist archive is contoured primarily by the fact that they circulated within activist communities in Victoria, British Columbia, and amongst grassroots groups of primarily—but by no means exclusively—settlers seeking to support Indigenous-led front line struggles elsewhere within the province. Moreover, as many of the other organizers within these movements share my own social location as a white, university-affiliated settler, the intellectual materials passed around these spaces certainly reflect the particularities of what it might mean to approach allyship from such a positionality. Nevertheless, the relatively broad public attention that many of these documents have received also points towards the significant role that they have played in shaping popular understandings of allyship. Through a critical discourse analysis of these toolkits, however, I suggest that their vision of reconciliation through allyship ultimately comes up short of an adequate response to the problem posed by the Canadian state in the form of settler imperialism. The political horizon of allyship is overly narrow; that is, because allyship thinks in terms of a dyadic relationship rather than social totality, it seeks merely accommodation *within* existing power relations, rather than a more thoroughgoing undoing or remaking of such relations. I ultimately suggest that allyship tends to come off as though it is more a project of moralistic or charitable posturing *for the would-be ally* than it is anything to do with struggling against settler imperialism or for Indigenous self-determination in the broadest sense of that project.

By contrast to this, in Chapter Four, “Who Needs Decolonization?” I turn to a distinct activist archive that theorizes the political horizon of settler-Indigenous relations through the goal of decolonization as a project of collective liberation. Drawing on a critical discourse analysis of eight further documents—including a number of zines, pamphlets, transcribed speeches, and a blog post—I note that while both the ally toolkits of Chapter Three and this second activist archive are worthwhile examples of political theories ‘from below,’ the latter set of documents is distinct for having developed a theory of power that is consistent with this perspective and method of struggle. Whereas the ally toolkits reified existing social relations by assuming that power naturally accrues to or is derived from certain offices or institutions, the documents examined in Chapter Four evidence an understanding of power as produced through collective (self-)organization. This resonates in important ways with the emphasis that I have placed on the articulation of social forces as the central defining feature of political activity, a sentiment expressed by the constant efforts of many authors within this archive to develop an account of decolonization as a collective political struggle to remake social relations in their totality. In the theory developed here, I note a profound emphasis on *relational autonomy*—that is, co-constitutive and mutualist forms of self-determination—as both a tactic and an aim of anti-colonial struggles. Against the narrowed horizon of possibility presented by theories of allyship, I suggest that this theory of decolonization is conversant with an emergent scholarly literature on “worldmaking” as a descriptive catch-all for the interrelated and multi-scalar processes that seek to challenge and unmake the present world system which has been constructed, reproduced, and recomposed over the previous six centuries in order to reflect the ontological totality of European and settler imperialisms. I ultimately suggest that this second activist archive is not only more analytically attuned to the problem of Canadian settler imperialism, but it also both emerges from,

and more convincingly depicts, many of the most impactful forms of Indigenous-led decolonization struggles in and against Canada today. Informed by this theory of settler-Indigenous relations, and enlivened by the possibility of collective struggle from below aiming at a liberatory horizon, I turn to Section Three which contains the final chapter of this dissertation.

In Chapter Five, “The Tiny House, In Common,” I explore Indigenous-led struggles against Canada’s proposed expansion of the Trans Mountain Pipeline (TMX) as a case-study through which to understanding the preceding discussions. Among my central concerns in this chapter is mapping out a multi-scalar account of both the Canadian state’s infrastructural project *and* of the resistance to it. For instance, I note at some length both the global significance of the TMX project, in terms of its role in (re)producing the critical infrastructure of racial capitalism and also in its significant intended contributions to anthropogenic climate change, while simultaneously drawing upon the Federal Court of Appeals’ decision in *Tsleil-Waututh Nation v. Canada* (2018) to highlight the profoundly grounded and direct impacts that the project is expected to have on the territories and communities through which it is being constructed. I describe the Government of Canada’s efforts to advance this project and their attempt to build a framework of legitimacy around it as strategies of maintaining and advancing *hegemony*, against which I note that there are a number of articulated *counter-hegemonic* efforts underway as well. Here, I theorize the work of a coalition of First Nations and municipalities in bringing both legal challenges against TMX and in helping to organize/support a grounded and institutionalized opposition to the project as a vital tactic that leverages the existing contradictions of the state-form towards anti-colonial purposes. This account, I hope, eschews hardened stances either in favour of the necessity of the courts and other state apparatuses, or of their fundamental corruption, and instead points towards the ultimately strategic nature of the decision as to *where* anti-colonial struggles take place. This is an

insight that I extend further by noting that the existence of counter-hegemonic struggles in no way necessarily precludes the emergence of grassroots movements, which seek to build a common front outside of and against the apparatuses of the state.

It is these grassroots movements against TMX that attract the bulk of my attention in the latter portion of this chapter. Here I turn to the example of a coalition of community organizations in Victoria, BC, that articulated their individual projects and interests in order to construct a mobile tiny home in solidarity with the Tiny House Warriors—a grassroots organization asserting Secwepemc self-determination in the face of the TMX project's proposal to run through their territories. Detailing some of the work that went into building the tiny home, and then focusing on the powerful march that sent it up the Saanich Peninsula and on to Secwepemcul'ecw, where it continues to be used in the assertion of Secwepemc governance, I strive to show the immensely generative work that goes on through grassroots movements of this sort. While I point towards the recalcitrance of local media coverage as evidencing a certain knee-jerk by many within the chattering classes towards a mode of political activity that refuses to genuflect towards the constituted apparatuses of state power, I also note that grassroots movements like this have the capacity to radically transform not only how we think about the political, but how we actually engage it too. These are, I suggest in short, movements of worldmaking from below, that strive to articulate the necessary social forces that can struggle towards a project of collective liberation from the world system of settler imperialism.

One final word on methodology pertains to the writing style of this dissertation, and may be helpful to any potential readers. In my effort to take seriously the task of conjunctural analysis, and to respond in a committed way to Stuart Hall's invitation to answer what these particular phenomenon have to do with 'everything else,' I have attempted to draw a number of connections

between the specific matters of concern to this dissertation and their antecedents, echoes, parallels, contradictions, and consequences ‘elsewhere.’ In some ways, I view this as also in keeping with some of the core lessons of Indigenous Studies which, through its emphasis on the inter-relationship of all things, offers an important methodological imperative towards thinking social totality.⁴⁹ In my best effort to streamline an already very busy text, I have thus relied heavily upon endnotes to achieve this. As such, my endnotes serve a dual function: in the first instance they provide the signage for the intellectual footpath on which I’ve travelled in producing this dissertation. But in their more substantive form, they are intellectual “rabbit holes” that fellow travelers are invited to fall down—should they find the subject at hand to be of interest.

Section One

Chapter One: Two Faces of Canada, (Con)Testing Critical Approaches

Political Science, like many other disciplines in the social sciences or humanities, thrives on what scholars like to call essentially contested concepts. Which is to say, much of our theoretical, qualitative, and quantitative wrangling is bound up in necessary disputes over the appropriate mobilization of tools for describing, and attempting to make discrete, portions of the totality of social life that are always essentially more complex, interrelated, and self-contradictory than can be successfully captured by a single concept—much less in the often theoretically idiosyncratic intended usage of any given concept.¹ I contend that ‘Canada’ represents just such a contested concept—it is a descriptor that, while in common usage, contains multiple, often contradicting meanings. ‘Canada’ is variously used to describe a bounded social community, to locate geological formations transhistorically, and even to describe certain apparently aspirational philosophical principles.² As a subfield of the larger discipline, Canadian Political Science mobilizes each of these disparate meanings to varying degrees in order to describe, whether implicitly or explicitly, its object of study. More frequently, however, Canadianists—that is, political scientists focused on the study of this thing called Canada—have deployed ‘Canada’ as term of art, a shorthand to evoke the institutional apparatuses of government. Amongst these apparatuses Canadianists variously include (but do not necessarily limit themselves to): the legislative, executive, and judicial branches; the bureaucracy and diplomatic corps; the security apparatuses of the police, the armed forces and the surveillance organs; and, sometimes, the ideological apparatuses, like the public schools, state-funded post-secondary institutions, and cultural organs like the art or research councils. Within the discipline, then, ‘Canada’ often most clearly evokes an institutional assemblage commonly understood as ‘the state’; though, as states are themselves manifestations of certain dominant social relations, it is almost never taken as a

fully discrete or totally unified object—indeed, its non-discrete and contradictory elements are typically the focus of disciplinary inquiry.³

Even in this relatively focused application, though, substantial disagreement persists over what it means to discuss the Canadian state. Canada has been described by competing authors and schools of thought variously as either a paragon of liberalism or a Whiggish/Tory counterformation against American liberalism; likewise, while some have stressed the importance of common law traditions in shaping governing institutions and norms, there are those who suggest that the framework of individual rights predominates how Canadians relate to the state; further still, while there are those who seem to suggest that Canada has been a benign state-building project relative to other examples close at hand, there are very mainstream commentators who—disputing this—argue vigorously that the Canadian state came about only through a series of ongoing, though “incomplete conquests.”⁴ Each of these could be described as a “face” that becomes visible when the Canadian state is studied through a particular theoretical lens or with attention to a variety of animating political concerns.⁵ The ambition of this chapter is not to tackle all the possible ‘faces’ of Canada, much less to arrive at a fixed intended usage for this contested concept. Rather, I intend to study just two faces of the Canadian state, both of which seem to me to be of increasing importance in both theory and praxis to—what might for shorthand be called—the broad political left and in critical Canadianist scholarship.

The two faces that interest me were well depicted, though likely unintentionally, in back-to-back issues of *Canadian Dimension*—a magazine that is among the oldest and largest popular publications of the left in Canada. Featured as the cover of the November/December 2006 issue, a thirty-two page special focus insert was quizzically entitled: “Canada: A New Imperial Power?” While it is a publication that is charged with political education, *Canadian Dimension* is also not

wholly for the uninitiated; it presumes as a matter of course, for instance, an anti-capitalist readership. As such, both the novelty and the uncertainty surrounding Canadian imperialism implied in the title can be read to indicate the editorial board's sense that the question must be asked and an argument must be made. Covering a diversity of topics including foreign 'aid,' militarism, global resource mining, state-form theory, and more, the special focus was impressive, but also strikingly limited to matters of exclusively foreign and trade policy. Framed in this way, *Canadian Dimension* structures its investigation of imperialism in a manner that evacuates the relevance of matters internal to Canada's assumed territorial jurisdiction, which often manifests as the ongoing dispossession/displacement of Indigenous peoples and the occupation of their territories in the northern portion of North America by settlers, industry, and the Crown.⁶

Canadian Dimension's subsequent January/February 2007 issue did, however, contain a special focus insert on Indigenous peoples that was framed largely through the lens of cultural resurgence. Many of the featured articles highlight the vital work of Indigenous artists reviving and renewing practices of their nations' cultures which had long been suppressed as part of Canadian colonial policy. Other articles focus on theories and modes of resistance to ongoing processes of colonial dispossession and extraction, such as mega-dams. Although Canada's domestic colonialism is discussed, there are no linkages drawn with the robust discussion of Canadian imperialism from the previous issue—links that the *global* existence of Indigenous peoples as primary targets of imperialism should have made relatively easy to note.⁷

Despite being published in sequence, the decision to separate the special issues in this way produces a topical segmentation, rather than synthesis. Evidently many—though certainly not all—left critics today have adopted a relatively rigid bifurcation within their analyses between the spheres of the 'domestic' and the 'foreign.'⁸ Herein lie the two faces of the Canadian state that I

study throughout this chapter: the colonial face of Canada 'at home' and the imperial face of Canada 'abroad.' As a result of staring overlong into either of these faces it seems that two conversations are developing within the broad left in stark isolation of one another, one of which might be carried under the name anti-colonialism and the other of which can be called anti-imperialism.

Far from being a problem restricted to popular publications of the political left, this bifurcated analysis is also reproduced within critical academic literature. An unsurprising reality, given that many of these authors are both engaged in popular organs of the left and within academia. Over the past twenty-five years non-Indigenous (settler) academics have shown increasing attention to the ongoing colonization of Indigenous peoples within the territories claimed by the Canadian state—these scholars form the core of my discussion in section one below. This literature often relies on the conceptual tools of settler colonial studies. Here the focus is squarely on the structural antagonisms between a settler population and the Indigenous nations whose territories they occupy, most especially on the eliminative drives that animate so much of the settler social order. While often in some degree of conversation, based on their sources, focus, and methods this subfield should be viewed as importantly distinct from Indigenous Studies. Parallel to this, a sizeable group of scholars have committed themselves to a critique of Canadian foreign and trade policies as either embedded within, or as emblematic of, systems of empire. In general, these scholars utilize methodologies inspired by Karl Marx's critique of political economy in order to trace the contemporary role of the Canadian state within the international political economy of global capitalism. This latter group of scholars are discussed below in section two.

Given the commonplace affinity between colonialism and imperialism—wherein they are often, though inexact, used interchangeably—it might appear as though there ought to be some

affinity between these bodies of scholarship, yet they rarely cross-pollinate. As I develop throughout this chapter, these literatures are isolated from one another as a result of their unavowed reliance on a dichotomized heuristic between domestic and foreign spaces—(re)creating a Manichaeian world of insides and outsides constituted by and through the Canadian state’s own claim to territorially delineated authority.⁹ To put it plainly, while these literatures (and the popular currents they parallel) remain apart, there persists a near-constant tendency towards being disciplined into the view that these ‘two faces’ of Canada represent objects that are actually radically discrete from one another, rather than understanding them as co-constitutive processes. While this chapter sketches and problematizes these two faces—the colonial domestic and the imperial international—in Chapter Two I strive to show the Janus-faced project of settler imperialism. Importantly, this dichotomy likely arises as a consequence of the epistemological presumptions and the point-of-view adopted by each literatures, a matter which I detail below as being statist in orientation. Notably, the literatures informed by Indigenous Studies, critiques of racial capitalism, and Global Histories tend not to suffer from this same Manichaeianism, because their primary subjects *endure* the colonial division of the world rather than perform it.¹⁰

For its part, the literature informed by settler colonial studies hews very closely to a critique of Canada’s domestic policies and of the political culture within the borders of the settler state. As I develop below, to the degree that settler colonial studies focuses solely on the processes of colonization applied to Indigenous peoples and their territories *within* Canada’s borders, it risks reifying those borders as the practical limits on its study of settler social power.¹¹ A consequence of this approach is that it potentiates the imagining of anti-colonial political movements that struggle primarily for egalitarianism *within* the existing institutional space and political economy of Canada, irrespective of the degree to which that egalitarianism remains predicated on global

systems of exploitation and domination in/through which the Canadian state and capital are positioned as a core power.¹² It is, in short, reliant on an implicit a theory of justice that not only mistakes the contemporary state system as a permanent and basic form of social life—and therefore the necessary terrain of struggle—but it also constructs incentive structures that, as they tend towards equity *within* a state, create amongst those groups fortunate enough to live within the benefiter states of the imperial core a degree of ignorance, quiescence, and disavowal about the *global* injustices maintained or expanded to maintain their supposed wellbeing.¹³ Put more plainly, my analysis of this literature suggests that in the context of such a global system, to struggle for egalitarianism on the terrain constituted by and through the state parallels what WEB Du Bois criticizes in his essay “The African Roots of War” (1915) as the salvaging of “the dream of exploitation abroad” through the promise that “the laborer at home... is beginning to receive his share.”¹⁴

Contrarily, the marxist critique of empire amongst Canadianists focuses almost solely on the role played by the Canadian state and capital *external* to the borders of Canada.¹⁵ I refer throughout this chapter to this second face as “the marxist anti-imperialist tendency” or sporadically as an “orthodox marxist” account. At its most analytically shaky, this literature seems to imagine the Canadian state as a tool by which liberation from empire can be achieved. While the imperative of liberation from empire is certainly essential, below I identify how, through its nearly exclusive focus on Canadian involvement in the ‘foreign’ sphere, this form of anti-imperialism normalizes and reifies the work of empire and colonization in the so-called ‘domestic’ sphere.¹⁶ In short, this tendency redounds to statist politics; an a priori assumption about the supposed necessity of particular political forms that, taken to its logical extremities, potentiates a rhetoric of anti-imperialism that is at minimum elite-centric and campist at its worst.¹⁷ Of

particular significance is the relative inattention within this school of thought to the legacies of anti-imperialist struggles led by both Indigenous peoples and other subject ‘domestic’ populations within and against Canada.

While these literatures are thorough critiques of both colonialism and imperialism on the terms which they have laid out for themselves, by operating on separate levels of analysis without incorporating each other’s insights, they perform a strange silencing of one another. Moreover, the separation of scales is itself part of the problem, as it mistakes scalar logics for categorical distinctions of size or space, when they are in fact interrelated and co-constitutive processes. I assert that through this silencing—through this uninterrogated dichotomous heuristic of domestic/foreign spaces—these literatures serve, each in their own peculiar ways, to unintentionally reify their supposed object of critique: the Canadian state. As such, this chapter follows Kevin Bruyneel’s call to attend to “the colonialist consequences of dominant political epistemologies that prioritize dualisms such as inside-outside.”¹⁸ While this chapter is concerned with these two faces of the state as described by Canadianists, I would also venture to suggest that this tendency towards reification of the state-form is a broader problem within Political Science as a whole.¹⁹ In the final section of this chapter, I turn to the literature on racial capitalism as a theoretical lens that is potentially quite usefully deployed in attempts to study the Canadian state not as an object but as a *social relation*. This literature also establishes many of the core concerns that will animate Chapter Two, wherein I explore the production of constitutional whiteness as a central mechanism of articulation enabling the projection of Canadian settler imperialism continentally and globally.

Finally, as will become apparent, much of my own position throughout this project, but especially in this first section of the dissertation, is informed by an engagement with the emerging

Global Histories literature. As such, there may be a tendency to read either this chapter or the next as comparative work; this is not my intention. Rather, informed by these particular accounts of Canada's two faces and by a broader global context of empire and anti-imperialist struggles, I see myself as attempting to develop conceptual tools to advance the study of Canadian state-building, but to do so in a manner that explicitly refuses to naturalize those processes or to begin from the presumption that there is a 'proper' place for Canada anywhere in the world. As such, the ambition of this chapter is relatively modest: it is to provide a robust account of both the significance and the shortcomings of these two faces—settler colonialism and Canadian imperialism—that presently shape many accounts of the Canadian state on the broad left, and to point towards a more robust theoretical framework which I develop further in Chapter Two.

Section 1: (Canadian) Settler Colonial Studies, The Logic of Eliminating the Outside

Despite an explosion of popularity, settler colonial studies is a remarkably recent field of discrete academic inquiry. As a concept that travels specifically under this name, settler colonialism has a much longer pedigree than is often discussed when it is used today. The term 'settler colonialism' traces back to the heightened anti-imperialist struggles and rich scholarly debates on empire and racial capitalism in the 1970s and 1980s—moreover, there have been many traditions that describe settler colonial realities under different names.²⁰ From the standpoint of the concept's contemporary usage, it is remarkable to note that settler colonialism originates in attempts to understand the unique political economies of white settler apartheid states in Southern Africa—a region and continent largely absented from settler colonial studies today. The express objective of this earlier scholarship was to better understand the actual operations of settler social power so as to appreciate the strategies of anti-colonial struggle that might be pursued in opposition to multi-scalar systems of domination—and, indeed, *were* pursued to considerable if not total

success.²¹ Today these origins of settler colonialism as a concept have been largely obscured by the emergence and institutionalization primarily within the academy in the imperial core of the interdisciplinary field known as settler colonial studies.

In spite of these roots, when the conceptual genealogy of settler colonialism is traced in contemporary usages, it is generally credited to Australian anthropologist Patrick Wolfe's *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology* (1999). In that text Wolfe, whose work is a self-conscious contribution to the broad political left and often draws on marxist literatures, identifies settler colonialism as a form of colonization distinct from others because of its specific demographic formations. Whereas colonialism is often defined as the domination of a majority Indigenous population by a powerful minority of foreign-born colonizers (either through direct rule or through a clientele-class of local elites), Wolfe argues that settler colonialism is defined by a situation wherein the colonizers come to stay. Settler colonies function in this account by developing an apparently permanent system of institutions that dominate Indigenous peoples. As a matter of statecraft, then, settler governance over colonized populations often entails pursuing deliberate policies designed to make Indigenous peoples into numerical minorities that are stripped of both the rights afforded to all peoples and—by explicit attempts to produce underdevelopment within and dependency upon the colonially imposed mode of economic life—the capacity to exercise self-determination of/within their own territories.

In this section I explore the scholarly treatment of Canada as a settler colony, highlighting the field's theoretical foundations and its application by Canadianist scholars, the literature's predominating focus on questions of positionality and subjectivity, and its reification of a colonial inside/outside by isolating its critique to the domestic face of the Canadian state. That is, I suggest

that the methods of settler colonial studies conceive of an anti-colonial critique that is limited primarily to matters *within* the borders that Canada claims for itself.

I tend to read the Wolfean vein of settler colonial studies, and its offshoots, as emerging in the wake of other critical (re)turns—such as whiteness studies or masculinity studies—to the formerly unnamed normative subject at the centre of dominant canons of political thought. As such, very different concerns have animated this school of thought as compared to the studies of political economy in Southern Africa where the concept originates or Indigenous Studies where the realities of settler colonialism have been well detailed. Settler colonial studies is attentive primarily to the political institutions and cultures of the non-Indigenous people occupying Indigenous peoples' territories either without consent or in violation of the terms of coexistence. Much like these other critical (re)turns, this focus on the “settler” is typically meant to facilitate auto-critique. This approach forces those with relative social power to interrogate the “settler” as positional rather than presume it to be universal—which is to say, it seeks to undo the disappearing trick of power. Paulette Regan puts this ethic well when she writes that a “singular focus on the Other” which often characterizes so much scholarship, “blinds us from seeing how settler history, myth, and identity... prevents us from acknowledging our own need to decolonize.”²² By recentering this subject through direct critique, settler colonial studies seeks to displace the settler's presumed universality, to uncover the contingent and oppressive processes upon which they rely in their constitution and reproduction.

What is more, as the blog for the journal *Settler Colonial Studies* makes clear, this field of scholarship is a deliberately political intervention: it seeks to highlight settler colonization as an oppressive formation that persists through time into the present.²³ This central conviction of the field is well summed up by Wolfe's famous and often quoted dictum that, in settler colonies,

“invasion is a structure not an event.”²⁴ Indicating that settler invasion operates through the formation of structures, Wolfe implicates a variety of institutions, norms, tactics, and processes that over time offer the appearance of regimentation, regularization, and legality to what is in fact the ongoing and often violent displacement of Indigenous peoples from their territories by, and in order to make all-too ample space for, settlers and the hyper-exploitative agricultural and industrial economies that animate and compel them.

Not only are these processes destructive of Indigenous peoples’ polities and cultures, settler colonial studies highlights that they are also productive of a new sense of place or home *for* settlers. Emma Battell Lowman and Adam J Barker observe that a “settler society is created when a newcomer people shift from identifying with the distant empires and states that often founded them... to identify primarily with the political constructs, goals, and society in a new homeland.”²⁵ While this identificatory process produces a variety of colonial structures—many of which are in internal contradiction or productive tension with one another—the ultimate goal of settler colonization focuses on redistributing land to settlers.²⁶ That is, on naturalizing the reterritorialization of settlers in Indigenous peoples’ territories in ways that circumvent the authority of Indigenous nations. Reterritorializing settlers through the dispossession/displacement of Indigenous political authorities requires, in Bruyneel’s words, an enormous effort to “constrain tribal sovereignty, treaty rights, indigenous identity, and indigenous political expression through the imposition of the spatial and temporal boundaries” of the settler state.²⁷

This seemingly constant effort to displace Indigenous peoples is emblematic of Wolfe’s second foundational observation: that settler colonial structures function through a “logic of elimination.”²⁸ While it is often taken up in this way, and while Indigenous peoples continue enduring processes of genocide, it is important to note that Wolfe is *not* indicating that settler

colonization necessarily requires the physical elimination of Indigenous peoples—though it certainly tends towards this objective. Rather, he points towards the state’s impetus to eliminate Indigenous peoples *as peoples or as nations* with the recognized authority and capacity for self-determination. This is attempted through a variety of tactics including mass murder, but also through techniques of lawfare like officially sanctioned ‘Indian status’ that is designed to disappear through the racist logics of laws that fabricate and then penalize ‘miscegenation,’ or through what Ruth Wilson Gilmore describes as the “state-sanctioned or extralegal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death.”²⁹ As Eric Ritskes writes, what is necessary to the logic of elimination is not that Indigenous peoples actually disappear, but that settlers are able to perform an “erasure of Indigenous peoples [in order] to lay claim to ‘virgin’ land, *terra nullius*.”³⁰ This is a central principle of the Doctrine of Discovery, which was premised on an ideology of Christian supremacy developed by successive papal administrations as justification for the expansion of christendom through wars of conquest, ethnic cleansing, and enslavement against non-Christian peoples in North America, the Levant, North and Western Africa, and within Europe itself. In short, it empowered Christian monarchs to strip non-Christian peoples of their rights and capacities to self-determination in the name of spreading the faith.³¹

Wolfe’s early work is primarily concerned with analyzing Australia as *the* emblematic settler colony. Because of his focus on a context defined by the overriding commitment to applying *terra nullius* to eliminate Indigenous self-determination in Australia (a history in which British colonialism proceeded through the wholesale rejection of Indigenous political authority, denying even the often perfunctory treaty processes engaged elsewhere within the empire) the field that follows Wolfe’s lead remains focused on elimination above all else. Put differently, as a field, settler colonial studies was incubated within a settler state-building project which conducted itself

historically as unencumbered by any necessary recognition of Indigenous political authority in the form of treaties. Nevertheless, the broader relevance of Wolfe's ideas—particularly to those polities that share Australia's history as an Anglo-colony (cum Dominion) cum 'independent' state—was not lost on Canadian scholars. Applying a settler colonial studies framework to the Canadian context clarifies that events like the Royal Proclamation (1763), the British North American Act (1867), or the Constitution Act (1982)—a history which I belabour in Chapter Two—are built upon and serve as the legal basis for the ongoing (indeed, territorially expanding) disavowal and attempted destruction of Indigenous peoples' rights and capacities for self-determination in and through imperial law. By enveloping Indigenous peoples into narratives of state-building as the progression towards 'independence,' 'democracy,' 'multiculturalism,' etc., the foundational denial of Indigenous self-determination is ostensibly obscured, perhaps even redeemed, by an overdetermined telos that historicizes Indigenous peoplehood.³²

Identifying the Canadian state's material and discursive erasure of Indigenous peoples' sovereignties, Todd Gordon asks the incisive question: how "can Canada deny sovereignty to people who have never conceded it, or demand [that] sovereign nations relinquish their title to their land."³³ Moreover, while this critique is often limited to the genesis of the settler colony—as a violent instant—settler colonial studies argues that the logic of elimination is not simply confined to a moment of foundations, it is an ongoing process sustained through structures of invasion to this day. Regan identifies that, as a settler colony, "[anti-Indigenous] violence is woven into the fabric of Canadian history in an unbroken thread from past to present."³⁴

Certainly, the framework of settler colonial studies has been used with convincing effect to study and critique a multitude of political, cultural, and economic phenomena in Canada.³⁵ For

instance, while fossil fuel and other extractive industries have long been critiqued and resisted by Indigenous peoples, settler scholars are also beginning to grapple with the implications of what pursuing environmental justice means on colonized lands. Settler colonial studies is one framework through which scholars and activists have understood how the destructive capacities of industry carry on the colonizing work of eliminating Indigenous peoples and their systems of land-based governance in order to produce increasingly diminishing dividends for the (settler) ‘public’ throughout royalties and taxes. Others affiliated with Indigenous Studies, like Melina Laboucan-Massimo, have long observed that “the exploitation of our [Indigenous peoples’] lands, and the extraction of our ‘natural resources,’” creates the raw wealth that sustains the settler colony.³⁶ However, extractive industry does not align with settler colonialism merely by transforming Indigenous territories into a source of commodity-based wealth generation *for* settlers (particularly those who belong to the owning classes), it also aligns through the harms that it does *to* Indigenous peoples. As Ramona Neckoway says, in the zero-sum game of extractive capitalist economies, “to ‘prosper’ we have to allow our medicines, burial sites, histories and other significant cultural effects to be destroyed.”³⁷ Thus, the Canadian state’s reproduction of capitalist social relations in general, but particularly extractive capitalism, functions in a decentralized and largely self-organizing way to perpetuate the work of disrupting—in Wolfe’s words, eliminating—Indigenous peoples’ own forms of social organization and governance. Indigenous Studies has been particularly attuned to this in a way that settler colonial studies largely has not.³⁸

For the past decade settler colonial studies has also been greatly influenced by the work of Lorenzo Veracini. Developing a theory of settler subjectivity, Veracini’s *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (2010) turns to Lacanian and Zizekian psychoanalytical accounts of

subjectivity. Veracini's remarkable third chapter, entitled "Consciousness," marks a shift in the field away from Wolfe's more orthodox, structural and materialist analyses towards interrogating the settler as a political subject. Veracini crafts a series of observations about settlers, he emphasizes the "paranoiac dispositions" and "aggressive instincts" that underpin settlers' encounters with Indigenous peoples.³⁹ Largely embraced by Canadianist scholars, this turn reorients the field from a structural critique—wherein the struggle over the (re)organization and (re)distribution of social power is paramount—towards now predominating questions of subjectivity, positionality, and the micropolitical.⁴⁰ Within Canadian scholarship, this is exemplified in Eva Mackey's *Unsettled Expectations* (2016), wherein she deploys a settler colonial studies framework in order to "understand the lived practices and discourses" of settlers who are actively—often aggressively—opposing Indigenous land claims.⁴¹ Moreover, Mackey frames this project as investigating the affective and psychological work of producing within settlers a sense that Indigenous peoples' "land rights [are] dangerous."⁴² While she remains attentive to the ways in which colonial institutions—courts, educational apparatuses, police, property regimes, etc.—serve to structure "[c]oncepts of certainty and uncertainty" in ways that favour settlers' retaining a sense of certainty, Mackey's primary object is the interiorization of "settler fantasies of entitlement."⁴³

Lowman and Barker are similarly interested in drawing attention towards the granular ways in which positionality and identity is constructed and reinforced by colonization. Far from simply being the work of states and businesses, Lowman and Barker assert that "settler colonialism is produced and upheld... by people," that is "by Canadians."⁴⁴ Whereas Wolfe—much less, the literature on settler colonialism preceding him—was less concerned with questions of positionality

and the interiorization of colonial ideologies, through settler colonial studies post-Veracini, many authors are finally identifying what Indigenous peoples and Indigenous Studies have long asserted: that “the political identity of Canadians” is produced through and therefore depends upon the ongoing dispossession of Indigenous peoples.⁴⁵ I think here particularly of works by acclaimed Indigenous scholars like Jack Forbes, Vine Deloria Jr, or Lee Maracle, who decades prior to the interior turn in settler colonial studies were already developing rich and detailed accounts about settler subjectivity. What’s critical to note is that many of these scholars were able to offer this critique without centring either the settler or whiteness in their analysis, the teachings and epistemologies of their particular nations were mobilized in each of these critiques.

The particular problématique that settler colonial studies seeks to address—(re)turning to a normative subject which was previously presumed to be universal by those in social proximity to it—easily lends itself to these questions of subjectivity and positionality. And this problem is all the more vexed by the fact that the structural conditions of settler society (from media to education, and political rhetoric to corporate agendas) incentivizes an unacknowledged disavowal of the reality that non-Indigenous peoples are in fact ‘settlers’ living on the territories of Indigenous peoples in ways that have not been consented to.⁴⁶ Regan highlights the need to politicize this identity when she emphasizes so emphatically that “as Canadian citizens, *we are ultimately responsible* for the past and present actions of our government.”⁴⁷ This attention to positionality or subjectivity, focusing on the responsibilities and incommensurabilities that emerge from social location has been profoundly productive within the broad left and in critical scholarship. Indeed, as the Combahee River Collective demonstrates, all politics are—in fact—positional, and it is *through* the specificity of positionality that collectively liberatory politics are developed against flatly and often falsely universalist claims.⁴⁸ Moreover, as I show particularly in Chapter Three, it

has also been an important shift in the grassroots theories of settler ‘allyship’ with Indigenous peoples.

It bears considering, though, whether a broader social totality may be obscured if this turn is made too fully; which is to ask whether this shift might occlude questions about the extant capacity of ordinary people to act in responsible ways *should they wish to*, given the existing distribution of relative social power. If the trajectory of settler colonial studies is towards the interiority of settlers at the loss of a focused and nuanced structural critique, it may simply re-centre that normative subject under a guise of criticism to the exclusion of more exacting questions about how to get free of the very social relations that produced the problem in the first place. A point which several critiques of settler colonial studies have already noted.⁴⁹

The turn towards subjectivity in settler colonial studies echoes how the field constructs its presumed level of analysis as restricted to the interiority of the settler colonies. In both instances, an inside/outside boundary is constituted, and the machinations of the inside are privileged as the site of critique. Moreover, the prominence of interiority in defining the scope of the problem and the mode of critique is not merely incidental to this method of analysis; it is foundational to the very logic of settler colonization that this field identifies. Put differently, settler colonialism is typically described as an inward-facing project. Wolfe’s observation that, following “the demise of the frontier, elimination turned inwards,” suggests an understanding of settler colonization as a distinctly spatialized process that occurs through and within enclosures, and the redistribution of this enclosed land as property for settlers. It’s this final element, the dispossession and redistribution of Indigenous peoples’ lands as property (always along lines of articulation that produce hierarchies out of apparent (dis)ability, racial, and gendered, distinction), that marks settler colonialism as a distinction species of enclosure movements.⁵⁰ Wolfe’s account of how

settler colonies encircle Indigenous polities (in whole or in part), delineate a frontier/border, and then seek to eliminate self-determining Indigenous peoples within that enclosure is a formative assumption underpinning much of settler colonial studies. Adam Barker makes clear, that the “search for the location of settler colonialism” requires an analytics of “a spatial form or dynamic that can be identified *as distinct*.”⁵¹ This approach evokes a spatial imaginary wherein a colonially excised territory is *the* primary level of analysis—methodologically, it sees through the eyes of the state looking in upon itself. The ideal-form of the settler colony is often imagined as part *of* the world, but all too rarely is it placed *in* the world in fulsome or convincing manner.

Although some scholars scale their research more locally, the default level of analysis provided by settler colonial studies largely coincides with the space of domesticity as claimed by extant settler states today.⁵² This is seen in the application of settler colonial studies to the Canadian context, as outlined above. With relentless criticality, these scholars identify the colonialism suffusing Canadian spaces, institutions, and identities. Where this literature runs aground, however, is in its reticence to think beyond the narrative of inside/outside—domestic/foreign—that the settler state constructs *for itself*. Reading Regan, one could conclude that the oppressive work done by the various apparatuses of Canadian settler colonialism is constrained within the borders of the settler colony. For instance, comparative references between Canada and South Africa in *Unsettling the Settler* are limited almost entirely to a discussion of parallel truth commissions. This, despite the fact that the Canadian systems of reserves and residential schools, Regan’s *primary* concerns, served as a direct model for the apartheid regime in South Africa.⁵³ This is to say nothing of the role played by Canada’s security apparatuses in supporting and training police forces to secure apartheid—just as they do with various despotic regimes around the world to this day. Indeed, while Regan effectively criticizes the peacekeeper

myth that Canada is so fond of, her deconstructive evidence against it is almost all drawn from contradictions within Canada and never—for instance—from Afghanistan, Libya, or Somalia. Similarly, Lowman and Barker remind socialists and anti-capitalists that “[i]n Canada capitalism needs settler colonialism to operate.”⁵⁴ While this is certainly true, and important for highlighting the necessity of grounding anti-capitalist principles in place-based resistance, the authors’ fixation on positioning their critique firmly *within* Canada does little to recognize that capitalism is never just simply ‘in’ Canada. Capitalism requires resources, institutions, markets, and global relations of power *beyond* the settler colony’s borders in order to continue functioning through and within those borders. Yet the extreme focus that settler colonial studies places on Canada as a firm container obscures this fact. It treats the state’s assumed territorial jurisdiction as if it were the discrete box it always strived towards but never was, nor could be given its co-constitutive relationship with global processes of imperial domination, exploitation, and dispossession. I develop some of these linkages more fully in my discussion of the anti-imperialist marxist tradition below.

Mackey gestures towards a potential explanation of this near-unanimity in focusing critique within the Canadian state when she writes that “[c]olonization and decolonization *are about relationships*, and therefore the possibility of decolonization depends on all parties *changing how they relate to one another*.”⁵⁵ Thus, a generous reading surmises that the settler colonial studies framework largely restricts its critique to *within* the borders of the settler colony in order to emphasize the primacy of relationships that are deemed most efficacious—whether that is towards oppressive or liberatory ends is a matter of the particular focus of any given study. Scholars who use this framework seek at once to highlight their subjects’ personal and collective implication in structures of oppression, but also to show that networks of relationships and obligations exist that

both demand and facilitate a dismantling of those structures. And the state is presumed as a primary structure that produces and mediates, or else contains and restricts such relations.

While I agree with the imperative of relational analysis provided here, the way in which it is constructed is precisely what concerns me about the settler colonial studies framework. The relationalities privileged by settler colonial studies recapitulate a state-centric narrative by implying that the strongest, most relevant relationships are those that exist *within* spaces of state enclosure. This framework takes what is in fact a processual technology of settler colonization—enclosure—and reifies it into an a priori ontological condition en/disabling relationality. Which is not to say that the effects of state governance, in particular bordering practices, aren't disruptive of relationality. As Indigenous Studies and critical ecologies show, they certainly are.⁵⁶ Settler colonial studies, however, seems to maintain a categorical presumption that the inside/self stands always-already in necessary non-relationality—or, at least *essentially* weaker relationality—to an outside/other, asserting that political struggle and ethical work can be most effectively focused in/on this enclosed collective self. In reality we know this is simply not the case. As Audra Simpson highlights so well, despite the (often violent) imposition of the Canadian/American, border the Haudenosaunee people at Kahnawà:ke have maintained systems of relationality that transit this boundary.⁵⁷ In overdetermining the impact of state borders on systems of relationality, and by eliding the global regimes of relationality that make and remake those very borders, settler colonial studies serves to totalize and reify the colonial technology of enclosure.

This obscures longstanding and still nascent practices of internationalism that resist or move without primary reference to the enclosures of state-building projects.⁵⁸ It also obscures the ways in which dominant power regimes (such as capital, cisheteropatriarchy, white supremacy) flow within, across, and through state borders in ways that contradict claims to sovereign

exceptional power but are also co-constitutive with them. While it is certainly true that the imposition of enclosures like the Canadian border have served to disrupt or reorient a host of relationships and to produce particular forms of enclosed subjectivity, this does not mean that relationality has ceased across those boundaries or that said subjectivities are total or without contradictions.⁵⁹ Whether it is runs of salmon or the radioactive seepage of nuclear waste, solidarity contingents reinforcing Indigenous land defenders, or communities forced into migration due to war or climate change, all these cognate parts are inextricably interrelated with one another within a social totality.⁶⁰

As Bruyneel observes, settler colonialism cannot be fully apprehended, critiqued, or struggled against “without calling into question the idea that boundaries create or perpetuate monological identities that deny the multiplicity and contingency of political identity, agency, and autonomy.”⁶¹ This requires dislodging the ways in which Canada’s em-bordered construction of itself shapes our critiques. Put differently, a critical study of Canada begins from a concrete assessment of where and how the Canadian state is constructed and moves in the world, *not* from the assessment of a single ‘face’ that is cleanly fixed in place. What are dominantly understood as ‘inside’ and ‘outside’ of the state remain in unavoidable, co-constituting interrelationship to one another, even if settler colonial studies does not give us the tools to describe this.

Section 2: Canada, In or As Empire?

In contrast to settler colonial studies’ tendency to reify the Canadian state by reproducing the colonially constructed ‘domestic’ face as its level of analysis, there is a growing body of anti-imperialist scholarship, primarily of a marxist bent, that preforms an inverse reification of the Canadian state by focusing its critique almost exclusively on Canada’s impact *beyond* the borders that it constructs for itself. Here, imperialism happens in the realm of the ‘international,’ which is

constructed as being necessarily *outside* the state. Framed as a materialist critique of empire, this literature follows Marx and Engel's observation that capitalism's need for "a constantly expanding market for its products" requires that capitalist social relations be asserted "over the whole surface of the globe. [They] must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere."⁶² From the observation of this expansionist logic, this marxist scholarship explores the construction of a dominant international order—a world system—that facilitates processes of capital accumulation and class rule on a global scale. In as much as this order constitutes a "global system of domination in which the wealth and resources of the Third World are systematically plundered by capital of the Global North," these scholars converge in designating it an imperial formation.⁶³ The state system, with its designed facilitation of global capital flows typically towards the 'North' or imperial core, is the taken-as-given space of international political activity and, therefore, where imperialism occurs. Within this field, however, there is significant disagreement regarding how the Canadian state and Canadian capital are positioned within this imperial order. Below I highlight debates within the literature over whether Canada is merely a complicit state *in* empire or whether Canada is constituted *as* an imperial state. However, I also draw attention to how the very terms of this debate unhelpfully position the question of Canada and empire *beyond* the borders of the settler state, ultimately obscuring Canada's imperial relation to Indigenous nations 'at home.'

While the wide array of positions and approaches in this literature exist on a spectrum rather than as fully discrete branches of thought, I present them schematically here in order to draw out two contending poles of interpretation. The first is that Canada is merely a privileged player *within* empire; which is to say that Canada itself is not understood as an empire, although it supports and legitimizes the imperial power(s) with which it is allied. Scholars arguing in this vein

emphasize that Canada must be thought of as somewhat less than a full imperialist state because it is a supposedly ‘middle power’—neither subservient nor dominative within the world system.⁶⁴ In his early work, Tyler Shipley (2013), draws this distinction quite clearly when he writes that Canada should be understood as “a *secondary component* in the new imperial apparatus centred around the United States.”⁶⁵ Canada, then, is seen less as a promulgator of imperialism—a role typically assigned to America as *the* superpower—than as its regularizer. As Anthony Fenton makes clear, American imperialism “depends on second-tier core states like Canada fulfilling their functions as legitimizers,” though at times this may include “taking a lead role in contexts ‘where U.S. activism would do more harm than good.’”⁶⁶

Canada’s relation to empire, then, is constructed within this strain of thought as giving a humane face to the ambitions—and often the atrocities—designed by more powerful states. We might look no further than future-former-Liberal Party of Canada leader Michael Ignatieff’s ignoble defence of America’s war against the people of Iraq. In a 2003 *New York Times Magazine* article, he nakedly used the language of empire to describe the Bush agenda while defending it in purely Kiplingesque terms as a “burden” which must be undertaken for the preservation of “free markets, human rights and democracy” (one presumes this is listed in order of priority).⁶⁷ With this and other similar examples abounding, Canada is positioned as less responsible for the *existence* of imperialism than for its *persistence*, which is perhaps an overly subtle description of what Linda McQuaig (former Member of Parliament with the New Democratic Party) sums up as Canada’s proficiency for *Holding the Bully’s Coat*. As McQuaig puts it, Canada has “behaved badly” in large part because, by following policies “crafted by the Bush administration,” Canadians are “not living up to the image of ourselves that we’ve projected in the world.”⁶⁸ Implied here is an

obfuscation: that any wrongdoing or harm caused by the Canadian state and Canadian business interests amounts, at worst, to a failure to meet some imagined best intentions because of some misplaced trust in the ‘real’ bad actor: America. But this obscures the premeditation involved in such harmful actions, their persistence in the face of enormous resistance, as well as the fact that such harm is typically caused because its consequences are perceived to be of some material benefit to the perpetrators.

These authors marshal impressive evidence to support Daniel Freeman-Maloy’s terse assertion that “the Canadian government has rapidly shed any pretence at having an independent foreign policy,” and it now merely serves the interests of imperial power(s).⁶⁹ Broadly speaking there are two ways in which Canada is interpreted as supporting (normally American) imperialism: militarily and economically. As McQuaig observes, in the wake of 9/11, Canada was perceived to be “lining itself up so uncritically with Washington” that it was “enabling a regime” that threatened the basis of international law.⁷⁰ Canada’s role in American imperialism, as constructed by McQuaig, is distinctively novel and *not* in keeping with Canadian traditions. Other critics who share less of McQuaig’s nostalgic view of Canada’s foreign policy, however, note that the integration of the Canadian state and capital with American militarism has a long history and involves more than just troop deployments. Justin Podur details that between 1959 and 1973, at the height of the Vietnam War, American ‘defence’ procurement from Canadian arms manufacturers topped \$3.2 billion.⁷¹ Citing Victor Levant’s *Quiet Complicity* (1986), Podur notes that the American government was also permitted to use New Brunswick as a testing-zone for the defoliants eventually deployed against the people of Vietnam and southeast Asia, and that from 1968 to 1970 American B-52s engaged in practice bombing runs in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

What these accounts often leave under-examined is that such training is very often conducted in areas that, while remote from large urban centres, are often quite near to Indigenous communities—bringing devastating consequences to human and more-than-beings.⁷² These authors identify Canada’s crucial role in enabling America to stage military imperialism globally.

Being *within* empire, however, requires more of Canada than just supporting or engaging in overt acts of aggression; Canada has also been instrumental in developing and stabilizing a global capitalist order. On this point, much of the literature draws on David Harvey’s work in *The New Imperialism*, where he argues that “coercion and liquidation of the enemy is only a partial, and sometimes counterproductive, basis for US power. Consent and cooperation are just as important.”⁷³ Constructing American hegemony—which I would distinguish categorically from any meaningful conception of ‘consent’—through institutions restricting and regulating membership in the ‘international community’ is perhaps the critical operation of the new imperial order that Harvey identifies. Many of these anti-imperialist marxists assert that Canada plays a crucial role in the creation, organization, legitimation, and reproduction of such institutions. As Shipley (2013) notes, the Canadian state strives “to create an [international] climate that will be amenable to all of its economic interests.”⁷⁴ In part, Canada functions within empire by giving legal cover to the excesses of this world system, reproducing the mythos of a rules-based international order.

For example, following a 2009 coup in Honduras—which saw a left-leaning government ousted and replaced by a pro-capital regime—representatives of the Canadian government lobbied at the Organization of American States (OAS) to secure international recognition for the new government.⁷⁵ While seemingly just banal diplomacy, Canada’s role in securing the withdrawal of sanctions and normalization of relations with a brutal regime, thereby ensured that Honduras

remained open to global capital which flooded into the country, propping up the new government. The coup regime was subsequently implicated in astonishing human rights abuses, including the extrajudicial murders of Berta Cáceres and other Indigenous land defenders, while Honduras was gripped by waves of violence as the regime persecuted dissenters.⁷⁶ Here, as in Canada's other interventions throughout Latin America in particular, it is possible to see the truly *global* role that Canada plays in structuring and seeking to legitimate anti-Indigenous political mobilizations and violence in order to facilitate the expansion of capitalist social relations. Moreover, I would insist on noting the *continuity* of this process, being only slightly modified by whichever side of the colonial border it occurs on rather than fundamentally distinct.

Approaching the question of Canada's relation to imperialism as a matter of how Canada fits *within* some other party's empire allows scholars and activists to describe Canada in a highly fluid manner. Indeed, in some ways, conceptualizing Canada in empire has a long scholarly pedigree, perhaps best emblemized by Arthur RM Lower's titular formula of the state's telos: *Colony to Nation* (1946). This formula has had a lasting hold, particularly over strands of so-called left-nationalism in Canada that seek to defend the Canadian state as the necessary bulwark of a progressive polity against the threat of external imperial encroachment.⁷⁷ Yet this framing conveys an almost tragic image of a state in arrested development between full independence and (re)capture by imperial powers. Implicit in such a framing is an understanding of the state as a potential vehicle by which to strike out away from the imperial hegemons. It is perhaps for this reason that this particular answer to the question of Canada's relation to empire, is most common in popular leftist publications (like *Canadian Dimension*) or political organizations.⁷⁸ This form of anti-imperialism is appropriable by a type of left-nationalism that reproduces the conceit that "the Canadian state can be a progressive space and play a central role in the struggle for sovereignty

from American influence.”⁷⁹ Anti-imperialism in one state, becomes the unspoken watchword. As such, the anti-imperial project implied by conceptualizing Canada as merely *in* empire unfolds a politic that rigidifies the container model of state sovereignty: Canada ceases to be imperial by asserting *greater* independence—understood here as a stronger assertion of state sovereignty, with more direct state-controls over the national political economy—from the ‘real’ imperial power(s).

Following the discussion in the previous section, I hope that the fallacy of this sort of anti-imperialism is quite obvious. Given that it depends—amongst other things—on both a Canadian nationalist project that further entrenches its dispossession/occupation of Indigenous peoples’ territories *and* that it has little to nothing to say about Canada’s own machinations within the world system, it’s a myopic anti-imperialism at best and a very subtle recuperation of a wounded imperial chauvinism at worst. Moreover, as repeated critiques of (especially the post-Second World War) decolonization movements have shown, achieving ‘independence’ through recognition as a member within the world system of nation states, themselves produced through and in order to facilitate the process of imperialism, is neither synonymous with, nor a substitute for, a thoroughgoing liberatory politics of decolonization.⁸⁰ This is true generally, but in the case of settler states built on/through Indigenous dispossession, the contradictions are far more explicit.

Against this left-nationalist critique of Canada *in* empire is a more strident form of *internationalist* left-critique that describes Canada *as* empire. This literature approaches Canada as an imperial power in its own right, with (a varying degree of) autonomy from other imperialist powers. Jerome Klassen observes that the tendency for left-nationalists to suggest that Canada exists merely *in* empire relies on a particular form of dependency theory that views “the Canadian-U.S. relationship without reference to global patterns of production, trade, and investment.”⁸¹ The reductive focus on a single bilateral relationship cannot adequately capture the influence that

Canada exerts globally; moreover, because left-nationalist analyses take as their sole reference-point Canada's relationship with the present global hegemon—America and Britain before it—they are bound to produce a skewed sense of Canada's own imperial clout. Klassen suggests, however, that while this bilateral relationship remains critically important to the study of Canada *as* empire, it must be “placed in the context of *global* patterns of economic and political power.”⁸² Additionally, this branch of literature pushes back on the unipolar—that is, America-centric—conception of imperialism. Against this, contemporary imperialism is posited as an internally differentiated world system of domination, in which the historic bloc that forms the present imperial core—variously obfuscated as the West, the North, etc.—contains a number of contingently but persistently and non-incidentally articulated imperial projects. As Gordon notes the unipolar interpretation of imperialism “incorrectly reduces the responsibility of imperialism to the superpower alone,” obscuring the “imperialist actions taken by countries like Canada independent of the U.S.”⁸³

While such scholars as Klassen recognize that Canada does not exert the same sort of gravity as does America, they nevertheless identify that the Canadian state and capital possess an enormous degree of agency within the world system and that it is deployed to the advantage of the Canadian power elite, while the dividends of plunder are used to incentivize collaboration within the Canadian population writ large. As such, rather than merely being shaped by American imperial demands, these scholars suggest that “Canadian foreign policy is a *class-conscious imperialism of the state and corporate elites*,” striving to “expand the global reach of Canadian corporations.”⁸⁴ Canadian capital exerts remarkable global influence as measured through foreign direct investments (FDI). Todd Gordon and Jeffery Webber observe that, from 1990 to 2013,

Canadian FDI in Latin America grew from \$2.58 billion to \$59.4 billion. While Canada's economy is a tenth the size of America's, Canadian FDI in Latin America is slightly more than one quarter that of America, indicating disproportionate influence.⁸⁵ Canadian capital exerts itself through this FDI, especially where Canadian businesses are major employers; any signal of discontent by capital or the potential for relocations could trigger enormous labour concerns. In Honduras, for example, the Canada-based garment manufacturer Gildan is the largest private sector employer in the country. As a result, it is able to exert an enormous amount of pressure on the Honduran government.⁸⁶ Further, capital has not achieved this reach simply by force of its own will; at multiple levels and through many agencies the Canadian state intervenes to facilitate the "outward expansion of Canadian capital."⁸⁷ Just as is the case 'at home,' the state and capital are imbricated in unfolding Canadian imperialism globally.

Brazen regime change and corporate maleficence aside, a more subtle method of solidifying Canada's global reach is through 'foreign aid'—a continuity of imperialist domination and value extraction that has been long noted by those whom it targets most directly.⁸⁸ While many Canadians hold up their global aid programs, few recognize that Canadian aid can be a poisoned cup, often requiring 'structural adjustments' in the receiving state. These programs generally entail:

the removal of trade and investment barriers for capital from the North; slashing of public services and government jobs; cuts to subsidies to local producers and consumers; privatization of communal land, natural resources and public utilities; and deflationary fiscal policies, which are aimed at providing stability in financial markets for foreign investors...⁸⁹

With aid monies tied to many or all of these adjustments the Canadian state gives with one hand, even while the other extracts concessions that disproportionately benefit Canadian capital. Thus, while it remains within an international institutional framework premised on American hegemony,

this literature explains how Canada pursues an imperial project—which they describe as a system of class rule that facilitates the extraction and transference of wealth—that is distinct and at least somewhat autonomous from America’s in both its methods and its interests. Relatively unnoticed in the literature reviewed here, is the manner in which this aid-as-extraction technique is often mystified and legitimated to Canadians by Orientalist and white supremacist narratives about an inherently backward Other and an essential Canadian beneficence. This manifests through saviour complexes, which themselves are often co-constituted with highly gendered tropes around the supposed vulnerability of predominantly racialized women in the Third World, who are need of ‘saving.’ Despite being obscured in the analysis of this literature, it is in precisely these gendering and racializing regimes—alongside the social construction of (dis)ability—that class is both *made* and *lived*.⁹⁰

By positioning Canada only *in* empire, the left-nationalist critique implies that Canadian national and elite interests are constrained or diminished through their support for imperial interests, while this more critical approach to Canada *as* empire reveals how the Canadian state and capital assert their own imperialism. For instance, while Canada’s effort to have Honduras recognized by the OAS certainly aided American businesses, it also enabled Canadian mining corporations to expand their profitability with the removal of an elected government that had sought to regulate extractive industry more thoroughly.⁹¹ This same logic played out in the wake of the 2003 coup that deposed the government of Jean-Bertrand Aristide in Haiti. Much like the Honduran experience, Canada lent credibility to the post-coup government. Shortly thereafter, Canadian garment manufacturer Gildan began to relocate its factories to Haiti, where the climate had suddenly been made much warmer to foreign business.⁹² Moreover, by analyzing empire as internally differentiated historic bloc, and organized around the pursuit of particular ‘national’

economic elites' interests that maneuver states, decisions like the one Canada made *not* to join directly in the attack on the people of Iraq become less evidence of a break with or "drift" away from empire—as left-nationalists would have it—and is seen as more in keeping with a complex understanding of the global system of empire as kaleidoscopic, wherein nodal points of sometimes contradictory interests coexist and articulate with one another.⁹³

Juxtaposed to the settler colonialism framework, however, this self-declaredly anti-imperialist literature is strikingly silent in response to the Indigenous-led resistance to Canadian imperialism occurring *within* Canada. Even those who construct Canada *as* empire, tend to do so in a way that spatializes and temporalizes the genesis of Canadian imperialism to the instant in which the Canadian state or capital *exceed* the state's assumed territorial jurisdiction—as evidenced in my discussion of Klassen below. Further, there is a tendency to project today's borders backwards in time, thereby naturalizing the supersession of each Indigenous nation and their territories as always already within the jurisdiction of the predestined but as-yet-to-arrive Canadian state. As Howard Adams notes, this is how actual struggles to *resist* imperial encroachment, such as those led by the Red River Métis from the 1860s to the 1880s, are decontextualized and subjected to historical revisionism as 'rebellions' or domestic 'uprisings' against the supposedly constituted authority of the Canadian state.⁹⁴ In eliding these struggles, this form of marxist anti-imperialist critique reifies the 'domestic' sphere as somehow an always-already existing and legitimate container for the Canadian state to assert political authority and (to a lesser degree) of Canadian capital to operate within. This acceptance of the 'domestic' as an assumed space of legitimacy for Canada, disavows the fact that the state's domestic sphere is continually (re)constructed through processes that are always-already imperial as they rely on the ongoing abrogation of Indigenous peoples' self-determination and the suppression of other

subjected populations. In brief, if Canada were only and always restricted to the territories that it claims for itself—something which it has *never* been—it would remain an imperial project. Canadian imperialism begins and is maintained ‘at home’ in a very literal sense.

While Klassen acknowledges that the “origins of the Canadian political economy lie in the colonization projects of the British and French empires,” his argument steadily delimits this observation.⁹⁵ Discussing Lenin’s theory of imperialism, Klassen argues that the “weakest part” of the theory is the suggestion that “colonialism is necessary for capitalist development” and this renders the theory somewhat “anachronistic.”⁹⁶ Thus, Klassen’s recognition that Canada’s existence requires the colonization of Indigenous peoples is circumscribed and rendered as an historical observation, rather than as a relevant and ongoing fact that structures the very basis of social relations within Canada today. His assertion, evoking Ellen Meiksins Wood, that the “Empire of Capital is not *premised* on territorial conquest” obscures the still ongoing invasion of Indigenous nations’ territories as the very condition of possibility which the Canadian state and capital draw upon in their *global* extractivist projects. As Shiri Pasternak, Anna Stanley, and Glen Coulthard have each noted, Canadian jurisdiction is continually (re)produced through the dispossession/displacement of Indigenous peoples’ polities, establishing the legal groundwork that regularizes both settlement and capitalist social relations.⁹⁷ One could, I think, reasonably ask of this formulation: *when* is the colony? A glib question, perhaps, but one to which the lack of a satisfying answer reveals the ongoing nature of the problem that Klassen seeks to disavow.

Moreover, in as much as Klassen maintains both that the Empire of Capital rests on American hegemony and that said empire is not premised on ‘territorial conquest,’ he misses that the ongoing occupation of Indigenous territories that also maintains the conditions of possibility for America to sustain itself as the global hegemon.⁹⁸ America too remains a *settler* empire,

therefore, the Empire of Capital has ongoing territorial conquest as its beating heart. But even if this were not the case—if Canada or America had actually enjoyed the immaculate births they pantomime—Klassen’s claim that the Empire of Capital “is not premised on territorial conquest” would still rest on the shaky ground of an untenable dichotomy between the realms of the political and the economic. To sustain this dichotomy, territorial conquest must be relegated to the realm of the former and is, therefore, transformed into the sole province of states. But this obscures the always territorialized reality of economic activity—and minimizes the significance of this fact in surprising ways, given this literature’s commitments to dialectical and historical materialist methods. For what are the still open veins of Latin America at Potosí, or the Canadian-owned Alamos Gold corporation’s strip mining projects in Kirazli, Turkey if not territorial conquest under another name?⁹⁹ Moreover, any a priori division between the political and the economic obscures the actual history by which so many of the contemporary settler states of today’s international order are formed as the precipitates of colonial corporations like the Virginia Company or the Hudson’s Bay Company.¹⁰⁰

Section 3: Towards an Account of State-Formation within Global Racial Capitalism

Struggling to grapple with the reality that the Canadian state’s very conception is as an imperial project is not merely a shortcoming of these methods of thought; rather, the deracination of Indigenous peoples’ anti-imperialist struggles is in fact a prerequisite of many orthodoxly marxist accounts within the academy. Thus, it recurs again and again throughout the literature, as when Greg Albo, in listing “oppositions” to the “imperialist agenda of the Harper regime,” neglects to include Indigenous peoples alongside “Palestine solidarity, anti-war campaigners, climate change activists, anti-globalization militants, and *others*.”¹⁰¹ This, despite the fact that his article was written only months after the Idle No More movement launched the most serious mass

challenge to Harper up to that time, fundamentally altering the Canadian political terrain. Orthodox marxist critiques perform this sort of erasure because they have as one of their central presumptions the idea that “the desire of the Canadian people” is set “at odds with the imperial agenda that has formed in Canadian business and state elites.”¹⁰² Though the conceptual framing of ‘the people’ versus ‘the elites’ is more populist than it is strictly marxist, we can infer from context that this mode of analysis has at the core of its dialectic the presumption of a constitutive, transhistorical, and absolute antagonism between workers/proletariate and owners/bourgeoisie. Orthodox anti-imperialist marxists rely on this presumed and singular oppositional relationship in order to make the normative claim against empire on the grounds that it is neither desired by, nor is it in the interests of, ‘the people.’

Yet, as demonstrated above in my survey of settler colonial studies—and as Indigenous Studies, the scholarship on racial capitalism, and Global Histories have theorized far more powerfully—the processes of capital accumulation and the means by which capitalist social relations reproduce themselves cannot be deracinated from the actual social and historical contexts in which they are embedded. Beyond settler colonial studies and this orthodox marxism, I want to suggest the possibility of developing a critical framework for studying Canada as an institutional manifestation of the social relationships produced in a particular place and time by the *global system of racial capitalism* that neither reifies the enclosures of the state system, nor disregards their imperial impacts.

Such an inquiry opens crucial insights into how and where Canada’s imperial project takes shape in the world. In his seminal *Black Marxism*, Cedric J Robinson clarifies that the class relations underpinning the formation and reproduction of capital emerge in the “intensely racial social order” of feudal Europe, and that “[w]orking-class discourse and politics remained marked

by the architectonic possibilities” of this malleable racialist order as the social relations of capitalism expanded beyond the continent on which they emerged.¹⁰³ Put plainly, debates on the North American political left pitting race and class against one another as primary sites of struggle miss that these regimes are so co-constitutive of one another as to be inextricable—and I would supplement Robinson by insisting on placing gendering regimes, the social construction of (dis)ability, and colonization at the core of these logics as well.

As alluded to above, the orthodoxly marxist account of class as defined straightforwardly by the division between those who must labour for wages in order to secure the socially necessary goods to reproduce themselves and those who profit off the labour performed by others (that is, respectively, between proletariat and bourgeoisie) is in fact a relatively abstract account of how class is actually *made* and *lived* as a social relation. In as much as it refuses to acknowledge how ownership has been constructed through regimes of white supremacy, how the division between waged labour and unwaged domestic work has been sustained by cisheteropatriarchy, how the ‘proper’ labouring or productive body is constructed through logics of (dis)ableism, and how the accumulation of capital has been achieved through the dispossession of Indigenous peoples globally, this orthodox marxism reduces itself to a fetishistic workerism largely bereft of concrete class analysis.¹⁰⁴

But while Robinson’s history of racial capitalism reveals the ways in which the drive towards conquest and plunder is facilitated by a shifting regime of racialization (co-constituted with gendered/ableist colonial power structures) that stabilizes a ruling historic bloc through incentives towards collaboration (eg. whiteness) and disincentives towards conflict (eg. racialized policing and militarist practices), his more abiding interest is in how this has been *resisted*. In particular, Robinson traces how the congealment of whiteness as a central social force within the

racial regimes of European and settler empires found its dialectical inversion in the solidarity built through co-resistance amongst negatively racialized peoples—particularly of interest to him was the Black Radical Tradition of anti-imperialism and anti-fascism. From this history, Robinson makes a critical observation that Marx’s account of the trade in enslaved African Indigenous peoples missed:

that the cargoes of laborers also contained African cultures, critical mixes and admixtures of language and thought, of cosmology and metaphysics, of habits, beliefs and morality... These cargoes, then, did not consist of intellectual isolates or decultured blanks.¹⁰⁵

Studied specifically through the Black Radical Tradition as the development of multiple Indigenous traditions forced into both diaspora and co-articulating as modes of resistance, Robinson’s methodology is crucial in developing an analytical lens that is meaningfully anti-imperialist. It informs much of the method in Section Two of this dissertation, where I turn to grassroots theories of change and resistance.

While orthodox marxist accounts presume the existence of a sense of solidarity based in a shared experience as exploited labouring subjects, a Robinsonian critique necessitates attention to the diremptive processes endemic to racial capitalism that intercede against overly flattened theories of solidarity. Robert Nichols has helpfully summarized diremption as the “splitting of humanity into constitutively antagonistic and hierarchically ordered categories.”¹⁰⁶ Authors like WEB Du Bois and Robin DG Kelley draw our attention towards the ‘wages of whiteness’ as a diremptive process through which cross-class alliances are formed between those who successfully assert and/or claim whiteness, in order to stabilize processes of accumulation dependent upon the hyper-exploitation of racialized and Indigenous communities, their labour, and their territories.¹⁰⁷ These alliances have been central to the creation and reproduction of settler polities, as I detail in Chapter Two.

Likewise, as the literature on socially reproductive labour has made clear, the very existence of the waged economy is itself predicated on the enormous realm of unwaged and predominantly feminized work that is essential to reproducing populations capable of engaging in waged labour.¹⁰⁸ Moreover, when gender is understood as always-already co-constitutive of/with race and class, even *waged* reproductive labour is seen to be disproportionately reliant upon a global system in which racialized and feminized workers are often extracted from their communities—typically in the Third World—through the possibility of acquiring waged work in the imperial core. In Canada, while much of the hospitality industry in major cities relies on a similar form of exploitation, and while the agricultural industry relies on regimes that target predominantly Caribbean men, this conjuncture is perhaps best emblemized by the live-in caregiver program.¹⁰⁹ Under this federally regulated program workers are brought to Canada (especially, but not exclusively, Indigenous women from the Philippines), where the designed precariousness of their residency status and the fact that their conditions of work are directly tied *to*, and serve to enclose them *within*, the homes of wealthy elites. This co-constitutes with the racial regimes of Canadian white supremacy and with the devaluation of (especially feminized) care-work generally, to construct live-in caregivers as a hyper-exploitable labour force.¹¹⁰ A labour force that, notably, is often not even seen as such by the broader Canadian labour movement—evidencing, with often lethal consequences, the non-self-evident nature of solidarity within and among labouring people.

Disability Studies has been similarly important for understanding that it is the social construction of particular bodies as desirable vs. undesirable workers—judged always on the assumed rate of profit associated with their labour time—that has structured contemporary associations of (dis)ability and (un)employment, which has dramatic consequences for the relative

generosity or miserliness of the social safety apparatuses of the state.¹¹¹ Citizenship regimes, as noted, have been central in producing a pool of potentially global proportions from which to draw hyper-exploitable workers who do not carry the same legal protections as citizens.¹¹² Imbricated coterminously with these processes, the actual processes by which settler states have come into existence collapses the orthodox marxists' presumption of a simple transhistorical dialectic between proletarians and the bourgeoisie. This is because the immediately perceived interests of capital and settlers—many of the latter of whom are drawn from those dispossessed through processes of accumulation elsewhere—are brought into partial alignment with one another in a cross-class alliance that aims to dispossess Indigenous peoples of their territories in order to render them as settler possessions—that is, as both private fee simple and Crown lands. As Cole Harris argues, for “both [capital and settlers], land was the opportunity at hand, an opportunity that gave settler colonialism its energy.”¹¹³

If, however, marxist anti-imperialists were to take Indigenous peoples' seriously *as nations*, they must then spatialize and temporalize Canadian imperialism not to the state/capital's transiting the containment of the border. Rather, Canada's imperialism begins with the very inception of what Joyce Green calls “Project Canada” as a cross-class alliance that solidifies the rule of a predominantly white, male, and bourgeois settler elite by articulating and securing the reproduction of processes of settlement through co-constitutive relations of whiteness, cisheteropatriarchy, ability, etc.¹¹⁴ To do this, however, collapses the normative and analytical ground beneath the feet of the orthodox marxist account, because the envisioned revolutionary agent—the proletariat—is shot through with internal contradictions, many of which offer immediate incentives for further investment in imperial occupation and expansion.

Nevertheless, Todd Gordon's *Imperialist Canada* (2010) and Tyler Shipley's *Canada in the World* (2020) stand out in this field, as the most serious efforts within the marxist anti-imperialist tradition to conceptualize more fully Canadian imperialism. Gordon's attention is primarily focused on the role that Canada plays politically, economically, and—at times—militarily in perpetuating imperial domination in Latin America. However, in his second chapter, "Empire at Home" he argues that accounting for Canadian imperialism requires acknowledging that the Canadian "state has itself been imperialist since its formation."¹¹⁵ What is more, he recognizes that each (re)formation of capitalism only further entrenches this foundational imperialism: "neoliberalism... [entails] in Canada a greater push into First Nation territories, in search of natural resources and more generally to facilitate the domestic expansion of Canadian capitalism."¹¹⁶ Gordon even acknowledges the limitations of workerist marxism when he writes that anti-imperialism in Canada is essentially hollow "if we do not put front and centre the fight against the ongoing dispossession of indigenous land and the denial of indigenous self-determination."¹¹⁷

Similarly, Shipley's recent *Canada in the World* is both an important reorientation in his approach to the question of Canada and empire—discussed above—and a significant contribution to the Canadianist literature in its own right. Among the texts' many valuable insights is its insistence that "there is no document more foundational to Canadian *foreign* policy than the *Indian Act* of 1876."¹¹⁸ Simple in its framing, Shipley's account nevertheless fundamentally undermines the inside/outside dichotomy that has plagued so much of these literatures by recognizing the always-already international character of that which the Canadian state attempts to present as purely 'domestic' matters. While noting the French and British roots of Project Canada, Shipley

points his readers to Confederation and the decades immediately following as the milieu in which the *Indian Act* emerges as a distinctly “Canadian product: a profound statement of what Canada was” and how it continues to orient itself in the world.¹¹⁹ In particular, the Act asserted the Canadian state’s intention and presumed right to strip Indigenous peoples of their nationhood and, having thus ‘domesticated’ them, to impose a racialized identity through which their basic rights and access to socially necessary resources were regulated via the ability of state representatives to extend or withhold “Indian” status. Approaching the *Indian Act* as both a technology of expansion/conquest and of internalizing/regulating Indigenous peoples is critical to understanding the specifically *settler* imperialist project inaugurated at Confederation in 1867. Moreover, as I highlight in the next chapter, this account of the *Indian Act* as a document of international relations helps to demystify some of the most untenable myths about the constitutional development of Canadian ‘foreign’ policy between 1867 and 1931.

Conclusion:

While there may have been something cathartic in the possibility of declaring with finality that the Canadian state is a “two-faced” institution, the discussion pursued in this chapter cautions against such a rhetorical strategy for at least two reasons. The first, relatively straightforwardly, is because as I alluded to in the introduction, the faces of Canada studied in this chapter are just two among many—this chapter has not addressed many of the most salient faces of the state as described within Canadian Political Science literatures. Instead of a broad survey, this chapter has engaged in a relatively concentrated study of two predominating critical approaches to the study of the Canadian state: settler colonial studies and marxist anti-imperialism. In the course of this study, however, I suggested that in both cases these schools of thought rely upon a heuristic of inside/outside (or domestic and foreign spheres) in order to construct the face of the Canadian state

at which their critique is levelled. Consequently, this produces methods of analysis that ultimately were found to reify their object of study—albeit from different directions. Far from just an idiosyncrasy of scholarship or disciplinary myopia, however, this same bifurcation was seen in popular political thought on the broad left, such as in the clear line that *Canadian Dimension* drew between its special issues on Canadian imperialism abroad and colonialism at home.

It is out of concern for the analytical, political, and normative consequences of maintaining this dichotomy that this chapter has endeavoured to evidence a second, more substantive reason for rebuffing the “two-faced” account of Canada implied by the critical approaches reviewed here. Against this, I have suggested the need to study the Canadian state as a social relation produced within and through global racial capitalism—a project which I pursue more fully in the next chapter of this dissertation. In the words of Nick Estes, settler colonialism can be more effectively analyzed and collectively struggled against if it is understood as an historically determined, but contingent “iteration of racial capitalism in specific locations and territories.”¹²⁰ As such, it can neither be isolated, as in the case of settler colonial studies, nor can it be ignored, such as in the case of much marxist anti-imperialism.

The analytical upshot of such an approach is that it seeks to face the Canadian state as it is actually—if always differentially—encountered in the world, without the encumbrances of abstracted heuristics that describe politics as either foreign or domestic and provide legitimizing bromides on that basis. In my critique of settler colonial studies, I suggested that its important interventions against colonization ‘at home’ must be understood within the global context in which it occurs and by which it is made possible. An anti-colonial politics that confines itself to struggling only within and against the settler state on the institutional and geographic terrain it sets for itself, risks eliding the global forces that constitute the state *and* the role of that same state in structuring

and reproducing global relations of domination and exploitation. By contrast, in the various corners of Canadianist marxist anti-imperialism's broad tent I found a tendency to leave the 'domestic' space of the Canadian state relatively unpoliticized. At one end of a spectrum this redounded to a left-nationalism that perceived the Canadian state as a vehicle for anti-imperialist struggle, and at the other end there was a relatively flat conception of class rule—reduced largely to a supposedly neutral (read: white, male, able-bodied) workerist account of class—that resulted in a fairly consistent aversion to interrogating how Canadian imperialism is reproduced through the articulation of interests that might otherwise seem to be contradictory. These approaches, too, manage to elide the constant reproduction of Canadian imperialism through recompositions of an historic bloc—mediating but also always exceeding the 'domestic' sphere—that enables, and is itself sustained by, the projection of Canadian economic, political, and martial power in the world system.

The absolutely lethal consequences of such elisions have become all too abundantly clear throughout the COVID-19 pandemic. Enforcing the demands of a powerful international business lobby, Canada's refusal to support a waiver of intellectual property laws has enabled enormous private profit-making by preventing low-cost and accelerated production of generic vaccines, at the same time as the federal government has also engaged in open acts of piracy—pilfering nearly two million vaccines from the global COVAX reserve that was established to support low-income (read: over-exploited) countries.¹²¹ In spite of its robust commitments to an equitable and socially just rollout of the vaccine *within* the country, Canada's role as a core buttress of *global vaccine apartheid* and its naked theft from those most hard-hit by the pandemic ought to evidence the inadequacy—if not the impossibility—of struggling for decolonization in or through one state.¹²² It is a situation that rings with echoes of Du Bois' accusation that social democracy in the imperial

core has meant little more than allowing “the dipping of more and grimmer hands into the wealth-bag of the nation,” which was itself a bag filled by plunder.¹²³ And, in a dialectical twist that presages arguments in Chapters Four and Five, Canada’s role in maintaining vaccine apartheid is a project of plunder which is ultimately proving to be self-defeating even on its own terms, as the security sought through the hoarding of vaccines has been rapidly eroded by the prolongation of the pandemic and the consequent proliferation of variants that threaten eventually to out-strip vaccine efficacy. Just as in the face of the virus, in the face of empire solidarity and struggle must always be internationalist.¹²⁴

In the next chapter I develop conceptual tools by which to better facilitate this orientation. Most notably, I make an argument for shifting away from the methodological limitations of both settler colonial studies and orthodox anti-imperialist marxism, and towards the more analytically holistic concept of settler imperialism as a processual technology for reproducing the social totality of racial capitalism. Drawing on an existing literature that theorizes America as *the* settler empire, I deploy the methods of historical institutionalism to argue for seeing Canada in a similar light—even as I mark a number of vital distinctions that ought to inform both study and praxis.

Chapter Two: Canadian Settler Imperialism

It was a typically dreary, cool Toronto day in November 1904 when nationally celebrated poet W Wilfred Campbell addressed a meeting of the aptly named Empire Club of Canada. Speaking to a room packed with the city's luminaries and likely humid with the haze of tobacco smoke and the musk of well-appointed woollen jackets, dampened by the light drizzle and sleet of the changing seasons, Campbell opened with the following: "I claim to be an Imperialist not only from the heart, but also from the head, and one of my strongest claims for Imperialism is that I believe it *the only means by which there will ever be a real Canadian nation.*" While his speech is remarkable for a number of reasons—many of which are likely immediately apparent following the discussion of the previous chapter—I begin this chapter by drawing attention to the co-constitutive relationship that Campbell posits between the Canadian 'national' project and a project of empire. For Campbell, imperialism suffuses his image of what Canada must be; the contemporary fervour for imperialism—witnessed, no doubt, in the unfolding viciousness of the 'scramble for Africa' by European powers and America's brutalizing of the Philippines—was described as the "one wicket-gate through which any young people of today can ever hope to finally attain a true national entity."

Indeed, he berates the "local Independence man" and other Canadian nationalists for not properly grasping the necessity of empire. Campbell's argument is teleological, suggesting that what the opponents of imperialism "fail to see is that true Imperialism, as it stands today, is more than an opinion; it is a vital force, a sort of necessary phase of human progressiveness." While Campbell situates the Canada of his day as teetering between British and American imperialism, and necessarily falling into one or the other for the time being, he also suggests that Canada may yet prove capable of developing an imperial project of its own, should it select the proper course in its alignment on the world stage. For him, this clearly

necessitated that Canada seek a greater role *within* the British Empire; not so as to be subsumed therein, however, but because Canada's "remoteness from the great Imperial centre [London] will in itself safeguard our own individuality" and the young Dominion will thereby "have a chance, ultimately, of becoming a great individual community on the northern part of this continent," separate from the American empire to the south and increasingly independent of London. Of this commitment to imperialism, he says, "instead of being the foe to the individual national life, it is the greatest necessary means to that end," suggesting that—energized and enabled by its solidarity with Britain—Canada will inevitably develop its own wholly unique imperial project. This speech is significant, I suggest, because it shows that for Campbell—a prominent "Confederation Poet," whose work was formative in the establishment of a Canadian imaginary—it was inconceivable that Canada could exist at all without being imperialistic. Campbell declares that Canada has been, is, and will be imperial, or it simply will not be.¹

Campbell's unequivocal stance on this matter is striking, given the relative difficulty that contemporary critical scholarship and popular left thought seem to have in seeing Canada within this light, as evidenced by the fact that the literatures I reviewed in the previous chapter were shown rarely to be conversant with one another. Despite presenting different aspects or 'faces' of a shared object of critique, the Canadian state, the frameworks of settler colonial studies and marxist anti-imperialism were shown to be critical theories of the state that lacked the sense of an imperial social totality. This sharp dichotomy might appear especially odd in light of the ease with which elites like Campbell see a unity of the Canadian project and empire—even if contemporary norms dictate that today's elite adopt different descriptors and (usually) a less celebratory tone towards empire generally. I have highlighted that the silence between these approaches is not merely incidental; rather, the analyses provided by both settler colonial studies and marxist anti-imperialists rely on and reproduce in distinct ways the very dichotomy between the 'foreign' and the 'domestic' through which Canada constructs for itself a 'legitimate' place and role in the world.

The analytical aporia between settler colonial studies and marxist anti-imperialism is thus precisely the space in which the Canadian state is reified. As such, neither field can be substantively corrected by a simple equation of ‘add the other and stir.’

In this chapter I attempt an alternative course, by outlining the analytical framework of settler imperialism. As I develop in section one, this is not a wholly novel concept, but to date it has been developed and mobilized almost exclusively within an American context; the implication of this focus, often, is that while America is seen as one among a number of similar settler *colonies*, as the contemporary global hegemon it is said to stand out as a settler *empire*. This, I argue, serves to confuse the concept of settler imperialism and, more importantly, to exceptionalize the American state in politically unhelpful ways. My goal in this chapter is to advance a slightly more consistent usage of the concept, developed here by tracing the distinctly *Canadian* project of settler imperialism as it congealed in 1867. Moreover, utilizing somewhat dormant tools within Canadian Political Science, I mobilize the methods of an historical institutionalist approach to locate settler imperialism as a central *raison d’être* for the very formation of the Canadian federation.² In particular, I write against a long-held disciplinary consensus that federalism is an antithesis of imperialism, by suggesting that in the Canadian case, federalism is a central technology of government that constitutionalizes whiteness, producing an institutional framework that enables the articulation of an alliance bent on the dispossession/supersession of Indigenous nations, the diminution of other subject populations, the conquest of the continent, and—ultimately—the projection of settler power within the global system of racial capitalism.

Distinct from tools offered by both settler colonial studies and anti-imperialist marxists, I turn to settler imperialism as an analytical lens that privileges relationality and thinks through social totality rather than through bifurcations. It is also a lens that brings into sharper focus the

ways in which power (and resistance) actually operates, as opposed to reproducing received narratives that legitimize the dominant social order and its institutions. As it stands, both settler colonial studies and orthodox anti-imperialist marxism reify the Canadian state by recapitulating its central conceit of a foreign/domestic dichotomy. Neither field grasps the dynamic force of Canadian settler imperialism as a de/reterritorializing social relation of class rule—constructed and reproduced through the articulation of hierarchized distinctions of race, citizenship, gender, and (dis)ability. While both these fields have largely accepted and reproduced what Lisa Lowe calls the “colonial divisions of humanity” that are, in part, produced by and through the state, understanding Project Canada as an exercise in settler imperialism—in both its conception and ongoing operation—draws global analyses of capitalism, cisheteropatriarchy, colonization, ecocide, martialism, state-nationalism, and racialization together in the understanding that these are always-already “imbricated processes, not sequential events; they are ongoing and continuous in our contemporary moment, not temporally [or spatially] distinct nor as yet concluded.”³

At the same time, in developing this concept within the Canadian context, I do not mean to produce a monism by collapsing all systems of oppression into a singularity. Rather, I seek tools to describe the social relations of empire that, for instance, draw together the corporate-led ecological/cultural destruction and waves of physical displacement—of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, and Huron/Wendat peoples, alongside low-income and racialized communities—in Tkaronto/Toronto, as that very same project simultaneously establishes networks of enclosure that are expanding Israeli settlements and (re)making Palestine as an open-air prison. It strikes me that neither settler colonial studies nor the anti-imperialist marxists I discussed in the previous chapter, possess the conceptual apparatuses to explain adequately how it is that something as seemingly mundane as the Canadian Highways International Corporation (CHIC) transits and

unifies these co-constitutive imperial projects—I discuss this example in my conclusion. As an analytic settler imperialism is meant to facilitate the exploration of these processes while remaining attentive to the ways in which imperial power “operates through precisely spatialized and temporalized processes of both differentiation and connection.”⁴ As noted in the previous chapter, however, this is not a comparative project; while I draw on Global History to inform my arguments and to buttress my theoretical work, this portion of my project remains primarily interested in providing a more fulsome theory of how the Canadian state came to be and how it continues to operate in the world as a settler empire.

Section 1: Settler Imperialism, Reviewing An American Exception?

In a recent and very helpful article, Krishan Kumar traces the intellectual development of imperialism and colonialism as concepts of political theory and frames of critique. He summarizes the primary distinction between the two in practice as: “[e]mpire is rule over peoples; colonialism is the acquisition of territory for the purposes of settlement and cultivation.”⁵ At first blush this may not appear particularly useful, as it seems to impose a rather old and hard distinction between these two processes, one could fairly ask: what of settlement projects that simultaneously exert settler rule over distinct peoples? In short, what about polities that today we often call ‘settler colonies’? Kumar’s thinking has, however, been beneficially sharpened and clarified as a result of the debates arising from settler colonial studies. He writes that one of the most “unfortunate” consequences of the course taken by settler colonial studies’ debates is that they tend to present “settler colonialism as different from other forms of colonialism, *rather than from types of imperialism.*”⁶ A small, but remarkably robust literature is closing this lacuna that Kumar identifies in our collective understanding, though it has predictably been developed almost exclusively

within the American context and, as such, an implicit American exceptionalism has largely constrained the concept's applicability to that context.

Aziz Rana's *The Two Faces of American Freedom* (2010) takes up this challenge of conceptualizing settler imperialism through a reconsideration of the apparent paradoxes embedded in America's independence from the British Empire. Rana observes that far from the straightforward account of republican emancipation, American freedom has been premised on and reproduces itself through a series of foundational exclusions and uneven integrations on conditions of structural exploitation—most notably the displacement of the Indigenous peoples of North America and the theft of their territories, alongside the stolen lives and labour of enslaved Indigenous peoples from Africa, the consequences of which not only reverberate today in regimes of racialization and land ownership but continues to shape the world system itself. This is what Rana calls the American “constitutional and political experiment in... *settler empire*.”⁷ Against those who characterize these contradictions as a failure of American liberalism, or a mere moment of arrested development on the road to a full unfolding of freedom, Rana shows that American freedom is constituted *through* imbricated regimes of domination and exploitation, the contradictions of which have never actually been resolved merely relocated. He argues that a “consequence of this conceptual failure to link insider freedom”—and here being an insider refers to those with full citizenship within the republic—“to practices of subordination is that for current political discourse the real struggles that produced the country's institutions remain opaque.”⁸ For Rana, the freedom that American settlers sought *from* British imperial control was also always simultaneously a struggle *to* extend further their dispossession and occupation of Indigenous peoples' territories and *to* expand/control the wealth produced through the forced labour of enslaved peoples (even as Britain itself continued in its own practices of enslavement and

conquest).⁹ It is also this theory of freedom that redounds to constant American militarism on a global scale today: the freedom of Americans to participate in an overdeveloped consumer society produced through plunder is only possible through maintenance of their preponderant power.¹⁰

With American independence, the project of settler *colonialism* initiated and contoured by the British Empire shifted in important ways. The general contours of this shift define the social form that I argue constitutes a uniquely *settler* form of *imperialism*. Settlers aspired not only towards the acquisition and cultivation of land, but to *direct* the project of empire themselves and, increasingly, for their *exclusive benefit*—rather than for the ultimate benefit of a distant aristocracy and financier class. These settlers sought to merge responsibility for the territorial acquisitions and transformations of colonialism with the assumption of imperial authority to govern over peoples and populations into a single political body which they controlled. The transition to settler imperialism thus re-centres the project of empire squarely on to settlers as an internally differentiated but emergent class—which is created by explicitly articulating regimes of whiteness, Christian supremacism, cisheteropatriarchy, and property ownership together. This re-centring of imperial authority was achieved, in part, by removing whatever constraints or moderating elements were imposed by London upon the settler colony in the metropole's efforts to balance conflicting interests within a much broader imperial context in which settlers are an invested class but, nevertheless, a peripheral one. Perhaps most notably in the American case this meant rejecting both the limitations on westward expansion and the modest recognition of both Indigenous and franco-Catholic rights in British North America after the Seven Years War. Moreover, it also necessitated the deepening and sharpening of core processes enabling this cross-class collaboration, namely the emergence of whiteness as the necessary condition for claiming

citizenship in the republic and for asserting the relatively horizontal civic rights associated with such membership.

Rana is far from alone in insisting on seeing America as a distinctly *settler* empire. From the opening pages of *Transit of Empire* (2011), Jodi Byrd clarifies that her interest, too, is in “U.S. settler imperialism née colonialism.”¹¹ The adjective here marks not only that what she calls settler imperialism is more often known and studied under the auspices of settler colonialism, but also indicates that the original colonial project has morphed into a fully-formed imperial project in its own right, even as it remains rooted in Indigenous dispossession and settler colonization of land. Like Rana, Byrd interrogates the constitutional and political project that structures and enables American settler imperialism. In particular, she turns to the Commerce Clause of the American Constitution and to the Supreme Court’s Marshall Trilogy. Following the Court’s interpretation that ‘foreign Nations,’ ‘the several States,’ and ‘the Indian Tribes’ are three distinctly enumerated political relations over which Congress has legislative power, Byrd notes that the Constitution’s:

conjunctive and prepositional logics of conquest over Indian tribes provide the United States the [institutional] means to assert extraterritorial sovereignty over foreign nations as the need arises... As the ghost in the constituting machine of empire the paradigmatic ‘Indian tribe’ that exists as a parallel to ‘foreign nation’ is not absent, but rather a *sui generis* presence that enables the founding of U.S. empire.¹²

Byrd argues that “Indianness” is a signifier constructed by, and in order to serve, settler conquest. While it is affixed to many different people(s), “Indianness” as a constitutional status in America describes neither real people nor existing cultures. Instead “Indianness” is a fabricated “contagion through which U.S. empire orders the place of peoples within its purview.”¹³ Legitimation of settler conquest requires, according to Byrd, the production of an imaginary “original enemy combatant” whose death in the process of conquest “cannot be grieved” because their life is

rendered as not fully human, not fully a life. Settler “ideas of Indians and Indianness have served as the ontological ground through which... *settler colonialism enacts itself as settler imperialism.*”¹⁴ Through the construction of “Indianness” as a constitutive other—which is neither *within* the settler polity, nor allowed to persist *outside* it—the American Constitution facilitates the near-constant transgression (even abrogation) of any and all limits on the exertion of settler political violence in the assertion of territorial jurisdiction. Put differently, Byrd sees “Indianness” as the fungible marker that ‘legitimizes’ the assertion of settler political authority on a global scale.

Both Norbert Finzsch and Julius Wilm also seek to develop analyses of settler imperialism. Finzsch, in particular, helpfully observes that settler imperialism is notable for its “rhizomatic” or multidirectional logics, by which the project of empire is at once embedded within capitalism’s global finance nexus but also defined by the desires of settler communities to control more directly the course of their imperial project.¹⁵ I read this as conversant with Cedric Robinson’s history of racial capitalism and with WEB Du Bois’ account of the politics of egalitarianism within the imperial core being predicated on plunder abroad—both of which were discussed in the previous chapter. Drawing out the implications of Finzsch’s account, I would argue summarily that settler imperialism is perhaps best understood as a supreme consequence of the continual displacement of the internal contradictions of political struggle within first feudal societies, then European empires, so that by a perverse bootstrapping or recursive logic those who might have once struggled against dispossession in one place very often form seemingly contradictory cross-class alliances as they enter into the vanguard of dispossession elsewhere. This is a contingent convergence, though, not transhistorical and not inevitable, but rather the product of decisions made and accumulated over time.

Noting in the relations between even *settlers* and the American federal government a constant (re)emergence of the sort of tensions that parallel those that Independence sought to resolve between the colonies and Britain, Wilm argues that the “source of aggressive behaviour against Native peoples” is often the result of “frictions between frontier whites and state authorities.” So much so that Wilm suggests that it is in fact the “internal contradictions and social tensions within white settler society [that] turned outwards and translated into seemingly non-directional anti-Native sentiments and actions”—which is in fact the engine of settler conquest.¹⁶ Supplementing this, I assert that it is by this very act of turning ‘outwards’ into the compensatory promise of conquest, that the ‘interior’ is actually constructed through a suspension or sufficient dampening of various political and class struggles that might otherwise have riven apart that which comes to present itself as a unified community, nation, or polity.¹⁷ Europe and its supposed whiteness—not to mention replicant logics in settler contexts—are not only empowered by the plunder accumulated through this turning ‘outwards,’ they are made by and in order to enable such a turn.

This production of an interior space functions through a number of co-constitutive discursive and material techniques that work to obscure the still ongoing operation of imperialism within the supposedly ‘legitimate’ political containers, often produced by the staking of claim to an exclusive territorial jurisdiction by one historic bloc, which is then recognized by other blocs making their own similar claims to legitimacy.¹⁸ “In North America,” writes Manu Karuka, “to speak of the nation-state is to invoke imperialism.” While he does not adopt the framing of settler imperialism (preferring continental imperialism), and while we can push his critique of the nation-state well beyond just North America, Karuka’s observation reveals how the “alibi” of the nation and statehood are used to obscure the reality of settler empire.¹⁹ Here, the claim of nationhood and

the state-form are mobilized as ways to present colonization as something other than what it is: a criminal usurpation of Indigenous nations' territories; or, in Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark's words, a "criminal empire."²⁰

This obscuring of settler empire by giving it an ostensibly proper home in the 'nation' and implying the necessity of state authority to curtail the assumed chaos of non-state social orders, was historically advanced by Christian supremacist principles like the Doctrine of Discovery and later by historically deterministic and racially hierarchical notions of social evolution that buttress white supremacy. But these ideologies have also no doubt been aided in part by the post-World War Two development of an international legal framework for decolonization which extends the right of sovereignty only to those colonized peoples who are 'overseas' or territorially discontinuous from the imperial metropole that exploits them. Moreover, sovereignty is legally understood as mode of self-determination attached specifically to the state-form. As Michael Asch notes, while embedding this "salt water" thesis into the implementation guidelines of the UN Declaration on De-Colonization (1960) facilitated its passage, it also "rescued" settler and other continental empires from the possibility of serious anti-imperialism agitation or confronting the legal necessity of decolonization compelled by this same mechanism.²¹

Given that this legal framework remains the predominating conceptual approach to contemporary understandings of both imperialism and the right to decolonization under international law, Karuka's attention to what he calls "continental imperialism" is an important intervention. It demystifies imperialism by interrogating the real saliency that saline water or cartographic distant *should* have in shaping understandings of imperialism as a political phenomenon. Karuka writes that America ought to be understood "not [as] a national entity, but an imperial one," and that this shift in perspective empowers us to "understand North America as

a space of imperialism, an international space of hundreds of colonized Indigenous nations,” rather than as the domestic space of settler nations/colonies. Moreover, and crucially in terms of avoiding the dichotomized method of critique which I outlined in Chapter One, seeing settler social orders through this lens reveals that North America is a “staging ground for imperialist techniques and processes that would reoccur elsewhere in the world.”²² While I find Karuka’s work in particular to be highly valuable, and the notion of continental imperialism has also been used in other important comparative studies, it nevertheless lacks the specificity that I believe is offered by the analytic of settler imperialism.²³ In particular, and as I develop below, the central figure of the settler drops away, allowing the class formation at the very core of this particular imperial project to slip from focus. Without noting the central importance of the fact that the mass of settlers continue to operate within a social order that recruits their activity and labour into (re)producing a social movement for, and a defensive bulwark of, the historic bloc constituting American—and, as we shall see, Canadian—settler imperialism, Karuka’s account of continental imperialism feels somewhat incomplete.

Section 2: Settler Empire by Revolution or by Redistribution

As this brief literature review has evidenced, to date settler imperialism has been predominantly studied as an American phenomenon. As such, its theoretical framing is very reliant on the revolutionary break of 1776 marking the transition from settler colonialism within the British Empire to American settler imperialism as a distinct project. Rana, citing Seymour Martin Lipset, suggests that the distinctive feature of settler ideology in America is that the state emerged as a consequence of the first “successful settler revolt against metropolitan rule.”²⁴ At stake in this revolt for the settlers were two things: “the shifting status of Anglo colonists in the British Empire”

and the question of who “should direct imperial expansion”: London administrators or settler elites.²⁵

But this account sits somewhat ill-at-ease with the distinctly non-revolutionary (or, viewed with the Loyalist exodus in mind, perhaps even counter-revolutionary) development of Canadian settler imperialism. By even the most generous accounts, Canada did not fully cut its constitutional tethers to the British Empire until the mid-20th Century—with some pointing to continuities, like the deepening constitutional entrenchment of the Crown, to this very day. Whereas rejection of the constitutional accommodations for the Canadien and Indigenous peoples that developed in the aftermath of the Seven Year Wars was a cause of American settler revolt and shaped their imperial project accordingly, these accommodations continued to develop in uneven ways within the remaining colonies of British North America that formed Canada. An important exception being the colonies that became British Columbia; in colonies on the Pacific coast, terra nullius was quickly established as the governing doctrine, at the same time that desire for hyper-exploitable Indigenous labour remained comparatively higher than in eastern colonies. Canadian settler imperialism must thus be understood as both distinct from its American counter-point in important but non-mitigative ways, and also as attempting to mediate internal contradictions between the colonial policies of Confederation’s cognate governments. In short, the institutional apparatuses of the Canadian state bear the markings of numerous, often contradictory, historical processes. Shaped in this way, these institutions can at once sustain policies of modest liberal accommodation, even as they also buttress imperial processes of expropriation, domination, and exploitation. In what follows, I suggest that we can read the *British North America Act* (1867) as a constitutional transcript of the transition from settler colonialism within the British Empire to a Canadian project of settler imperialism.

The promulgation of the BNA Act on July 1, 1867, has routinely been marked by both the state and public as the genesis of a distinctly continental Canadian political project. Recently enormous energies and resources were invested in sesquicentennial celebrations, with the federal government's contributions to official "Canada 150" programmes totalling at least \$610 million.²⁶ In spite of this, even mainstream Canadianist scholars have long been, and largely remain, skeptical about attempts to repackage 1867 as a radically transformative moment. Peter H Russell, for instance, discusses the BNA Act's success in federating several of Britain's North American colonies as only part three—very much a midpoint—in his six-part narrative of Canadian constitutional development. Moreover, Russell insists that Confederation "did not create Canada."²⁷ His argument has merit from at least two perspectives. As Russell details in the first two parts of his history, a lot of what defines contemporary Canadian constitutionalism—such as the *Royal Proclamation* (1763), the *Quebec Act* (1774), the *Act of Union* (1841), and the practice of responsible government in matters of 'local' affairs—predates Confederation by as much as a century. Vital contemporary constitutional arguments have been developed and serious legal victories won with recourse to these pre-Confederation principles; the continued existence of Aboriginal rights and title being chief amongst these victories and part of what John Borrows describes as a process of "recovering" Canadian constitutionalisms.²⁸ Conversely, however, whether it is the continuation of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as the court of last resort until 1949; the fact that, relative to today, Confederation was initially quite confined in terms of both geography and cognate jurisdictions; or that the power to amend written elements of the constitution remained in London until 1982, ample evidence exists to argue that Confederation was at most only a partial genesis leaving much constitutional work undone.²⁹

Despite the much-needed deflation of Canada 150's self-adulation, minimizing the significance of 1867 also risks obscuring how the important shifts towards a distinctly *settler imperialism* in British North America—already well underway by that time—coagulated through Confederation into a political project with devastatingly robust institutional apparatuses designed explicitly for continental conquest and asserting settler power in the world. Moreover, the shifts that Confederation engenders are of truly global significance, as they solidify within the British Empire imperatives towards what the Canadian constitutionalist Frank R Scott calls the “redistribution of Imperial sovereignty.”³⁰

Scott's phrasing is key to my own argument. Confederation must be seen not as a *reformation* or *decolonization*, but as a *redistribution* or *devolution* of the exercise of Crown sovereignty in North America (and later in the world writ large), which Borrows pithily notes amounts to “magic crystals being sprinkled on the land as a justification for the diminution of Aboriginal occupation and possession.”³¹ Confederation, crucially, transfers responsibility over the scattering of magic crystals in North America from the Imperial Parliament in London to the settler government(s) and the corporate allies to which they delegate the project of reaching out into the continent. This Canadian model of imperial devolution became a defining feature of the early 20th Century recomposition of the British Empire through the further extension of Dominion status to other jurisdictions in the Empire dominated by white settlers. With recourse to debates in both the Imperial parliament and the legislature of the united provinces of Canada, I draw out how these redistributions coagulated into a distinctly Canadian settler imperialism—albeit one that remains partially within the ambit of the British Empire until the mid-20th Century as the Empire underwent substantial renovations, largely as a consequence of the Canadian experiment.

It has become a truism of Canadian political history to assert that the Dominion government lacked competency in ‘foreign’ affairs from Confederation until the ratification of the *Statute of Westminster* (1931). The sixth edition of Stephen Brooks’ textbook, *Canadian Democracy*—a standard of many introductory-level Canadian Politics undergraduate courses—suggests that in 1867 the “power to enter into foreign treaties” was retained by London.³² Notably, however, such an account becomes vexed if the histories of treaty-making in Upper Canada prior to Confederation and the proliferation of the Numbered Treaties from 1871 to 1921 are taken seriously. That is to say, that such an account can stand *only* if we continue refusing to see Indigenous peoples as *nations*. By effacing the significance of these treaties, dominant disciplinary accounts of Canadian ‘foreign’ policy reproduce the racist conceits of the imperial worldview embedded within the BNA Act itself. The realm of the ‘foreign’ becomes constituted through an implicitly racialized understanding of nationhood and through the transhistorical projection of Canada’s contemporary claims to continental territorial jurisdiction that are, in fact, only possible retrospectively. The suggestion that Confederation withheld from the Dominion government’s jurisdiction competency in matters of ‘foreign’ relations reveals that Canadianists continue to believe that properly ‘foreign’ relations were only between states in which whiteness (or something sufficiently analogous) unified the ruling classes. Simultaneously, this understanding of ‘foreign’ repeats the BNA Act’s effacing of the nationhood of Indigenous peoples by transmuting their status as collective *actors* (constrained, but nevertheless still recognized within the 18th Century British imperial system) into the jurisdictional *objects* of settlers. This was institutionalized in 1867, presaging within North America and likely informing the emergence of the world system of states premised on the Wilsonian theory that the internationally recognized right to self-determination accrued along only one side of the global colour line that structured the inter-war period and the League of Nations.³³

It is helpful therefore to dwell on the ways in which the BNA Act, in order to redistribute Imperial sovereignty, actually required a substantial reduction of what James Tully describes as the ‘strange multiplicity’ of political subjects and sources of authority recognized both on the ground and even within the constitutional documents of British North America prior to 1867.³⁴ For instance, while the extent and depth of the recognition is contested, the *Royal Proclamation* (1763) and the *Treaty of Niagara* (1764) functioned conjunctively to extend a degree of constitutional recognition for the political autonomy of Indigenous peoples alongside or within the ambit of the British Empire.³⁵ Notably, these were extracted from the Crown through concerted, internationalist struggle by Indigenous nations throughout the Great Lakes regions. Nevertheless, even the most reductively black-letter interpretation of British North America’s pre-1867 constitution, the “*Nations or Tribes of Indians*” must be considered as “connected” to the Crown—and, perhaps, thereby recognized as persisting with some degree of autonomous authority—or, at minimum, as being “under [the Crown’s] Protection” and therefore they were not to be “molested or disturbed in the Possession of such Parts of Our Dominions and Territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are reserved to them.”³⁶

In short, these documents construct Indigenous peoples as constitutional actors within the Empire, imbued with certain affirmed rights that could be exercised *against* settlers. Indeed, as gestured towards above, even this ambiguous degree of constitutional subjecthood, recognized by the Crown out of a perceived necessity in order to maintain an imperial balance of power, was a catalytic factor in the American Revolution. An imperial order that countenanced Indigenous constitutional subjecthood provoked anxiety, animus, and eventually revolt amongst land-hungry settlers who perceived themselves as unjustly hemmed-in by a distant imperial government as it sought to balance a broad ledger in which the perceived needs of settlers were weighed in the

balance against other allies of the Crown—some with diametrically opposed interests. America's westward invasions following Independence should be read in this light: as the fulfillment of the settler revolt *for* an empire of their own.

Without recourse to revolutionary means, Canadian settler imperialism was also nevertheless brought into being through the de facto abrogation of the *Royal Proclamation*. There is no singular moment in which jurisdiction for relations with Indigenous nations is transferred to settlers in British North America. Rather, it occurred through the gradual expansion of settlers' legal and political power relative to other populations within the Empire. As late as 1837 the select parliamentary committee on "Aboriginal Tribes" in London was warning the Imperial Parliament *against* devolving such jurisdiction to settler governments, as it correctly feared the consequences of influential land-speculators driving local policy.³⁷ That is, they recognized that local landed settlers would seek to exert control over their governments' policies in order to abrogate whatever limited protections were held by Indigenous peoples in order to seize more territory as property. In relatively quick order, however, the committee's advice was disregarded, and settlers began setting day-to-day "Indian policy."

Often, in glossing this period of transition from British to settler responsibility for Indigenous relations, authors point to the declining importance of imperial military alliances with Indigenous peoples as a consequence of the demographic surge of settlers into the Canadas and the Atlantic colonies following the War of 1812.³⁸ Though this is no doubt a vital part of the history, it is also fraught to rely too heavily on these claims. Not only do they fail to account for the aggressive application of naval force and the doctrine of terra nullius on the west coast, they also do little to lay a helpful groundwork for understanding the full-scale paramilitary invasion and subsequent occupation of Red River and the Prairies that Ottawa orchestrated in the course of

claiming a continental empire towards the close of the 19th Century.³⁹ These are often narrated teleologically, as *inevitable* settler ‘triumphs,’ but the sheer scale of the violence and the brutality of its application suggests that it was seen as anything but inevitable at the time. The use of force was overwhelming because it was opposed by an entrenched anti-colonial resistance. Howard Adams’, Chris Andersen’s, and James Daschuk’s account of Indigenous resistance in the North-West, as well as Gord Hill’s, Adele Perry’s and Keith D Smith’s histories of the west coast resistance, are vital historiography reminding us of just how much force and violence settlers required to establish their rule through the dispossession and displacement of Indigenous polities.⁴⁰

These facts evidence a profound capacity on the part of Indigenous peoples to exert themselves against settler invasions, and they suggest the continued possibility of significant military alliances—had this actually been desired by settler governments. The focus on military allegiances, however, also risks obscuring the equally important developments *internal* to the cohering settler class at this transitional juncture. Most notably, such military histories miss how the sometimes raucous demands for settler autonomy acted as a point of articulation by which a cross-class alliance of settlers emerged around the call for, and assertion of, greater settler authority in matters of ‘local’ importance.⁴¹ Local, here, being closer in meaning to ‘near,’ rather than ‘domestic’ given the expansionist agenda of settlers throughout the Ontario Peninsula. Put more plainly, it is analytically suspect to presume that the mere presence of settlers past an arbitrary demographic threshold is sufficient to tip the scales of imperial decision-making. Instead, it’s necessary to understand the imperatives at play within the particular and contingent formation of settlers as a class in which relatively poor white men are invited to deliberately articulate their interests *with* the colonial elites and in *opposition* to Indigenous peoples by participating in the usurpation, occupation, and commodification of land. As Howard Adams details, in resisting the

invasion and occupation of Red River, white and Métis farmers were able to briefly articulate their interests into a common front *against* Canada; this front was eventually broken, however, by both military force and Canada's insertion of white supremacist governing institutions that empowered white farmers above the remaining Indigenous peoples.⁴²

Echoes of Rana's thesis, that American freedom is produced through the unfreedom of others, can be seen by considering the select parliamentary's committee's urging against devolution in 1837 alongside the radical liberal Lord Durham's recommendations (1839) that 'responsible' government was the solution to unrest amongst settlers in the Canadas.⁴³ Whereas the latter holds out local self-rule as a technology of governance to quiet unrest amongst settlers, the former recognizes (though only implicitly and not in these terms) that when coupled with the mute compulsion of racial capitalism's social relations a democratic political revolution amongst settlers will likely produce a drive towards territorial expansion. It is a drive pushed by the land-hungry elites who already profit by withholding the necessities of life in exchange for capital, but it is enacted by the landless poor who think they have everything to gain through participating in Indigenous dispossession and colonization. As Lorenzo Veracini sums up, settlement 'abroad' is perceived by those who enact it as the more viable "*alternative* to revolution" at 'home'—a perception which is, no doubt, aided by longstanding doctrines of Christian supremacy, especially as those transition into the recognizably modern notions of white supremacy.⁴⁴ It is more viable not in actual terms—as the real and ongoing histories of how the current world system was made reveal the otherwise unthinkable violences it necessitates—but in the ideological terms of a social order premised on co-constitutive processes of property-formation and racial difference-making, alongside the solidification of cisheteropatriarchy and regimes of (dis)ability.

The relocation of decision-making over relations with Indigenous nations from London to settler governments in British North America, thus, largely paralleled the gradual entrenchment of responsible government, as the constitutional principle that the exercise of executive authority was answerable to a legislative body elected almost exclusively by propertied male settlers. Legislation thus bears the marks of these particular interests. Governors in British North America increasingly were directed by local legislatures—dominated as they were by land speculators and railway barons—rather than by London where such interests merely jockeyed for influence amidst a wide array of competing imperial sectors.⁴⁵ By 1860, the so-called “Indian” Department had been fully transferred to the province of Canada, where it was tellingly housed under the Crown Lands Department. Though initially a neglected office, James Leighton details that, within these new institutional realities, the interests of both land-hungry settlers and the business elite of the colonies successfully converged in pressuring the legislature and bureaucracy to expedite territorial expansion.⁴⁶ Thus, while the BNA Act did not *revolutionize* settler-Indigenous relations, it congealed into law the emerging logics of settler supremacy enable by the *redistribution* of imperial sovereignty. Perhaps nowhere is this more in evidence than in section 91(24), which summarily asserts the new Dominion government’s jurisdiction over “Indians, and Lands reserved for the Indians”—gormlessly squeezed in between copyright law and citizenship regimes.⁴⁷ Through this clause the recognition afforded to Indigenous peoples within the British Empire via the *Royal Proclamation* was largely abrogated, in fact if not in law. The redistribution of Imperial sovereignty in 1867 unilaterally passed Indigenous peoples and their territories into the ambit of a Dominion dominated by, and answerable primarily to, those who understood themselves as having a direct interest in expanding processes of territorial dispossession throughout the northern interior of North America.

Section 3: Dominion unto the Ends of the Earth

Political scientists, historians, and legal theorists, on the whole, view the BNA Act as constituting a space of domesticity within which the Dominion and provincial governments were granted *only* local self-government under the umbrella of the British Empire. But this obscures that the BNA Act redistributes jurisdiction over relations with people with Indian status squarely to the Dominion government, albeit in a manner meant to domesticate and ultimately dismember Indigenous nations. While Tyler Shipley is likely right in treating the *Indian Act* (1876) as the first *declaration* of Canadian ‘foreign’ policy as I discussed in Chapter One, by insisting on the recognition of Indigenous peoples’ nationhood, however, we can see à la Byrd that section 91(24) is the ‘ghost in the constituting machine’ enabling the transition from settler colonialism within the British Empire to a project of increasingly autonomous Canadian settler imperialism. Moreover, in conjunction with section 146, which imagined a near-future in which much of northern North America was annexed within the Dominion’s territorial ambit, section 91(24) is the cornerstone of the constitutional apparatus through which the Canadian state was brought into being as a tool for settlers in pursuit of continental imperialism and projecting settler power globally.

Indeed, continentalist ambitions were indicated in the very nomenclature of these new institutions. Many note that conferring “dominion” status—as an alternative to ‘kingdom’—on Canada was meant to appease America’s republican sensibilities, which may have been anxious over an explicitly monarchical polity on their northern border.⁴⁸ But relatively few have marked the intention of conquest declared by the invocation of Psalm 72; in particular, in verse 8’s assertion that the ruler’s “dominion” reaches “from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth.”⁴⁹ The redistribution of Imperial sovereignty was intended to empower a settler class to

use their new self-ruling Dominion to make real the Crown's nominal claims to a globe-spanning sovereignty throughout the North American continent.⁵⁰ Even fewer, though, have considered what was portended for Indigenous peoples and other subject populations within the settler polity by the promise in the subsequent verse 9 that those who “dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him [again, the ruler]; and his enemies shall lick the dust.”⁵¹ The very concept of Dominion status, thus, far from the merely supine position within empire that some Canadianists have lamented, has embedded within it Kumar's definition of empire as *rule over peoples*. These were the images sitting ready at hand and deliberately invoked by the framers of the BNA Act, drew on many Orientalist and Christian/white supremacist doctrines energizing European imperialism as they positioned their own ambitions towards a continentalist project clearly envisioned within the long trajectory of other crusader states.⁵²

As Russell notes, in constructing the apparatuses of this new settler state, “a continent-wide Dominion” was very much seen as the “manifest destiny” to which Canada's architects were ascending.⁵³ Though, I think, Russell does not necessarily dwell sufficiently with the implications of this deliberately imperialist institutional design—preferring instead to uphold the incompleteness of Canada's intended conquests as evidence of the possibility of salvaging something better. This sense of manifest destiny is, however, also palpable in the province of Canada's 1865 Confederation debates, which largely set the agenda leading into Confederation. Thomas D'Arcy McGee was notable amongst those in the debates for the forthrightness with which he tied a liberatory future *for settlers* to the expansion of their imperial reach. Drawing his lessons from the American example, and effectively beating both Campbell and Rana to the punch, McGee asserted that the desire for the “acquisition of new territory” is seemingly an “inexorable law of democratic existence.”⁵⁴ No serious thought was given throughout these debates in the

Canadas to the fact that Indigenous peoples were already engaged in systems of governance throughout the entirety of the territories proposed for annexation, or to the brutal realities of what dispossession and displacement would entail. The few scant references made to Indigenous peoples throughout these debates reduced Indigenous life to mere occupancy and sought to downplay the significance of even this fact. George Brown's breezy attitude typifies whatever marginal thought was lent to the realities of conquest when he asserted that "the vast Indian [sic] Territories between [Atlantic and Pacific]... will ere long, I trust, be open to civilization."⁵⁵

The devolution of explicitly imperial ambitions and planning to settlers, now embedded within the very framework of Confederation, was more than a mere ideational telos; it was explicitly understood at the time as the solution to the perceived 'problem' of a stall in the advancement of colonization. Viewed from the distant imperial vantage point of London, the northern interior of North America was seen as "one of the most inaccessible regions of the earth." In justifying his government's fulfillment of a loan in 1869 (by which the new Dominion government purchased much of so-called Rupert's Land and the North West from the Hudson's Bay Company (HBC)), British Member of Parliament (MP) and Secretary of State for War, Edward Cardwell, suggested that the "[c]ontinual embarrassment" resulting from the persistence of Indigenous governance systems throughout these territories could be corrected through "an arrangement by which—the sovereignty of this region remaining with the Crown—the rights which the Sovereign exercised were transferred to the Colonial Government." While Cardwell wouldn't have used these words, we can see Indigenous *governance* and mobility keenly at work in his timorous concerns that, as a result of the lack of "settled Government" in the area, "bodies of Indians" were reported to be "traversing... that extensive region" and crossing "from time to time [into] the neighbouring American State of Minnesota." The active presence of the living

seasonal round of Indigenous governance striates the efforts of imperial powers to smooth the territories, and evokes an anxiety that ultimately culminates in support for the settler-led invasion of these territories in order to subdue Indigenous governance systems.⁵⁶

Notably, the redistribution of imperial sovereignty to settlers, empowering them to direct the spread of empire throughout the interior of northern North America, was selected as the most desirable option by the Imperial Parliament despite serious competing proposals for alternative solutions such as the establishment of a new Crown colony in the region as late as 1865.⁵⁷ Geography and distance were not the only perceived impediments to settlement, however, as the institutional inertia of the HBC—which was far more concerned with extraction than with ‘civilization’—was also viewed as a major problem. British MP Arthur Mills asked forcefully whether the government of the day would allow the “obstruction” that was the HBC’s charter “to intervene between the colonization of [northern North America] and a colony [Canada] which has manifested its readiness to undertake” this project.⁵⁸ Here, also, is a hint of the British elite’s panicked search for a spatial fix to solve the problem of their own surplussed populations produced by the displacement of enclosures and the mechanizations of the Industrial Revolution in Britain. The BNA Act, in George Browns’ words, was designed to bring into existence the “governmental machinery” that could achieve this end under the direction of a ruling class drawn *from settlers*.⁵⁹ To facilitate the ascendancy of settler imperialism, then, the HBC’s power to exert exclusive territorial authority against others within the Empire was sharply curtailed and limited to a few remnant forts. As Alexander Galt made clear in Canada’s Confederation debates, it was the task of Confederation to equip this emerging settler polity with the resources to take the “immense extent of territory that stretches away west of Upper Canada” and ensure that it becomes a “source of strength instead of a burden to us and to the Mother Country also.”⁶⁰ Settlers, as an cohering

class (which was, in fact, attempting to subtend within itself a seemingly contradictory assemblage of cross-class alliances—see my discussion in Chapter One), were understood to have the most immediate and voracious interest in dispossessing Indigenous peoples in order to annex and occupy the continent.

This was the hinge on which a project of settler colonialism within the British Empire pivoted towards a distinctly Canadian project of settler imperialism. This cohering historic bloc of settlers provided the greatest possibility to extend and expand processes of accumulation that were of central concern at the time (and largely continue to be), primarily in the form of acquiring land. While the expulsion of Europe's landless poor into empire's false promise of 'empty lands' explains much of this drive amongst settlers, notably many other reasons—eg. Christian and white supremacisms, and attendant 'civilizing' missions—powerfully explain why settlers were the most energetic force propelling colonization. While such reasons do not appear immediately economic in nature, they are co-constitutive of the ontological totality of racial capitalism as Robinson explains it.

Section 4: Confederation and Constitutional Whiteness

But this transition to settler imperialism also needed an institutional arrangement that could facilitate and regulate settler territorial hegemony. In part, this required overcoming longstanding *internal* antagonisms amongst settler, especially between anglophone/Protestants and their francophone/Catholic counterparts—as these represented the central axes of fracture within the settler population in British North America at the time. The solution, famously, was federalism; but while nearly every Canadianist has had something to say on the centrality of the federal arrangement to Canadian political life, relatively few have paused to consider the recompositionary work of race-making that it performs in constitutionalizing whiteness.

The coagulation of whiteness into a constitutional principle of settler rule was, I argue, institutionalized in Canada through the federal arrangement. The pathbreaking account of Confederation as the institutional entrenchment of a ruling class within Canada that Stanley Ryerson provides in his *Unequal Union* (1968) suggests that the “‘problematic’ of colonial union embraced three areas of difficulty: geographic, economic, and ethnic.”⁶¹ On this third matter, Ryerson gestures towards the foundational cleavage between the “[t]wo historically constituted national communities—two nations” that, in his estimation, “dwelt side by side in British North America”: francophones and anglophones.⁶² It is well beyond the scope of this project to enter into the lengthy debates on the status of the Québécois nation within Canada; nevertheless, Ryerson’s thesis that Confederation was an *unequal* union is a useful departure point for this discussion.⁶³ In particular, while he details throughout the myriad ways in which the position of the Québécois within Confederation was one of deliberate underdevelopment, Ryerson also notes the importance of the aspirant union between francophones and anglophones as facilitated by the federal mechanism of government.

This was a much-discussed point during the Confederation debates as well. From the floor of the Canadian provincial legislature, George-Étienne Cartier offered this remarkable assessment of the union that was being pursued:

The question for us to ask ourselves was this: Shall we be content to remain separate—shall we be content to maintain a mere provincial existence, when, by combining together, we could become a great nation?... Nations were now formed by the agglomeration of communities having kindred interests and sympathies... [some assert] The idea of unity of races was utopian—it was impossible... Look, for instance, at the United Kingdom, inhabited as it was by the three great races... Had the diversity of race impeded the glory, the progress, the wealth of England? Had they not rather contributed their share to the greatness of the Empire?⁶⁴

Commentators have long looked to sentiments like this and to the “social union” of francophones and anglophones as evidence that the political union produced through the BNA Act had toleration as one of its core tenants.⁶⁵ Indeed, no less an authority than the Supreme Court of Canada has pointed to this precise statement from Cartier as evidence that “respect for minorities” was a foundational principle of Confederation and that “[f]ederalism was the political mechanism by which diversity could be reconciled with unity.”⁶⁶ The Court is hardly alone in this characterization either. Within Political Science, William H Riker’s claim that federalism is the “constitutional alternative” to empire and that it was allegedly arrived at first by the newly independent American settlers because “imperial expansion was impossible,” has long been the accepted account of the federal-form.⁶⁷ Even contemporary political scientists who have developed a far more nuanced account of settler sovereignty as a claim staked *against* Indigenous peoples, tend to be rather heavy-handed in insisting that empire and federalism are altogether distinct political formation.⁶⁸

My claim is *precisely* the opposite: within the Canadian context federalism *is* the technology of government that enables settler imperialism, because it is fundamentally a technology of racecraft—it makes whiteness.⁶⁹ The Supreme Court’s account of Confederation repeats an anachronism present in Ryerson as well, as it translates the explicitly racialist logics at work in Cartier’s address into the softer and more esoteric contemporary language of ethnicity and, even worse from a purely analytical standpoint, minority status.⁷⁰ Such an ahistorical and deracinated account of federalism uses the alliance between just two hitherto antagonistic national groups (who understood themselves in racialist terms) to stand in for a generalized principle of toleration that never existed. This revisionism at once obscures this intra-settler alliance’s central project of continental conquest *and* the nearly instantaneous move by the cognate governments of the federation to exclude other non-white populations from the polity. Initially one of the most

rapidly implemented forms of exclusion was the decision by several provincial governments to withdraw the electoral franchise from Asian-descended communities. In British Columbia, the relatively large Chinese-descended communities, who had built the critical rail infrastructure that made colonization in western Canada possible, were stripped by the new provincial legislature of their right to vote in 1872 alongside people with Indian status—together it is estimated that these groups formed a demographic majority within the province at the time. Similarly, in 1895 Japanese-descended communities were disenfranchised and in 1907, a year that also saw white mob violence seize the city of Vancouver in an anti-Asian riot, emigres from South-Asia and their descendants were also removed wholesale from voter rolls. Moreover, as federal voter rolls were typically drawn from provincial lists, this often meant the total disenfranchisement of racialized communities.⁷¹

When strictly political exclusion failed to produce a Canada that was sufficiently whitened on its own, settler governments often turned to more all-encompassing exclusionary legislation, such as the 1885 Head Tax on Chinese emigres or the 1908 *Continuous Passage Act* which was designed to prevent immigration to Canada from throughout Asia, but especially from the Indian subcontinent. The latter piece of legislation is particularly significant in the context of my arguments about the development of settler imperialism, as it was implemented by the Dominion government as an explicit assertion of white settler sovereignty against the principles of Imperial citizenship that would have otherwise permitted free movement within the British Empire as a whole. Indeed, this assertion of settler sovereignty, as the right to exempt Canada from these specific obligations within empire should they threaten the perceived stability of whiteness in the settler polity, was tested in 1914 with the arrival of the *Komagata Maru*, which was not permitted safe harbour and its 340 passengers forced to make a perilous journey to Calcutta.⁷² In a darkly

ironic twist, this exercise of settler sovereignty against certain obligations in the British Empire occurred only weeks before Canada—along with the rest of the Empire—elected to fulfill its military obligations to Britain by sending hundreds of thousands of mostly poor and working class young men into the industrial slaughter of the First World War.⁷³

But this exercise of settler sovereignty against the mobility rights of racialized migrants has also been echoed more recently, as in 2010 when the Canadian Navy intercepted the *MV Sun Sea* off the coast of Vancouver Island. Aboard were 497 Tamils seeking refugee status in Canada as they fled the destruction of Tamil Eelam during the Sri Lankan government's genocidal civil war and Sinhalese resettlement project. Rather than an assertion against imperial citizenship, however, in 2010 what we witnessed was the flexing of Canadian sovereignty against its international humanitarian obligations under the United Nation's Refugee Convention (1951), as the refugee claimants were detained as criminals—many were subsequently refused status and at least one person, Sathyapavan Aseervatham, who was deported back to Sri Lanka and tortured as a consequence.⁷⁴

As settler sovereignty was being exercised to produce Canada as a white state through *exclusion*, it was also being simultaneously wielded to produce the same effect through the *enclosure* and *confinement* of Indigenous peoples within the reserve system. This system functioned in response to political-economies shaped by distinct *settler* needs in various places. So that, in British Columbia where industrial demand for hyper-exploitable Indigenous labourers remained relatively high in sectors like canning and logging, reserves were designed to be smaller and in closer proximity to urban centres in order to produce a greater compulsion towards engaging in waged labour as necessary means of subsistence.⁷⁵ By contrast, in the Prairies, the implementation of the "pass system" was designed to effectively incarcerate Indigenous peoples

on reserves, unless expressly permitted to leave by an Indian Agent. This was designed so that Indigenous peoples would be cut-off from the bulk of their territories and access to subsistence hunting and harvesting, so that the land could be subjected to increasingly intense industrial agriculture.⁷⁶ In all cases, the reserve system functioned through intensely intimate forms of surveillance and violence—often highly gendered in the ways in which Indian agents and police would target Indigenous women—in order to racialize Indigenous peoples as ‘out of place’ within white Canada’s vision of itself.⁷⁷ Importantly, this discussion is not to suggest flattened equivalencies between the Indigenous peoples experiencing colonization of their territories in North America, and racialized migrants (often themselves Indigenous peoples forced into diaspora as a consequence of empire elsewhere) excluded from the settler polity. These experiences evince a multiplicity of distinct trajectories within a world system of European and settler imperialisms, at the same time as they are often lived through interrelated histories of struggle.⁷⁸ Rather, the inflection point here is to note that where these processes converge is in their co-constitution of and through explicitly white-settler power structures as the institutional bedrock for the extension of racial capitalism throughout North America.

On the one hand, it comes as no surprise that there is an aversion in mainstream Canadian Political Science to discussions of the actual racial logics at work in the transition towards, and maintenance of, settler imperialism. Many scholars note a strong aversion towards interrogating race as a power relation within the social sciences in general and within Canadian Political Science more specifically.⁷⁹ Moreover, this aversion easily crosses into complicity in the reproduction of dominant power relations. Nisha Nath argues that by absencing race from the history and study of the “unity/diversity problematic, not only have analysts posited equality between the [white] norm and the supposed [racialized/Indigenous] threat, but in doing so, analysts have inaccurately

inverted the flow of power”—hence the supposed threat that white settlers seem to perceive from the *Komagata Maru*, the *MV Sun Sea*, or from Indigenous peoples writ large.⁸⁰

Even in spite of all this, however, it is still jarring to see how little analysis is given to the intensely racist logics of Confederation that Cartier outlines above. To the degree that race is commented upon even tacitly, most scholars reflect on the *exclusion* of racialized groups (particularly Indigenous peoples) from the Confederation process.⁸¹ An assertion which while true on the face of it may unintentionally smuggle in an implicit and uninterrogated normative assessment that it in fact would be good to be included in a project like Canada. A focus solely on exclusion also simultaneously misses the fact that Indigenous peoples and other subject populations were often forcibly included within the polity on differentiated terms of highly exploitative uneven integration.⁸²

In short, what is almost invariably missed here is the role of Confederation in congealing and *producing* a racial regime that can best be described as being predicated on constitutional whiteness, deliberately aimed at continental conquest. Viewed from the perspective of the 21st Century, Cartier’s description of the anglophones and francophones of British North America as distinct races likely seems counter-intuitive. At the time, however, it was absolutely common sense within either community; indeed, the question of whether a ‘unity of races’ was possible in British North America was not merely rhetorical, it had bedevilled and destabilized British Imperial designs in North America since the Conquest of 1763. The assimilationist stance of the *Royal Proclamation* (1763) towards the Canadien was eventually rescinded as unworkable and replaced by a policy of modest (if uneven) accommodation through the *Quebec Act* (1774)—the first instance both of non-anglophones and Catholics gaining declared legal recognition as rights-bearing subjects of the Crown. While these events dramatize the oscillations of an imperial project

desperate to articulate a coherent historic bloc capable of equilibrium, there is perhaps no more famous account of franco-anglo division than Lord Durham's Report, where nearly the entirety of the 1837-1838 rebellions was reduced to a matter of racial animosity between francophone and anglophones: Durham went so far as to characterize this as a 'war' between the two communities.⁸³

Thus, in a very real sense we should take seriously the work that the BNA Act did in producing a polity in which Cartier's appeal to unity between francophones and anglophones has become counter-intuitive (even absurd) as a racial discourse, as this is evidence that we live in the midst of his successes. Put plainly, Canada produced this unity by constitutionalizing whiteness through the suppression of intra-European racial conflict. But, *crucially*, this cannot be anachronized or abstracted into a claim that Confederation was founded in some universalist principle of 'respect for minorities.' It was not; no matter what the Supreme Court would say to assuage liberal guilt or to redeem the state-building project. Quite to the contrary, what we see instead is the suspension—or, at least, a sufficient dampening—of these particular divisions so salient to conflicts in Europe and the initial struggles over colonization of North America. The aim was to produce a state apparatus with the capacity to exert continental dominance over those *outside* this racial alliance. In short, what we see is the final constitutionalization of an already nascent political whiteness through which settlers, both franco and anglo, Catholic and Protestant, are able to unite both in claiming the territories of Indigenous nations for themselves and in dominating, exploiting, and/or excluding others who are outside of the pale of whiteness.⁸⁴ In this vein of thought, I have largely followed Robinson's account that whiteness is *produced* in North America by the offshoring of racialisms internal to European societies, and Aileen Moreton-Robinson's observation that the aims of whiteness are to facilitate Indigenous dispossession.⁸⁵ But I also should make note of Joel Olson's argument that whiteness emerges through "*a cross-class*

alliance between the dominant class and one section of the working class,” which is invited to partake in a share of the plunder of dispossession and hyper-exploitation in exchange for their labour and/or quiescence in maintaining the presently dominant social order.⁸⁶ The settler class that is at the core of this Canadian imperial project thus remains internally differentiated, even as the struggles produced through those antagonisms tend to become displaced *into* the project of empire.

This differentiation is not only along lines of socioeconomic status either, class here means something thicker and more concretized. The racial regime of Canadian settler imperialism is in a near constant state of recomposition—as are all racial regimes—both as a result of anti-imperialist struggles and the shifting needs of the dominant social order. For instance, while federalism has enshrined a constitutional whiteness that bridges and anachronizes the racist animosities between anglophones and francophones of the 19th Century, it has always remained a point of *articulation* rather than a total synthesis. The potential for rupture or disarticulation has always been there, such as when the state murder of Louis Riel for his leadership of resistance to Canadian imperialism in the North West evoked considerable sympathy and anger amongst his fellow francophone-Catholics throughout the Dominion. Importantly, though, as Kevin Bruyneel points out, because the significance of Métis self-determination, and the possibility of this for Indigenous peoples generally, was overshadowed by Riel’s perceived scapegoating as a French-speaking Catholic, his murder was eventually recuperated as a “sacrifice” that was later used to ideologically re-suture the federal project.⁸⁷ In Sections Two and Three, I consider efforts to disarticulate settlers from our positions within this historic bloc at some length.

Importantly, though, the instability of the racial regime of settler whiteness—this potential for disarticulation—has persisted well into the 20th Century, as segments within the Québécois

nationalist movement have at times sought to build bonds of solidarity between their struggle and those of Third World decolonization movements and the Black freedom struggle in America.⁸⁸ While this produced rhetorical framings that were clumsy and even at times gratuitous in their comparisons, and while it was certainly premised on the nearly total erasure of the Québécois' status as settlers, evincing relatively little interest in solidarity with the Red Power movement that was burgeoning at that same time, the conjuncture in which a portion of the Québécois nationalist movement saw itself as tied to the fate of the Third World produced one of the most serious challenges to the core point of articulation within Canada's federal order since Confederation. A fact which was not missed by the security apparatuses of the state, which sprang into full repressive, counter-revolutionary overdrive in order to smash these currents and to domesticate the separatist movement as a whole.

With constitutional whiteness at its core, this new Dominion status facilitated the pivot from settler colonialism *within* the British Empire and towards *settler imperialism*, a gradual shift which became increasingly evident in retrospect. Several decades after the passage of the BNA Act one British MP stated, to the wide agreement of his peers as they debated further devolution of sovereignty throughout the Empire, that the "Dominions have grown not towards the status of ordinary nations but towards the status of *Imperial nations*" which have accrued to themselves "a position and a sense of Imperial responsibility like ourselves."⁸⁹ When the Balfour Declaration (1926) gave sinew to the bones of Dominion status it was notable that amongst all the jurisdictions of the Empire, Australia, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, Newfoundland, and South Africa alone were granted this status. Indeed, the political theory of Dominion status inaugurated in 1867 exerted an almost ineluctable pull throughout the British Empire, resulting in a significant renovation of its institutional frameworks as sovereignty and responsibility for the project of

conquest was increasingly redistributed to the imperial jurisdictions in which the ruling settler classes became unified and deemed ‘capable’ of self-rule *through* their assertion of whiteness. Ireland being the sole exception here as (barring in the six northern counties dominated by Protestant-supremacist Ulster settlers) Dominion status was wielded by the Irish people themselves as a tool to facilitate an exit from the Empire altogether.⁹⁰

No lesser a figure of English white supremacy than Winston Churchill made clear the perceived necessity of maintaining this connection between Dominion status and constitutional whiteness. In addressing to the House of Commons his concerns about the *Statute of Westminster* (1931), which codified the principles of the Balfour Declaration, Churchill argued in bellicose fashion that all Members should “contemplate the frightful disaster which would be brought upon [British] India if full Dominion status... became the law governing India.” Showing his hand, he intoned that “[n]o-one can doubt that Dominion status... would be incompatible with the slightest semblance of Imperial authority over the races, peoples, and the States” of India.⁹¹ This is *not* because there is no empire within Dominion, Churchill was amongst those who agreed that Canada and the other recognized Dominions were ‘imperial nations.’ Rather, Dominion status was incompatible with imperial authority here because India lacked a settler class that would exert white dominance outside of London’s orbit—and, as such, was denied Dominion status, a decision which continues to shape the region to this day.

While it has primarily been studied and theorized in its American manifestations, the history explored here suggests that it may in fact be the Canadian model of settler imperialism which has done more to project settler rule and to enshrine the colour line on a truly global scale. The innovation of Dominion status, achieved as the vehicle towards settler imperialism in Canada, was replicated throughout the British Empire. Indeed, the power of this drive towards settler

empire was such that by the mid-20th Century British courts were actively seeking to put it back in the bottle, so to speak, as they were forced to begin denying the saliency of constitutional whiteness in the face of the African decolonization movement.⁹² The centrality of constitutional whiteness as one of the core tenets of settler empire, should draw the Canadian experience into closer comparative analysis not only with the two other still extant white Dominions (Australia and New Zealand), but also with those jurisdictions in which constitutional whiteness and settler rule have been at least partly undone (such as in Algeria, South Africa, Zambia, or Zimbabwe). Moreover, echoing the previous chapter's dialogue with the broad left in Canada, this evidences the vital need for analyses that aim at describing a social totality, in order to understand the historical processes by which settler rule has in fact been at least partially overthrown and points to the necessity of engaging a politics of internationalism 'from below' to at once act in solidarity with such movements against the global edifice of racial capitalism, and to strive towards liberation 'at home.'

Conclusion:

The ambition of this chapter at its core was to develop settler imperialism as a more analytically robust and politically efficacious concept for both studying and confronting the Canadian state as a social relation, rather than as a reified or naturalized object. I contended, building out of my arguments from the previous chapter, that this requires an analysis of the concrete ways in which Canada moves through the world—rejecting abstract heuristics that would offer a priori legitimation to the state, as either being 'at home' within the domestic sphere that it claims for itself or as a humanitarian power on the world stage. Instead, using the methods of historical institutionalism, I have attempted to show that the Canadian state is at once a product of, and itself strives endlessly to reproduce, the social relations of global racial capitalism. While the

arguments of this chapter have been primarily historical, and largely focused on the scale of so-called ‘grand’ politics, state-building and racial capitalism are always-already a multiscale process. Thus, in as much as we can see the work of white supremacy, cisheteropatriarchy, (dis)ableism, and colonization in securing the reproduction of racial capitalism through the formation of state institutions designed to enable continental conquest, we can also find it in the seemingly more mundane infrastructure and built environments that express and enable settler imperialism on local and international scales.

As I alluded to in my introduction to this chapter, the Canadian Highways International Corporation (CHIC) is a primary example of how settler imperialism moves through the world and is encountered through quotidian social relations. Founded in 1993, as a partnership between four Ontario-based engineering and construction firms, CHIC was quickly awarded a \$1 billion contract by the provincial government to design, build, and to operate a for-profit mega-highway north of Toronto—Highway 407.⁹³ Paving over wetlands and other ecologically sensitive areas which had long been cared for by the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, and Huron/Wendat under the Dish with One Spoon Treaty, the highway not only further locked-in this ongoing century and a half long history of displacing Indigenous peoples and their governance systems from the area, but the fact that it was sited through the heavily racialized and low-income regions of Brampton, Markham, and the Jane and Finch area, also led to the segmentation of those communities, fundamentally transforming their relationship to place. Moreover, the decision to operate this highway on a for-profit basis has meant, perversely, that it is often used *least* by the communities that have *most* directly born its impact—whether that be through direct displacement or through the environmental consequences that attend it. And, further still, while Highway 407 has certainly enabled the relentless unleashing of countless tons of carbon, it has done almost nothing to achieve

the stated goal of alleviating traffic throughout the city. Its abject failure in this regard has put the province on a course of seeming path-dependency towards the further expansion of the highway system—inaugurating proposals for still more mega-projects that threaten further ecological and cultural destruction.⁹⁴

While the CHIC operated Highway 407 for just a few short years before the province re-tendered the contract, this provided the start-up capital that has enabled the corporation to go on to further ignominy in its subsequent projects. Perhaps most notably, CHIC received one of the major contracts from the Israeli government to participate in the construction of a network of explicitly settler-only highways that weave through and carve up Palestine. As many as seventy-five Palestinian communities were expropriated by the Israeli state in order to open land for these highways, which serve as the infrastructural lifelines to the illegal settlements throughout the Occupied Territories.⁹⁵ In the case of both Highway 407 and the apartheid roads, the reach of Canadian capital is only ultimately enhanced by the symbiotic actions of these settler states. As a result of Ontario privatizing the ownership and tolling rights on Highway 407, CHIC benefited from the enclosure of hundreds of miles of territory and an entire piece of critical infrastructure that had previously been outside the realm of the market. In this instance, imperial interests are advanced by the partial withdrawal of the state from a function which it had previously performed (the provisioning of roads) and the simultaneous extension of state power through the expropriation of the territorial corridor under the roadway. In CHIC's construction of Israeli highways, the Canadian state's efforts to open more markets to Canadian capital proved to be invaluable. The *Canada-Israel Free Trade Agreement* (1997) is a documentary transcript evincing the contours of a global historic bloc, by at once opening access to Israeli markets for Canadian capital (and vice versa) and simultaneously serving as a tacit two-way legitimation of Israel's

occupation of Palestine and Canada's abrogation of Indigenous self-determination. By not sanctioning the activities of Canadian companies in the Occupied Territories, the Canadian government has effectively delegated to its corporate allies the power to work on behalf of the Israeli state in the dispossession of Palestinians. Here, the active role played by the Canadian state opened new spaces for capital to pursue its interests in complementary alignment with Israeli imperial interests, just as the initial public-private partnership between Ontario and CHIC created the base capital by which the corporation launched itself into world operations. In both instances, the social totality of racial capitalism working through white settler power seems evident.

I opened this first Section of the dissertation by contending with two bodies of literature that share a common object of critique: the Canadian state. I suggested that these two literatures actually both rely on and reproduce a single dichotomous heuristic of inside/outside—domestic/foreign. Quite apart from simply leading these two literatures into a mutual silencing of one another—which would be problem enough, given their intuitive affinities—I suggested that, by relying on this heuristic of inside/outside, both literatures were serving, in their own particular ways, to reify the Canadian state. For instance, while enclosure through the construction of settler state borders is a critical tool in the project of dispossessing Indigenous peoples, settler colonial studies serves to mystify the fact that enclosure is merely a technology and mode of colonization that enables dispossession, not the thing itself. Far from simply enclosing, settlers continually construct borders only to then transgress them in the effort to ensure the reproduction of the totality of social relations that define racial capitalism. So the settler colony is always already outside itself. Conversely, the anti-imperialist marxists with whom I engaged continually conflate the transgression of state borders with the essence of imperialism. Throughout this literature, Canadian imperialism is constructed as occurring at the moment capital and the state transgress their borders,

when in actual fact the very assertion of settler rule in Indigenous peoples' territories *is* a formative and ongoing act of imperialism—an historic bloc that emerges through the articulation and institutionalized regularization of white supremacy, cisheteropatriarchy, (dis)ableism, and Christian supremacy. In both fields, one half of the state's self-constructed dichotomy between inside and outside is ultimately reified by the analysis that is provided.

Against this reification, in this chapter I sought a heuristic model by which to analyze Canadian settler imperialism by tracing its moves beyond and within this inside/outside dichotomy. That is, to grapple with the ongoing territorial conquest of northern North America and global processes of exploitation as parts of a social totality that manifests itself as, and through, the Canadian state. Beyond em-bordered understandings of colonialism and imperialism, I pointed towards an understanding of Canadian settler imperialism as intensely territorialized while simultaneously in constant transit beyond and through its self-constructed borders. Moreover, I suggested that the pivot between settler colonialism, as a project within empire, and settler imperialism can be traced in the development of the constitutional apparatus of Confederation. Most specifically, I noted—contra the disciplinary consensus of Political Science—that inasmuch as the federal arrangement of the Canadian state seeks to suture the internal contradictions of settler society, it was in order to (re)produce a racial regime that I have called constitutional whiteness. Out of this historically contingent point of articulation, Canadian settler imperialism emerges as an historic bloc capable of exerting itself on a truly global stage and—by its example—recomposing much of the world system that existed at the time of Confederation.

Section Two

Interlude: A Monumental Task

Just after 7pm on July 1st, 2021, calls came up from a gathered crowd, unified in declaring that there can be: “No pride in genocide! No pride in genocide!” They were echoed by a crash, as the collective strength of those assembled toppled the oversized statue of Queen Victoria from a plinth on which it had glowered, enthroned above lands adjacent to the Forks of the Assiniboine and Red Rivers since October 1904. Manifesting a radical tradition of anti-imperialist resistance that has been maintained on that riverbank across generations of Anishinaabek, Cree, Métis, and other Indigenous nations along with their kin, and rekindled amidst a slow awakening of the settler public to the mass murder of Indigenous children in residential schools, this symbol of the imperial might at the foundation of settler ‘democracy’ was dislodged with remarkable ease and only a couple dozen feet of nylon rope.¹

Quickly the statue and plinth were covered in red hand prints, as the figure of Victoria was draped with an orange shirt across its face and with a Canadian flag emblazoned with the words “We were children.” Out of the cheering crowd—most of whom wore orange shirts in memory of the stolen Indigenous children and as an assertion that the lives of all children must be made to matter equally—a number of people scaled the plinth. (Re)Presencing Indigenous political authority, they hoisted flags of the Anishinabek Nation, the Warriors Society, the Women’s Warriors, and an inverted Canadian flag with ‘35’ stitched on, evoking the *Constitution Act* (1982). Shortly after this, another nearby statue depicting Victoria’s successor and Canada’s current sovereign, Queen Elizabeth II, was also toppled. As Niigaan Sinclair wrote the next day, the community had come together and done something remarkable, they “created their own monument... By the end of Canada Day, the Manitoba legislature had its first statue commemorating First Nations.”²

The response of state officials and the power elite to this assertive and grassroots reclamation of the common space of the Forks was swift and almost universal in its condemnation. Perhaps most predictably, the Conservative premier, Brian Pallister, decried the damage that in his words was not “confined to statues, it extended well beyond that. It extended to the grounds themselves, it extended to the flags and flag poles.” With provocative belligerence, he stated that “the statues will go back up,” though he stopped short of committing to returning them to precisely the same clearly vulnerable public locations.³ In contrast Wab Kinew, the Leader of the Opposition and a member of Onigaming First Nation, took pains to assert that Pallister’s rhetoric was divisive at a time when attention ought to be on the growing number of identified remains of Indigenous children. Nevertheless, Kinew also clearly distanced himself from the community actions on July 1st, asserting that “acts of destruction do not further reconciliation and we unequivocally condemn violence.”⁴ By framing their comments in this way, both Pallister and Kinew insinuated that the toppling of statues by crowds without state sanction is an act of violence. This link they each participated in creating between crowd actions and violence was quickly repeated in both media and popular discussions of the statue topplings. Malak Abas, writing in the *Winnipeg Free Press*, echoed the provincial leadership noting that “[a]side from the *attacks* on the two statues, Thursday’s protest was *largely non-violent* and there were no reported injuries.”⁵ Thus, even while admitting that there was no direct or even inadvertent harm consequent to the toppling of the statues, it somehow becomes possible to assert that it still constitutes, *prima facie*, an act of violence.

This effort to produce a public consensus that peaceful iconoclastic direct action constitutes—in itself—a *violent attack* was also striking in the consistency with which it deployed the rhetoric of reconciliation. Like Kinew, Pallister also evoked reconciliation in his denunciation

of the community actions, asserting that they were “unhelpful to those of us who are genuinely after actions that cause reconciliation to occur. Not just words, actions.”⁶ Pallister used this cudgel to position himself as the real champion of reconciliation, despite having previously claimed that Indigenous peoples’ enactments of their hunting rights were stoking a “race war” and recently having decried it as “unfair” that Indigenous peoples were to be prioritized—as vulnerable populations—in receipt of their COVID-19 vaccines.⁷ Reconciliation, here, becomes a project that is detached from its own imagined subjects, in order to insistently discipline those same subjects for their supposed willfulness, their refusal to comport themselves in ways deemed by those who hold elite political offices to be properly reconciliatory.⁸ The wishes, needs, and demands of Indigenous peoples in the streets are not permitted to imprint themselves on the project of reconciliation already devised and sanctioned ‘from above.’ Indeed, the attempt by those outside the corridors of official power to raise their demands is itself construed as a threat to the very possibility of the project at all.

Concerns that community-led statue removals may negatively impact the project of reconciliation were also expressed by no less a public figure than Murray Sinclair, formerly the Chairman of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and a recently retired Senator. Sinclair expressed his disapproval through public social media posts where he explained his fears about unintended consequences. He wrote that those who toppled the statues “and those who condone them, need to understand how much they set back any chance of moving the dialogue on changing the bad relationship we have, forward.” While not explicit on the matter, Sinclair’s brief comments insinuate a number of reasons why he is concerned that community-led direction actions such as the statue removals may set back reconciliatory work. Notably, he is particularly concerned about what he perceives as the expression of negative affect embodied by the crowds, asserting—

rather than evidencing—that anger or vengeance is at the root of these actions. More ominously, perhaps, he also implies that this crowd may somehow have been manipulated: “You may have been instigated by those who want nothing to do with changing the relationship. You may have been instigated by people bent on making you look bad.”⁹

There exists a through-line in the political theory that is being articulated against those taking direct action. Most clearly, there is a discursive transformation of the expressive demands of a grassroots community assembled in the *crowd*, into the actions of a *mob*. This, I suggest, maintains a political theory perspectively situated ‘from above,’ within and for constituted power relations, it thus warps the account of events in order to preserve its own presently privileged position. The reality of July 1st, was a clearly articulated, precisely targeted, and efficacious set of actions that peeled back what Nichole E Grant and Timothy J Stanley call “the wallpaper of domination,” emblemized by statues to imperial grandeur.¹⁰ By contrast, the rhetoric of political officialdom produces the image of an unreasonable and unruly mass that is at once both excessively agential in its collectivity even as its constituent subjects are simultaneously implied to be without agency and easily manipulable.¹¹ Beyond this, it’s striking how consistently elite actors express that the state's reconciliation project is threatened, based on a presumption that the toppling of statues will further set back or poison an already “bad relationship.” This, however, seems to skirt a prior question, one that implicitly guides Chapters Three and Four, as to precisely *which* particular relationships are threatened by direct actions such as this—substituting an ideal type for more grounded analysis. And, further, which relationships *ought* to be preserved or strengthened. Evidently, as these concerns are framed in the language of reconciliation, clearly they’re attentive to relations between Indigenous peoples and settlers living on their territories.

But, stated this flatly, the claim seems to abstract the actions of July 1st from the social conditions in which they are inextricably bound.

Articulated in the abstract, these concerns necessitate that we minimize the importance attached to the work of relationship-building *prior to, through, and in the wake of* direct actions such as those that occurred in the process of toppling the statues. That is, it asks us to ignore ‘politics from below,’ as they move in and amongst non-elite actors. The significance of the conversations, preparations, and trust that went into this community-led direct action, in which both Indigenous persons and settlers partook, are shrunken in order to focus our concerns on an ambient and more amorphous set of relationships not present at, but *presumed* to be hostile to, the actions at the Forks. It would be naïve to dismiss these concerns entirely, especially given the evident mobilization of state resources to identify, target, and criminalize those involved. Clearly there are some—perhaps a significant number, but certainly a powerful cross-sectional alliance—for whom the toppling of statues represents the crossing of some line of civility. However, it would also be a mistake to allow those particular relationships that may be strained or frayed as a consequence of such direct actions to be presented as universal, or to overdetermine our assessment of the totality of what these actions mean politically. Indeed, to do so not only strips the actions of the communities assembled together on July 1st of their significance in a project of relationship-building at the grassroots, it also removes them from the multi-scalar relational webs in which they are embedded and through which they were made possible—at least in part.

The toppling of statues depicting Queens Victoria and Elizabeth II in Winnipeg can be read productively as manifestations of particular local histories and trajectories that are also enmeshed within a profoundly internationalist, anti-imperialist struggle. Across what is presently known as Canada, statues glorifying the vanguard of empire are being challenged, a tactic of struggle that is

as much material as it is symbolic, given that it contests “who controls the material arrangements that make up” the common space of the city.¹² Where the inertia or intransigence of elite officials has stymied transformative work, grassroots communities have organized to take action themselves. Only weeks prior to the actions in Winnipeg, a community-led direct action in Toronto toppled a statue of Egerton Ryerson—widely understood as a principle architect of Canada’s genocidal residential schools. Not only was this action successful in removing a symbol of white supremacy from the centre of the city, it also dramatically accelerated the long-drawn out process of renaming the eponymous university to which the statue was adjacent.¹³ The *relational* webs that make these actions possible, that uplift communities in the assertion of their dignity and enable them to stand confident in their own collective power, were further revealed when the statue’s head later appeared nearly 100km away at 1492 Land Back Lane—a Haudenosaunee land reclamation struggle at Six Nations.¹⁴

Moreover, there is an undeniably mimetic quality to these community-led direct actions, as the fate of the Ryerson statue closely mirrors that of a John A Macdonald statue in Montréal. The August 29th, 2020, removal of this particular monument serves as a powerful symbol, as the towering heights on which it had been perched combined with the relatively cheap materials involved in its construction, so that as the toppling statue met cobblestone its head spun off dramatically into the crowd.¹⁵ Evinced the assembled crowd’s sense of themselves as engaged in a struggle that is at once local and specific in its choice to target a statue of Macdonald for his role in charting the Canadian trajectories of empire and white supremacy, they simultaneously placed themselves as respondents to and participants in the global uprisings of 2020. With chants of “No justice, no peace, abolish the police!” the centre of Montréal echoed with rallying cries begun in the hours following the police murder of George Floyd and that reverberated throughout the long

summer. These flashpoints, which may at first appear merely to be imitative, are more generatively understood as being themselves embedded within a broad community of struggle, maintained through a type of relationality that must be seen for the radical potential that it carries. As Siddhartha Mitter writes, the examples of community-led direct action in Richmond, Virginia during the 2020 uprisings “have boosted protesters elsewhere in a loop of creative emulation. They express, in ways that are inherently impossible to disentangle, both the clear set of shared [inter]national concerns that have coalesced a movement, and the city’s idiosyncratic local mix” of political struggles.¹⁶

As North America rumbled under the feet of communities on the march and statues toppling, that sprawling relational web built through solidarity and co-resistance reached out to challenge other centres in the imperial core.¹⁷ In the days following the murder of George Floyd, but also in the wake of years of inaction by the city of Bristol, England, community members took direct action to remove a statue of Edward Colston. Rolled along the streets, the toppled likeness of Colston was soon deposited in the river—a method of disposal replicated a year later with the head of the Victoria statue in Winnipeg.¹⁸ Celebrated as the city’s greatest benefactor, that Colston’s wealth was largely acquired in his role as the Deputy Governor of the Royal African Company, and produced through the theft and enslavement of African Indigenous peoples amidst the plunder of their lands, these facts bore hardly a passing mention in official memorializations. It is crucial here to also note the vital importance that the Rhodes Must Fall campaign has had in shaping this struggle in the UK, and in building relationships of solidarity and co-resistance between advocates in the UK and South Africa where the campaign originated.¹⁹ As Bristol had been linked to Africa and the Americas through the Atlantic triangle, contemporary resistance to empire and white supremacy in Minneapolis (re)made relations of affinity with the multiracial

crowd that took it upon themselves to begin dismantling the material residuals of Colston's legacy. An always multi-scalar struggle to reject heroes of what Russell Rickford calls the "Great White Canon of Conquest."²⁰

C Wright Mills notes that "every revolution has its counterrevolution—that is the sign that the revolution is for real."²¹ As such, this story of global relationships evinced by and built through community-led direct actions—of anti-imperialist politics 'from below'—cannot be a simple triumphalist narrative, as it is already shot through with contradictions and counter-movements. Indeed, in the days following the toppling of the Colston statue, the concerns that Murray Sinclair would later express around the possibility of backlash to such actions in Winnipeg seemed to begin manifesting. Organized largely over social media, a number of groups sprang up around the UK with the stated intention of mobilizing in defence of monuments to the British Empire. One monument that drew some news coverage on this matter was a statue to Captain James Cook in the Whitby harbour. Erected in 1912, and adorned with plaques presented by the High Commissioners of Australia (in 1970) and Canada (in 1978); the statue and its accoutrements symbolize Cook's work in charting the precise lines along which British (and later settler) imperialism slithered throughout the world. Cook's voyages linked the Indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/New Zealand, Australia, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Hawai'i, Indonesia, Malayasia, the Pacific Northwest of North America, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, the Solomon Islands, and South Africa, materializing what Jodi Byrd calls a "transit of empire."²²

Composed almost exclusively of older, white, male Britons, the group—much smaller compared to the crowd in Bristol—that came out to defend the Cook statue approximates in many ways a representative cross-section of the historic bloc that is symbolized in/by the statues themselves and that has been (re)produced as hegemonic through co-constituting regimes of

accumulation, racialization, and cisheteropatriarchy. In short, this group seems prepared to defend statues not merely as inert material, but as the active evidence of the continuity of power relations in which they see themselves and their (perceived) interests reflected. This observation is analytically vital, because it should prompt a serious consideration of the degree to which backlash to community-led direct actions is understood either as *reactive* or as *reactionary*.

Where backlash is described as reactive, actors are interpreted as simply and directly responding—and perhaps genuinely—to a perceived slight or injury. But this risks an overdetermined methodological individualism that strips actors of their social location and emplacement within webs of power relations. By contrast, understanding backlash as reactionary positions those who engage in it—such as the Cook statue’s defenders—as socially situated *political* actors. Instead of mechanistically aggregating individual responses, when framed as reactionary it is possible to see perpetrators of backlash as being positioned within, and *choosing* to act in defence of, the social totality of racial capitalism and the (seemingly contradictory) alliances that (re)produce it. This distinction also disabuses the notion that, prior to catalytic direct actions, there existed a state of neutrality or social tranquility. Naming such movements as ‘reactionary’ draws attention towards the structural violence necessary in the maintenance of the social relations of empire. Backlash is deputized vigilantism; the carrying out—on an interpersonal level and, typically, in a moment of crisis—of violence that would otherwise be structural, and thereby often invisible to those whom it benefits. Thus, the work of building movements and communities prepared to defend or to topple the monuments to the Great White Canon of Conquest is not—as commentators of all stripes have chided—*merely* a culturalist or symbolic struggle. Nor is it an irrational venting of anger. Rather, it is one part of building the collective capacity and

confidence necessary to engage in the deeply material struggle over the (re)organization of social relations.

Thus, far from a move that can be simply dismissed as a “set back” to any generic process of dialogue, community-led removals of statues glorifying architects of apartheid, empire, and genocide are a tactic by which counter-publics reveal themselves to one another by honouring, sustaining, and (re)building a commitment to internationalist struggle for collective liberation. Rather than put the anxieties of those who defend the symbols or institutional authority of empire at the front of this conversation, careful power analysis recognizes both that those anxieties emerge as the result of having achieved at least a relative degree of comfort within the imperial system and—perhaps more importantly—that such voices are at present more interested in preserving that comfort than in collaborating in the project of building something far better than what we have. Yet, these spirals of revolt against the symbols of empire simultaneously evince a vast, multi-scalar world of other, potentially deeper relationships that already exist and are deserving of our time and attention.²³

In my next two chapters I unpack many of the issues animating this discussion by outlining two tendencies within both scholarly and activist literatures on anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism in Canada today. The first, and the primary subject of Chapter Three, studies the project of reconciliation of settler-Indigenous relations at the grassroots through the lens of “allyship” and “alliance-building.” The second tendency, which I address most squarely in Chapter Four, writes from within movements for decolonization that conceptualize themselves as struggling toward collective liberation. While engaging a range of scholarly materials in each chapter, I am simultaneously drawing extensively from activist archives. What I aim at here might

be roughly described as an intellectual history of grassroots movements, *through* grassroots thought.

As such, this Interlude marks a perspectival shift in this dissertation, moving away from the state theory of Section One, situated ‘from above’ and towards political theories ‘from below’ as the primary materials in Section Two. Using critical discourse analysis, in Chapter Three I engage a number of ‘ally toolkits’ produced by civil society organizations and social movements, before turning in Chapter Four to review a collection of zines, pamphlets, and speeches produced for and through community organizing. While all of these materials were produced within, and respond to, contexts of ongoing Canadian settler imperialism, I find sharply divergent theories of change underpinning them. And, as a consequence, these tendencies articulate radically distinct political projects. Building on the account of settler imperialism established in Section One of this project, I ultimately aim to assess both tendencies in terms of the adequacy with which they respond to the multiple overlapping crises of the day produced through a multi-scalar world system founded on settler imperialism as one of the principle engines of racial capitalism.

Chapter Three: With Allies Like These...

What is to be done? This question, remarkable in its concision and often explosive in its consequences, arises again and again in light of the crises of (settler) imperialism.¹ Whereas political elites continually seek to reify their positions and the social relations through which they are empowered by insisting that ‘there is no alternative’ to the current order, those who seek to answer the question of what is to be done continuously (re)generate methods of struggle and, just as crucially, visions for living otherwise.² In this chapter and the next I explore a number of responses to this question, primarily focusing on two diverging tendencies amongst the models of political change offered specifically by, for, and to settlers; it is, however, helpful to first situate a broader terrain of political struggle before addressing the two settler-specific models.

Among the most vibrant and enduring traditions of struggle that envision an otherwise beyond settler imperialism, are what Cedric Robinson calls the Black Radical Tradition and what Robert Nichols has recently called “Indigenous structural critique,” both of which manifest through collective practices of community and resistance. As Robinson explains it, the Black Radical Tradition is an “accretion, over generations of collective intelligence gathered from struggle.” Noting that his choice of descriptor is an *accretion* is vital in order to understand the profundity of what Robinson identifies. The Black Radical Tradition cannot be reduced to a proscribed set of actions or confined to a discrete canon of elite thinkers. Rather, Robinson spots in the common, “daily encounters and petty resistances to domination” by Black people, a layering of forms of living that, by insisting upon a more dignified life *now*, refuse—and are therefore cast as acts of radical resistance against—the dictates of imperial modes of living.³ In his study of Indigenous resistance to settler-led processes of dispossession, Nichols finds radical traditions similar in kind to those of Robinson. Taking a “synoptic evaluation”—that is, one that studies

“macrohistorical processes”—Nichols observes that while the “ratchet effects” of continually expanding dispossession have been devastating in their social and ecological consequences, Indigenous peoples have continuously resisted these processes. That resistance, however, is not *merely* or even *primarily* oppositional. Rather, it insists on the validity of ways of being and relating which are entirely otherwise to the imperial mode of living that, parasite-like, seeks to expropriate and extirpate anything outside itself.⁴ Indeed, while Nichols suggests that indigeneity articulates as an “oppositional praxis,” it is oppositional only because of the prior fact that it is made possible by, remains embedded within, and is responsible to the multiple, relational and generative modes of living that Indigenous peoples (re)produce intergenerationally and that are targeted by empire for appropriation, exploitation and/or extermination. It is the insistence on these practices of living otherwise, however, that has “prevented processes of dispossession from ever fully realizing themselves.”⁵

As Manu Karuka notes, the persistence of these traditions as challenges to the smooth reproduction of settler imperialism has meant that settler state-craft is constantly “marked by efforts to capture and neutralize both Black and Indigenous self-determination *within* terms that reanimate the sovereignty claims” of the state.⁶ These constant efforts at capture were dramatized following the 2021 Canadian federal election, when the new Minister for Crown-Indigenous Relations, Marc Miller, said in his post-appointment press-scrum that “the relationship [between Canada and Indigenous peoples] has been broken because of land, land theft. And it’s time to give land back.” Miller’s comments evoked the “land back” slogan and call to action issued by grassroots Indigenous resistance and resurgence movements. But, as Courtney Skye and Veldon Coburn note to the Aboriginal Peoples Television Network (APTN), while “land back” has always been among Indigenous peoples’ predominating responses to dispossession, Miller’s comments

assiduously skirted the fact that this call to action crystallized most recently in opposition to his own government's actions during the early 2020 Indigenous-led uprisings in solidarity with Wet'suwet'en land/water defenders.⁷ The fact that his government continues to authorize paramilitary invasions of Indigenous communities and criminalization of land/water defenders makes Miller's pantomime of land back dubious at best.⁸

Further, Miller's comments show a lack of appreciation for the depth of what "land back" means. Land back is not—and, in many ways, cannot be—about simple transferences of title to land as parcels of property. Mike Gouldhawke writes that there's a simplification of

our struggle as being just about who owns the land, whether it belongs to Canada or our Peoples. But just as importantly, it's about *how* the land is owned—how we relate to it, how we relate to each other through it, and who 'we' are as Indigenous Peoples... When we say Land Back, we also mean Relations Back.⁹

Land back, then, calls forth a social revolution in the classical sense: a fundamental re-orientation of the totality of social relations.¹⁰ As such, whether ministers of the Canadian state are able to engage in land back in its deepest sense—except potentially through the deliberate self-abolition of the colonial offices and authority they embody—remains to be seen.

As discussed at length in Section One, however, settler imperialism is not reducible simply to the state or state officials. Rather, settler imperialism functions through the formation of an historic bloc—in which the terms of articulation and the interrelationships between the cognate elements are in a constant state of recomposition. Rife with internal contradictions, each historic bloc is stabilized through collaborations secured by the proliferation of incentives and disincentives that attempt to suspend or sufficiently dampen competing interests that might otherwise manifest as conflict.¹¹ Mediated, always, through shifting regimes of (dis)ability, gender, and racialization, personal property in land—as an active or aspirant possession—is the sine qua non of historic blocs rooted in settler imperialism. It is at once the technology that

(re)produces settlers as a class, and the promissory note incentivizing their collaboration within the ruling historic bloc.¹² Gina Starblanket and Dallas Hunt make clear that this collaboration has deadly consequences. They note that, through settler state-craft, dominant property relations deputize settlers (but especially white, able-bodied men) as colonial functionaries, incentivized to continue the violent project of dispossessing and displacing Indigenous peoples in order to maintain their own *personal* property by lethal violence if it is deemed necessary—and, more generally, to defend *collective* settler possession as regulated through whiteness, masculinity, and production for the purposes of profit accumulation. Settlers, write Starblanket and Hunt, are constantly presented with the possibility of becoming like the imaginary “farmer serving as king of this realm—and of his castle—whose responsibility it then becomes to protect against intrusions.”¹³ While it is always an offer attenuated by proximity to power along multiple, co-constituting and recomposing axes, settlers are constantly presented with incentives to reinvest themselves, personally and collectively, in the historic bloc.

Importantly, though, this reinvestment is never guaranteed; the future of Canadian settler imperialism is in near-constant need of buttressing because of both its own internal contradictions and the external challenges levelled against it (some of which are discussed in this chapter and the next). In this way, it is the same as all other historic blocs. While there has yet to be a *mass* movement of settlers breaking from Canadian settler imperialism, those breakages which have occurred and their potential to be followed by still broader disarticulations represent an enormous concern to the regime’s power elite—those who both benefit most, but who also have most ready access to the dominant levers of constituted power.

This is perhaps most clearly evinced by the response of the security apparatus to Indigenous-led social movements. It is well documented that in much of the territories presently

claimed by Canada the police were established to regularize the surveillance, dispossession, and displacement of Indigenous peoples in the service of accumulating land and thereby producing settlers.¹⁴ Moreover, despite a number of piecemeal reforms, the institutional relationships of police to Indigenous peoples today remain fundamentally violent.¹⁵ Importantly, though, recent scholarship notes that the tactics police use against Indigenous-led movements are shifting. Investigating the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's (RCMP) Project SITKA, a mass surveillance effort targeting Indigenous community leaders, Miles Howe and Jeffery Monaghan observe that after several years of pursuing a "negotiated management model [which] allows for a 'right' way and a 'wrong' way to protest," police forces are increasingly reverting to a model of movement policing premised on overt antagonism towards all community mobilization.¹⁶ This "strategic incapacitation" model of policing social movements uses mass data collection to create 'risk profiles' both of individual community leaders (who are then often targeted for criminalization) and of whole movements. I draw attention to this shift as significant in order to suggest that it can be understood productively as a signal that the security apparatus is responding to the potential of disarticulations and significant recompositions already underway within the historic bloc of Canadian settler imperialism.

Through Access to Information Act requests, Howe and Monaghan obtained the documents that the RCMP use to create a "public order profile scale" that 'measures' the 'risks' associated with a given movement. The RCMP score movements against a list of twenty criteria, with a risk factor scaling from one, or very low, to five, or very high. Howe and Monaghan note that, as is standard for "risk logic, an option of 0 [or no risk] is not a possibility" within the RCMP's assessments. Here, the overt antagonism of policing to movements is made clear, as *any* community mobilization *must* carry some risk which then approves the security apparatus'

surveillance and likely intervention. Even more striking, however, are the precise criteria against which this risk profile is built. These include such things as: “the protest group is very well known and credible,” “the group is supported by many other groups,” “the group has high public support,” and “there are linkages from the main issue to others”—movements are deemed to be of *greater* risk the more their mobilizations are characterized by these features.¹⁷

Despite much police rhetoric about fears over extremism, the security apparatus’ internal documents confirm that their most pervading concern is over social movements that are broadly supported, that speak to clear and longstanding grievances, and that are able effectively to build their struggles in relationships of reciprocal solidarity with the struggles of others. In short, the security apparatus’ concern is that Indigenous movements have the capacity to and, indeed, are already proving capable of destabilizing the historic bloc on which Canadian settler imperialism rests by *disarticulating* the cross-sectional alliances which are constitutive of the regime and then *rearticulating* new solidarities that seek to refuse or dismantle imperial modes of living. Put more simply, Indigenous social movements are remarkably effective at building solidarity within and across Indigenous communities and nations, but also with settlers and other non-Indigenous communities as well. It is for precisely this reason that policing seeks to maintain the stability of settler imperialism by strategically incapacitating movements. That is, in the words of an internal Canadian Security Intelligence Service document, by disrupting the “connectivity between Aboriginal issues and allied groups” through the targeted surveillance and subsequent criminalization of key community members.¹⁸

The scale of the resources mobilized by Canada’s security apparatus to disrupt social bonds *within* Indigenous movements, and in their linkages with settlers and non-Indigenous groups, indicates that the formation or strengthening of those relationships is taken very seriously by the

state.¹⁹ So much so that these recompositions are viewed as a threat to the stability of Canada's historic bloc should Indigenous movements continue evincing to settlers and other non-Indigenous people that an otherwise to imperial modes of living is both possible and desirable. In short, the work of policing movements here is the work of ensuring the smooth reproduction of settler imperialism as a mode of social relations. Given how seriously these matters are taken by the coercive organs of the state, critics of settler imperialism should also take seriously the work of understanding how to disarticulate settlers from their historic and ongoing role as the mass movement energizing global processes of dispossession.²⁰ *Not* because settlers represent any kind of essential subject of historical telos. We do not. But, rather, because at present the ongoing reinvestment of settler populations in imperial modes of living represents one of the sturdiest bulwarks against the self-emancipation and self-determination of peoples dispossessed by Canada around the globe.²¹

In this chapter and the next, I study just two of the many distinct tendencies by which grassroots actors, community groups, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) frame this work of disarticulation: reconciliation and decolonization. These chapters focus on responses to the question of 'what is to be done *by settlers*'—how can those who are interpellated as most fully *within* the social totality of settler imperialism struggle *against* it? I mobilize critical discourse analysis to examine the theories of change that are at least implicit in both tendencies. While reviewing a number of scholarly literatures, I draw most extensively from activist archives in order to see these discourses in motion as part of a politics from below—that is, as a politics that is primarily rooted in communities, rather than giving primacy of place to offices of state or academic materials. Chapter Four focuses on those who work towards and theorize disarticulation from settler imperialism through the lens of decolonization, understood as the (re)articulation of

struggles for *collective liberation*. But first, in this chapter I explore how a number of actors frame reconciliation as a process of disarticulating settlers from colonial practices within Canada. In particular, I examine the framing of reconciliation work through a language of “*allyship*” or “*alliance-building*.” Despite the rather harsh bifurcation of a chapter break, I intend for these approaches be understood as interrelated and conversant tendencies, *not* as camps.

This chapter is divided into three sections, the first of which reviews the “alliance-building” literature as a crucial development in the scholarship. I suggest that this emerging literature enables a shift away from the state-centricity embedded in previous studies of Canadian-Indigenous relations, towards a methodological approach that remains attentive to the role of the state within a more expansive framework of settler-Indigenous relations. The second section engages an activist archive comprised of a number of “ally toolkits,” produced by NGOs, labour unions, and grassroots community organizations. These toolkits are primary materials by which I study the discourse of allyship as it is variously mobilized in pursuit of reconciliation. In the final section, I ask two questions of both the scholarship and the activist archive: first, how is the ‘ally’ discursively constructed and imagined as a political subject? And, second, what is the political horizon of allyship—what, concretely, does it seek to achieve?

Ultimately, I suggest that the theories of allyship and the figure of the ‘ally’ that emerges in both the alliance-building literature and the activist archive are unhelpfully dyadic. That is, by thinking only at the scale of one constitutively antagonistic relationship, the theories of allyship I examine here ultimately lack a social theory by which to think about settler imperialism as constituting a world system rife with internal contradictions that can be leveraged through political struggle. As such, I suggest that theories of allyship constitute an overly *thin* account of the sorts of political mobilizations that are necessary to struggle in and against Project Canada. In particular,

informed by my account in Chapter Two, of Canadian settler imperialism as part of a *world system* of differentiated but interrelated and co-constitutive processes of dispossession, expropriation, extraction, and exploitation, the tendency within the allyship literatures explored below to rely upon and reproduce a domesticating conception of political activity is particularly dissatisfying. Which is to say, I am skeptical that the approaches of this particular tendency can match the actual challenges against which they have set themselves.

Section 1: As Above, (Not Necessarily) So Below

The mainstream of Political Science remains premised on methodologies, epistemologies, and social ontologies that have historically excluded Indigenous peoples from the discipline's purview of study.²² In her review of the field, as constructed through the *Canadian Journal of Political Science (CJPS)*, Kiera Ladner finds that the study of Canadian Politics has long been marked by similar exclusions. For its first two decades, Ladner notes that Indigenous peoples were almost entirely absent from the journal. Absent as political *actors* especially, but also absent as even *subjects* of political processes; contributors to the *CJPS* do not consider Indigenous politics in any sustained manner until the late 1980s.²³ One of the primary reasons for this exclusion is that Political Science has long assumed that the state and, most especially, its legislative institutions are *the* locus of political activity. Moreover, this assumption is reinforced by a disciplinary tendency to uphold a relatively unproblematized and de-historicized account of the state, in which its very existence becomes naturalized and ongoing contestations over its basic legitimacy are invisibilized or are rendered as 'cleavages' that the state itself is somehow uniquely capable of mediating, despite often being the source or contouring the shape of the fracture itself. Given this, the fact that Canadian Politics has recently alighted to the study of Indigenous peoples as political actors—with the vast majority of *CJPS* articles featuring Indigenous peoples being published since

2000—certainly represents a monumental opening within the discipline and one that has been arrived at only as a consequence of decades of sturdy critique levelled by Indigenous scholars and movements.

Ladner correctly notes, however, that while there has been a recent proliferation of scholarship on Indigenous politics in Canada, it has focused largely on “the interplay between Indigenous people and the settler-state.”²⁴ She details further how this “inability to see beyond the state” means that the legal and political orders and philosophies of Indigenous peoples are still largely precluded from study in Canadian Politics, which “remains fundamentally grounded in Western-eurocentric thought” even as it seeks to include Indigenous peoples within its research—albeit largely as “mere research subjects.”²⁵ This predominating approach within Canadian Politics is what I describe as the study of *Canadian-Indigenous relations*, wherein ‘Canada’ refers primarily to the institutions (re)produced through the state-building project of settler imperialism. This approach is helpfully distinguished from a smaller, but growing, body of scholarship which I characterize as studying *settler-Indigenous relations*. Largely situated in disciplines other than Political Science, this literature is nevertheless crucial in beginning to escape the state-centricity that Ladner identifies as so problematic in the study of Indigenous politics by shifting attention to grassroots political relations between non-elite settlers and a variety of Indigenous actors—but with a special emphasis on social movements. Unmistakably, the settler-Indigenous relations literature still does not get at precisely what Ladner notes as lacking in Political Science, as it also does not seek to shift its focus squarely onto the political systems or philosophies of Indigenous peoples themselves. Nevertheless, by displacing the state as the presumed centre of political action and moving to the (still uneven) terrain of politics from below, this literature makes important contributions to a broader understanding of Indigenous politics beyond the state.

In what is likely among the earliest deliberate efforts at making this shift towards the study of settler-Indigenous relations, co-authors Lynne Davis, Vivian O'Donnell, and Heather Shpuniarsky note that while "Aboriginal-settler relationships have been long studied, particularly those with governments and increasingly, with industries," there is nevertheless "an area of relations little examined in Canada," that being "the growing partnerships, alliances, and coalitions between Aboriginal peoples and social movements."²⁶ In a substantive contribution to the study of grassroots politics in what is presently known as Canada, their article explores how community-organizers—both settlers and Indigenous persons, albeit animated by very distinct commitments—led campaigns that successfully called for a public inquiry into the so-called Ipperwash standoff of 1995, during which Dudley George of Stony Point was murdered by the Ontario Provincial Police while reclaiming Aazhoojena from Canadian occupation. The study of settler-Indigenous relations opens productive analytical space in which the structural logics constitutive of settler imperialism contend with the agential possibilities of everyday life—where processes of settler imperialism are simultaneously reproduced *and* contested. Crucially, however, this analysis has to be done without romanticizing grassroots actors.

Just as much as this shift to a politics from below has made visible the generative possibilities of social movements marked as 'alliances' between settlers and Indigenous peoples, it has also shown the realities of settlers acting in ways that are *more* assertively colonial than the policy designs of the state. Studying both Ipperwash and the 2006 land dispute at Six Nations/Caledonia, Michael Morden tracks reactionary grassroots movements of settlers who pushed local and provincial politicians to more aggressively confront Indigenous movements and, where these efforts bore little fruit, took to the streets themselves in order to provoke direct conflict. It's in this context of settler-driven backlash against both Indigenous movements *and* the state,

that Morden notes that the “level of analysis” in much of the scholarship on Canadian-Indigenous relations is “focused at the level of high politics, and there is a broad conflation of settlers with the institutions and structures of settler colonialism.”²⁷ Against this, approaching questions of both solidarity and backlash through the lens of settler-Indigenous relations, as the study of politics from below, reveals a cacophonous disarray of competing drives and interests, which evince a number of distinct potentialities for shifting alliances and counter-alliances—or recomposing competing historic blocs—that are only made to appear fully coherent after the fact.

Further, moving beyond Political Science’s state-centric models has also made emerging scholarship much more attentive to co-constitutive regimes of power and the interrelationships formed in and against those regimes by a variety of grassroots actors. As Amar Bhatia notes while discussing the place of racialized migrants in treaty discourses, the dominant focus of research on the “relationship between racialized immigrants and Indigenous peoples is *vertical*”; that is, it studies these communities almost exclusively *through* their “regulation by the British Crown and then the Canadian state,” seldom—if ever—considering their direct interrelations with each other.²⁸ This verticality also produces an image of both racialized communities and Indigenous peoples as merely the objects of regulation rather than as communities striving towards self-determination against the adverse conditions produced by Canada’s co-constitutive regime of white supremacy and colonial dispossession. By displacing disciplinary presumptions that such relations must necessarily be mediated through and by their relationship with the state in order to become properly political, a distinct form of inter-nationalism long practiced as solidarity in the streets, in the prisons, on the job, in the kitchens, or on the land against the vicissitudes of racial/colonial capitalism begins to impress itself in the scholarship.²⁹

Yet, even while it is displaced from its typical position of centrality, the state is never wholly absent in the study of settler-Indigenous relations.³⁰ Indeed, it is evident that in many cases the shift to studying settler-Indigenous relations is in fact driven—at least in part—by a desire to better accommodate the ethical and political commitments of both researchers and their interlocutors in their often fraught relations with the state as the primary structure of a colonizing project. Paulette Regan typifies this sentiment when she writes that “as Canadian citizens, we are ultimately responsible for the past and present actions of our government,” and it is this sense of responsibility that animates her commitment towards reconciliatory work as a process of “unsettling” colonial sentiments primarily through education.³¹ In another seminal text on settler-Indigenous relations, Roger Epp asks the challenging but fundamental question: “Whose work is reconciliation?” While much of the Canadian-Indigenous relations literature points to the courts, ministries of the federal government, or modern treaty-negotiators, Epp draws attention to both the ethical distinction and the possibility of a politics from below that the settler-Indigenous relations literature holds out. He writes that, in the project of reconciliation, “the subject under closest scrutiny becomes ‘ourselves,’” because when the institutions of state are no longer assumed to be the *necessary* central mediating force, reconciliation is seen as a response not to “the ‘Indian problem’ but the ‘settler problem.’”³² Eschewing the search for absolution ‘from above,’ typically through the interventions of state institutions, the settler-Indigenous relations literature instead studies reconciliation as a process of grassroots alliance-building grounded in the community-organizer’s ethos that, ultimately, all we have is each other. This is not to say that this approach is necessarily superior—especially in the form in which it’s being pursued within these literatures—only to note the analytical and political significance of the shifts engendered here and which I complicate more fully below.

Lynne Davis' edited volume *Alliances*, remains not only a foundational text but also a methodological weathervane in studying settler-Indigenous relations specifically through processes of alliance-building. While the volume's contributors are all personally interested in the study of alliances between settlers and Indigenous peoples, they also take care not to overdetermine this phenomenon. Davis and Shpuniarsky write that there are "certainly Indigenous leaders for whom alliances and coalitions with non-Indigenous people are peripheral or are to be avoided"; indeed, the authors note that some leaders demur from such relations for important political reasons, as it may be cynically interpreted by others as diminishing their "Nation-to-Nation relationships and [such leaders prefer instead to] deal with state actors directly."³³ With this important caveat squarely in view, the alliance-building literature nevertheless precedes from the observation that the challenges long-levelled against the "morality of the settler project" by Indigenous movements have produced a "particular historical juncture," wherein not insignificant segments of the settler population are prepared to work with and alongside Indigenous peoples—in some cases, to work directly against the state that claims to represent them.³⁴ That said, not all alliances are alike, and one of the most important insights of this literature is that alliances are often microcosms in which broader relations of power—such as colonial chauvinism, white supremacy, misogyny, cisheterosexism, and ableism—are reproduced and contested. Davis notes that the contributors to *Alliances* describe three distinct ways in which settler-Indigenous alliances can be broadly characterized today, these descriptors manifest as a consequence of "very different concepts of relationship" and, consequently, "embody varying power configurations" *within* the alliance itself. Settler-Indigenous alliances, according to Davis, can be characterized by partnerships of relative mutual respect, by settler paternalism whereby non-Indigenous participants

or organizations seek to impose an agenda, or by a commitment to upholding Indigenous leadership.³⁵

Some of these tendencies are likely a consequence of the motivating factors that bring various individuals, communities, and organizations into the process of alliance-building. Little remarked upon, perhaps, but a major strength of the alliance-building literature is that it is methodologically rooted in conversations with grassroots actors and movements, and thereby has more ready insight into the strange multiplicity of motivations present in even a single movement at any given time. At times, somewhat jaggedly-fitted commitments like struggles for self-determination and appeals to the state for recognition of human/civil rights are able to articulate with one another in the space of a temporary alliance striving toward clear and relatively short-term shared goals. This is the case for the alliances that forced the province of Ontario to open the Ipperwash Inquiry. As Davis, O'Donnell, and Shpuniarsky record, the Coalition for a Public Inquiry into the Death of Dudley George made the terms of their contingently articulated alliance quite explicit in their "Statement of Unity." Whereas, for Indigenous members of the Coalition, the fundamental issue was "one of sovereignty," for settlers "there was a responsibility to address this clear violation of human and civil rights of Aboriginal people." While the authors gloss these distinct commitments as necessary so that the Coalition could act as "an accessible doorway for non-Aboriginal social justice groups and the broader public to come on board," very little is done to interrogate how congruent these commitments ultimately are beyond the limited goal of establishing an inquiry. As will be discussed later in this chapter, and more extensively in the next, this is at least partially a consequence of relying on a theory of power as *an object to which pressure must be applied*. This obscures the reality of power arising as a consequence of *social relations*,

wherein power is *collectively built* and can be positioned with relative autonomy from dominant institutions.³⁶

At other times, even relatively longstanding relationships of solidarity and mutual aid can flounder if actions deemed necessary or tactical under certain conditions are unacceptable to a sufficient number of participants. This can be the case even for alliances that appear to be deeply rooted in shared commitments to building communities of relational autonomy that have at least some degree of separation from the state. Lucille Marr tracks one such instance with the Mennonite Central Committee of Ontario's decision to back away from endorsing the formation of the Union of Ontario Indians, as this was deemed "too political for the constituency to handle at this time," despite the fact that many Mennonite communities were engaged early on in offering direct and material support to resurgent Indigenous movements.³⁷ It's because of these incongruities in motivating commitments and in the power differentials that are also ever-present in alliance-building, that scholars like Davis, O'Donnell, and Shpuniarsky emphasize that this work is always "risky for all parties involved."³⁸

While this literature positions itself as primarily interested in movements, there is also an unmistakable current of methodological individualism that runs through and seems increasingly to feed many of its predominating concerns. A leading scholar in this field, Avril Bell, notes in her study of settler and Indigenous identities that after having understood how these identities are produced through the "legal and political processes" of state-building, she focuses most "directly on the responses and responsibilities of settler subjects *as individual actors*." This follows, to at least some degree, the methodological turn towards settler interiority that in Chapter One I suggested currently defines much of Settler Colonial Studies, a point on which Bell is relatively explicit.³⁹ As such, in much of the most recent scholarship—and, as I show in the next section, in

grassroots political discourses more generally—the collective work of alliance-building is increasingly read through and even overshadowed by a concentration on the individuated figure of the ‘ally.’ Displacing a prior interpretation of alliances as emerging through the articulation of collective movements, perhaps though not always on the basis of shared or common interests within a given historical moment, the increasing focus on allies implies that alliances should instead be understood as at best an aggregation of otherwise discrete individual actors.

Perhaps most perniciously, this also signals a shift in the theory of change that undergirds much of the alliance-building literature. Above, I note that scholars studying settler-Indigenous alliances have long been attentive to the reproduction of broader power relations within coalition spaces. As I develop most fully below in section three of this chapter, however, it is my contention that the shift in emphasis towards a theory of change premised on individuated allies and ‘allyship’ ultimately serves to *reify* the social relations that shape settler imperialism, rather than understand how they might be overcome *through* the collective work of alliance-building itself.

This is because, as it is dominantly applied, the theoretical framework of allies and allyship is premised on a conceptual definition of alliance-building as a phenomenon that occurs across at least two degrees of fundamental and unbridgeable separation—experienced, again, at the level of the individual. Kevin FitzMaurice evinces this in the introduction of his contribution to the *Alliances* volume:

the term ‘ally’ suggests a relationship across difference. In its basic form, to be an ally is to align oneself and to work cooperatively and collaboratively with a group other than one’s own... a relationship across not only difference, but differences in power and colonial standing.⁴⁰

Allies, as rendered in this formulation, are *definitionally* outsiders, differentiated in both a socio-cultural sense but also in terms of being thought of most often as outside the struggle itself—they ally themselves to those who are seen as authentically and essentially within a political struggle.

In some instances, allies are presumed to be fully apart from the struggle itself and from the regime of power with which it contends. However, for those who do seek to position allies in relation to the contested regime of power, allies are understood to be separated from those with whom they ally themselves by the fact of their relatively privileged social location. In this way, power—understood exclusively in this formulation as dominative—is theorized as being almost entirely external to coalitions or alliances and is merely imported as the stowaway of allyship. This dyadic political relationship obscures both the multiple and co-constitutive forms of power that exist within any and all groups, *as well as* how alliances are generative of their own form of collective power that can be oriented with relative autonomy against the dominant regime. Further, and as I demonstrate below, while the framing of allies as privileged in relation to the groups with whom they are allied *could* provide space to think in terms of a concrete power analysis, it is more often translated into politically reductive and starkly moralizing terms.

Though many would reject this characterization, the theory of allyship tends to bear more resemblance to appeals for charity than it does to theories of political struggle—as it is often characterized by the rhetoric of a volitional act of ‘giving’ from a place of selflessness. Rarely does this rhetorical framing permit or invite an interrogation of the broader structural conditions through which that which is to be given up (privilege, attention, authority, etc) became so evidently maldistributed in the first place. Moreover, without analytically attending to, and striving towards the abolition of, these historical and structural processes—what Olúfẹ̀mi Táíwò calls the distributive machines of white supremacy, cisheteropatriarchy, (dis)ableism, capitalism, and national chauvinism—acts of individuated allyship, even when aggregated, do little to unmake the institutionally entrenched and still ongoing flows and allocations of social power and its attendant advantages and penalties.⁴¹

Consequently, much of this scholarship fixates *not* on the political struggles of alliances to achieve actual reconciliation, but rather on the struggles that allies themselves face while striving to act in solidarity. Davis, O'Donnell, and Shpuniarsky presage this tendency in their very first article; rather than emphasizing reconciliatory work as a worldmaking project through which all can be beneficially transformed, they instead stress that being an ally “means being open to being transformed, to risk being *hurt* at a *personal* level.”⁴² This fixation on the affective responses of allies—almost always presumed to be negative and individualistically pathological—resonates with criticisms that Cornel West offered of dominant theories of white allyship during the Black-led uprisings in the summer of 2020 following the murder of George Floyd. West notes that the “genius” of white supremacist societies is to make “every issue revolve around white fears, insecurities, and anxieties rather than Black suffering, Indigenous peoples’ suffering, Trans suffering—no matter what colour.” He continues: “It’s that self-indulgent, narcissistic move—no matter how sophisticated, no matter how ‘progressive’... that we have to accent here” and that what we really ought to be striving to think about isn’t allyship but “solidarity *across the board*.”⁴³ The alliance-building literature presumes that all would-be allies supporting Indigenous movements do so from a position *best* characterized by its privilege—a presumption that has both seriously limited the scope of what the framework of allyship deems to be politically possible and that obscures the potentialities of articulating struggles for collective liberation across a variety of social locations, I take this up in conversation with different activist and scholarly literatures in Chapter Four.

Section 2: What’s in an Ally’s Toolkit Anyway?

While discussing the tendency of specifically rural settlers’ political expressions to swing “ineffectively between rage and resignation,” Roger Epp points to the increasingly ubiquitous issue

of “political deskilling.” By this, Epp draws attention to the structural processes—such as the dissolution of communal institutions, assaults on organized labour, increasing displacement of people and whole communities from their neighbourhoods, and other bellwethers of accelerated social alienation—that accumulate to strip communities of the reliable venues through which organizers, both formal and informal, are often trained in political action.⁴⁴ A variety of efforts have been made in response to this deskilling at the level of both the grassroots and civil society organizations. The proliferation of what are often called ‘ally toolkits’ is one such effort—and an increasingly common one at that. In recent years, there has been a veritable explosion of such toolkits, across any number of political struggles.⁴⁵ To the degree that these toolkits receive scholarly attention at all, they are most likely to be treated as a very elementary form of political education—which they undoubtedly can be, and which is an important project in its own right.⁴⁶ In this way, toolkits are likely to be treated as efforts to translate theories or commitments that are presumed to be more complex or, perhaps, more politically charged than is assumed to be acceptable to the imagined layperson. By contrast, my interest in them here emerges from a desire to study these toolkits as texts of political theory; more specifically, to approach them as a form of what others have called “low theory,” though I reposition this as theory from below.⁴⁷ I contend that ally toolkits stand as the intellectual products of typically non-elite actors labouring to develop a theory of change under conditions not fully of their own making—in this case, responding to the political problem which is framed through the question as to how to make reconciliation a meaningful project. In essence, I am insisting on taking non-elite actors seriously both as political actors, but also as theorists of their own actions.

As such, I compose an activist archive of six ally toolkits that are designed primarily for a readership of would-be ‘settler allies’ seeking to advance reconciliation. In Chapter Four I

construct a corresponding activist archive made up of a number of zines, pamphlets, and transcribed speeches on decolonization. Archives are never neutral things, they are always at once products and processes of power. Power sets the agenda of what is/is not to be preserved, thereby acting as a throttle on which voices are likely to be available to posterity. It collates and organizes those materials into discrete and intelligible collections, shaping the visibility or invisibility of a myriad of relationships. And even access to the archives themselves is controlled. Activist archives, then, aren't merely traditional archives that contain the voices and materials produced by those who are deemed to be activists—though, those collections are *vital*. Rather, activist archives also include those inchoate cumulations of material that individual activists and/or collectives acquire and/or produce in the course of their organizing. These include the minutes of meetings, threads of communications, press releases, books, zines, pamphlets, posters, banners, chants/slogans, stencils and art gear, props and equipment used in demonstrations, etc. More often than not, these archives are stored in community-homes or dispersed throughout the residences of community members. Such archives show the labour (physical, intellectual, and emotional) of building power at the grassroots. These are collections that will rarely be 'displayed' as is typical of institutional archives' holdings, but counter-intuitively they actually may be far more open to the public as a living archive in which all can participate.⁴⁸

While I provide pertinent details for each ally toolkit where appropriate or helpful, as an overview it may assist the reader to know that they were authored in a number of distinct ways: one is a single-authored document, one is authored by a labour union, one by a professional association subcommittee, two are produced by NGOs, and one by an NGO-funded community group. Further, in all but one case, there was clear evidence that these toolkits were either primarily authored by, or at least they were composed in close dialogue with, Indigenous persons—the only

outlier here being the Canadian Building Trades Union's (CBTU) toolkit, for which I was unable to locate information pertaining to authorship. Finally, each of these toolkits was selected based on having a relatively wide distribution amongst various community and civil society groups since publication. In all cases, these are documents that have been broadly shared, and can thereby be considered significant contributions to developing a political theory of allyship and reconciliation not just on textual terms, but in terms of their social impact as well.⁴⁹ While there is little by way of complete consensus across even this relatively small sample of toolkits, they are unified by their shared interest in offering a theory of how settlers can work as allies towards reconciliation with Indigenous peoples. As such, a number of themes surface across most of the documents, these include: the importance of language and speech acts; discussions of what I call 'ally affect'; and an account of the motivations of allyship as being grounded in the principles of universalist, liberal humanism.

Perhaps unsurprisingly, given that these toolkits strive to be as broadly accessible as possible, there's a pervading interest in language across many of them. This functions on a number of different registers, but in three of the toolkits it appears in the most explicit form possible with the inclusion of a lexicon or glossary of terms.⁵⁰ Something of a spectrum of specificity emerges across these glossaries. At the most abstracted end, is the CBTU's toolkit, which offers snapshot definitions of nine keywords meant to give the reader the most broadly applicable language for discussing Indigenous-related issues (eg. Indigenous, Aboriginal, Métis, Privilege). All the CBTU's keywords are English. By contrast, the Calgary Foundation toolkit includes a glossary that's grounded in the territories over which Calgary has been built. This toolkit provides slightly more extensive snapshots than the CBTU document, but they centre on the six Indigenous nations whose territories are covered by Treaty 7. Additionally, the Calgary Foundation toolkit includes

both forms of greetings and names for the “landscape now known as Calgary” in four different Indigenous languages (Blackfoot, Cree, Îyâxe Nakoda, and Tsuut’ina). The Montréal Urban Aboriginal Community Strategy Network toolkit strikes something of a balance between these approaches, offering a dozen keywords of which three are specific to the territories on which Montréal is situated. Like the glossary in the Calgary Foundation’s toolkit, this one includes a (smaller) number of words in both Anishinaabemowin and Kanien’kéha that are meant to situate the reader in the physical space of and around Montréal.

This spectrum of specificity is likely the result of at least two factors: first, the amount of Indigenous involvement in designing the toolkit itself, which is evidenced as being considerable in both the Calgary and Montréal toolkits. Second, and perhaps more determinative, is the likely geographical dispersion of the toolkit’s intended readership. That is, the CBTU toolkit may be more generic because it imagines readers potentially drawn from the whole membership of the building trades unions which is spread across the entirety of what’s presently known as Canada and it therefore becomes quite difficult to decide which specific Indigenous nations or languages to highlight. Interestingly, the CBTU toolkit—as a microcosm of a broader labour movement organized *through and by* the nation-state—reconstitutes the precise problem of methodological nationalism that approaching settler-Indigenous relations from below attempts to avoid. Inversely, this also reveals some of the political possibilities that are opened up by deliberately place-based approaches to political struggle, a topic to which I return in Section Three of this dissertation.

It bears making a few remarks on the politics of the language here. Most notably, there is a clear—if subtle in terms of its textual impact—effort across these toolkits to provide readers with a vocabulary that is contemporary, explaining that much of the received language is not merely antiquated but has also been deeply implicated in the reproduction of white supremacist

epistemologies. Despite this, however, and perhaps because of the brevity required by the toolkit format, some of the contemporary realities of ongoing colonization are obscured in favour a more sanitized language. This was made most apparent around the usage of the term ‘Indian,’ which the CBTU toolkit describes as an “*outdated term* which should be avoided... although it is still used in *some* legal settings.”⁵¹ The Montréal toolkit is somewhat more forceful on this matter, correctly listing ‘Indian’ alongside other racial slurs used against Indigenous peoples as “terms that are not okay *for you* [a settler] to say.”⁵² The trouble comes from the fact that in neither case do these toolkits confront head-on the fact that, in Canada today, ‘Indian’ is both a racial slur and constitutional term of art. Or, to put the matter more bluntly, far from being ‘outdated,’ the ongoing nature of Canada’s system of colonial apartheid means that while ‘Indian’ is undoubtedly a racist word when used against Indigenous peoples, it is a form of racism embedded in the very constitutional and legislative frameworks foundational to the Canadian state-building project itself. Indeed, in the case of the Calgary Foundation toolkit, there’s a strange obfuscation of the Indian Act’s role in advancing, maintaining, and regularizing colonial apartheid. The toolkit suggests that “[a]lthough the Indian Act was enacted in 1876, Indigenous people have only recently begun to obtain the same rights as other people in Canada.”⁵³ The usage of ‘although’ is inexplicable here, as it seems to suggest that the conjunction between the enactment of the Indian Act and the social marginalization of Indigenous peoples is unlikely or incidental. It implies that the Indian Act might have been meant to alleviate such marginalization, rather than the actuality whereby the Act codified colonial apartheid into law. To be meaningfully anti-racist here, then, clearly asks something much more than merely more careful language.

The importance of language—or, maybe more precisely here, of speech acts—manifests in another very common way across these three toolkits, as well as in the document produced by the

British Columbia Association of Social Workers (BCASW).⁵⁴ Territorial acknowledgements are treated here as significant acts of allyship, as it is asserted that they contribute towards reconciliation in and of themselves. Indeed, discussion of such acknowledgements is given considerable space in both the Calgary toolkit, where the topic takes up 1/6th of the total space, and even more so in the CBTU toolkit where it accounts for nearly 1/3rd of the entire document. While described as a “simple way” to show “commitment to Indigenous allyship,” across all these toolkits there is stress put on the fact that territorial acknowledgements should never be merely pro forma; rather, they ought to be opportunities for those who give them and those who encounter them to “form deeper connections and grow their knowledge of the original people of the land,” and further still they should “come from a personal place.”⁵⁵ The value of such acknowledgements, then, is implied to be twofold: to show respect for Indigenous peoples’ relationships with the surrounding lands and to invite settlers into a process of self-education. There is, however, no sustained emphasis within the toolkits on the *political* work that land acknowledgements can do—under certain conditions—by revealing that settler imperialism, and specifically its dispossessive and dominating relationship to land, is deeply contested by the ongoing presence of Indigenous jurisdictions.⁵⁶ Territorial acknowledgements, while treated as deeply significant by these toolkits, also have their political edges sanitized into being about recognition and consciousness *for the settler*, rather than about advancing an explicitly political program of land back in solidarity with Indigenous peoples.

Another major theme that suffuses the toolkits in this activist archive is attention to what I call ‘ally affect.’ Which is to say that there is a predominating focus throughout these toolkits—mirroring the alliance-building scholarship—on the emotional or affective orientation and comportment that settlers ought to have towards their role as ‘allies.’ Interestingly, though,

whereas a previous generation of movement literatures concerned itself with the collective work of *producing* a revolutionary consciousness, the focus of ally toolkits is almost exclusively on the necessity of disciplining a *prior* affective comportment to which it is presumed would-be allies have been politically conditioned, as individuated subjects. Across these toolkits, the necessity of settlers refusing *guilt* as the motivating or animating force of their allyship with Indigenous peoples is among the most consistently and directly addressed questions about ally affect. In Lynn Gehl's "Ally Bill of Responsibilities," the very first point she lists is the obligation of would-be allies to "not act out of guilt, but rather out of a genuine interest in challenging the larger oppressive power structures."⁵⁷ The importance placed on the question of ally affect, as conveyed through Gehl's decision to foreground it prior to all other responsibilities, is echoed throughout many of the other toolkits. For instance, in the CBTU toolkit, it is stressed that part of "learning to be an ally" means understanding both complicity and the privilege that it produces but it "*doesn't* mean dwelling on feelings of guilt," instead allies ought to be "challenging ourselves to do better."⁵⁸ Similarly, the Montréal toolkit makes clear that guilt "should not be the main reason" for supporting Indigenous peoples. Instead, the toolkit asserts that while it "is completely normal" to "grapple with these feelings of guilt" as one educates themselves about colonialism, emphasis must always remain on "the steps and actions" that are being taken to make allyship meaningful—not on seeking absolution for guilt.⁵⁹

Indeed, many of these toolkits seem, perhaps implicitly, to presume that guilt is the reflexive affective state animating or at least initiating the work of would-be allies. This can, I want to suggest, be usefully read as evidence of the sorts of interactions that are occurring within many movement spaces—and, perhaps by extension, it says something about the composition of those movements at present, in particular the sorts of social locations occupied by would-be allies.

As such, the toolkits place considerable emphasis on the importance of self-reflection as itself an act of allyship. At a number of points in her bill of responsibilities Gehl explores the necessity of allies doing this work. Positing something akin to standpoint epistemology, Gehl's sixth responsibility asserts that allies can come to better understand "the larger oppressive power structures that serve to hold certain groups and people down" by "critically reflecting on their own experiences with oppressive power structures." Gehl suggests that by "[r]eflecting on their subjectivity"—by which we can infer she means how social location shapes one's relationship with dominant regimes of power—allies can "ensure critical thought."⁶⁰ Other toolkits follow a parallel course. The BCASW makes clear that the very impetus for their putting together a toolkit in the first place was to "encourage and facilitate reflexivity and dialogue about reconciliation" in the wake of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's calls to action.⁶¹ The Calgary Foundation's toolkit places a similar emphasis on self-reflection as allyship; though, whereas the BCASW's account has a distinctly individualist bent to it, here it's stressed that self-reflection must also be coupled to a practice of "regularly debriefing with community members."⁶² It's important to note that in all cases self-reflection is characterized not merely as a necessary component or precondition for allyship, but rather as itself a key enactment of the responsibilities of being an ally. Even as many of these toolkits continue to assert that actions speak louder than words, the overriding stress placed on self-reflection *as praxis* says something quite significant about the relatively limited scope of the political imaginary underpinning the theory of allyship developed in and through these toolkits. Allyship, then, counter-intuitively, facilitates the self-actualization *of the ally*, and it thereby becomes a strangely self-referential political theory/project.

Finally, having attempted to uproot some of the more problematic ways in which ally affect manifests itself within movements, evincing motivations that are often more egocentric than

they are concerned with solidarity, these toolkits attempt to reground the commitments of would-be allies in appeals to universal, liberal humanism. In the Calgary Foundation toolkit this attempt is made with jarring directness, when it reminds the reader that “Indigenous people are grandparents, parents, children, & siblings. They are doctors, teachers, social workers, entrepreneurs and artists—they are human beings.”⁶³ This passage is jarring *not* because it says anything even remotely controversial or radical, quite the opposite. It ought to be jarring because it reveals the prevailing conditions of the Canadian social order in and through which Indigenous peoples are so thoroughly and systematically dehumanized that it is even necessary to make such an assertion *at all*. Beyond this vital groundwork, however, both the Calgary Foundation and the Montréal toolkits assert that one of the guiding principles for allies is recognition of the fact that “every person has a basic right to human dignity, respect, and equal access to resources.” Moreover, both toolkits argue that allyship is ultimately aimed at making this principle a reality.⁶⁴ The claim, then, is that the political relation of allyship emerges consequent to the recognition by the would-be ally that they have a *shared* or *universal* status in common with those with whom they ally themselves *as a result of them all being, simply, humans*. Moreover, that this shared status or commonality imposes an ethical and moral obligation on the would-be ally to actualize some form of minimal equality. Movement towards such equality is to be measured, almost certainly, by alleviating the degree of difference measured against the would-be ally’s own privileged position which is often presumed to be the normative benchmark.

In several instances these toolkits are quite direct about the mechanisms through which this alleviation is to take place. Dealing specifically with allyship in the workplace, the CBTU’s toolkit is perhaps the most explicit of them all when it cites the “Canadian Human Rights Act or the comparable Provincial Human Rights Act[s]” as the ultimate authority for backstopping

discriminatory practices.⁶⁵ As is the case for much *liberal* political theory, then, these toolkits conceive of the state as standing outside of and above social relations of domination, exploitation, and discrimination, in the hope that it might intervene to ensure the alleviation of those conditions should they arise—an occasion which is treated as incidental rather than inevitable within, or as a consequence of, the very social order of which the state is simultaneously a manifestation and the primary mechanism for reproducing dominant social relations.⁶⁶ The role of the ally, then, is conceived of primarily as an *advocate*. The CBTU and the BCASW stress this, writing that the basic definition of an ally is one who “supports and *advocates* for others” and, as such, the objective of the toolkits is to enable readers to “*advocate* for systemic change at a local, community, and societal levels.”⁶⁷ That is, the toolkits under consideration here strive to facilitate allies in making an appeal, presumably to the state which is supposed to be accepted as a legitimate constituted authority with the power to intervene wherever social antagonisms happen to arise. Perhaps as a consequence of the narrowed and dyadic relationship implied by the very concept of the ally, the many contradictions of deepening one’s implication within the totality of social relations structured by, and reproduced through, the state that might arise as a result of articulating the work of allyship with the state in this way are not considered within any of the toolkits in this activist archive.

Section 3: ‘Ally,’ Another Word for Having Too Much to Lose

Having considered both the scholarship and the activist archive at some length, one of the primary questions that remains to be answered in this chapter is how are these texts discursively constructing the ‘ally’ as a political subject? Which is to say, not only how is the ally imagined as an ideal type, but also who is actually being actively interpellated as a would-be ally within this theory of change? The fairest answer, judged from the point of view of the texts themselves, is that

they are attempting to theorize a *generic ally*. That is, I take it that in both the case of the scholarly literature and the ally toolkits, the desire is to understand the ally as a relational political subject position that is sufficiently capacious so as not to be predetermined in terms of its specific content. Put more plainly, I suspect that the authors with whom I have been preoccupied thus far would answer that they are not engaged in a process of interpellation—or, conversely, that their interpellative work is universal—that *anyone can potentially* become an ally of the sort that they have theorized, an orientation which I problematize below. That said, I want to suggest here that their framing of the type of work that is asked of would-be allies—the political horizon of allyship—betrays more content than it intends. The effort to step outside of or to get beyond the particularities of real, granular questions about how various interests, political institutions, and structures of power articulate with one another ultimately risks reproducing the very social relations that allyship was ultimately meant to challenge as part of the process of reconciliation—albeit while also (potentially) achieving successful, though only ever partial, recompositions within or spatial fixes to said relations.⁶⁸

The toolkits reveal some of this content when they venture into enumerating practical steps that can be taken as acts of allyship. For instance, expanding upon the process of self-reflection, the Calgary Foundation's toolkit encourages would-be allies to ask themselves whether their interest in allyship stems “from the fact that the issue will meet quotas or increase chances of any funding?”; in short, whether there is a business and/or financial motive behind their allyship. Moreover, as an active step, the same toolkit pushes its readers to hire Indigenous peoples at their place of work.⁶⁹ Both of these are potentially quite important acts, as they can stymie the extractive and performative elements of reconciliation as a “carnival” put on by state actors or private interests, just as much as they can also transfer very real resources to Indigenous persons who have

been historically excluded from workplaces and economic life writ large as a consequence of Canada's apartheid laws and the aftermaths thereof.⁷⁰ At the same time, though, in a relatively short list of recommended tangible acts of allyship—offered in a toolkit that we must remember is designed precisely to encourage action—these suggestions represent a species of action that is not actually equally open to everyone. Instead of a *generic* ally, then, the distinct impression is of an ally who might be described in the language of older literatures on political struggle as part of the *petite bourgeoisie*, but who I will describe here simply as a member of the *professional* and/or *managerial* sectors. Moreover, given what we know about the co-constitution of these class hierarchies through racial and gendering regimes, the implicit whiteness and masculinism of this subject is also revealed.

Tellingly, I think that this imaginary of the would-be ally as very specific social actor is most apparent *precisely* where the toolkits intend for it to be most universal. In the already quoted passage from the Calgary Foundation's toolkit, where the reader is implored to see Indigenous persons as human beings, the fact of that humanity is established both in terms of kinship relations and also through an appeal to the fact that Indigenous persons are “doctors, teachers, social workers, entrepreneurs, and artists.”⁷¹ Given the overwhelmingly negative portrayal of Indigenous persons in media, popular culture, and public discourse writ large, there is good sense in emphasizing that they in fact occupy every rung of social life. However, constructing an appeal to basic humanity through a group's proximity to professional class-based respectability is not without its consequences. The most immediate of which here, seems to be an appeal that would-be allies recognize the need to support Indigenous persons through a shared commonality of class position—which we must remember is always-already constructed through regimes of white supremacy, misogyny, ableism, and cisheteropatriarchy. Something significant is left unsaid by

the fact that the Indigenous person as service worker, as land defender (which is to say, as care worker), as unemployed or displaced and dispossessed is not considered a viable representative of the ‘human being’ as a universal subject. The disconnect lies not in the Indigenous persons at all, but rather in the imagined reader for whom this appeal is being constructed so as to overcome the prejudices of petite bourgeois respectability.

This unstated characteristic of the call to allyship as interpellating subjects of a specific social strata is reflected in the scholarly literature as well. At a highly conceptual level, it is evinced in the preceding discussion of the alliance-building literature’s turn towards the theory of allyship laid out here, as an aggregation of individuated moral or ethical projects rather than as a collective political struggle. The decision to enunciate one’s political self in primarily individualized terms—as unencumbered by the realities of occupying social locations problematized by ableism, cisheteropatriarchy, class, misogyny, white supremacy, etc.—belies an implicit assumption about the relative social power of the would-be ally. The tendency to interpellate allies of a specific social strata also appears to shape the type of decolonizing work pursued by the settlers themselves, as evidenced through Carolyn Stirling’s interviews with several allies. Stirling notes that there is a clear bifurcation in terms of how these settlers—most of whom are drawn from professional circles—think of allyship in decolonizing work, she writes:

interestingly land was seldom mentioned by the participants in this study despite many of them living close to and/or being involved in land disputes... for the participants in this study the focus of decolonization is on decolonizing their minds and restoring Indigenous languages and cultures.⁷²

This is a striking division in the sorts of labour that settlers are emphasizing. A clear preference emerges among Stirling’s interlocutors to engage in the vital—though, compared to land defence, less likely to be criminalized—intellectual and cultural work of decolonizing language and correcting the historical record. This work is absolutely crucial, but the stark division in uptake

may speak to the specific articulation of this type of decolonizing work with the *professional* incentives/disincentives already guiding those who are interpellated as allies.

We could also consider Avril Bell's work on theorizing allyship again. Grounding her account of settler allyship in what she describes as Levinasian ethics, Bell writes that the relationship between self (here: settler) and Other (Indigenous peoples) "is not reciprocal, but one of 'radical generosity'... It is the movement of a self who doesn't 'have time' for self-concern." Bell insists that the turn to Levinas' ethics is meant to "provoke and incite us to better forms of political engagement," by forcing our commitments to reorient to a starting place of radical alterity, "while stopping short of providing any prescriptions" for specific political actions.⁷³ In the common parlance of today's movement politics, this ethic could be summed up by the memefied assertion: 'I don't know how to explain to you that you should care about other people.' While inarguably this is a laudable and unambiguous commitment towards 'the Other,' even at the imagined expense of oneself, it might be worthwhile to ask: under what social conditions is it reasonable to ground a political program in the *expectation* that its partisans act with no self-concern?

One very standard answer to this question is to suggest that it is only under conditions of relative affluence that it becomes possible to orient one's politics towards the Other. This thesis defines much of the so-called postmaterialist turn that is alleged to have taken place in social movements and the scholarship studying them.⁷⁴ And, to a certain minimal extent, something important is grasped here—most apparently, that these texts *likely are* (though perhaps only unthinkingly) interpellating relatively affluent people as would-be allies. But, if this is the case, the ally cannot really be claimed as a generic political subject, nor can allyship actually be about the Other. Rather, it is revealed as a twofold project: first, of self-actualization for the apparently

guilt-ridden beneficiaries of uncontested social power. Second, and more crucially, of attempting to articulate heretofore disparate—perhaps even antagonistic—social positions with one another, in such a way as to maintain the stability of the current social order writ large and of their relative positions within said social order, even as modest recompositions *within* the order are accommodated.

Testing this theory of allyship against a clear limit-case may be instructive in seeing where its ethical grounding breaks down politically. To my mind, it is difficult to sustain as a political argument the claim that a person living in conditions of severe destitution, such as entrenched homelessness or displacement, can be called upon and expected to act as an ally *inasmuch as that is presumed to mean that they must act with no self-concern*. That many such marginalized people *do*, in fact, sustain relationships of deep and reciprocal solidarity with Indigenous peoples is not proof-positive of the theory of allyship; rather, it is a consequence of materially rooted and far more expansive social relations of solidarity than can be captured in the concept ‘allyship.’ To my mind, the problem of an ethics-first approach lies in the ways in which it replicates a basic conceit at the core of the theory of allyship which I have discussed in this chapter. That is, the theory’s radically dyadic nature—wherein, the political world is reduced to relations between allies (as definitionally well-to-do) and those to whom they are allied (as definitionally disadvantaged). Which is to say, the theory of allyship strips away a broader social context, filled with an uneven topography of *relative* social power which is productive of an even greater number of contradictions that can, if deliberately politicized, offer fruitful bases for solidarity. In short, because it abstracts its subjects from the bundle of contradictory relations through which they’re actually produced, and in which they live a textured social existence, allyship as a political program

lacks a *social* theory—that is, a theory of political activity as always-already situated within and necessarily responsive to a differentially shared social totality.

A more fulsome answer, I believe, insists on the importance of this wider social context—shaped and produced within a global system—when developing a theory of articulation that is more robust than the account of allyship we have received here. One of the strengths of such an approach is that it prompts us to consider not what should be asked of the affluent or comfortable—those with considerable stake within the presently dominant social order—but to focus on what is already being built or envisioned by and amongst the *global masses* who have been dispossessed, displaced, and rendered or pushed increasingly towards destitution within the social relations constituted by settler imperialism. Importantly, this is *not* an invitation to replace one ideal subject with another that is somehow considered more morally pure as a consequence of suffering—that ultimately reproduces the same problem. Rather, it's to incite a different method of inquiry by which we can approach our obligations to one another.

At the panel talk featuring Cornel West in the summer of 2020 that I discussed above, Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor suggested that “this whole ‘ally’ thing has to go... I’m not interested in ‘allies.’” Her reason presages the concerns that I have attempted to theorize here, she asserts that the framework of allyship is constituted on the presumption that “over here in ‘our’ America, everything’s *great*—we just need improve ‘your’ America.” The reality, Taylor insists, is that America—though I would extend her argument further to incorporate the world system produced through settler imperialism—“is a country of suffering,” even as the distribution and intensity of that suffering is radically uneven along lines of ability, class, colonial status, gender, race, etc. Taylor is emphatic that “we have to move this conversation beyond ‘allyship,’ to talk about what is actually happening... and what are the strategies, and tactics, and politics, and understandings

of history that are necessary to transform it so that all of our lives can improve.”⁷⁵ In short, what are the actual social conditions within which political articulations—and, simultaneously, *disarticulations*—are presently occurring.

Concretely, we might return to my proposed limit-case, empowered to ask not how can we expect settlers or non-Indigenous people experiencing entrenched houselessness or displacement to act without self-concern, but rather how can their conditions be understood as differentiated outcomes of the shared social relations that are constitutive of settler imperialism. This question is more than theoretical, as it enables us to think about how to develop a political program in which self-concern is not set aside, but rather is fulfilled and addressed *through* its articulation *with* Indigenous sovereignty and *against* the dispossessive regimes of proprietorship that have historically been used to incentivize collaboration with settler imperialism. Ultimately, this transforms how the self is even enunciated, *not* merely in ideational terms but also in its very material dependencies on others. Rather than limiting ourselves to interpellating professional and managerial types as the imagined would-be allies whose allyship is thought to be constituted through a negation, we can instead begin thinking about this type of liberatory work as enabling a greater degree of *presence* amongst those who have much to gain *with* one another. Moreover, given the degree to which settler imperialism has rendered Indigenous peoples around the world houseless, a reality that has concomitantly produced an intergenerational commitment amongst numerous Indigenous leaders to make the struggle for housing justice an essential front in anti-imperialist struggles, I suspect that scholars of alliance-building would be arriving relatively late to this conversation and have much to learn from their houseless neighbours on the matter.

Conclusion:

I am far from the first voice, or even the most forceful, expressing a degree of skepticism as to whether discourses of ‘allyship’ and ‘alliance-building’ offer a sufficiently robust account of the sort of *thick* relationships necessary to engage in political struggles in and against settler imperialism. Several of the texts contained in the activist archive that I compose in Chapter Four are also in critical dialogue with the theory of allyship as it is encountered at the grassroots in movement spaces. Evincing the deeply deliberative nature of politics from below, these texts are also crucial to understanding that the critique of allyship that I have developed here is not meant to be from some point of removal or scholarly distance. Rather, it is informed by and immanent to the various intellectual and praxis-based tendencies *within* movements.

At the same time, however, there has also been an abundance of scholarly criticism directed at discourses of allyship. Writing from a quite orthodoxly marxist position, Jodi Dean asserts that the framing of allyship, ultimately, is not about solidarity but “is a matter of the *self*... of the *individual* who stands alone, and of this single individual taking on a struggle that properly belongs to another. *It’s as if struggles were possessions.*” While there are certainly resonances between Dean’s argument and my own, the distinctions are a helpful stone on which to sharpen my position. Most pressingly, Dean’s antipathy towards allyship as today’s predominating discursive frame for political relationships rests on her opposition to its egocentricity: “allyship is a disposition, a confrontation not with the state or capitalist power but with one’s own discomfort.”⁷⁶ The discussion that I’ve staged in this chapter with both the alliance-building literature and the activist archive of ally toolkits has shown, contra Dean, that allyship is primarily about the self only if that self is to be conceived of as an almost purely *ideational and moral project* that is divorced from material needs. Dean’s critique that allyship discourses centre on the self, neglecting the political, itself permits the impossible notion of an atomized individual. As shown in section three, the

attempt to theorize the ally as a generic subject position has more often functioned to strip away the actually existing social relations and material conditions through which political solidarities are made and remade. Real self-concern, regard for oneself as a subject produced through and situated within social relations (which always encompasses how one relates with the more-than-human world), necessitates constantly grappling with how one's interests articulate with those of others.

Crucially, this is not to claim that merely adopting a relational conception of the self is a panacea for the imperial mode of living—such a claim would simply reproduce the idealism that it critiques. Rather, what I'm suggesting is that a social theory of political solidarity enables us to see past the dyadic structure superimposed by the frame of the ally/allied relationship, and to confront the reality that undoing settler imperialism is a question of articulation *all the way down*. We cannot settle for recomposing unjust or colonial settler-Indigenous relations *into* a deepening or widening of their articulation with other relations which are themselves characterized by distinct forms of exploitation and domination. As suggested in Section One, settler imperialism is a world system, and what might appear as greater degrees of inclusion in one place often produce deepening processes of dispossession and exploitation elsewhere. Ultimately, a political program that is about liberation, rather than advantage, must be responsible to the totality of these relationships, even and perhaps most especially where they appear to us primarily in the abstracted form of commodity-relations. This necessitates something thicker than allyship, which I've suggested often sounds like either charity or an effort to recompose the internal and interpersonal relations of relatively privileged or elite spaces while leaving the structural conditions of power largely untouched. Ruth Wilson Gilmore suggests that a good definition of solidarity is “mutual dependence,” which is achieved through a constant and radically democratic negotiation of the

totality of our social relations “so that dependence doesn’t become domination... that we *hang from each other*, rather than that *some hang from others*.”⁷⁷ In Chapter Four, I bring into visibility a number of Indigenous and settler theorists who exemplify Gilmore’s theory of solidarity, by turning to a distinct activist archive composed of zines, pamphlets, and transcribed speeches on decolonization as a project of *collective liberation* from the world system of settler imperialism.

Chapter Four: Who Needs Decolonization?

If you have come here to help me, you are wasting your time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together.
 — Aboriginal activist groups, Queensland, 1970s¹

The previous chapter began with the initial observation, emerging from scholarly studies of policing in Canada, that in an effort to reproduce the social relations comprising the historic bloc of settler imperialism ‘at home’ the state’s security apparatuses are increasingly seeking to disrupt relationships both within Indigenous movements and between such movements and the settlers or other non-Indigenous peoples who support them. To me these observations signal the importance of interrogating the theoretical and rhetorical framings employed within political movements working in various ways to disarticulate the historic bloc of settler imperialism; these are important because these framings shape both general understandings of the conditions under which anti-imperialist struggles occur and the strategic courses of action that those same conditions necessitate. In short, these framings express—often only implicitly—the multiple theories of change guiding movements towards their visions of an otherwise beyond imperial modes of living. Chapter Three, therefore, focused on the increasingly dominant and powerful framing that the political work of disarticulating settlers from their role in reproducing Canadian colonialism are best understood as a project of *reconciliation* pursued through *allyship*. The current chapter takes up another distinct framing, in which disarticulation is described as a project of *decolonization* conceptualized as *collective liberation* from both the social conditions of, and the world system shaped by, settler imperialism. Both chapters share a common interest in understanding political theory as produced ‘from below’—that is, both rely on a concerted engagement with, and study of, non-elite actors’ political theories and practices.

As stated previously, in my view, the framings I study across these chapters are interrelated and conversant tendencies, that can and often do operate complementarily and, thus should not be treated as camps. There may also be an immediate response to read the distance between these tendencies as something of a spectrum—superimposing either scales of radicality (understood, I suspect, primarily as an aesthetic comportment) or, worse still, gradations of isolationism onto these tendencies. This should be resisted as unhelpful, both analytically and politically. Rather, to the degree there is important political distance to be covered between these tendencies—and I believe that there is—I suggest that it consists primarily in the distinct ways in which these tendencies, when presented in starkest relief against one another, theorize power. In the previous chapter I noted passingly that in accounts of allyship there is a predilection for discussing power as characterized almost exclusively by its dominative manifestations. Here, I contend more fully that allyship tends to theorize power as *positional*, wielded *over* and *apart* from others—a point which I illustrate in this introduction by returning briefly to the Canada’s Building Trades Unions (CBTU) toolkit. By contrast, those who conceptualize the struggle for decolonization as one of collective liberation tend to express an understanding of power as being produced *with/in* collectivities and in pursuit of *generative* aims of worldmaking. I strive to illustrate this latter point throughout this chapter.

Embedded in the reductively dyadic political relationship that underpins theories of allyship, is a tendency to describe power in absolute terms: as if it were an object (something that one ‘has’) or as if it resides in fixed locations (a position that one is ‘in’). While this is certainly the dominant vernacular by which political power in particular is described—but increasingly economic power as well—James Tully insists that it is nevertheless a “parochial” theory of power.² That is, it is parochial precisely because it seeks to authorize particular *social* relations over others

and by that authorization to reify a conception of who has or ought to have *political* power; plucking, as it were, carefully selected strands from the web that it is the totality of social relationships in order to privilege some as properly authorized above others.³ By stripping from view the *social relations* that are in fact always necessary to (re)produce presently dominant institutions, this account enables a conception of power reduced to its most coercive, dominative, and exploitative expressions. Power, then, becomes conceptualized as strictly about what Tully calls “power-over,” the capacity to exert, impose, or wield oneself against another.

Pointing to the shortcomings of this account is certainly *not* to deny the reality of power expressed coercively, only to insist that that it too must still be understood as always dependent upon a sprawling set of relationships that make such coercion possible—even as those relationships are often disavowed in order to reify these hierarchies. In short, power, even and perhaps especially when exercised coercively, is only ever possible *with* and through the social relations that enable it. For instance, the power of any particular landlord—which, from the point of view of tenants is quite literally the power ‘*over*’ their personal security or destitution—is only possible to the degree to which it is articulated *with* the courts, the police, the homeowners’/property managers’ associations, a legislature deeply captured by each of these interests, etc. Absent these social relations, the capacity of anyone claiming the right of ownership as the basis upon which to extort capital and deference from tenants is largely limited to an interpersonal capacity for either violence or (far less likely) persuasion. Beyond the theoretical cul-de-sacs of certain idealist theories of power, then, the actual exercise of coercion or domination relies upon social relations that enable, delegate, or normalize such forms of violence.

More than just parochial, an account of power as only ‘power-over,’ eliding the reality of power as the accretion of social relations, ultimately proves itself to be thoroughly tautological.

The cumulative effect of the tautology of conceptualizing power almost exclusively as power-over manifests in the insistence that the only way out of the traps that have been set by presently dominant relations of power is *through* the very institutions that ‘have’ power. While multiple strategies exist within this framework—from allying with, applying pressure on, or advocating to, those who are ‘in’ power, through to ‘winning’ or even ‘taking’ power—they share the fundamental conceit of a basic division between those ‘with’ power and those without. This division is treated as a fixed and immovable reality even if the particular contents of the division are disputable. Indeed, it is upon this division that the discipline of Political Science is founded.⁴ Given all this, it is not altogether surprising that even grassroots and civil society actors working towards a more just world might end up theorizing their struggles in ways that recapitulate the very traps of power-over against which they have set themselves.

The CBTU’s “Indigenous Allyship” toolkit was among the primary documents reviewed in Chapter Three and, in part, it offered a compelling call for workers in construction unions across Canada to address anti-Indigenous racism wherever they find it—whether that be on their work-sites, socially with their fellow union members, or in their own attitudes. Given the ubiquity and increasing intensity of racism in the construction industry, the fact that a labour organization representing as many as half a million organized workers is focusing attention—and self-critical attention at that—on the need to build an anti-racist culture among workers is a crucial development.⁵ However, just as I expressed concern over how the principles of universal, liberal humanism that underpin theories of allyship writ large tend to depoliticize dominant relations of power (like those that manifest as the state), so too does the CBTU’s approach to anti-racist allyship depoliticize many other relations of power specific to the workplace itself.

For instance, the toolkit suggests that while it may sometimes be possible for a worker to “directly address” anti-Indigenous racism at the moment in which it is witnessed, at “other times it might be best to take it up with a supervisor.”⁶ The CBTU thus seems to reproduce the dominant relations of power, already inscribed in labour law, by legitimizing employers and management as the properly constituted final authority for addressing instances of workplace racism. The implications of this move are manifold. But they are especially stark here, as it’s worth underlining that this deference to existing workplace hierarchies is being advocated in union literature—meaning that the workers reading this advice are almost certainly already collectively organized with relative autonomy from their employers. Perhaps most notable among the various implications, then, is that this is a self-abnegation not only of the collective power of unions to educate and organize their members into disciplined anti-racism, but also of their existing capacity and responsibility to do precisely that. When it is the supervisor, and *not* the union representatives, stewards, or rank-and-file members, who is presumed to be responsible for tackling instances of hate in the workplace, anti-racism is constructed as being somehow external to the authorized work or purpose of organized labour.⁷

At the end of the day this effectively requires racialized and Indigenous workers to rely on the supposed anti-racist commitments of their employers to create better workplace conditions. That is, they are perversely expected to rely on benevolence in a relationship that is otherwise recognized *by the union itself* as being constituted by fundamentally antagonistic interests. This acceptance of the constituted authority of the bosses belies the CBTU’s implicit understanding that racism manifests primarily as interpersonal conflict, rather than in structural distributions of dominant power relations and the consequential production of group vulnerability to social penalties (eg. precarious access to socially necessary goods and the attendant exposure to

premature death that that produces).⁸ Racism, then, is treated by the CBTU as if it were a series of discrete events between individuals in a workplace, while the ways in which the workplace is at once constructed through and itself serves to reproduce racial capitalism fall from view. For instance, despite its claims to want an anti-racist and reconciled relationship with Indigenous peoples, the CBTU repeatedly endorses infrastructure projects such as the TransMountain Expansion (TMX) or Keystone XL pipelines that seek to expand the fossil fuel industry in the face of often unprecedented Indigenous-led resistance (see Chapter Five for more discussion of TMX specifically). The guiding logic here seems to amount to a commitment to anti-racism up to the point where that conflicts with the union's narrowly constructed view of its members' financial interests, which are presumed to be insuperably linked to the dictates of capital.⁹ This underlying racial capitalist orientation is all also broadly in keeping with the tenets of what is today called business unionism. Under this model of organizing union activity, in exchange for being recognized by the employer and the state as the collective voice of their members, unions recognize the 'right' and accede to the legal obligation of employers to manage the workplace.¹⁰

Pertinent to our discussion here, this deference is helpfully read as evidence that the CBTU's call for allyship comes in a context in which power is primarily theorized as power-over. It seems *most generous* to assume that the primary reason for a union turning to the bosses to intervene in instances of racism is because the CBTU takes for granted—perhaps unthinkingly—that 'real' power accrues only as one advances up formally extant workplace hierarchies. Indeed, if we were concerned purely with matters of current labour law, that is certainly the case. But to be concerned only with matters of law or with the presently dominant distribution of social power elides a core principle of unionism: that, when organized, people produce their own *collective power*.¹¹ Indeed, such collective power *has* in fact been mobilized by (self-)organized workers in

solidarity with Indigenous peoples; not infrequently either, but in ways that are hardly legible within the scope of what allyship frameworks or the strictures of business unionism imagine to be possible.

For instance, in February 2021, mine workers in Mary River, Nunavut, published an open letter. For days the Nuluujaat Land Guardians had blockaded the airstrip and roads into the Baffinland Iron Mine Corporation's operations, asserting that regional authorities were misrepresenting their community in negotiations over a proposed mine expansion. In the letter—which was authored anonymously for fear of reprisal by their employer—Baffinland workers expressed their “full support for the efforts, means and goals” of the Guardians. This solidarity was deep; the workers recognized both that the Guardians are the “rightful custodians of this land” and that their actions asserted Indigenous sovereignty, as they are “the people who should make the decisions about how [the land] is used.” The letter evinces a process of collective theorizing about how the labour struggle of the mine workers and the Guardians' project of Indigenous-led decolonization fit *within* one another to articulate *against* the interests of the extractive industry and the assumed authority of the state: “our support is... not with our superiors in the company, but with you.”¹² While the blockade lifted prior to events escalating, the possibility of future work-stoppages—potentially in the form of wildcat strikes—in solidarity with the Guardians holds out immense political promise.

Whereas the CBTU understands allyship as occurring within a situation of power-over and, therefore, appeals or advocacy must be directed at those in the workplace ‘with’ or ‘in’ power, the mine workers and Guardians at Mary River are an (admittedly still nascent) example of the possibilities that come into view when political activity is analyzed and pursued from a perspective in which power is understood as collectively produced. That is, it is understood as *power-with*.

Contrasting these approaches, I believe, helps to measure the distance between the project of reconciliation pursued through allyship that was considered in the previous chapter and the struggles for decolonization as collective liberation that concern me here. As such, the theme of power-with runs throughout this chapter, though often as a subtending feature rather than the primary focus. Here, though, I think it important to extol just a few of the benefits of thinking of power as always-already being power-with; beyond merely being more descriptively accurate, I assert that understanding ‘power-with’ has analytical and political advantages as well.

First, thinking of power always as power-with requires constant responsibility for how movements within struggle articulate with one another; far from an incidental matter, if power exists only as it is *built with* others then the manner in which it is built, with whom, and on what terms of constitutive exclusion or uneven integration become central issues. It is from this same perspective that many of the most troubling features of presently dominant social structures become apparent in their articulations with global processes of exploitation and, concomitantly, that the prospect of conciliation within such relations becomes more unsavoury. Second, and relatedly, imbibing the principles of power-with enables us to reject modes of analysis that reify received or disciplinary notions of what constitutes a “basic structure” of political life and/or social analysis.¹³ Whereas power-over presumes the fixity of constituted power, ‘in’ places like the state or managerial hierarchies, applying the analytical lens that power always exists as power-with enables us to see these structures as aggregates of social relations whose apparent fixity is, in fact, characterized by constant processes of recomposition which though persistent and often deadly are, ultimately, fully mutable. Finally, power-with invites an understanding of political action as the coordinated self-activity of ordinary people. In this way, power-with extends what I take to be the most laudable impulse of the allyship literature—it’s relative openness to mass and immediate

participatory action—even as this alternative framework simultaneously envisions the emergence of a much broader horizon of political possibility, should sufficient countervailing collective power be built.

The following pages maintain the previous chapter's interest in moving the discipline of Political Science towards a greater appreciation of political activity and theorizing 'from below.' In many ways the centrality of this activist archive in my work is meant to push the discipline beyond both its self-imposed echo chambers and the enormous condescension of elite-centric political theory. In contrast to Chapter Three, the texts under consideration here have the distinct advantage of also conceptualizing power in a manner that is consistent with the commitments of studying politics from below. The remainder of this chapter is divided into two sections: in the first, I thematize a second activist archive, comprised primarily of zines, pamphlets, and transcribed speeches produced by/for grassroots social movements organizing for decolonization—understood as a project of collective liberation. In the second section, I situate this activist archive in dialogue with a growing body of scholarship that theorizes decolonization in its articulations with other struggles—such as abolition—as part of a process of “worldmaking.” I conclude this chapter, by way of transition to Section Three of this dissertation, with some reflections on the need to at once fully embrace the analytical and political insights of understanding power as power-with, while simultaneously resisting the idealist conception that merely being 'with'—whether that's expressed in overdetermined ontological claims or reductively populist political notions—is sufficient to contest constituted power (which is itself only another form of power-with). What's necessary, I suggest, is the sufficient organizational capacity to both contest constituted power and to construct and maintain other forms of relating, in short to remake the world system on each and every scalar level.

Section 1: An Archive for Agitants

While I approach it with intentions essentially identical to the first archive, the activist archive in this chapter is distinct from that in the previous not only in terms of its theoretical and political orientations, but also in the format of its content. The archive I mobilize here is composed of eight documents: three zines, two pamphlets, two transcribed speeches, and one blog post.¹⁴ Of these materials, five pieces were authored by Indigenous persons (two share an author), two by settlers, and one is a compilation of settler and Indigenous authors curated by a settler. Like the toolkits, each of these documents was included based on their relatively wide circulation. To be more precise, in the case of this archive these are all documents which have circulated extensively within the activist communities in which I've participated. While—as with the toolkits—some of the pieces in this archive are also shared by civil society groups, in each instance I first encountered them by word-of-mouth or as they were passed hand-to-hand in grassroots organizing meetings.¹⁵ This method of distribution and (as it pertains to their inclusion in this chapter) aggregation is, I believe, in keeping with the political commitments of the documents themselves. These texts—possibly excepting the blog post—are intended to circulate within and amongst already politicized (often activist or more militant) groups, in the hopes of sharpening analyses and shaping praxis. They are, consequentially, accessible documents in which decolonization is written about as a tangible and pressing struggle, as far from metaphor as is possible. And, for my purposes here, they form part of what it means to do an intellectual history of decolonization struggles ‘from below.’

Authored by individuals and collectives situated in multiple, overlapping but distinct social locations, coming from numerous ideological/political traditions, and written in sharply distinct organizing contexts, the documents in this archive speak from and to a multiplicity of divergent

tendencies and concerns within a broad decolonization movement. Nevertheless, a number of relatively coherent themes do emerge across them. First among these is a common effort to theorize settler imperialism as a differentially shared social order. Here, dyadic accounts are eschewed in favour of attempts to map-out an impressively dense and richly topographical social theory of the Canadian imperial mode of living. Second, a number of these documents shed light on the martial characteristics that both define and shape so much of the social order within settler imperialism. Conversant with a similar tradition of thought to that which animated much of my own argument in Chapter Two, martialism and warfare are deployed as important organizing concepts within this archive. Third, almost invariably these documents stress the importance of mass, collective direct action. Crucially, this is distinguished from relatively flat conceptions of majoritarian or populist politics by its focus on the importance of both leveraging and building social power, rather than on the abstraction of something like changing ‘public opinion.’ Fourth, and most pressingly within the archive itself, these documents share a striking concern for the importance of developing a diversity of tactics within decolonization movements. In contrast to the sometimes suppositious or overly narrow scope of actions entailed by allyship frameworks, these documents suggest a plenitude of concrete ways by which to engage in decolonization struggles—in which struggles against cisheteropatriarchy, white supremacy, (dis)ableism, and capitalism, are understood to be more than intersecting or interlocking, they are fundamentally co-constitutive struggles.

Among the strongest efforts to account for settler imperialism as a differentially shared social order is the document in this archive which has likely been most widely read, as it was spread broadly throughout social media. Chelsea Vowel’s “An Open Letter to ‘Angry Settlers’” is a powerful intervention exploring, amongst other things, how most *settlers* should understand themselves as having a positive stake in the success of Indigenous-led decolonization struggles.

Written at the height of the 2020 “Shutdown Canada” movement, which was sparked following the Royal Canadian Mounted Police’s (RCMP) second invasion of the Wet’suwet’en yintah to enforce a civil injunction held by the TC Energy corporation against land/water defenders at the Unist’ot’en and Gidimt’en camps, Vowel’s intervention is pressingly political in its theorizing of the imperial mode of living. As the critical infrastructure of settler imperialism (highways, ports, rail, etc.) ground to a halt in the face of solidarity blockades that were unprecedented in both their scope and their steadfastness despite state and vigilante violence, the leader of the opposition New Democratic Party, Jagmeet Singh, published a tweet calling for “peaceful de-escalation” of the situation.¹⁶ This was shared and responded to many times on social media including by a verified Twitter user named Claude, who suggested that while they were “all for reconciliation” the fact that these blockades had now “put [their] family’s well being and safety at stake” risked turning them into “an angry settler.”¹⁷

Vowel takes Claude’s Twitter exchange, and the notion of settler anger bubbling over in response to Indigenous-led blockades, as the jumping-off point for her open letter to at once develop a social theory of settler imperialism and, subsequently, to highlight a differentially shared interest in the struggle for decolonization. Importantly, while Claude’s tweet clearly manifested potentially rancorous anxiety in the face of anti-colonial eruptions that they experienced as threatening because of how the actions unsettled the perceived security of the status quo, Vowel does not merely reject Claude’s sense of being under threat out-of-hand.¹⁸ Rather, she actually takes this sentiment quite seriously, writing: “You and your families [settlers generally] are absolutely being harmed. You are at risk. And it has nothing at all, NOTHING, to do with Indigenous peoples.” Whereas Claude projected their undefined sense of insecurity onto the immediate *inconvenience* of the blockades, Vowel extends a whole social theory explaining the

very real reasons why someone—even someone occupying a position of relative social power, such as a settler on colonized land—not only *might*, but *should* feel themselves to be under imminent threat in the current conjuncture. Expounding on this assertion, Vowel points to such things as eroding labour rights, collapsing or increasingly privatized healthcare services, environmental degradation/toxification, and crumbling public education infrastructure as evidence that if settlers “aren’t absolutely terrified for the well-being and safety of your family over all this, then you are in deep, deep denial.”

Vowel enumerates each of these issues not as incidental, discretely occurring, or as analogous, but rather as internally related manifestations of the shared social order of settler imperialism. Each process exists as a recursive expression of the others. They are brought into being through an unfolding of the common, principal logic of the imperial mode of living: concentrated accumulation through dispossession and externalization of the subsequent penalties. Against dominant theories and seemingly common sense discourses that seek to compartmentalize each of these issues from one another, as well as from the Wet’suwet’en struggle, Vowel’s social theory aspires towards a mode of critique that understands itself as responsible for the totality of social relations in which its subjects are situated. The very real dividends of settlement are appreciated here, as they produce the collaborative conjuncture in which articulation occurs and through which settler imperialism seeks stability. But they are not reified, that is they remain in the realm of relatively persistent but fully mutable social relations, rather than as natural or a priori conditions. Crucially, though, Vowel also exemplifies that her concern for totality is *not* synonymous with lapsing into totalization.

While a social theory of settler imperialism is vital for understanding it as a *shared* social order, Vowel’s letter also helpfully displays important ways in which it is always-already

differentially shared. Maintaining that “we are ALL being harmed by the things Indigenous peoples are fighting against”—in this specific case, the unconsented to expansion and extension of fossil fuel infrastructure amidst climate catastrophe, in order to reap private profits at public expense—Vowel also insists that “[o]n top of that we [Indigenous peoples] are being harmed in ways that you [settlers] are not.” Vowel thus alludes not only to differences in the degree of intensity with which the deprivations of social life under settler imperialism are experienced, but also differences in the kinds of experiences themselves.¹⁹ Moreover, Vowel does not merely limit herself to making note of how the distinction between settlers and Indigenous peoples differentiates, she extends this into an account of how the social order of settler imperialism is (re)produced *through* processes of ableism, cisheteropatriarchy, the mute compulsion of a capitalist society, and white supremacy. These co-constitutive regimes (re)produce a social order characterized by processes of ongoing diremption that at once stabilize a governing historic bloc by incentivizing collaboration and disincentivizing conflict, while—as a consequence of this uneven integration—simultaneously producing underlying conditions of near-ubiquitous precarity which may ultimately prove radically destabilizing to the social order itself.²⁰ Vowel writes to Claude:

you are only valued slightly higher than Indigenous peoples, because of your skin colour, your support for the settler colonial state, your health, your cishetero presentation, your socioeconomic class. And if you slip up, get sick, get too queer, slip down the rungs of prosperity, you’ll only [be] slightly less reviled than we are.

Thus to blame the blockades for the very real sense of material insecurity that someone like Claude might feel is not only a projection of deeper, more systemic insecurities that are endogenous to the settler social order itself. According to Vowel, it is simultaneously to reject the possibility of building solidarities with Indigenous peoples in a manner that—by reinvesting one’s commitment

to the supposed legitimacy of dominant power relations—serves to “shore up the power of the state that DOES. NOT. LOVE. YOU.”²¹ Far from the dyadic political relationship that pervades the literature of the previous chapter, Vowel’s social theory evidences a number of contradictions internal to the settler social order that, ultimately, can be leveraged in order to potentially build solidarity with Indigenous-led decolonization struggles as a leading framework of collective liberation. In theoretical terms, the force of Vowel’s argument arises from the fact that it moves in precisely the opposite direction of the “false universalisms” that have shaped so much dominant political philosophy.²²

Others in this activist archive have offered similarly nuanced accounts of the need to think broadly about the contradictions, and consequent leverage points, that exist within the presently dominant social order. Indeed, some of the deeper commitments that underpin Vowel’s writing resonate strongly with earlier work by Kwakwaka’wakw anti-imperialist militant and anarchist Zig Zag. Most well known for a number of graphic novels, Zig Zag’s body of work also contains zines and pamphlets that have remained in constant circulation amongst activists—especially on the west coast of North America—for more than a decade.²³ In his pamphlet, *Colonization and Decolonization*, Zig Zag argues that one of the core tasks of decolonization movements is “identifying the enemy” against whom they are struggling.²⁴ Mobilizing a method of critique that is analogous to Hall’s concept of the historic bloc, Zig Zag notes that given the ostensibly free and democratic nature of the settler state and its capitalist economy it *is*, in fact, plausible to argue that the whole “colonial *society* is itself the enemy.” Instances like Claude’s easy slippage into aggressive anti-Indigenous sentiments may even signal a degree of well considered self-defence and common sense behind such an approach. This, however, is a comportment that Zig Zag—seemingly aligned with Vowel—rejects as ultimately apolitical, because it “fails to account for

internal divisions within the society.”²⁵ Such divisions are not, on Zig Zag’s account merely of analytical importance or matters of nuanced academic theorizing.²⁶ Rather, in his reckoning, to elide the existence or importance of diremptive processes within the settler social order “limits our [Indigenous anti-imperialist movements’] ability to expand resistance into the lower ranks of the settlers themselves.”²⁷ In short, a social theory is an essential component of efficacious political organizing, as it maps-out, within a differentially shared social order, how and under what conditions presently dominant relations of power articulate with one another and—*crucially*—where the possibility for them to be disarticulated exists.

A core insight that emerges from the activist archive in its attempts to understand the staying power of this historic bloc is how centrally, in the final calculus, the reproduction of Canada’s social order relies upon its capacity to organize and carry out coercive violence—against Indigenous peoples ‘in’ Canada especially, but also against numerous other racialized populations and dissident movements both ‘in’ Canada and throughout the world. Indeed, many of the documents included here describe Canada as a fundamentally martial society.²⁸ Zig Zag, for instance, argues that “colonization itself can be considered a *war for territory*.”²⁹ And, consequently, that the social order produced through this ongoing war for territory maintains its martial qualities in the face of constant Indigenous-led resistance to processes of dispossession, modifying tactics as needs be. This functions multiscalarly, through ongoing dispossession, gentrification, and landlordism, each of which ultimately relies upon security apparatuses to stabilize contested ‘ownership.’ In her 2004 speech, delivered in the context of solidarity organizing with both Kanien’kehá:ka and the Montréal chapter of No One is Illegal, Nora Butler Burke characterizes the Canadian social order in a similar manner. She notes that the escalated policing of, and the expanded insertion of forces into, Indigenous communities post-9/11

constituted merely a “new front in the war” that the Canadian state organizes against Indigenous peoples. Butler Burke continues, noting that this conflict is best understood as a “long and drawn out process of assimilation and extermination, primarily carried out through means of low-intensity warfare.”³⁰ Crucially, though, given her apparent connections to Kanehsatà:ke, the relatively recent escalation of RCMP violence at Ts’Peten/Gustafsen Lake, and the then-ongoing crises in Mi’kma’ki at Burnt Church, Butler Burke no doubt was acutely aware of just how quickly the state can and likely will escalate this low intensity warfare to a situation of full-scale armed conflict when faced with Indigenous peoples who refuse to be removed from their territories.³¹

One of the most interesting accounts in this activist archive of the martialism underpinning the settler social order is Tom Keefer’s pamphlet from 2014, *Mutiny on the HMS Capital*. In this Keefer returns to a primary constitutional document regarding relations between numerous imperial powers (including, at various times, the British, Dutch, and French) and nations of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy in whose territories European monarchs, or their royal companies, sought an interest: the Kaswentha or Two Row Wampum.³² The Kaswentha’s core principles are emblemized by the wampum’s description of two ships—or a ship and a canoe, depending on the reading—travelling in parallel courses down a shared river, neither interfering unduly with the other. They remain connected to one another, however, through a commitment that relations *between* the treaty partners would be premised on peace, friendship, and mutual respect in perpetuity. For his part, Keefer sees the principles of the “Two Row Wampum as a guide to decolonization and social transformation,” but on the primary condition that the historic and ongoing reasons for the de facto collapse of this constitutional document as a governing principle that is actively upheld by settlers must first be understood and rectified. Thus, his pamphlet sets out to explain this problem—which comprises the transition to and ongoing history of Canadian

settler imperialism—from the point of view of the “very different characteristics of the societies which produced the ship and the canoe” respectively. In his estimation, because of the distinct social relationships through which they were produced the “canoe and ship are... social artifacts of a fundamentally different nature.” While his characterization of the canoe—which, again, emblemizes the Haudenosaunee Confederacy (and, too easily, all other Indigenous nations)—is rather underdeveloped, if not outrightly reductive, Keefer’s account of the ship is, by contrast, a vital intervention worthy of some consideration here.³³

Following, helpfully, in the method of the *Kaswentha* itself, Keefer eschews a merely metaphorical reading of the ship described by the wampum, suggesting instead that it can usefully be read as the literal ships crossing the Atlantic, which function as synecdoches of the social order which produced them. Put differently, the ship depicted in the *Kaswentha* is at once a literal ship, *as well* as the British—and later, Canadian—social order in miniature. Like the imperial kingdoms from which they sailed, observes Keefer, the ships that stalked first along the western coast of Africa, and then soon after swarmed eastern North America, “embodied a crystallization of early capitalist social relations.” Their crews were largely composed of indentured persons; many enslaved people, stolen from their homes, were forced onboard and treated as if they were cargo.³⁴ Threatened with the gaols or death at home and the lash or summary execution while at sea, terror masqueraded as authority aboard these floating hells, where many—if not most—had been “kidnapped and press ganged into service.” Unmentioned by Keefer, the almost invariably masculinist character of especially early crews similarly belies how regimes of misogyny and cisheteropatriarchy co-constitute with the processes of racial capitalism to produce the ship.

Much like Zig Zag and Vowel pointing to the importance of internal contradictions within the Canadian social order, Keefer also notes that this uneven integration of passengers produced

conditions that meant that “there was a constant class struggle taking place on board these ships.” Seen in the often interrelated—but also never fully synonymous or comfortably fitted together—forms of struggle that included flights to freedom, mutinies, and revolts of enslaved people.³⁵ While collaboration with the regime of terror was lethally common, final relief for the shipmasters amidst such struggles was often only found in the conquests that were pursued once their crafts came ashore; a ripple of the project to dampen internal contradictions within Europe through the pursuit of global imperialism.

The ship, then, according to Keefer, was from bow to stern “a conflicted and highly stratified vessel,” built and only barely held together for the express purposes of “plunder and war.” Such ships, as Marcus Rediker and Stephanie Smallwood have both shown in chilling detail, were designed and redesigned with cold and precise calculations over generations to ensure that the greatest amount of ‘value,’ in the form of capital, could be extracted from each sailing—regardless of, or more often enabled through, the immense human suffering exacted in the process of its production.³⁶ From this fact Keefer observes that while the “captains and owners of the ship”—sometimes literally, sometimes in the form of the governors or treaty representatives who captained the settler social order—presented themselves as “the lawful and righteous representatives of the whole of their society,” their very capacity to position themselves as such “was contingent upon their brutal and ongoing repression” of all those who might challenge this claim to authority.

They represent not society writ large, then, but the elite of a social order with interests not only distinct from the rest of those aboard, but more often antithetical to them. An antithesis suspended, for some, through the invitation to collaborate as junior partners in or pioneers of imperial projection. That there exists such internally differentiated hierarchies and incentives

towards collaboration, both onboard the ship and in the social order that produced it, does not mitigate the fact that its overall orientation is towards increasingly concentrated accumulation by dispossession and externalization of the consequent penalties. Indeed, such diremptive processes actually *explain* the relative staying power of what is otherwise likely to be an unstable situation. It is this social order, premised on conditions of exploitation, oppression, and mute compulsion that was being unloaded from the ships of enslavement, plunder, and warfare on the docks of those early settlements. The geographically and temporally uneven, but nevertheless deliberate unfolding of these dynamics, Keefer surmises, is at the root of the abandonment of the Kaswentha by settlers. Which is to say, that until the internal social order of the ship is righted, Keefer believes relations with those aboard the canoe will largely be dictated by matters of convenience for whomever lays claim to the helm. Importantly, though, the fact that these processes of dispossession have been persistently resisted as they were extended and continue to reproduce themselves across the continent and beyond explains the martial character of the settler social order as it continually attempts to secure itself. Although undergoing (important) recompositions since entering into the Kaswentha, the settler social order has yet to be fundamentally transformed.

It's significant to note here that none of these authors appear to be using this language analogously; they're *not* saying that Canadian settler imperialism is *like* a war. Rather they argue that it *is* a specific mode of warfare and should be understood as such. Thinking of Canada as an unfolding project of warfare may be jarring, especially if one takes the viewpoint (standardly offered by academic disciplines) of the relatively comfortable or if one has in mind a vision of what is typically and misleadingly called 'conventional warfare,' in which opposing regularized armies face off with one another. Instead, it is more germane to read these documents as theorizing settler imperialism as a social order (re)produced through asymmetrical or, more aptly, *hybrid*

warfare. As Zig Zag explains, the war for territory that has defined so much of the Canadian project continues to involve, with varying degrees of intensity over time and space, “all the means used to carry out wars: military, political, economic, psychological, diplomatic, cultural” and other tactics that seek—desperately—to secure uncontested governing authority in a given territory by pacifying resistance.³⁷

This interpretation—that the hybrid warfare of colonization is inclusive of a number of interlocking strategies, many of which appear non-martial and even consultative or conciliatory in character—reflects how the doctrine of hybrid war has developed amongst its tacticians, particularly within contexts of settler imperialism. Manu Karuka suggests that this doctrine emerged in the early 21st Century, following a number of failed conventional/asymmetrical wars—notably of the American-led alliances in Iraq and Afghanistan, but also of Israel in its wars against Hezbollah and the Palestinians. Hybrid war, then, is a response to a persistent situation in which “the communities that are fighting the war are unwilling to take casualties, unwilling to support aggressive war, and the populations that are on the receiving end of war have figured out ways to resist the war.”³⁸ A 2016 report prepared for the Canadian Special Operations Forces Command (CANSOFCOM) by Colonel Bernd Horn bears out these observations. By Horn’s description hybrid warfare involves the “mobilization of all means available to a state or non-state actor to achieve specific political goals”—including, alongside physical violence, the combined usage of psychological, legal, and media tactics—with the aim of demoralizing and destabilizing a targeted population, in order to precipitate crises during which it becomes possible to seize “control of the target society by internal forces acting in concert with the attacker.”³⁹ While Horn’s report is positioned primarily as Canada responding to the emergence of this doctrine elsewhere, not only does he assert that CANSOFCOM ought to be developing a formal strategy for engaging in hybrid

war, his descriptions of the doctrine's tactics and aims largely reflects how authors in this archive characterize the colonial situation.⁴⁰

Indeed, based on the insights of this activist archive, I postulate that the doctrine of hybrid war can be understood in part as the 'externalization'—in a moment of challenged global hegemony—of the martial conditions or tactics developed through the ongoing settler conquest of 'internalized' Indigenous nations and their territories, alongside other internally subjected populations. This, importantly, reverses the directionality typically thought to characterize imperial blowback. Instead of a relative unidirectionality in which lessons learned 'abroad' get applied to 'domestic' populations—most commonly discussed as the so-called 'militarization' of the police post-9/11, but other examples abound in Chapter One of this dissertation too—this critique of settler martialism reveals a multidirectional flow of tactics within an imperial world system, in which the war 'at home' can just as easily condition and inform the tactics of conquest 'abroad.' Moreover, as Karuka suggests, this is the zero-point from which to view a material basis for solidarity amongst vast swaths of the world's "poor and the dispossessed," as they share—in differentiated ways—deprivations manufactured by the imperial mode of living.⁴¹

Indeed, many of the documents in this activist archive share Karuka's sentiment, as they too theorize the necessity of mass, collective direct action against the social order of settler imperialism. Given, however, that each is written by people engaged in anti-imperialist organizing primarily in the territories of Indigenous peoples presently contained within Canada's assumed territorial jurisdiction, a central question is how settlers who are similarly located—and thus, in at least this specific way, are recipients of colonization's dividends—can actually engage in such struggles. To phrase their question eponymously in the context of this dissertation: how can one be in and against Canada? Perhaps surprisingly, there is relatively little by way of shared focus

between these texts and the allyship toolkits of the previous chapter. Whereas the latter called in general terms for an ‘unsettling’ or ‘giving up’ of the social power which accrues to settlers, and in their more specific moments call on settlers to ‘step back,’ many of the documents in this archive emphasize the need for settlers to deepen their commitments and engage in more sustained, concrete actions to advance decolonization by building and exercising social power in *opposition* to the settler social order—though, crucially, the authors invariably note that Indigenous leadership remains the vital precondition for such organizing.

In some cases, while authors theorize a generalized crisis, which they argue ought to compel settlers into taking action alongside Indigenous peoples, they also see a relatively clear division of labour within the struggle itself. Keefer, for one, exemplifies this as he continues developing his account of decolonization informed by the Kaswentha’s principles. Evaluating the co-constituting crises of anthropogenic climate change, nuclear catastrophes, and the “growing ruthlessness” of settler imperialism, Keefer suggests that “humanity is approaching a massive waterfall on the river of life” and that the ship which produced these crises is not likely to survive the plunge.⁴² As such, he argues that “indigenous struggle for liberation must involve a mutiny or rebellion” amongst settlers, whereby in joining together it will become possible to “take control of the ship.”⁴³ Although Keefer’s core insight here on the need for settlers to mutiny against their shipmasters is shared by many others in this archive, the objective of seizing the ship of empire—even for ostensibly liberatory purposes—is a metaphorical gloss that is unlikely to be shared by others. A more commonly expressed objective might be summarized as attempting to scuttle the ship.⁴⁴ tawinikay makes a point similar to this in her transcribed speech, asserting that the Canadian state is “your [settlers’] government... and it shouldn’t be their [Indigenous peoples’] responsibility to tear it down.”⁴⁵

“Autonomy” is, consequently, a key concept at work behind much thought on these matters within this activist archive. tawinikay, like Keefer, turns to the Kaswentha as a key text from which to draw lessons on decolonization and finds autonomy as one of its core principles. In her zine, *Reconciliation is Dead*—a searing indictment of Canada’s invasion of the yintah published and shared extensively in the midst of the 2020 Shutdown Canada movement—tawinikay writes directly to settlers, imploring them to “[r]emember the Two Row: you can fight parallel battles towards the same goals.” She argues explicitly that for decolonization struggles to spread and become entrenched on the necessary scale to contest Canada’s historic bloc, settlers will have to begin conceiving of themselves as more than “just cogs in the solidarity machine, you too can take up struggle in the cities [where] you live.”⁴⁶ In the particular conjuncture in which this zine emerged, tawinikay urges the expansion of solidarity blockades.

This is all to say that the fundamental and incontrovertible importance of Indigenous leadership in decolonization struggles within and against Canada should not be mistaken as a call for settlers to merely await explicit, personalized instructions. Nor can it be an invitation for settlers engaging in solidarity actions to burden Indigenous leadership or comrades with a constant refrain of the uncertainties or insecurities that arise in the course of their work. As Xhopakelxhit makes clear in her zine, “if you are organizing [in solidarity with Indigenous peoples’ struggles] then you need to make decisions and act on them without being guided every step of the way.” The reason is just as much a matter of practicality as it is of principle, Xhopakelxhit makes clear that an overly deferential organizing model, in which Indigenous persons must address each and every settler insecurity about the appropriateness of their own strategies, “causes stress and creates bad relations.” She insists on the importance of autonomous organizing within the context of

Indigenous-led decolonization struggles, and reminds her reader that no one should “confuse autonomy with privilege”—even if the line between them may at times be thin or permeable.⁴⁷

Importantly, and in keeping with the principles of the Kaswentha, the authors in this archive can be interpreted as theorizing a *relational* autonomy. Here, the social power of any one group in struggle is seen to be dependent upon their shared commitments of solidarity with and responsibility for/to one another, while also not being so fully subsumed by that relationship as to preclude self-directed action.⁴⁸ This resonates with conditions of relational autonomy and mutualism made clear during certain heightened periods of struggle in defence of the Wet’suwet’en yintah. While calls for solidarity issued by the camps often offer direction in terms of the types of tactics and targets that are deemed appropriate, there is also a certain necessary reliance on the autonomous capacity of those acting in solidarity to identify how their local and specific contexts could be made to fit within the overall call to action.⁴⁹ Indeed, a partial cataloguing of solidarity actions hosted on Gidimt’en camp’s website shows just how successfully the distributed ingenuity of autonomous solidarity actions can be in producing a diversity of tactics geared towards local contexts.⁵⁰ And, moreover, the emphasis on autonomy enables supporters to calibrate their own actions so that they can be carried out most effectively—that is, maximizing impact (measured variously by attention, financial/material consequences, disruption, etc.)—while minimizing necessary exposure to state, corporate, or vigilante reprisals. Undoubtedly, there were certain vital lines of communications enabling thicker relationships to develop even at the movement’s peak, but the veritable explosion of solidarity actions in early 2020 indicates the importance of relational autonomy in struggle.

Not only does such autonomy enable a proliferation of so-called ‘frontlines’—sites of heightened and immediate conflict—which itself produces a crisis of governance for the dominant

settler order. As tawinikay notes, it also enables a more expansive understanding of the struggle for decolonization itself, without ever losing sight of the foundational importance of Indigenous self-determination in both motivating and shaping the movement. Writing in early 2020, as more frontlines were drawn on Gitxsan territories, at Tyendinaga, in Victoria, Montréal, Toronto and beyond, tawinikay asserts that:

[t]his is about *all of us*. Any day now the RCMP could attempt to move in and evict the rail blockade at Tyendinaga. I stand in solidarity with them as much as I do with the Wet'suwet'en. This moment is not just about getting the government and their militarized goons to back down at Unist'ot'en and Gitdum'ten, it's about getting them to loosen their grip around all of our necks. This moment is about proclaiming reconciliation dead and taking back our power.⁵¹

tawinikay's words resonated powerfully with many in the midst of the 2020 solidarity actions, where her zine spread like wildfire. And they continue to resonate today, in no small part because she insists on theorizing decolonization as a project of collective liberation from a social order that while differentially shared ought to be universally rejected. Crucially, her vision, as with the others in this archive, also refuses to lapse into idealism on the one hand or succumb to the temptations for the immediacy of liberal reformism on the other—recognizing defeat in the former and, in the latter, an attempt at recomposition within, or the shapeshifting character of, Canada's historic bloc. Instead, it's a remarkable effort to both theorize and build towards decolonization as a struggle from below, the horizon of which demands nothing short of the remaking of the world system which has been received as constituted through settler imperialism. The theorizing from below observed in this activist archive resonates in important ways with an emerging body of scholarship on 'worldmaking'—though, as I illustrate below, this archive also pushes this concept in important ways.

Section 2: A Whole World in the Remaking

The centrality of relational autonomy to the practice of decolonization struggles can, I suggest, be helpfully viewed from yet another direction. That being that Indigenous led-struggles in and against Canada exist within a larger, global anti-imperialist front. Decolonization is, necessarily, an unfolding process; in a world system quite literally made by imperialism, decolonization has been struggled for everywhere, but completed nowhere. As of yet. Far more than any other political dynamic, the “irresistible” process of liberation advanced under the name decolonization—and the rearguard action of the imperial core attempting to thwart it—has shaped and reshaped the world for the past 231 years.⁵² To the degree that they have avoided total scholarly erasure, decolonization struggles within North America have long been treated by most academics as somehow radically distinct from these global circumstances. Often this has followed conceptual lines that reinscribe hard categorical distinctions which were themselves produced as a consequence of counterrevolutionary efforts by the imperial powers to stave off the most profound implications of decolonization ‘at home.’ A particularly dramatic example of this can be traced through the promulgation within international law of a right to self-determination for colonized peoples predicated on the still ongoing exclusion of the Indigenous peoples largely—though not only—living within the assumed territorial jurisdiction of settler empires like Canada, Australia, America, etc.⁵³ In addition to this reification of the legal categories received through ongoing histories of global apartheid—a form of intellectual collaboration—it also has become standard fare for many scholars in the imperial core to cite the very real shortcomings of Third World struggles as further evidence of the need to categorically distinguish the project of decolonization here and now. Internal contradictions and historically contingent reversals or transgressions of decolonization movements are often inscribed by scholars as overdetermined and inevitable—perhaps even desired—outcomes. But such accounts rely at once on racist and

imperial chauvinisms to facilitate a collective amnesia about the viciousness of imperialism, the disastrous and deadly effects of the counterrevolution against decolonization, and on continuing the erasure of ongoing struggles over the future of decolonization in the Third World itself.

As Adom Getachew illuminates, the counterrevolutionary movement against Third World decolonization struggles not only buried a generation of the most committed anti-imperialists—stymieing or overturning the gains of whole regions in the process—it has also transformed how the aims of these struggles are understood in retrospect.⁵⁴ Many scholars in the imperial core suggest that decolonization in the Third World is reducible to a project of eliminating ‘alien rule’ or merely dispelling colonizers. They thereby argue that this produces an undesirable isolationism or pulls towards radicalized conceptions of independence mediated through a particularly rigid adoption of the state-form and acceptance of any/all its subsequent consequences. Getachew’s far more careful history of the period counters this, and insists instead that what anti-imperialists were struggling for—and, indeed, were achieving in always less-than-perfect forms until the massive imperial backlash—was a project of “worldmaking.” Just as the then-500 year history of European imperialism was a “world-constituting force,” in which the dominant social relations of empire reproduced themselves through the building of multiscalar institutions, securing the distribution of and ‘ownership’ over resources, and maintaining control over what types of knowledge were validated within this world system, Getachew asserts that decolonization is itself “a project of reordering the world.” That is, it seeks to unmake or abolish the inherited “political form” of the world system—which constantly proves “incapable of realizing the ideals of a democratic, egalitarian, and anti-imperial future”—by building the social relations in which mutual flourishing are possible. Sometimes this requires recomposing existing structures, sometimes establishing wholly new ones. Importantly, while equal in the scope of its vision, the qualitative difference (or,

more accurately, the political and moral inversion) that distinguishes this as *anti*-colonial worldmaking is that it seeks “to create a domination-free and egalitarian international order.”⁵⁵

Robin DG Kelley helpfully develops Getachew’s usage of worldmaking, deploying it to understand the significance of historic and ongoing solidarities between Black freedom struggles (particularly, but not exclusively, in America) and the liberation of Palestinians from Israeli occupation and apartheid. Notably, both are contexts constituted primarily through regimes of settlement. Kelley suggests that the strength of worldmaking as both concept and practice resides in the fact that it treats “justice as *indivisible and global*, that it knows no boundaries and is founded not on shared experience but shared principles”—that the liberation of each is bound up in the liberation of all, and that no one is free until everyone is free: everywhere, always.⁵⁶ Decolonization, then, is just one name under which the *work* (in all the valences carried by that term, be it labour that is physical, intellectual, caring, etc.) of worldmaking travels. Another travelling-name of worldmaking, and one that has gained prominence largely because of the movement for Black lives’ successes, is *abolition*—specifically of the coercive and carceral apparatuses of the state, and I think the activist archive’s critique of Canadian martialism should resonate here.⁵⁷ While some cleave abolition and decolonization from one another, Ruth Wilson Gilmore suggests that the worldmaking perspective shows us that “abolition requires decolonization,” because while

Abolition might *start* with the focus on the deadliness of prison and jail... in order to live in a world without prison and jail everything has to change. *Everything*. That means colonialism cannot continue, that means capitalism cannot continue. Therefore, abolition—rather than being a narrowly defined movement that is for, by, and about a *segment* of the world’s dispossessed people—what it actually is, is an opening *of* freedom movement, *to* freedom movement, *within* freedom movement.⁵⁸

Moreover, while skeptics of both abolition and decolonization often characterize them as merely *negationary* projects—that supposedly seek only to tear down existing edifices—Gilmore constantly reminds us that although worldmaking requires negation, specifically of that which causes harm, it is in order to enable a greater degree of *presence*. That, by abolishing the presently dominant organization of social relations, power, and resources, we enable a transformative redistribution of such things to where they are most needed and ensure the greatest degree of *mutual* flourishing. Or, as one of the texts in this chapter’s activist archive puts it: “By arming ourselves with the ability to create a new world and destroy the one that has been imposed on us... We continue to fight, because we are in love with all the possible worlds that are not allowed to bloom.”⁵⁹

Olúfẹ̀mi Táíwò also draws from Getachew’s account of worldmaking to describe his “constructive view” of reparations, which requires the remaking of the world system so that “[g]lobal racial empire, and it’s history of slavery and colonial domination” can be unmade by undoing its vicious half-life: the contemporary distribution of social power and advantage/disadvantage from a global scale down to the biopolitical.⁶⁰ He emphasizes, though, that regardless of the name under which it travels, if the aim of worldmaking is “building the just world to come” the more specific question that must occupy it’s proponents “concerns *how* we get there.”⁶¹ This is the principal point on which my attention to this activist archive, and usage of worldmaking to describe the stakes of its vision, diverges from Getachew’s, though only slightly and perhaps (perhaps even hopefully) only as a consequence of our attention to distinct historical conjunctures. As Arash Davari has noted, the core protagonists of Getachew’s narrative in *Worldmaking After Empire* are an assemblage of anti-imperialist statesmen—the gendered language here is unfortunate, but accurate—and scholars. While recognizing sound

methodological reasons for this focus, and upholding the historiographic importance of what Getachew achieves here, Davari nevertheless makes the key point that this attention “precludes considerations of *popular politics* as worldmaking.” In other words, Getachew’s focus on (admittedly) remarkable individual anti-imperialists obscures the vital role of the masses—the classes, the movements of various sorts, the grassroots social organs—in shaping and enabling both her protagonists and the conditions of possibility available to them. For Davari, this is not just a matter of a fuller picture. In fact, he suggests that attention to popular politics is likely to produce less exactitude than does Getachew’s ‘elite’ approach. What is gained, instead, is the capacity to appreciate and “identify the creative spirit *required* for anticolonial worldmaking.”⁶² Obscured in Getachew’s account, then, is the role—the always central and irreplaceable role—of popular social forces, both as theorists and as practitioners of worldmaking ‘from below.’⁶³ The power of worldmaking is always the power of being *with/in* those social forces, and its aim is to do so in different and liberatory ways.

It is in this specific light that I hope the activist archive discussed throughout this chapter can now be fully appreciated. My contention is that to struggle for decolonization as a process of collective liberation is to participate in the work of worldmaking—to be in both solidarity and dialogue with all those often unseen or forgotten relations highlighted by Getachew, Kelley, Gilmore, Táíwò, and Davari. Moreover, though, by focusing first and foremost on an activist archive it is possible to see what the work of worldmaking looks like from below, in the non-elite spaces where ordinary people are attempting to build the vision and collective power needed to *radically* transform their world. tawinikay sees this clearly in the ways in which blockades of railways serve a dual role as both an immediate impediment to the steady flow of capital *and* as the vehicle by which to politicize the very built environment of settler imperialism. Just as Butler

Burke also points us to the work of creating a common front, by evidencing the possibilities for expanded struggle and solidarities that emerge when Indigenous nations and racialized migrants articulate their shared interests—a project that necessarily both shakes the white power structure of settler imperialism ‘at home’ by displacing the presumed and singular authority of the settler state, and positions this common front within global struggles.

As Davari suggests, what we find is necessarily *not* a study in scientific exactitude. But such a thing, if it could exist, would be politically “useless and irrelevant” as it would encourage mistaking the map of social science for the terrain of struggle itself.⁶⁴ Moreover, whereas many who study worldmaking through the more exact traces left by elite actors tend to historicize this as a now-foreclosed period of struggle, attention to worldmaking from below shows the contemporary moment to be rife with deeply transformative possibilities. Instead of a deferred to futurism—a worldmaking-to-come should the wave of counterrevolution ever turn itself back—my hope is that this activist archive evidences the ongoing struggles towards worldmaking that presently persist in the interstices of the dominant social order. Crucially, this is *not* to call for the valourization of the micro-political, the small, the local, the everyday, or the gestural. Rather, it is to describe the contemporary challenge of anti-imperialist worldmaking in precisely the same way that it has always been described by those who struggle for it: as a problem of building and exercising collective power. Power, it must be reiterated, that is understood here as the strength and durability of social relations that at once seek to abolish the imperial mode of living in order to build non-dominative and egalitarian modes of freedom that enable mutual flourishing.

Additionally, this archive not only shows the theorizing of worldmaking from below, but it also demonstrates a remarkably astute effort to politicize that theory in such a way as to make it a reality. Which is to say, that the ambition of this chapter is something more than just intellectual

history, it's also an attempt to partially situate the work of decolonization movements within the truly imaginative and capacious visions that they carry for a world after empire. This archive has proven itself to have a deep and nuanced social theory of settler imperialism, one that studies the fractures of an internally differentiated social order so that it can both identify and exploit the contradictions found there. Similarly, through its attention to the martial characteristics of the Canadian social order, this is a project of worldmaking that remains clear-eyed about the radical imbalance of social power as it presently stands. Indeed, this is particularly significant as it evidences that within decolonization movements there is an abiding appreciation of the challenges to projects of worldmaking that occur not only after the counterrevolutionary backlash, but also that engage in such struggles from *within* the imperial core itself and strive to do so in ways that don't reproduce dynamics of domination. The deep understanding that both Zig Zag and Keefer show of the martial character of the settler social order evidences that neither is naïve about the overwhelming capacity towards organized violence that exists within the presently dominant order. We should, I think, read the shared commitment within each of the texts in this archive to advance tactics of *social* struggle (blockades, strikes, targeted property destruction), as opposed to *martial* resistance, as a strategy decision in light of these assessment. As such, while the authors in this chapter have retained a truly astonishing vision of a world remade through anti-imperialist struggle, their attention to the necessity of mass, collective direct action is important as it demonstrates an effort to understand the conditions—and limitations—under which such struggle must presently be waged. The social power exercised through blockades, in particular, stands out as a key strategic effort to think dialectically, both in *and* against the flows of dominant power in order to disrupt them for anti-imperialist purposes.⁶⁵

Another core feature distinguishing the manner in which I study worldmaking from that of Getachew is that the context of this activist archive shifts the vantage point to struggles which are very much ‘in the belly of the beast.’ This is not to fetishize a specifically geographical understanding of the terrain of struggle or to reify the distributive logics of the present world system itself; rather, it suggests that decolonization movements *within* and *against* the assumed ‘domestic’ jurisdiction of settler empires necessitate a more immediate and direct confrontation with many of the social forces that have historically produced and continue to form the bulwark of the presently dominant historic bloc. Just as I have emphasized throughout this dissertation the alchemical role that racecraft has played in the (re)production of settler imperialism—especially, the lodestone of constitutional whiteness which has been and remains a central joint enabling the articulation of Canada’s historic bloc—this activist archive, and its relation to other practices of worldmaking, provides a number of important tools for unmaking the global colour line that structures racial capitalism.

These tools allow for work in two directions. First, perhaps understandably given the demographic context in which these texts are written, they seek the abolition of whiteness as a power structure predicated on a revanchist identity politics. This is pursued on a number of levels; most expansively through the abolition of the very institutions that Joel Olson has so aptly described as enshrining “white democracy.”⁶⁶ As tawinikay makes clear in both her texts, even the highly constrained vision of ‘democracy’—which is largely only accessible in a meaningful sense to those with considerable property—that exists within the Canadian state is predicated on the continued usurpation of Indigenous nations’ rights to self-determination. As such, to abolish the conditions of colonization is, simultaneously, to seek the abolition of that which is both a manifestation of those social relations and the principle institution through which they are

reproduced: the state. But authors in this archive are also committed to developing an account of solidarity that seeks to facilitate a disidentification with *personal* whiteness. Whereas many of the ally toolkits inadvertently centred on appealing to an implicitly white ally while never naming them as such, the texts in this archive directly confront whiteness in order to seek its abolition. This is, in part, what Chelsea Vowel's letter to angry settlers was striving towards. Just as she suggests that Claude's decision to direct their rancour at Indigenous-led blockaders works to shore up the state, Vowel simultaneously implies that it is also rooted in and reproduces their identification with whiteness as a form of social power which is meant to insulate them from the consequences of settler imperialism. But as Vowel strives to show, Claude's insulation is thin, and only becoming more so by the day as the contradictions within settler imperialism heighten. The world-constituting force of Canadian settler imperialism has been enabled through race-making processes that (re)produce whiteness and, therefore, its dialectical inversion is found in the race-breaking struggle to not only create a sense of misidentification with the terms of whiteness, but to abolish it as a necessary condition of anti-imperialist worldmaking.⁶⁷

But the second direction in which the tools of this archive prepare their reader to move is towards deepening of anti-imperialist solidarities amongst those who have a more direct and less mediated interest in breaking the global colour line, that is, amongst the vast majority of the world's population, who have been negatively racialized as a consequence of European and settler imperialisms. As Kelley reminds, these solidarities are neither autogenetic nor an inevitable byproduct of global racial empire. Rather, such solidarities as have already been built and must continuously be sustained and expanded in opposition to imperialism ought to be "understood as a contingent political project rather than some kind of natural, essential, transhistorical alliance." Moreover, as Kelley also notes, these have most often been (re)produced by a political minority

committed to liberatory internationalism and who are often in tension with other members of their communities.⁶⁸ In other words, while the domination of whiteness creates the material conditions that might necessitate such solidarities there is no historic telos or essential being that makes them inevitable—they must be deliberately imagined, built, and cared for.

This sort of commitment to building robust internationalisms as the basis of solidarities that view decolonization struggles as indivisible and global in nature, and that seek to abolish the centrality of whiteness to the presently dominant social order, are also evident throughout the activist archive on a number of scales. Notably, Nora Butler Burke's thinking and activism is forged in the crucible of Montréal, where she ties together solidarity work with the Kanien'kehá:ka on whose land she resides and with predominantly racialized migrants targeted by Canada's citizenship regime for exclusion, criminalization, and discrimination. Herein Butler Burke shows by her own example the possible emergence of a common front against the white power structure undergirding the Canadian state. Butler Burke's engagement with both an expansive account of Indigenous sovereignty *and* with a thorough critique of border imperialism is instructive, as it shows the on-the-ground applicability of solidarity between Indigenous struggles and racialized migrants (as well as the potential for white settlers to be engaged here too).⁶⁹ Looking towards a different trajectory, Zig Zag works assiduously throughout his zine to tie the global antiwar movement—specifically in solidarity with the peoples of Vietnam and Iraq—into the account that he provides of decolonization struggles. Whether it is in the abrogation of the right to self-determination of racialized peoples, or the investment in whiteness (mediated as either the right to dominate or the responsibility to 'save'), Zig Zag's attention to martialism traces out how race is made and structures the world system. And, therefore, what lines to follow in the attempt to unmake it.

Conclusion:

Similar to my argument in Section One of this dissertation, Butler Burke and Zig Zag—but also this activist archive as a whole—exemplify what it means not only to refuse the reification of the state as *the* site of political power, but instead to understand it as a manifestation of and technology for reproducing multiple articulating regimes of power. Following the contours of global structures of white supremacy they map an account of anti-imperialist solidarity that is better able to understand the forms of struggle that are necessary to build the social power that will make decolonization possible. In my estimation, this activist archive is most remarkable, then, because it struggles for decolonization as a project of collective liberation at a scale and depth that adequately responds to settler imperialism as a world-constituting force. Moreover, it does so in a manner that recognizes this as a world system which is experienced most immediately at the level of a differentially shared social order. It is these differentiations, the uneven integrations, of the settler social order that proliferate a number of internal contradictions which potentiate the formation of solidarities amongst disparately situating social forces. Such an account is both more analytically nuanced, while simultaneously being more politically robust, than accounts of allyship seen in the previous chapter. Further, the texts in this activist archive also remain clear-eyed about the very real difficulties that stand between such an expansive vision of worldmaking and the possibility of actually achieving it based on present conditions. While allyship frameworks might be applauded for providing a straightforward and immediate course of action, they lack an overarching theory of how that scales to actually confront the enormity of the contemporary crises to which they ostensibly respond. This includes crises which are likely to produce increasingly reactionary social forces committed to defending the status quo by whatever are the most convenient means. By contrast, this activist archive at once appreciates how dominant social

relations reproduce themselves—not exclusively through, but always against the backdrop of a surplus of martial capacity—in order to theorize strategic forms of struggle.

Importantly, I want to reemphasize in closing that this relatively robust theory of decolonization is a downstream consequence of the fact the texts in this archive eschew dominant conceptions of power as power-over, thinking instead of power as always-already being power-with. This section of the dissertation opened with concerns over how community-led direct actions may negatively impact already strained or toxic relationships, the texts under consideration in this chapter are important responses as they ask readers very directly to consider which relationships are actually worth tending to, and under what conditions. Simultaneously, they also point towards a host of other relationships that are so often obscured through the privileging of that which *appears* to be most immediate, which in the case of allyship frameworks often served to reify inadvertently domesticating/state-centric theories of political action and to reproduce almost entirely the mystification of the commodity-form which too often permits irresponsibility towards social relations which are experienced only as concrete objects.

Moreover, I hope also that it is apparent there are potentially enormous contributions to Canadian Political Science offered from all the texts in both the activist archives considered in this section—to both the emerging study of Canadian-Indigenous relations and to the discipline's still more nascent appreciation of settler-Indigenous relations. Indeed, while the latter of these two approaches is relatively novel within scholarship, it is evidently a longstanding concern for grassroots movements. While the privileging of scholarship produced by accredited individuals/groups within academia is a deep and ubiquitous norm of nearly every constituted discipline, one of the primary aims of this section has been to uplift non-elite actors as both political agents and as theorists of their own actions. And to suggest that they must be taken

seriously on the terms which they have set for themselves. This is then an attempt to shift not only our attention to politics ‘from below’—in order that we can actually ‘see’ the world from a vantage point other than that of the state, which has for so long overdetermined the discipline’s point of view—it is also an attempt to shift our *thinking* into greater dialogue with grassroots actors. And to do so in manner that neither condescends, patronizes, or genuflects, but rather tends towards dialogue and uplift.

Section Three

Chapter Five: The Tiny House, In Common

It's difficult to know where to begin telling a story that, fundamentally, is about relationships cultivated and nurtured over millennia. This is especially true when, as that story catches up to present-day realities, the gnashing maw of empire too easily consumes all attention. In this chapter I focus on the struggles around and against the proposed expansion of the Trans Mountain Pipeline (TMX) as a case-study in grassroots anti-imperialism, or anti-imperialism 'from below.' The political conjuncture on which these events open a window contains multiple, nested temporalities of struggle and of governance; perhaps most evidently, these events are the consequences of decades of contestation over the extractive processes and material flows of a globally-sprawling fossil fuel industry that is the primary catalyst of a truly epochal reckoning for life as we—those enduring the last days of the Holocene—know it. More to the point, this decades old battle against fossil capital has been brought to a head by the Canadian state's belligerent and monomaniacal commitment to propping-up the fossil fuel industry.¹ As was detailed in Section One of this dissertation, Canada is itself a contested political project (re)produced, in part, through a centuries-old and ongoing imperialist effort to conquer Indigenous peoples, to dispossess them of their territories, in order to project settler power in the world and to reproduce the social relations of racial capitalism. And resistance to that process has been carried out in the name of defending a web of reciprocal relations—cultivated and deliberately pursued since time immemorial—between the human and more-than-human beings targeted by processes of extraction and commodification.

In both popular and academic discourses land/water defenders continue to be represented as “protestors.”² Framing Indigenous-led anti-imperialist struggles in this way is premised on the often unstated assumption that the state is *the* constituted and singular political authority—that the

state is a fixed point around, towards, through, or against which the entirety of the social world ‘moves.’ But, as John Borrows notes, the ascription of ‘protestor’ or of ‘civil disobedience’ erases the presence of other sources of law and legitimacy that are being upheld and defended by such actors, an erasure that works to solidify the hegemony of state authority.³ The grassroots land/water defenders who take centre-stage in the latter portion of this chapter are thus examples of practices of *contestation* only insofar as one chooses to politicize their actions while accepting the supposed neutrality of imperial institutions and processes. Manu Karuka helpfully displaces imperialism’s presumption of neutrality—its effort at disappearance—by naming empire’s governing logic as “countersovereignty.” He argues for making the violence of everyday life lived through empire cognizable by insisting on seeing the state, and its claim to sovereignty, not as a priori or a *fait accompli*, but as an ongoing movement against *other* social forces that produce and carry their own forms of legitimacy.⁴ This reframing begins from the observation that empire rests on “*reactive* anxiety, [and] *fragile* modes of power that can take overwhelmingly violent form” in their efforts to deny and displace the existing and persisting political authority of Indigenous nations and other subject populations.⁵

Karuka’s formulation is helpful not only for noting that the empire has no clothes, but also for insisting on the central importance of specifically Indigenous modes of social relations that govern in place prior to and endure through the colonial present.⁶ Their central importance derives both from their relationship to the territories in which they are situated and from their ongoing role as an infrastructure of solidarity in freedom struggles. The politics central to this chapter emerge from and are driven by a staunch commitment to the defence and integrity of modes of social relations and systems of governance that sustain and enhance life. These politics are not principally

about contesting or resisting—even as that somewhat constrictive language is easiest for discussion—instead, these politics are about upholding Indigenous political authorities.⁷

In much of what passes for the canon of political theory within the imperial core, Indigenous peoples are positioned between two poles of racist misrepresentation. On one side is the deliberate project of Lockean myth-making about Indigenous peoples' pre-political, pre-agricultural societies and, on the other, are the equally fictitious Rousseauian narratives about noble, ecologically pure and therefore vestigial “savage” communities.⁸ Others have expertly deconstructed this constitutive exclusion at the heart of dominant political theory, and Political Science generally, by highlighting the intelligence, the fecundity, and the durability of Indigenous governance systems. Additionally, a much wider body of Indigenous thought and scholarship exists with which Canadianists and political theorists should familiarize themselves.⁹ In my discussion of the struggles against TMX, I take the vitality and the vital importance of Indigenous self-determination as my assumed political starting place—though I do not necessarily enter directly into the significant debates on the shape, content, or edges of these political orders.¹⁰ I begin from this assumption foremost because Indigenous peoples have a common right to govern themselves, their territories, and their relations unencumbered by imperial regimes. But I also want to suggest that, inasmuch as it necessitates a confrontation with the cannibalistic urges of empire and the increasingly unliveable ecology those drives are producing, the resurgence of Indigenous self-determination is a struggle in defence of life itself.¹¹ As James Tully says, in this struggle “[n]o one is offsite or not responsible. The choice is change or self-destruction.”¹²

This chapter is structured into four sections. In the first, I provide a history of the struggle against TMX, up to the Canadian federal government's re-approval of the project on June 18th 2019. In the second and third sections, I examine the federal government's press conference re-

approving TMX in juxtaposition to a press conference held moments later by a coalition of First Nations, municipal governments, and major civil society groups opposed to the project. In these sections, I consider both the logic and limitations of strategies of hegemony and counter-hegemony, respectively. The fourth section moves to the level of grassroots politics, focusing on the week-long project to build a Tiny House and the 20km march up the Saanich Peninsula to send it on its way to Secwepemcul'ecw where the Tiny House Warriors now use the House in the resurgence of Secwepemc governance, and in their usage of direct action tactics to halt the construction of TMX through their territories. Drawing on my own engagement with the Tiny House build-project, as well as on local reporting and editorials, I am particularly interested in reflecting on a more expansive view of the political, one in which power and authority are not necessarily mediated through the state or reflective of its attendant logics of hegemony/counter-hegemony. The intention here, however, is *not* to create overly discrete typologies; as I highlight, interrelations exist within and across each of these level of analysis. Rather, I am attempting to understand a topography of anti-imperialism, by 'mapping' as it were a variety of terrains of struggle.

While engaging this ethic of turning away from the state as *the* site of political activity, I also nevertheless want to avoid overly reductive or easy answers by insisting on grappling with the very serious problems that the state (especially settler states) continues to pose for anti-imperialist struggles today. Inasmuch as the state exerts both an ideational and material hold over how political life is understood and pursued today, it must be contended with. This turn, then, in my mind is not—as it has occasionally been mischaracterized—about a project of 'isolationism,' understood as a caustic form of anti-relational independence. As I highlight below, the autonomist tendencies of 'anti-hegemonic' struggles are inapt for understanding or acting effectively in this

context. Rather, it is a *strategic* call to turn away from the (settler) state as *the* normative mediating social force, and simultaneously to turn *towards* a sprawling, tangled network of predominantly non-state and grassroots relationships in which the vision and work of worldmaking is being actively pursued with/in different forms of collectivity. Similar to arguments I pursued in the Interlude to Section Two, this call to turn away from the state is in fact a call to engage in highly nuanced and considered reflections on where and with whom it's actually possible to build something that is broadly liberatory and that enables mutual flourishing, that isn't achieved simply by spatially displacing the contradictions of racial capitalism. I am thus interested in conducting this analysis with an eye—though often only implicitly—towards how decolonization struggles might seek to eliminate relations of domination and exploitation that appear to us in the imperial core most immediately in the mediated and fetishized form of commodity relations. As such, a turn like this is also *not* a pursuit of some edenic space unmarred by, or beyond the ken of, the state system or racial capitalism. Such spaces, if they exist, are under constant threat of invasion and destruction so long as the dominant social relations that define the imperial mode of life persist, including *within* the marginalized spaces of dissent through and in which decolonization is sought.

Ultimately, I think what the events studied in this chapter reveal is that the reality of being situated within the social relations of a world system of racial capitalism constituted through settler imperialism, necessitates strategies of struggle that work towards its unmaking. As such, I read this turning as part of the necessary intellectual and practical work of being *in*, but aspiring to be *against* the project of settler imperialism that is presently called Canada. Throughout this chapter I am informed by Karuka's problematique for anti-imperialists in the 21st Century, which has echoes of both Tully and Rosa Luxemburg: that today we face a choice between “[d]ecolonization, or mass extinction.”¹³ This is the pressing context within which I consider what the resurgence of

Indigenous self-determination means as a social struggle in an era of ongoing climate catastrophe, and how it both interpellates and (perhaps counter-intuitively to some) how it should activate even someone who shares my own positionality as a white settler—which is to say, someone with relative social power and who likely sees themselves reflected to at least some degree within dominant social relations.

Section 1: Trans Mountain, A History of Expanding Struggle

In this section I reconstruct the pertinent history of the TMX project itself, and of the overlapping struggles against it. Unless noted otherwise, in detailing the history of Trans Mountain’s engagement with the National Energy Board (NEB) and various stakeholders up until mid-2018, I rely predominantly on Justice Dawson’s reconstruction of the history for their decision in *Tsleil-Waututh Nation v. Canada* (2018). This was the Federal Court of Appeals decision that “quashed” the initial Cabinet approval of TMX. I rely upon this particular account of the chronology, not to recenter organs of the state as apparatuses of truth-making, but for two very different reasons. The first, is that the history outlined in the decision is actually drawn extensively from the submissions of the plaintiffs (that is, from the First Nations), and thus represents a publicly-available (albeit in a mediated form) version of their own account. Secondly, given that it was rendered by a Canadian justice and accepted by all levels of government, the chronology established in this decision represents a minimally agreed upon set of facts. However, as I detail later in this chapter, by pointing to the exclusions and elisions in the frame of reference adopted by the court, it certainly does *not* represent *all* the facts. For details subsequent to 2018 or outside of the realm of official record, I rely primarily on news reporting, excepting in circumstances—such as the Protect the Inlet March and Tiny House builds—where I participated in the

demonstrations or direct actions (at no point, though, will I be discussing anything that was not a matter of public knowledge to those following these movements).

In December of 2013, the Trans Mountain Corporation, which at the time was owned by Kinder Morgan, applied to the NEB—the arms-length national regulatory body for the Canadian energy sector from 1959 until its disbanding in 2019—for a certificate of public convenience and necessity authorizing the Trans Mountain Expansion Project (TMX). The project proposal primarily entailed: (1) construction of roughly 987km of new pipeline ‘twinning’ to the 1,147km of existing line; (2) construction or modification of pumping stations and tanks, with a doubling of the Burnaby Mountain tank farm from thirteen to twenty-six storage tanks; (3) expansion of the Westridge dock facility; and (4) construction of two wholly new pipelines from the Burnaby storage facility to the Westridge docks. While the language of ‘twinning’ evokes a sense of parity, upon completion TMX is actually intended to increase the pipeline’s transportation capacity by nearly threefold—from 300,000 barrels/day to 890,000/day. Furthermore, as the project is meant primarily to facilitate an export pivot from American to Asian and Pacific Rim buyers, the so-called ‘downstream’ impacts of the project on shipping are of an even greater order of magnitude. Filings with the NEB estimate tanker shipping through the port and the Salish Sea jumping from roughly five tankers per month, to thirty-four tankers per month—an increase of nearly 700% solely as a consequence of TMX.

Between December 2013 and November 2016, the NEB pursued a three-phase process to review TMX’s social, economic, and ecological impacts in consultation with Indigenous peoples and First Nations—separate processes were also pursued with a number of other stakeholders. The bulk of the meetings occurred between April 2014 and February 2016 during which time, Justice Dawson notes, many Indigenous participants raised serious concerns not only about the project

itself, but also about how their participation in consultations was confined to relatively narrow post hoc issues of mitigation and revenue sharing. In effect, the process presumed the project itself to be a *fait accompli*, and sought merely to retroactively build buy-in for it. Higher order questions about sovereignty, jurisdiction, and rights expressed under the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) to offer/withhold their free, prior and informed consent for the project as a whole, were never seriously on the table during these consultations. As such, the NEB's recommendation in May 2016—prior even to completing Phase III of consultations—that Cabinet approve TMX was met with severe consternation from many Indigenous peoples. The assertion that the project serves a vital “public interest,” clarified just how fundamental Canada's exclusion of Indigenous governance is in the face of imperatives towards economic ‘development.’¹⁴ This series of euphemisms serves at once to cover the internally fragmented and contradictory interests of the ‘the public’ (even in its limited intended usage here) and to obfuscate the enormously destructive realities of further entrenching the infrastructures of fossil capital.

Despite the NEB's recommendation for approval, many who opposed TMX remained inordinately hopeful that the project would be cancelled. Their hope was a consequence of a sense that, in spite of the failings of the state's regulatory arms, a major victory seemed to have been secured elsewhere, in the legislative and executive branch of government with the recent removal of Stephen Harper's Conservatives and the election of Justin Trudeau and the Liberal Party. Moreover, these hopes were not based merely on projection. As Martin Lukacs details, Trudeau's 2015 campaign was peppered with rhetoric almost wholly novel to Canada's dominant partisan landscape. The promise of “nation-to-nation” relationships with Indigenous peoples, and even of “decolonization,” that Trudeau offered on the campaign trail seemed to fulfil the vision of UNDRIP.¹⁵ Moreover, cancellation of such hotly contested infrastructure as TMX seemed assured

given that one of Trudeau's constant refrains throughout the campaign and beyond was that while governments "may be able to issue permits... only communities can grant permission"—a sentiment he delivered to the Calgary Petroleum Club as long ago as 2013.¹⁶ Many opponents of the project were therefore dismayed when Trudeau announced his Cabinet's approval of TMX on November 29, 2016 following completion of Phase III of the review process. Without any apparent sense of contradiction, this approval came at the same press conference in which Trudeau cancelled the Northern Gateway and Energy East pipelines citing both Indigenous objections and climate concerns.

Following the approval of TMX a series of legal challenges were launched, the most successful of which was brought by sə'lilwətaʔl (Tsleil-Waututh) and Sk̓w̓x̓wú7mesh Úxwumixw (Squamish) First Nations, supported by the municipal governments of both Vancouver and Burnaby, alongside a number of other governmental and civil society interveners. As opposition was being partly channeled through state judicial apparatuses, a number of grassroots groups also coalesced around campaigns of both public outreach and direct action. While much of the grassroots organizing against TMX took expected forms (marches, petitions, and other demonstrations of collective opposition), Lukacs details how surprising the opposition to the project was in both its breadth and depth, with thousands of people indicating their preparedness to risk arrest.¹⁷ At the gates of the Burnaby storage tank facility, a protracted soft blockade slowed work on the site. Day after day new people came forward, defying a civil injunction issued in 2018 to stand in front of the facility gate in order to snarl construction and operations traffic. Hundreds—including prominent local and national figures—have been arrested and, in some cases, imprisoned as a consequence of their dissent.¹⁸

As alluded to in the introduction, much of this dissent refuses to travel under the title of civil disobedience. Dissidents position themselves instead as *proponents* or *defenders* of the lands and waters under threat, as well as of the Indigenous governance systems that are at the heart of organizing—both materially and conceptually—this resistance.¹⁹ This is perhaps clearest in the *Women’s Declaration Against the Trans Mountain Man Camps*, issued from Secwepemcul’ecw in November of 2017.²⁰ As the Declaration makes clear, the right of the Secwepemc to exercise their self-determination with/in “the land, waters, and resources” of their territories remains fully intact. The Declaration effectively ties together the threats that TMX poses to their self-determination as a political body, to their territories, and to their own bodies through the degradation/toxification of land and the threat of gendered and sexualized violence that accompanies heavy industry: “We, as Secwepemc women, declare that we do no consent! We do not consent to the desecration of our sacred land; we do not consent to the transgressions on our sacred bodies!” However, rather than channel their dissent towards the courts or appeals to elected officials, this Declaration announces their intention to construct “ten solarized Tiny Houses on our land,” an act that they note is just as much about “housing... Secwepemc families, re-establishing our village sites, and asserting our Secwepemc responsibility to our lands and waters” as it is about blocking TMX. I return to the Tiny House Warriors in the third section of this chapter, but want to note here how radically they shift the terms and terrain of the struggle over TMX. To call the Declaration a “refusal” of the state and its legal apparatuses seems to imply a degree of priority that those institutions clearly do not command.

This Declaration embodies a compelling theory of power—echoing the discussion in Chapter Four—in which the space of the political was never confined within the limestone buildings of state capitals, nor even in opposition directed at those presumed ‘centres of power.’

Rather, power here is understood to be produced through collectivities and it is always-already located in and responsible to the living relations of the territories in which those collectivities persist. Moreover, the Declaration engages in struggle from the point of view of the social totality, in which the housing crisis, gendered and sexualized violence, colonial dispossession/destruction of the land and more-than-human kin, and racial capitalism are not discrete issues. Instead they are nested co-constitutively within one another. The Declaration advances a strategy that is similarly robust in its vision for collective liberation; it is, in short, a document of worldmaking much like those discussed in the previous chapter.²¹

One of the broadest public demonstrations of opposition to TMX came on March 10, 2018, when as many as 20,000 people joined the Protect the Inlet March to Burnaby Mountain. Headed by Indigenous leaders from along the proposed pipeline route, but primarily from local nations like səl'ilwətaʔl, Sk̓w̓x̓wú7mesh Úxwumixw, and xʷməθkʷəyəm (Musqueam), the show of immense collective power and solidarity was also the strategically chosen moment in which members of səl'ilwətaʔl revealed a project to both assert their governance *and* strengthen their on-the-ground opposition to TMX. As thousands demonstrated their collective power by marching past the gates of the storage tank facility in defiance of the court's orders, just a stone's throw from the injunction zone a crew under the leadership of Will George busily constructed Kwekwecnewtxw, or "a place to watch from."²² Built in the style of Salish watch houses, Kwekwecnewtxw evokes and actualizes the nations' jurisdictions. In continuity with a millennia-long practice of governance meant to ensure community safety, today the threat that Kwekwecnewtxw guards against is posed by an infrastructure project that is facilitated through, and itself serves to further facilitate, colonial dispossession.²³ Since March of 2018, Kwekwecnewtxw has acted not only as an assertion of Indigenous governance, and as a hub and

home for the grassroots resistance to TMX, it has also been an invaluable bridge spanning Indigenous and settler communities. That Kwekwecnewtxw has sustained itself over such a long duration is enormously educative: both in its direct efforts at community engagement, but also as an example of the capacity that grassroots coalitions have to create and sustain frontlines against the imperial nexus of the state and industry.

Faced with an entrenched and expanding resistance, the responses from the state and industry are perhaps not surprising, even though their brashness should never fail to be shocking. As Lukacs details, responding to the popular upswell against this project, the fossil fuel industry leaned heavily on the state, calling upon politicians to impose a “law and order” regime that advances and protects their infrastructure.²⁴ In 2018 David Dodge, former Governor of the Bank of Canada, told a crowd in Edmonton that as opposition “fanaticism” grew, it made certain that people “are going to die in protesting construction of this pipeline.”²⁵ Though he later walked back his statements, in the days following Cabinet’s approval of TMX, the then Minister of Natural Resources, Jim Carr, seemed to threaten just that, asserting that his government was prepared to advance construction against public dissent. Carr promised to mobilize the Canadian state’s “defence forces... its police forces” if needs be.²⁶ In spite of these assurances, however, the confidence that capital had in the project eroded rapidly in the face of organized resistance and the legal strength of Indigenous peoples’ jurisdictional claims.²⁷ In April 2018, barely a month after Protect the Inlet, Kinder Morgan announced that it was halting all “non-essential activities and related spending” on TMX in order to consult shareholders, setting May 31st as a deadline by which to determine the viability of the project.²⁸ Faced with the imminent collapse of this cornerstone infrastructure project, the Trudeau Cabinet announced on May 29th that the federal government was purchasing Trans Mountain from Kinder Morgan for \$4.5 billion dollars—a sum that included

only existing infrastructure and not the immense, outstanding construction costs.²⁹ The government affirmed its commitment to financing the completion of TMX, in the hopes of later finding a private investor to buy and operate the expanded pipeline.

It was likely because of this increasingly apparent integration of the state and fossil fuel industry that many opponents of TMX responded so jubilantly to the federal Court of Appeals' August 30th ruling against the project in *Tsleil-Waututh vs. Canada* (2018). In Metulia/Victoria, BC, hundreds poured into the downtown core that evening in an impromptu celebration of Dawson's decision to "quash" Cabinet approval of TMX. The possibility that TMX could be defeated so cleanly, and without the need for an even more protracted or escalated struggle, overawed the fact that the Court's decision was, in fact, quite technical and narrow in scope. Far from a decision to "quash" TMX in its entirety, *Tsleil-Waututh* merely remitted approval of the project back to Cabinet for further consideration on two points: (1) a more thorough assessment of the ecological impact on the Salish Sea caused by marine traffic associated with TMX, and (2) to more adequately "explore possible *accommodation* of those concerns" raised by Indigenous peoples and First Nations. Indeed, the Court even went so far as to affirm that Canada had "acted in good faith" in its consultations, even if they had come up somewhat short. No doubt the Court's rosy portrayal was due, in part, to the overly constrained scope of the issues under consideration. For instance, the fact that TMX would significantly contribute to accelerating the climate catastrophe, increasing Canada's overall greenhouse gas emissions by as much as 2%, was only obliquely noted in the Court's reference to an Environment Canada report, but the devastating consequences—both local and global—of this were never directly considered by the Court.

More immediately pertinent to participants in the *Tsleil-Waututh* case itself, however, was the fact that the Court confined the scope of its proceedings to reviewing the process initiated by

the NEB in 2013. Drawing on industry-wide tactics, Kinder Morgan had deliberately minimized the scope of the TMX project's review process by relying on the logic of "pipe in the ground." The potential impact of the project was viewed by the NEB as minimal because it was portrayed as *merely* expanding *existing* infrastructure, rather than establishing *new* corridors.³⁰ Not only does this conceal the enormity of TMX's ecological impact, it also serves to fully elide Canada's historic failure to live up to its own—already highly constrained—duty to consult with Indigenous peoples in the initial construction of Trans Mountain. By choosing to start the clock on the duty to consult only in 2013, the court thereby ignored the reality that Trans Mountain construction began in 1951 in response to a perceived energy crisis in the imperial core generally and as the wave of Canada's most egregious apartheid laws was only just beginning to break. The Court's review of TMX implicitly legitimates the lack of historic consultations—much less consent—with Indigenous peoples all along the route. The circuits of empire are concealed as part of what the courts take to be the always-already built environment, which is understood to be neutral and not an expression of ongoing relations of domination.³¹ Furthermore, as this approach was successful, and it actualized the returns on Kinder Morgan's investment in this "pipe in the ground" strategy, it makes clear how the Canadian state works towards the erasure of Indigenous nations' jurisdictions in a way that "augments and reinforces the intracapitalist coalition supporting and advocating for pipelines and oil infrastructure" on a global scale.³²

Importantly, TMX is not novel in terms of the Courts' using the existence of private property and the built environment to retroactively legitimate the dispossession/displacement of Indigenous peoples.³³ Nor is the state's intervention to salvage and complete a floundering infrastructure project—in order to potentiate its sell-off into private hands—wholly unexpected to students of Canadian history. As Reg Whittaker notes "the basic engine of development in Canada"

has been “*private enterprise at public expense*.”³⁴ Though, pithier commentators have remarked that Canada is simply “three mining companies in a trench coat, wearing a stupid hat and carrying a gun.”³⁵

Section 2: Hegemony...

While intense, the excitement about the *Tsleil-Waututh* decision was short-lived, as the government announced almost immediately that it intended to fulfill the Court’s skeletal outline of the steps necessary to discharge its obligations. It came as little surprise, then, just nine and a half months later on June 18th, 2019, when the government announced with all the false contrition in the world that it had listened to the Court’s calls to “do better” and was now prepared to re-approve TMX.³⁶ Flanked by Ministers Morneau (Finance), McKenna (Environment), MacAulay (Agriculture), and Sohi (Natural Resources), Trudeau’s press conference attempted to execute a major pivot in the conversation around TMX. The strategic reason for the absence of the Ministers of both Crown-Indigenous Relations and Indigenous Services was apparent throughout the press conference in which Trudeau portrayed his critics as mired in false choices between ‘the economy’ and ‘the environment.’ Throughout this conference Trudeau strenuously avoided reckoning with the fact that TMX is contested primarily and most stridently on the grounds that it violates the jurisdictions and self-determination of numerous Indigenous nations.

The promised nation-to-nation relationships with Indigenous peoples—which Trudeau continually asserts are the country’s “most important relationship”—were not mentioned.³⁷ Instead, Trudeau opened this press conference by asserting that his government was elected in 2015 on paired commitments of “growing the middle class” and to “protect our environment and fight climate change.” A rhetorical strategy that seems to evoke the implicit whiteness of the so-called middle class, constituted in part through the near-total exclusion of Indigenous peoples in

this discussion. Implicit in Trudeau's strategy is the suggestion and appeal that he would be seeking re-election only months later, in the fall of 2019, on those same priorities. Alleging that his partisan challengers believed these objectives are irreconcilable, Trudeau insisted that they were not only "complementary" to one another but that TMX is preternaturally capable of threading them together. In spite of the apparent ease with which his government appropriated billions of dollars to purchase fossil fuel infrastructure only a year prior, Trudeau repeatedly emphasized that while he viewed it as absolutely vital, a transition away from fossil fuels would be costly. Trudeau estimated that the tax revenue from TMX "could be around \$500 million per year"—at which rate the government would recoup the cost of its impulse purchase in a mere decade. He went on to outline that the construction and operation of the pipeline will not only create opportunities for people to "earn a good living," he also announced that all revenue earned from the completed TMX would be earmarked to be "invested in Canada's clean energy transition"—this includes "any profits from the sale of the pipeline." In one of the few unprompted references to Indigenous peoples in his press conference, Trudeau indicated that his government is encouraging possible Indigenous buyers. Seemingly, the only way Indigenous nations can have a say over fossil fuel infrastructure in their territories is if they are prepared to bankroll it and absorb its operating costs and risks.

Trudeau sought to deepen his case for TMX by further asserting that the project—increasingly treated as a panacea for all woes—would solve a "core economic problem" facing the fossil fuel industry in Canada. Overlooking the mere externality of the unfolding climate catastrophe, Trudeau asserted that the single biggest crisis facing Canadian fossil fuel exports is that they are beholden to a monopoly buyer. As Trudeau suggested, the fact that nearly all fossil fuels extracted in the territories claimed by Canada are bound for American refineries means that

the price on Canadian oil is dictated south of the 49th Parallel. Never mind that fossil fuel exports are sold on private markets—not primarily to states—or that global commodities trading in crude oil was already in sharp decline, Trudeau was effectively stitching together a case for TMX grounded in an overt petro-nationalism.³⁸ This was made apparent as Trudeau paired a rather obtuse invocation of then-President Donald Trump, and the growing fear Canadians have that “anything can happen with our neighbours to the south,” with his strident assertion that “Canadians are our own people, and we make our own choices.” Given not only the evident fractures that exist around just TMX but also the well noted historic failings of the Canadian state-building project to constitute for itself a coherent “people,” Trudeau’s efforts to leverage TMX as the point of articulation necessary to maintain the hegemony of the Canadian historic bloc could hardly be more apparent.³⁹

The political left in Canada also has its own long and twisting relationship with economic nationalism, typically grounded in anti-Americanism—see Chapter One's discussion of how this has tended to preclude a direct contestation with settler imperialism—but which has recently aligned itself with petro-nationalism.⁴⁰ The political and ideological work that Trudeau’s press conference did, however, is of a different species than even those troubled projects. It is a near perfect embodiment of what Lukacs calls “the Trudeau formula,” which he distills as a political program advancing the promise of “changeless change.” As Trudeau appropriates the rhetoric and affects of more progressive, at times even radical, political movements, his actual policies make clear that “his goal was not to transform the status quo but to smoothly defend it.”⁴¹ What is more, is that as Trudeau maintains this rhetoric while in office—in flagrant contradiction of the real consequences of his policies—the Trudeau formula is in fact a striking development in the classic Liberal Party playbook of ‘campaigning from the left, governing from the right.’⁴²

Despite the vigour of Lukacs' analysis, I believe he underemphasizes the enormity of what the Trudeau formula achieves. Far from merely a cynical electoral strategy, I want to suggest that by maintaining adherence to a rhetoric of social/economic/environmental justice while pursuing policies directly antithetical to those goals, Trudeau has stumbled upon a major ideological project that is causing a massive reduction in the horizon of the politically possible. To suggest that Trudeau is merely appropriating, misusing, and denuding more transformative or radical political discourses is to identify only one half of the ideological work being done. More troublingly, the deeper consequence of the Trudeau formula is that it actually does *transmute* the public meaning that associates his soaring rhetoric with the relatively paltry policy content accompanying the discourses that he appropriates. Put more plainly: for the vast majority of casual observers of national politics—which, in a society as thoroughly depoliticized and demobilized as is Canada, constitutes the vast majority of people—there is no necessary contradiction between Trudeau's appropriation of transformative rhetoric and his status quo politics. Rather, many come, wholly understandably, to associate that otherwise transformative rhetoric with the continuity of the material conditions under which a sizeable and growing majority of them continue to struggle day-to-day. By pairing the rhetoric of transformation with the actual continuity of the status quo, the Trudeau formula achieves a subtle coup by making concrete the Thatcherite slogan that 'there is no alternative.' Because the rhetoric of an alternative is merely being plastered over the continuity of the same.

This is perhaps nowhere more apparent than in the case of Trudeau's pursuit of "reconciliation" with Indigenous peoples—a project that's meaning is so perverted as to have somehow become congruent with multiple invasions and occupations of untreated lands by paramilitary police in order to remove Indigenous land/water defenders from their territories at the

behest of private interests. Such is the toxic vacuity of the Trudeau formula, that grassroots leaders like Freda Huson of the Wet'suwet'en nation and director of the Unist'ot'en Camp declared, in light of the very real violence that she and her nation continue to face, that “reconciliation is dead.”⁴³

I should note that part of the Trudeau formula's success is contingent on the contemporary partisan landscape in which Trudeau operates. Briefly stated, this is one in which an increasingly verbose and outwardly reactionary Conservative Party and its surrogates have been only too ready to denigrate Trudeau as some sort of rabid “social justice warrior.”⁴⁴ This charge only serves to reify Trudeau's false claims of pursuing a transformative politics; as, by comparison, the Tories' often unhinged rhetoric allows him to seem more reasonable to some and sinisterly revolutionary to others. At the same time, the ostensible parliamentary left, embodied predominantly by the New Democratic Party (NDP), has—by the admission of many of its own supporters—abandoned positions that are even marginally oppositional to such dominant social relations as capitalism, settler colonialism, white supremacy, cisheteropatriarchy, (dis)ableism, etc.⁴⁵ Their evacuation of seriously oppositional politics means that there exists no more compelling challenge to Trudeau on the grounds of a meaningful program of, or vision for, actual social justice. The Trudeau formula is thus able to curtail dramatically the horizon of political possibility largely because—on the partisan landscape of electoral politics—it is unchallenged from the left and is perversely validated in its self-presentation from the right. Given this, the emergence of a project of counter-hegemony in rebuttal to Trudeau's June 18th re-approval of TMX is all the more remarkable.

Section 3: ...and Anti-colonial Strategy

As Trudeau and company wrapped up in Ottawa, across the continent another press conference hosted at səl'ilwətaʔl was beginning.⁴⁶ This press conference was remarkable not only

in that it modelled a different relationship to place—the abstracted distance of the state-eye-view from Ottawa was displaced by systems of governance firmly rooted with/in the territories threatened by TMX—it also displayed a strikingly more dispersed theory of power and authority.⁴⁷ Contrasting the singular authority of the Prime Minister and his Cabinet, on stage in this second press conference were representatives from səl'ilwətaʔl, Skwxwú7mesh Úxwumixw, and x^wməθk^wəyəm, alongside other Indigenous leadership from Sumas First Nation, Tsartlip First Nation, the Neskonlith Indian Band, and Stewart Phillip, the Grand Chief of the Union of BC Indian Chiefs; also on stage were Vancouver Mayor Kennedy Stewart and City Councillor Jean Swanson—both of whom had been arrested on Burnaby Mountain. Embodying a commitment to polyvocality and internationalism, this press conference centred on the imminent and very material threat that TMX poses to each and all of the communities represented there. As Rueben George (səl'ilwətaʔl) stated in his introductory comments, those gathered on the stage did so because Trudeau's actions in re-approving TMX “are hurting Canadians.” This necessitates the formation of a coalition prepared to “protect what we love” in a way that is grounded in Indigenous governance systems that teach the necessity of working “to protect all the human beings on our lands and waters, that's *our* law.” Chief Leah George-Wilson (səl'ilwətaʔl) affirmed this sentiment. She asserted that her “obligation is not to oil. Our obligation is to the land, the water, to our people, to the whales” and that none of the Prime Minister's comments or consultation processes had adequately addressed those concerns or the risks that his Cabinet is imposing on her nation and their obligations.

Chief Dalton Silver (Sumas First Nation) noted that what this boils down to is a shared responsibility to protect the Salish Sea from harm. This responsibility exists far beyond the shoreline of the Sea itself, Silver continued, it begins hundreds of miles inland at the Fraser River's

headwaters and flows downstream through the territories of his own nation. This is radically distinct from the abstracted, Cartesian thinking of the Cabinet and the NEB, the excesses of which had treated the Salish Sea as somehow separable from the over-land route of the pipeline. Such a reductive and terrestrial-centric mode of governing ultimately resulted in the *Tsleil-Waututh* decision forcing a temporary delay of TMX so that the project's impacts on the Salish Sea could be considered. By contrast, Silver articulates his nation's theory of responsible governance as one that is produced through and bound-up in the actual material relationships of the territories in which it is situated. Sumas is not connected to the nations and communities upstream from and around the Salish Sea merely as a consequence of the inevitable common destruction that TMX represents, they are primarily connected through the life sustaining relationships embodied in flows of water, runs of salmon, and the political alliances that are embedded within and have enhanced those relationships since time immemorial. Canada's vision of territoriality occludes these relationship from the work of governance in all forms excepting as objects over which state authority is deemed to be supreme. This is as concrete an enunciation of how Trudeau's pursuit of TMX manifests the countersovereignty of imperial regimes as one is likely to find. Grand Chief Phillip made this all the more clear by noting that his sense of déjà vu at the Cabinet's announcement is a consequence of the fact that for Indigenous peoples persisting in their governance under direct threat from the colonial state is very much "another day at the office," even as he staunchly asserts that "Indigenous peoples walking... in solidarity with their friends and neighbours and their allies" in collective struggle is the pathway towards victory over this particular project and over Project Canada generally.

To at least some degree, this united front can be helpfully understood as an effort to build and to make visible a *counter-hegemonic* formation that challenges the ongoing accomplishment

of the petro-nationalist hegemony forwarded by the Canadian federal government. As William Carroll notes, the “deep transformation” portended by counter-hegemonic struggles “gets its start on, and draws much of its vitality from, the immediate field of the conjunctural, in resistance to the agenda of the dominant hegemony.”⁴⁸ Put more simply, while they often appear as both primarily *responsive* to the actions of the constituted power and confined to seemingly *particular* issues or interests, the deeper undercurrents of counter-hegemonic struggles envision a truly radical uprooting of the dominant order. Importantly, the strategic terrain of counter-hegemony is also embedded in struggles that are of immediate and material consequence to the communities with/in whom solidarity and affinity are being built, rather than persisting predominantly in the realm of pure ideals. Struggling towards this deep transformation, counter-hegemonic formations seek to draw “together subaltern social forces around an alternative ethico-political conception of the world, constructing a common interest.”⁴⁹ The shared threat that TMX represents to these communities has contributed to a conjuncture in which the articulation of a common front between First Nations and municipalities becomes both politically possible and socially necessary in combatting the unfolding disaster orchestrated by and through the Canadian state. Moreover, inasmuch as Indigenous-led decolonization struggles are always local and emplaced in character, requiring alliances or ententes with neighbouring communities, and insomuch as TMX is a particular struggle in the much wider battle against climate catastrophe, the coalition stepping forward to challenge Trudeau embodies a genuinely transformational critique of the dominant order. It represents both a resurgence of systems of governance which the settler state had sought to suppress and destroy, as well as the potential disarticulation of segments of the state’s historic bloc.

This coalition against TMX reflects Carroll’s account of counter-hegemonic struggles in another important way. Carroll writes that, for a counter-hegemonic movement to “walk on both legs” it is “elemental” that it engage in a struggle that aims at “reclaiming the state.” While Carroll insists that this is a matter of strategic—rather than normative—importance and that the state need not be “privileged” as *the* site of struggle, a concerted effort towards “democratizing state practices” must be “understood as one part of broader transformations.”⁵⁰ Put plainly, the state’s ability to martial both considerable violence, but also enormous capacity, means that it must be taken seriously as a terrain of political struggle. This is a point which is likely all too apparent to those on stage at səl’ilwətaʔl responding to Trudeau’s press conference, given the deprivation forced on First Nations by the Indian Act and the strain endured by municipal governments under neoliberalization—not to mention the slipping mask of liberal toleration revealed by comments like Dodge and Carr’s, or the clear evidence of state-industry collusion through the capture of ostensible regulatory bodies like the NEB.

Chief George-Wilson’s promise that səl’ilwətaʔl will continue the fight against TMX using “all legal tools” should, I think, be read in this vein as being one part of a counter-hegemonic struggle. Far from an effort to seek recognition from the colonial government, or an acceptance of any normatively meaningful ‘legitimacy’ within that institution, the strategy that səl’ilwətaʔl and its allies are pursuing is one that leverages the internal contradictions of the Canadian state to their own—anti-colonial—purposes. Whereas many persist in presenting the state as a unified and homogeneous thing, the strategy being pursued against TMX is premised on the political utility derived from the existence of contradictions between the governing logics of various state apparatuses.⁵¹ Analogously, this strategy pursues at an institutional level what many in Chapter Four sought to do at a grassroots or sociological level—meaning it’s focused less on appeals to

competing interests within the state, but rather on the contradictory logics of how various apparatuses of the state function in seeking to legitimate and reproduce themselves. The relatively immediate electoral logics that capture the legislative and executive branches, incentivizing their commitments towards a market-logic of quarterly returns that necessitate the diminution of Indigenous peoples' political authority, runs into contradiction when it confronts the courts' commitment to stabilizing colonization and Crown sovereignty over the *longue durée*, a project that can accommodate a comparatively capacious conception of Aboriginal rights as outlined by the Canadian judiciary. Leveraging the spaces of contradiction that exist between the multiple logics contained within the state is an effective strategy that, since the *Calder* decision (1973), has used the judicial elements of the state to significantly curtail many of Canada's most egregious colonial excesses.

Importantly, this is *not* pointing to the existence of so-called checks and balances—that is, these are not *designed* elements of a democratic process within a state that's actually open to deeply transformative visions. Rather, it reveals the existence within the state of multiple colonial logics that can both articulate with, but also contradict one another. In spite of the potential that struggles within the judicial sphere have unlocked, the foundational commitment of the judiciary to colonization is widely understood. Long noted by grassroots Indigenous leaders and scholars, the courts themselves freely admit it when they acknowledge that it is beyond the scope of their powers to interrogate the Canadian Crown's assertion of allodial title.⁵² Nevertheless, using the space that *does* exist here requires no normative commitment to the state as such, it is a matter of strategy rather than necessarily ceding anything that can be meaningfully called legitimacy. As Olúfẹmi Táíwò makes clear, the gap between the course of public action available to individual or collective actors and their actual normative commitments is a function of the social relations of power and

the appraised likelihood of success and consequences attendant to failure, not of any necessary adherence to the supposed legitimacy of dominant institutions.⁵³

Section 4: Sending out Grassroots in an Extinction Event

It is, *in part*, because of the fact that the multiple apparatuses constituting the state share a foundational, if differentially enacted, commitment to maintaining colonization and settler imperialism that Indigenous peoples and other subject populations have always pursued a diversity of anti-imperialist strategies. While strategies of counter-hegemony—engaging anti-imperialist struggles within/against the terrain of existing state apparatuses—have yielded crucial victories, many Indigenous leaders and scholars assert that, ultimately, liberation cannot be achieved through state avenues alone. Rather, they emphasize the importance of Indigenous governance systems and resurgent cultural practices as an embodiment of their nations’ jurisdictions throughout their territories.⁵⁴ Further, each of these scholars point towards the necessity of maintaining, developing, and strengthening a host of relationships within and beyond their nations in order to advance this struggle. Their thinking resonates with the activist archive from Chapter Four, attempting to develop decolonization as the name for the struggle towards collective liberation from empire, capitalism, cisheteropatriarchy, (dis)ableism, white supremacy, etc. Moreover, as I stated in the introduction, Indigenous governance systems exist both prior to and without any necessary reference to the processes of imperialism through which they persist. As such, they represent one of the most enduring infrastructures of the freedom struggle in North America. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson describes this precisely when she writes that the processes of resurgence are, in many ways, “just Indigenous life as it has always unfolded.”⁵⁵ This is also striking in its resonance with how Chief Silver characterized Sumas First Nation’s self-determination as being about a fulfillment of the obligation to defend the land and waters that sustain his nation and all

those who live in their territories. Just as Chief Silver is engaged in a vital counter-hegemonic struggle which attempts to leverage the state's internal contradictions, creating space for those obligations to be pursued without threat of colonial violence, those who are focused on *grassroots* strategies for resurgence pursue those obligations without seeking to make them cognizable within colonial structures. By being inattentive to these dynamics, to the primacy of Indigenous self-determination on the ground, many non-Indigenous commentators continue to miss some of the most transformative anti-imperialist work of worldmaking from below—the grassroots resistance to TMX is no different.

Before discussing the Tiny House build and the accompanying march, it feels necessary to make a few clear delineations. Given the preceding discussion and some of the literature with which I have been engaged throughout this dissertation, some may equate the following discussion with political movements that scholars like Carroll (disparagingly) and Richard Day (approvingly) describe as being committed to anti-hegemonic strategies.⁵⁶ “Anti-hegemonic” does *not*, however, properly describe the relationships I discuss as they are at work on the ground, because the very question of hegemony (and whether it is to be retained, resisted, or rejected) gives undue priority to the state as *the* space of politics. At once fully recognizing the importance of movement and dynamism *within* and *between* Indigenous governance systems—both in terms of actual geographic mobility and in terms of cultural movements—I nevertheless ask that the reader take Indigenous self-determination as their lodestar in understanding what I describe as politics at the “grassroots” that is set against TMX and the whole imperial infrastructure of which it is only one part.⁵⁷ This framing is, importantly, *not* my own creation but rather comes out of the vernacular of the very organizing communities that it describes.

Delineating further, while the image of the “grassroots” seems tailor-made to evoke the notion of a politics “from below,” this is an affiliation with which I initially was uncertain, but have come to embrace over the course of this project.⁵⁸ While I have long shared many of the political and intellectual commitments that scholars like Jakeet Singh expertly describe as part of their method of seeing the space of politics “from below,” its presentation of a seemingly hierarchical relationship felt inapt for the context in which I am thinking here.⁵⁹ This is because, even as it seeks to describe suppressed but still extant agency within actually existing relations of domination and exploitation, the framing of above/below seemed—inadvertently—to recapitulate the erasure of Indigenous political authority by subordinating it to the presumed priority of imperial systems.⁶⁰ My understanding that the self-determination of Indigenous nations is better interpreted as neither *below*, nor as necessarily vying *against* empire through counter-/anti-hegemonic strategies, but rather as fully constituted and extant orders of political authority *in their own right* led me to reject this description. The *Women’s Declaration*, cited above, incapsulates this; for, inasmuch as it is evidently *against* TMX’s man camps, this is staked from a *prior* commitment to the exercise of, and responsibilities attendant to, their self-determination as Secwepemc. As implied by the *Declaration*, TMX is trespassing upon their territories and authority, the primacy of which militates against characterizing their actions (and the actions of those supporting them) as reactive. Upon reflection, though, I have increasingly felt that my initial reaction reads the phrase ‘from below’ in an overly normative light—smuggling in airy conceptions of good or bad based on cultural baggage associated with various topographical metaphors—instead of seeing it as a concrete analysis of domination and exploitation. That is, that such Indigenous self-determination is a struggle from below *not* in terms of primacy, but in terms of organizational strategy against empire. As such, I have come not only to embrace the heuristic

of being ‘from below,’ but also to see in it a different, more earthy set of subterranean metaphors. A space where grassroots can flourish, if you will.⁶¹

As the coalition assembled at səl’ilwətaʔl announced their continued commitment to the fight against TMX, across the Salish Sea in the territories of the Lkwungen and WSÁNEĆ peoples, volunteers tidied up an empty lot just outside of the downtown core of Metulia/Victoria. Over the past ten days, this space had seen a flurry of activity around the construction of a mobile Tiny House in solidarity with the Tiny House Warriors of the Secwepemc nation. As noted above, the Tiny House Warriors announced in 2017 that they intended to use a fleet of tiny houses to assert their jurisdiction as Secwepemc women and that, as a consequence of their grounded authority, TMX could not pass through Secwepemcul’ecw—this was their fourth Tiny House overall, and the third one built in Metulia/Victoria.

While imperfect and uncertain in the same ways as is any political project, this Tiny House build was remarkable for the ways in which it drew upon, thickened, and generated relationships within and across the various communities that surrounded it. Perhaps most in evidence, are those clear networks of solidarity between the Island and Secwepemcul’ecw that brought the build into being in the first place. In someways this is manifested by sending material support ‘upstream,’ in order to strengthen and advance a frontline that is understood to be in defence of all those who are ‘downstream.’ Vital infrastructures of solidarity, also existed *within* and *around* the build-site itself. Volunteers working on the House were supported by the socially reproductive labour of others, as lunches were provided by individuals and affinity-based community groups like Food Not Bombs or the Community Cabbage meal program. Leftovers typically made their way to community-houses or else were dropped off at nearby food programs. Artists also proved pivotal in this build. Visual artists donated designs and studios for producing screen-printed t-shirts that

were sold on a pay-what-you-can basis to cover build costs. Likewise musicians hosted a fundraising dance-party with an accompanying silent auction of art and craftworks. Members of the Fearless Collective also hosted a workshop on the build-site for Indigenous and racialized community members, out of which came the creative vision for a mural that accompanied the House to Secwepemcul'ecw, celebrating the Indigenous women, matriarchs, and femme and non-binary people—those most targeted by extractive industry and its attendant violences—who are “Protecting What Heals Us” in the face of the threat posed by TMX.

A series of “Tiny House Talks” were also held on the build-site most nights after construction wrapped, with the explicit aim of political education, as well as of broadening and deepening the community’s intellectual and practical tools for engaging anti-imperialist work. Workshops linked the struggle against imperialism in Canada to struggles in the Middle East, the South Pacific, and Latin America; they developed tactical strategies about the tools for targeted direct action; and they interrogated how we carry the co-constitutive logics of empire within our daily, intimate lives. It was out of these Tiny House Talks that a vision for the future work of this community was brought forward by Tsastilqualus, an Indigenous matriarch and salmon warrior. That vision eventually culminated several months later in the Little Big House build, a crucial step forward in the struggle to evict fish farming operations from Kwakwaka'wakw waters in the Broughton Archipelago and to rematriate Ma' amtagila territories. Likewise, the relationships built in and through the construction of the Tiny House and the Little Big House became a vital infrastructure of solidarity only months later as the community mobilized around direct action during the uprisings that occurred following Canada’s 2020 re-invasion of the Wet'suwet'en nation's yintah.

In spite of the vibrancy of the political space created through this flurry of activity and despite the enormity of the TMX debate at the time, the Tiny House received almost no media attention during construction. The sole exception was a lone cameraperson from local news, who showed up to the build-site after being tipped-off that houseless people may be congregating in order to establish a tent city. That a tent city appears as red meat to media, but direct action to produce housing of which the residents are in full control of does not is a telling insight on their priorities. Media coverage only turned towards the Tiny House as a consequence of the 20km march on June 22nd that sent the House up the Saanich Peninsula on to govern and defend Secwepemcul'ecw. The march itself was truly stunning: as the sun rose over the Salish Sea, hundreds of supporters gathered in Centennial Square, where they were welcomed by local elders. Within the hour a stream of hundreds of people poured into the streets, headed by representatives of the Tiny House Warriors and of Kwekwecnewtxw, and tailed by the Tiny House itself—adorned with a banner that read “decolonization or mass extinction.” The incredible reach of the internationalist grassroots coalition opposed to TMX and the terms of the struggle were in full evidence, as members from dozens of nations up and down the coast and beyond were in the streets together. Winding through the city, drum circles and round dances were set up at various intersections and bridges, temporarily (re)claiming civic infrastructure, declaring themselves and this struggle as the present antérieur of an anti-imperialist future tense. As it moved up the Peninsula, members of local nations came out to greet the march, welcoming their relations to the territories with food, stories, drums, and company. Nearly twelve hours and just over 20kms later, the Tiny House pulled into Island View Park, where a feast was held to celebrate this resurgence of Indigenous governance and the broad coalition that empowers and sustains it.

Unsurprisingly, significant media attention arrived only as a consequence of the march closing the entirety of north-bound traffic on a major arterial highway—which, as we saw in Chapter Two are a primary technology of settler imperialism—for several hours. Despite ample warning about the coming disruptions from the march organizers, media portrayed this event as an almost thoughtless and eruptive act of indiscriminate disruption. While entirely predictable, the nature of this media slant is nevertheless worth analyzing, especially some of the leading local commentary as I consider it a revealing window into how the space of the political is reflexively and dominantly constructed. Particularly revealing in this vein was a piece authored by the Victoria-based *Times Colonist*'s editorial board on June 25th, originally entitled “Highway March a Plodding Farce”—though the online version was later retitled to: “Effective protests can be difficult. Just look at Saturday’s effort.”⁶² In the editorial, as in Trudeau’s press conference, the march and the resistance to TMX that it is a part of were reduced to an environmentalist protest—there was no mention about the assertion of Indigenous nations’ self-determination, despite it being core to, and at the front of, everything. Reduced to this singular axis, the authors suggest that the march had made a “mockery” of its own cause. Primarily the authors took umbrage at the idea that a so-called ‘climate’ march may have inconvenienced or delayed motorists; a charge which led them to assert that for every extra ounce of gasoline burnt because of the increased traffic difficulties that this action certainly *did* cause, the march was an effort “that reeked of hypocrisy.”

Setting aside the impossibly zero-sum nature of the efficacy calculation to which this editorial wants to hold environmentalist movements, I think it is even more striking for the theory of power and political authority that it evidences. The authors write that, confronted by the “life and death” reality of the climate catastrophe, “[w]e need answers and we need solutions.” As such, they implore their readers and, especially, those who participated in the march to “become part of

the solution” by making an effort to “talk to decision-makers.” The editorial continues that “we need to convince those in power, around the world, that something must be done quickly.” While this is simply presented as common-sense, the authors are in fact reifying a conception of power and authority as necessarily ‘power-over,’ the power to command or direct. They specifically treat that power-over as also being simultaneously power wielded at a distance, to which one must make an appeal, supplication, or—in the most extreme cases—a protest. Moreover, given the presence of numerous Indigenous leaders, First Nations and municipal representatives whose presence in the march can be taken to indicate their own decisionary capacity, clearly only *certain* (read: colonial) institutional positions are seen within the editors’ minds as having been imbued with power. In short, power here is presumed as the property of those who hold state offices and, perhaps, the upper echelons of the corporate world.

Coincidentally, within the very same week that the *Colonist* published its editorial, the United Nations (UN) Human Rights Council’s Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights released a report on “Climate change and poverty.”⁶³ In a truly daunting assessment of the ecological and social crises brought on by anthropogenic climate change, the Special Rapporteur warns of the “climate apartheid” that is solidifying globally. Those regions, countries, cities, neighbourhoods, and households with the means are already isolating themselves against the impacts of the climate catastrophe.⁶⁴ Given the structure of the world system of racial capitalism this means, perversely, that those most insulated are also the inheritors and, in many cases, the very agents instrumentally responsible for perpetuating the causes of climate catastrophe in the first place. Meanwhile the world’s most poor and marginalized peoples—disproportionately non-white, disproportionately non-masculine, disproportionately disabled, and disproportionately Indigenous—are actively, and as a matter of policy decisions, being left to fend for themselves.

That same report warns that “the best-case outcome is widespread death and suffering by the end of this century,” the worst: humanity on “the brink of extinction.” Clearly, then, this report shares in the editorial’s sense that climate change generally, but as also specific projects like TMX that expand and lock-in fossil fuel extraction and consumption, are matters of life and death. Interestingly, however, whereas the *Colonist* critiqued the Indigenous-led grassroots resistance to TMX as missing an opportunity to engage with ‘those *in power*,’ the Special Rapporteur asserts that because states are power structures that “overwhelmingly stand for the status quo,” they are therefore “unlikely to take a strong lead when radical change is needed.” In the Rapporteur’s assessment, the “real driving force for progress can only come from community mobilization.”

The Rapporteur’s diagnosis is significant for a number of reasons that are of direct interest to discussions that have animated various parts of this project. First, while they clearly recognize the dominative and extortionary capacities wielded by states, the Rapporteur also mobilizes a theory of power as always-already power-with—akin to the argument I advanced in Chapter Four. The reason for the intransigence of many states (especially those most powerful states within the imperial core) in the face of this existential crisis is not a matter of lack of knowledge, capacity, or even incentive. More pressingly, it’s not epiphenomenal to what states are either.⁶⁵ That is, this is not simply a matter of an historical accident in which bad actors are making bad decisions at a moment of crisis, to which the easy solution is installing good actors who will make good decisions, such as preventing the collapse of planetary ecosystems by curbing the power of fossil capital. Rather, as the Rapporteur makes clear, because states are themselves the manifestations of particular, dominant social relations, they ‘stand for the status quo’ because they are the product of, and primary point of reproduction for, precisely those interests that profit off or benefit from things as they are. Put differently, the state is just another manifestation of the same social relations

that *are themselves the crisis*. Thus, again, it is the particular formation—the historic bloc—of social relations on which the state rests, and of which it is merely an institutional expression (albeit one that certainly contains the contradictions of those relations), that shapes in whose interests it is prepared to act. Crucially, this explains how the Canadian state in particular, but much of the state system especially within the imperial core, exercises its monopolistic delegation of ‘legitimated’ violence to exert power—with private interests representing an infinitesimally small and ever-shrinking global minority, in order to structure and reproduce the apparatus of climate apartheid.

This report also lays bare the necessity of coming to grips with the fact that, inasmuch as it is composed of those who are most directly affected by the consequences—especially the ecological consequences, which are always matters of life and death—of empire, the space of grassroots politics is *the leading* place from which to engage in transformative struggle and to pursue the work of worldmaking. As I’ve suggested, in North America—as elsewhere in the world—Indigenous nations are among the most enduring infrastructures of solidarity in such struggle. Crucially, however, this will also likely necessitate that the masses within the imperial core recognize their only modestly delayed fate in the face of climate apartheid and break from their role as a bulwark of global racial capitalism. But this is no small feat in the face of the overwhelming ideological apparatuses set into motion manufacturing not only quiescence but often fervent support for intensified and increasingly brutal nationalism in the face of climate refugees.⁶⁶ Therein lies much of the work of political struggle within the imperial core today. Again, the Rapporteur’s call for grassroots political struggle is not an abstracted, essentialist, or transhistorical claim. Rather it is conjunctural, it seeks to grasp not only the problem at its roots,

but also to map the possible formation of an alternative historical bloc—composed of those on the under side of climate apartheid—that must recognize and assert itself.

Most generously, the *Colonist*'s scathing editorial is read as a form of realpolitik. However, their understanding of power—which is widely shared—as an object of state offices erases the reality that *all* power, including that of the state, derives from social relations and is produced and reproduced through processes of collective action. The distinction, then, is not in abstract questions of form, but rather in always ongoing analyses of the concrete consequences of those social relations. Realizing how tightly the *Colonist* hews to this rigidly statist theory of power reveals the bleak irony of their crescendoing coda that “[w]e need answers and we need solutions. We should not expect to get them from those souls who are easily led.” Far from being easily led, I think of those who participated in the Tiny House Build, the march, and who are defending Secwepemcul’ecw and all the territories downstream from TMX—which is to say, all of us—as remarkable for the degree to which they understand themselves and their comrades as historically situated, collectively empowered, and therefore responsible actors. Rather than seeking anyone’s advice on what constitutes ‘effective protest,’ these grassroots strategies set aside the logic of offering *protestations* to those ‘in power.’ Instead, they participate in the always internationalist work of (re)asserting Indigenous governance systems in ways that eschew appeals to the hegemonic order entirely. This collectively produced, grassroots politics does not appeal to or protest those ‘with’ power, because in its collectivity it is itself a manifestation of power.

As media responses to the march reveal, most often that collective power is made broadly legible when it is read as being asserted against the constituted authority of the state and industry through blockades, the withdrawal of labour power, or riotous acts. But the true strength of this grassroots politics, this struggle for decolonization from below, is not in what it necessarily seeks

to *abolish*—the actually existing infrastructure, institutions, and social relations of empire. While the necessity of abolition in order to enable the flourishing of otherwise ways of being cannot be forgotten, the strength of grassroots politics lies, ultimately, in what they *defend* and what they *produce*. That is, the territories that support the flourishing of life itself, the systems of governance that have learned over millennia how to accommodate themselves to the places in which they have grown, and the human and more-than-human relations that embrace and enhance both. In short, the social relations—presently expressed as infrastructures of solidarity and resistance—that enable a struggle to remake a world in which all flourishing is truly mutual.

Conclusion:

Left out of both the NEB's assessment of TMX and absent from Justice Dawson's recounting of the 'relevant' facts of the case is the much longer historical role played by Trans Mountain as a critical infrastructure for maintaining the preponderant power of settler imperialism. Original construction of the Trans Mountain pipeline in 1951 and was motivated, in part, as a response by the imperial core to the globally rising tide of anti-colonial struggles. Most acutely, Mohammad Mosaddegh's ascendancy to the premiership of Iran, on an electoral platform of popular reforms including the nationalization of oil resources hitherto dominated by British Petroleum, provided the rhetorical backdrop against which Canadian investors and politicians accelerated the Trans Mountain project. As detailed by Laura Gray, the supposed threat posed to the imperial core by the Iranian people securing for themselves both the benefits resultant from, and control over, the use of their natural resources was to be counter-posed by Canada's expansion and entrenchment of fossil fuel extraction from, and transport through, the territories of numerous unconsenting Indigenous nations for export to global markets.⁶⁷ While the British and Americans were predominantly responsible for launching both the initial campaign of red-baiting and the

eventual fully-fledged counterrevolution against Mosaddegh, Canada too was clearly prepared to play its part in securing racial capitalism on a global scale. Karuka's observation that settler empire works through logics of countersovereignty—constantly recomposing itself in response to resistance movements—is made abundantly clear here, as the success of anti-colonial struggles elsewhere are used as a perverse justification to further entrench the dispossession of, and environmental threats to, Indigenous peoples within the territories claimed by Canada. As Canadian petro-nationalism solidified as a cornerstone of the settler project in response to growing Iranian self-determination struggles, Trans Mountain was birthed and is being re-born today as a stop-gap in the faltering circuitry of imperial domination. But a world linked through imperial circuits is also a world linked in struggles for collective liberation.

To focus solely on the circuits of imperialism is to persist in a mode of scholarship that assumes a states-eye-view as *the* lens on the political.⁶⁸ Rather than continuing in Political Science's oldest traditions of seeing like a state, in this chapter I attempted to understand the struggle against TMX as an Indigenous-led project of anti-imperialist internationalism, which has manifestations that orient themselves to the spaces of politics in ways that are informed by logics of both counter-hegemony and grassroots coalition-building. More to the point, in accounting for these struggles I have attempted to show the primacy of Indigenous self-determination as an infrastructure within these freedom struggles, expressed through modes of governing social relations that build on the inter-generational production and transference of knowledges that emerge with/in the places in which they are situated, and that are made possible through their articulations with others around the globe.

To displace the centrality of the state in this account is not to deny its importance; indeed, such displacement is, in fact, necessary in order to see how these anti-imperialist struggles have

and continue to (re)politicize the state in ways that very often outstrip the tools of critique and analysis held dear by political scientists. As the horizon of political possibilities provided within the confines of liberal democracy continues shrinking or transforming into more authoritarian and reactionary versions of itself, these struggles—linked with countless others—are reminders of our not only our collective power to build, deconstruct, and rebuild our social relations on co-constitutive scales ranging from the home to the world system, but of our fundamental obligation to do so.

Works Cited

Scholarly Materials:

- Abella, Irving Martin. *Nationalism, Communism, and Canadian Labour: The CIO, the Communist Party, and the Canadian Congress of Labour 1935-1956*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.
- Abrams, Philip. "Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State (1977)." *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1(1) (March 1988).
- Abu-Laban, Yasmeen. "Narrating Canadian Political Science: History Revisited." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(4) (2017): 895-919.
- Abu-Laban, Yasmeen, and Christina Gabriel. *Selling Diversity: Immigration, Multiculturalism, Employment Equity, and Globalization*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2002.
- Adams, Howard. *Prison of Grass: Canada from a Native Point of View* 2nd Edition. Toronto: Fifth House Books, 1995 [1975].
- Adler-Bolton, Beatrice, and Artie Vierkant. *Health Communism: A Surplus Manifesto*. Toronto: Penguin Random House, 2022.
- Ahmed, Sara. *Willful Subjects*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2014.
- Ajzenstat, Janet, and Peter J Smit. *Canada's Origins: Liberal, Tory, or Republican?* Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1995.
- Allard-Tremblay, Yann, and Elaine Coburn. "The Flying Heads of Settler Colonialism; or the Ideological Erasures of Indigenous Peoples in Political Theorizing." *Political Studies* (June 2021).
- Amborn, Hermann. *Law as Refuge of Anarchy: Societies without Hegemony or State*. Translated by Adrian Nathan West. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2019 [2016].
- Amin, Samir. *Eurocentrism: Modernity, Religion, and Democracy A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism*. Translated by Russell Moore and James Membrez. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2009 [1988].
- Andersen, Chris. "*Métis*": *Race, Recognition, and the Struggle for Indigenous Peoplehood*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014.
- Anderson, Perry. *Lineages of the Absolutist State*. London: Verso, 2013 [1974].
- Anwar, Arif. "Canadian Immigration Policy: Micro and Macro Issues with the Points Based Assessment System." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 46(1) (2014): 169-179.
- Asch, Michael. *On Being Here to Stay: Treaties and Aboriginal Rights in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.
- Baloy, Natalie JK. "Spectacles and spectres: settler colonial spaces in Vancouver." *Settler Colonial Studies* (2015).
- Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950-1350*, (London: Penguin Books, 1993).

- Barker, Adam J. "Locating Settler Colonialism." *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 13(3) (Winter 2012).
- Barker, Adam J, and Jenny Pickerill. "Radicalizing Relationships To and Through Shared Geographies: Why Anarchists Need to Understand Indigenous Connections to Land and Place." *Antipode* 45(5) (November 2012): 1705-1725.
- Barker, Adam J, and Russell Myers Ross. "Reoccupation and resurgence: indigenous protest camps in Canada." In Gavin Brown, et. al, editors. *Protest Camps in International Context: Spaces, Infrastructures and Media of Resistance*. Bristol: Policy Press, 2018.
- Barker, Joanne. *Red Scare: The State's Indigenous Terrorist*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2022.
- Barker, Joanne. Edition. *Critically Sovereign: Indigenous Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017.
- Basok, Tanya, Danièle Bélanger, and Eloy Rivas. "Reproducing Deportability: Migrant Agricultural Workers in South-western Ontario." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(9) (2014): 1394-1413.
- Beaulieu, Alain. *The Congress at Niagara in 1764: Historical context and meaning of the British-Aboriginal Negotiations*. Ottawa: Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, 2017.
- Belich, James. *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783-1939*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Bell, Duncan. *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- Berger, Carl. *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970.
- Berlinski, Claire. *"There Is No Alternative": Why Margaret Thatcher Matters*. New York: Basic Books, 2008.
- Bhandar, Brenna. *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2018.
- Bhatia, Amar. "We Are All Here to Stay? Indigeneity, Migration, and Decolonizing the Treaty Right to Be Here." *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice* 31(1) (2013).
- Biermann, Werner, and Reinhart Kössler. "The Settler Mode of Production: The Rhodesian Case." *Review of African Political Economy* 7(18) (1980): 106–16.
- Binford, Leigh. *Tomorrow We're All Going to the Harvest: Temporary Foreign Workers Programs and Neoliberal Political Economy*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2013.
- Bishop, Anne. *Becoming an Ally: Breaking the Cycle of Oppression in People* 3rd Edition. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2015 [1994].
- . *Beyond Token Change: Breaking the Cycle of Oppression in Institutions*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2005.

- Bloom, Joshua, and Waldo E Martin, Jr. *Black Against Empire: The History and Politics of the Black Panther Party*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2016 [2013].
- Borrows, John. *Freedom and Indigenous Constitutionalism*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016
- John Borrows, "The Durability of Terra Nullius: Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia." *UBC Law Review* 48(3) (2015): 701-742.
- . "'Landed' Citizenship: An Indigenous Declaration of Interdependence." In *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002. 138-158.
- . "Physical Philosophy: Mobility and Indigenous Freedom." In *Freedom and Indigenous Constitutionalism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016. 19-49.
- . *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- . "Wampum at Niagara: Canadian Legal History, Self-Government, and the Royal Proclamation." In *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada*. Edited by Michael Asch. Vancouver: UBC Press, 1998. 155-172.
- Bowden, James WJ. "'Dominion': A Lament." *The Dorchester Review* (Autumn/Winter 2015): 58-64.
- Brand, Ulrich, and Markus Wissen. *The Imperial Mode of Living: Everyday Life in the Ecological Crisis of Capitalism*. London: Verso, 2021.
- Brodie, Janine. "Politics on the Boundaries: Restructuring and the Canadian Women's Movement." 8th Annual Robarts Lecture. York University, Toronto, March 1, 1994.
- Brooks, Maegan Parker, and Davis W Houck. *The Speeches of Fannie Lou Hamer: To Tell it Like it Is*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2011
- Brooks, Stephen. *Canadian Democracy*, 6th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Brown, Wendy. "Rights and Losses." *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995. 96-134.
- Brownlie, Robin Jarvis. *A Fatherly Eye: Indian Agents, Government Power, and Aboriginal Resistance in Ontario, 1918-1939*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003.
- Bruyneel, Kevin. "Exiled, Executed, Exalted: Louis Riel, *Homo Sacer* and the Production of Canadian Sovereignty." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 43(3) (September 2010): 711-732.
- . "Political Science and the Study of Indigenous Politics." (May 17, 2012), <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2061662> (accessed November 12, 2021).
- . *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Burbank, Jane, and Frederick Cooper. *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Burns, Joe. *Class Struggle Unionism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2022.

- Burrill, Fred. "The Settler Order Framework: Rethinking Canadian Working-Class History." *Labour/Le Travail* 83 (Spring 2019): 173-197.
- Byrd, Jodi A. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011.
- Cardinal, Harold. *The Unjust Society: The Tragedy of Canada's Indians*. Edmonton: MG Hurtig, 1969.
- Care Collective, The. *The Care Manifesto: The Politics of Interdependence*. London: Verso, 2020.
- Carroll, William K. "Hegemony, Counter-Hegemony, Anti-Hegemony." Keynote. Society for Socialist Studies. Toronto: York University, 2006.
- Cairns, Alan. "The Judicial Committee and its Critics." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 4(3) (Sept. 1971), 301-345.
- Camfield, David. *Canadian Labour in Crisis: Reinventing the Workers' Movement*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2011.
- Cavanagh, Edward, and Lorenzo Veracini. "Definition." *Settler Colonial Studies Blog* (2010). <https://settlercolonialstudies.org/about-this-blog/> (accessed March 3, 2017).
- Chang, David A. *The World and All the Things Upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016.
- Chapnick, Adam. "The Canadian Middle Power Myth." *International Journal* 55(2) (Spring 2000): 188-206.
- Cherry, Myisha. *The Case for Rage: Why Anger is Essential to Anti-Racist Struggle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Christie, Gordon. *Canadian Law and Indigenous Self-Determination: A Naturalist Analysis*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019.
- Ciccariello-Maher, George (Geo Maher). *Building the Commune: Radical Democracy in Venezuela*. London: Verso, 2016.
- . *Decolonizing Dialectics*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017.
- Ciepley, David. "Is the U.S. Government a Corporation? The Corporate Origins of Modern Constitutionalism." *American Political Science Review* 111(2) (May 2017): 418-435.
- Clark, William, Edited. *Empire Club Speeches: Being Speeches Delivered Before the Empire Club of Canada During its Session of 1903-1904*. Toronto: William Briggs, 1904.
- Clarkson, Stephen. *The Big Red Machine: How the Liberal Party Dominates Canadian Politics*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005.
- Combahee River Collective. "The Combahee River Collective Statement." In *How We Get Free: Black Feminism and The Combahee River Collective*. Keeanga-Yamaahatta Taylor, Edited. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2017. eBook.
- Corntassel, Jeff. "Life Beyond the State: Regenerating Indigenous International Relations and Everyday Challenges to Settler Colonialism." *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* (1) (2021): 71-97.

- Coulthard, Glen. "Place against Empire: Understanding Indigenous Anti-Colonialism." *Affinities* (November 2010), online.
- . *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.
- . "Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the 'Politics of Recognition' in Canada." *Contemporary Political Theory* 6 (2007): 437-460.
- Counter Power. *Organizing for Autonomy: History, Theory, and Strategy for Collective Liberation*. Brooklyn: Common Notions, 2020.
- Cowen, Deborah. "Following the infrastructures of empire: notes on cities, settler colonialism, and method." *Urban Geography* 41(4) (2020): 469-486.
- Creighton, Donald. *The Empire of the St. Lawrence*. Toronto: MacMillan, 1970.
- Dadzie, Stella. *A Kick in the Belly: Women, Slavery, and Resistance*. London: Verso, 2020.
- Darlington, Ralph. *Radical Unionism: The Rise and Fall of Revolutionary Unionism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2013.
- Daschuk, James. *Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation and the Loss of Indigenous Life*. Regina: University of Regina Press, 2013.
- Davari, Arash. "On Inexactitude in Decolonization." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 40(3) (2020).
- Davies, Barrie. "'We Hold a Vaster Empire than Has Been': Canadian Literature and the Canadian Empire." *Studies in Canadian Literature* 14(1) (1989), <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/SCL/article/download/8092/9149?inline=1> (accessed May 16, 2022).
- Davis, Lynne, Jeff Denis, and Raven Sinclair. "Pathways to Settler Decolonization," *Settler Colonial Studies* 7(4) (2017).
- Davis, Lynne, Vivian O'Donnell, and Heather Shpuniarsky. "Aboriginal-Social Justice Alliances: Understanding the Landscape of Relationships through the Coalition for a Public Inquiry into Ipperwash." *International Journal of Canadian Studies* (36) (2007).
- Davis, Lynne, and Heather Yanique Shpuniarsky. "The Spirit of Relationships: What We Have Learned about Indigenous/Non-Indigenous Alliances and Coalitions." In *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*. Edited by Lynne Davis. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.
- Iyko Day, *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016).
- Richard Day, *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*, (London: Pluto Press, 2005).
- Richard JF Day, *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000).

- Demba Moussa Dembélé, “Thomas Sankara: an endogenous approach to development,” (October 25, 2013), <https://www.thomassankara.net/thomas-sankara-an-endogenous-approach-to-development/?lang=en> (June 2, 2022).
- Chandni Desai, “Disrupting Settler-Colonial Capitalism: Indigenous Intifadas and Resurgent Solidarity from Turtle Island to Palestine,” *Journal of Palestine Studies* 50(2) (2021): 43-66.
- Dhamoon, Rita [Kaur]. *Identity/Difference Politics: How Difference is Produced, and Why It Matters*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009.
- . “Racism as a Workload and Bargaining Issue.” *Socialist Studies* 14(1) (2020): online.
- . “Relational Othering: critiquing dominance, critiquing the margins.” *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 9(5) (2021): 873-892.
- Dhamoon, Rita Kaur, Davina Bhandar, Renisa Mawani, and Satwinder Kaur Bains. Editors. *Unmooring the Komagata Maru: Charting Colonial Trajectories*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019.
- Dhillon, Jaskiran. “Notes on Becoming a Comrade: Indigenous Women, Leadership, and Movement(s) for Decolonization.” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 43(3) (2019): 41-54.
- Du Bois, WEB. “The Souls of White Folks.” In *Darkwater: Voices from Behind the Veil*. New York: Dover Thrift Editions, 1999 [1920].
- Emmanuel, Arghiri. “White Settler Colonialism and the Myth of Investment Imperialism.” *New Left Review* 73 (1972): 35-57.
- Epp, Roger “The Political De-skilling of Rural Communities,” in *Writing Off the West: Globalization, Governments, and the Transformation of Rural Communities*, edited by Roger Epp and Dave Whitson, (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2001), 301-324.
- . *We Are All Treaty People*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2008.
- Estes, Nick. *Our History is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance*. London: Verso, 2019.
- Estes, Nick, Ruth Wilson Gilmore, and Christopher Loperena. “United in Struggle.” North American Congress on Latin America, August 24, 2021, <https://nacla.org/news/2021/07/28/nick-estes-ruth-gilmore-united-struggle> (accessed June 23, 2022).
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press, 2004 [1961].
- Federici, Silvia. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2004.
- Ferguson, Kennan. “Why Does Political Science Hate American Indians?” *Perspectives on Politics* 14(4) (December 2016): 1029-1038.
- Fields, Karen E, and Barbara J Fields. *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life*. London: Verso, 2014 [2012].

- Finzsch, Norbert. “‘The intrusion therefore of cattle is by itself sufficient to produce the extirpation of the native race’: social ecological systems and ecocide in conflicts between Hunter–Gatherers and commercial stock farmers in Australia.” *Settler Colonial Studies* 7(2) (2008), 165.
- FitzMaurice, Kevin. “Are White People Obsolete? Indigenous Knowledge and the Colonizing Ally in Canada.” In *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*. Edited by Lynne Davis. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010.
- Flanagan, Tom. *First Nations? Second Thoughts*. Montréal: McGill-Queen’s Press, 2000.
- Fontaine, Jerry. *Our Hearts Are as One Fire: An Ojibway-Anishinabe Vision for the Future*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2020.
- Forbes, Jack D. *Columbus and Other Cannibals: The Wétiko Disease of Exploitation, Imperialism, and Terrorism*. New York: Seven Stories Press, 2008 [1979].
- Ford, Lisa. *Settler Sovereignty: Jurisdiction and Indigenous People in America and Australia 1788-1836*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Fortier, Craig. *Unsettling the Commons: Social Movements Against, Within, and Beyond Settler Colonialism*. Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2017.
- Freeman, Linda. *The Ambiguous Champion: Canada and South Africa in the Trudeau and Mulroney Years*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Freeman, Victoria. “‘Toronto Has No History!’ Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, and Historical Memory in Canada’s Largest City.” *Urban History Review* 38(2) (Spring 2010).
- Frye, Northrop. “Conclusion to a Literary History of Canada.” *The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination*. Toronto: Anansi, 1971. 213-51.
- Fudge, Judy, and Eric Tucker. *Labour Before the Law: The Regulation of Workers’ Collective Action in Canada, 1990-1948*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Fudge, Judy, and Eric Tucker. Editors. *Work on Trial: Canadian Labour Law Struggles*. Toronto: The Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History, 2010.
- Galeano, Eduardo. *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*. Translated by Cedric Belfrage. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997 [1973].
- Gallie, WB. “Essentially Contested Concepts.” *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56 (1955-1956): 167-198.
- George, Rachel. “Inclusion is Just the Canadian Word for Assimilation: Self-Determination and the Reconciliation Paradigm in Canada.” In *Surviving Canada: Indigenous Peoples Celebrate 150 Years of Betrayal*. Edited by Kiera Ladner and Myra Tait. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2017. 49-62.
- Getachew, Adom. *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.
- Gietinger, Klaus. Translated by Loren Balhorn. *The Murder of Rosa Luxemburg*. London: Verso, 2019.

- Gilio-Whitaker, Dina. *As Long as the Grass Grows: The Indigenous Fight for Environmental Justice, From Colonization to Standing Rock*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2019.
- Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. *Change Everything: Racial Capitalism and the Case for Abolition*. Edited by Naomi Murakawa. Chicago: Haymarket Press, 2022.
- . "Fatal Couplings of Power and Difference: Notes on Racism and Geography." In *Abolition Geography: Essays Towards Liberation*. Edited by Brenna Bhandar and Alberto Toscano. London: Verso, 2022. 132-153.
- . *The Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. Berkley: University of California Press, 2007.
- . "What Is to be Done?" *American Quarterly* 63(2) (June 2011): 245-265.
- Gobby, Jen. *More Powerful Together: Conversations with Climate Activists and Indigenous Land Defenders*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020).
- Goldberg, David Theo. *The Racial State*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002.
- Gonzalez, Mike. *In the Red Corner: The Marxism of José Carlos Mariátegui*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2019.
- Good, Kenneth. "Colonialism and Settler Colonialism: A Comparison." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 33(3) (1979): 339-351.
- Gordon, Todd. *Imperialist Canada*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2010.
- Gordon, Todd, and Jeffery R Webber. *Blood of Extraction: Canadian Imperialism in Latin America*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2016.
- Grant, Nichole E, and Timothy J Stanley. "Reading the Wallpaper: Disrupting Performances of Whiteness in the Blog 'Stuff White People Like.'" In *The Critical Youth Studies Reader*. Edited by Awad Ibrahim and Shirley Steinberg. New York: Peter Lang, 2014. 172-183.
- Green, Joyce. "Canaries in the Mines of Citizenship: Indian Women in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 34(4) (2001).
- Green, Joyce. Editor. *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2007.
- Greer, Allan. *The Patriots and the People: The Rebellion of 1837 in Rural Lower Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Gunster, Shane, Darren Fleet, and Robert Neubauer. "Challenging Petro-Nationalism: Another Canada Is Possible?" *Journal of Canadian Studies* 55(1) (Winter 2021): 57-87.
- Haiven, Max. "Toward a materialist theory of revenge." In *Revenge Capitalism: The Ghosts of Empire, the Demons of Capital, and the Settling of Unpayable Debts*. London: Pluto Press, 2020: 16-43.
- Halberstam, Jack. *The Queer Art of Failure*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2011.
- Hall, Stuart. "The Great Moving Right Show (1979)." In *Selected Political Writings: The Great Moving Right Show and Other Essays*. Edited by Sally Davison, David Featherstone, Michael Rustin, and Bill Schwarz. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017. 172-186.

- . *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left*. London: Verso, 1990.
- . "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10(2) (1986).
- . "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities." In *Culture, Globalization, and the World System*. Edited by Anthony D King. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991. 41-68.
- . "Political Commitment." In *Selected Political Writings: The Great Moving Right Show and Other Essays*. Edited by Sally Davison, David Featherstone, Michael Rustin, and Bill Schwarz. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017.
- . "Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance (1980)." In *Essential Essay Vol. 1: Foundations of Cultural Studies*. Edited by David Morley. Durham: Duke University Press, 2018. 305-345.
- Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000.
- Harney, Stefano. *State Work: Public Administration and Mass Intellectuality*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.
- Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study*. Brooklyn: Minor Compositions, 2013.
- Harris, Cheryl I. "Whiteness as Property." *Harvard Law Review* 106(8) (June 1993): 1707-1791.
- Harris, Cole. "How Did Colonialism Dispossess? Comments from an Edge of Empire." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94(1) (2004), 173
- . *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002.
- Harrison, Trevor W. "Petroleum, Politics, and the Limits of Left Progressivism in Alberta." In *Alberta Oil and the Decline of Democracy in Canada*. Edited by Meenal Shrivastava and Lorna Stefanick. Edmonton: Athabasca University Press, 2015. 69-88.
- Harvey, David. *The New Imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Henderson, Phil. "Imagoed communities: The psychosocial space of settler colonialism." *Settler Colonial Studies* 7(1) (2017), 40-56.
- . "Like a Brick Through the Overton Window: Reorienting Our Politics from the House of Commons to the Tiny House." In *Democratic Multiplicity: Perceiving, Enacting and Integrating Democratic Diversity*. Edited by James Tully, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming. 259-280.
- . "Transcending Boundaries: All the Parts are in Conversation with Each Other." *Active History* February 23, 2018. <https://activehistory.ca/2018/02/transcending-boundaries-all-the-parts-are-in-conversation-with-each-other/> (accessed May 6, 2022).
- Hernández, Kelly Lytle. *City of Inmates: Conquest, Rebellion, and the Rise of Human Caging in Los Angeles, 1771-1965*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017.
- Heron, Craig. *The Canadian Labour Movement*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, 1996.
- Hill, Gord. *500 Years of Indigenous Resistance*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2010.

- . *The 500 Years of Resistance Comic Book*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2010.
- . *The Anti-Capitalist Resistance Comic Book*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2012.
- . *The Antifa Comic Book: 100 Years of Fascism and Antifa Movements*. Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2018.
- Hill, Susan M. *The Clay We are Made Of: Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2017.
- Holdren, Nate. "The Disabling Power of Law and Market." In *Injury Impoverished: Workplace Accidents, Capitalism, and Law in the Progressive Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 137-174.
- Horne, Gerald. *The Apocalypse of Settler Colonialism: The Roots of Slavery, White Supremacy, and Capitalism in Seventeenth-Century North America and the Caribbean*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2018.
- . *The Counter-Revolution of 1776: Slave Resistance and the Origins of the United States of America*. New York: New York University Press, 2014.
- . *The Dawning of the Apocalypse: The Roots of Slavery, White Supremacy, Settler Colonialism, and Capitalism in the Long Sixteenth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 2020.
- Howe, Miles, and Jeffery Monaghan. "Strategic Incapacitation of Indigenous Dissent: Crowd Theories, Risk Management, and Settler Colonial Policing." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 43(4) (2018): 328-329.
- Inglehart, Ronald. *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977.
- Innes, Robert A. *Elder Brother and the Law of the People: Contemporary Kinship and the Cowessess First Nation*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2013.
- Jackson, Michael. *The Canadian Kingdom: 150 Years of Constitutional Monarchy*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2018.
- James, CLR. *The Black Jacobin: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*, 2nd Edition. New York: Vintage Books, 1989.
- . "Every Cook Can Govern: A Study of Democracy in Ancient Greece and its Meaning for Today." In *A New Notion: Two Works by CLR James*. Edited by Noel Ignatiev. Oakland: PM Press, 2010. 129-155.
- . *A History of Pan-African Revolt*. Oakland: PM Press, 2012 [1938].
- . *World Revolution, 1917-1936: The Rise and Fall of the Communist International*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2017[1937].
- James, Matt. "A Carnival of Truth? Knowledge, Ignorance and the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission." *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 6(2) (July 2012): 182-204.
- Johnston, David. *The Idea of Canada: Letters to a Nation*. Toronto: Penguin Random House, 2019.
- Jones, Carwyn. "A Māori Constitutional Tradition." *New Zealand Journal of Public and International Law* 12(1) (2014)

- Jung, Moon-Ho. *Cane and Coolies: Race, Labour, and Sugar in the Age of Emancipation*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2008.
- . *Menace to Empire: Anticolonial Solidarities and the Transpacific Origins of the US Security State*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2022.
- Kalman, Ian. *Framing Borders: Principle and Practicality in the Akwesasne Mohawk Territory*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2021.
- Karuka, Manu. "Black and Native Visions of Self-Determination." *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3(2) (Fall 2017):
- . *Empire's Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2019.
- . "Hunger Politics: Sanctions as Siege Warfare." In *Sanctions as War: Anti-Imperialist Perspectives on American Geo-Economic Strategies*. Edited by Stuart Davis and Immanuel Ness. Boston: Koninklijke Brill, 2022. 51-62.
- Kauanui, J Kēhaulani. "The Politics of Indigeneity, Anarchist Praxis, and Decolonization." *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* (1) (2021): 9-42.
- . "'A Structure, Not an Event': Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity." *Lateral* 5(1) (2016). Online.
- Kelley, Robin DG. *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2002.
- . "From the River to the Sea to Every Mountain Top: Solidarity as Worldmaking," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 48(4) (2019):
- . *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists during the Great Depression*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015 [1990].
- . "The Rest of Us: Rethinking Settler and Native." *American Quarterly* 69(2) (June 2017): 267-276.
- . "'We Are Not What We Seem': Rethinking Black Working-Class Opposition in the Jim Crow South." *The Journal of American History* 80(1) (June 1993): 75-112.
- Kelley, Robin DG, Jack Amariglio, and Lucas Wilson. "'Solidarity Is Not a Market Exchange': An RM Interview with Robin D. G. Kelley, Part 1." *Rethinking Marxism* 30(4) (2018): 568-598.
- . "'Solidarity Is Not a Market Exchange': An RM Interview with Robin D. G. Kelley, Part 2." *Rethinking Marxism* 31(2) (2019): 152-172.
- Kim, Jodi. *Settler Garrison: Debt Imperialism, Militarism, and Transpacific Imaginaries*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2022.
- Kimmerer, Robin Wall. *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge, and the Teachings of Plants*. Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 2013.
- King, Hayden. "The Problem with 'Indigenous Peoples': Re-Considering International Indigenous Rights Activism." In *More Will Sing Their Way to Freedom: Indigenous Resistance and Resurgence*. Edited by Elaine Coburn. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2015.

- King, Tiffany Lethabo. *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2019.
- Klassen, Jerome. *Joining Empire: The Political Economy of the New Canadian Foreign Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014.
- Klein, Naomi. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. Toronto: Random House, 2007.
- Koot, Stasja, and Bram Büscher. "Giving Land (Back)? The Meaning of Land in the Indigenous Politics of the South Kalahari Bushman Land Claim, South Africa." *Journal of Southern African Studies* 45(2) (2019): 357-374.
- Kumar, Krishan. "Colony and Empire, Colonialism and Imperialism: A Meaningful Distinction?" *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 63(2) (2021),
- . "Nation-states as empires, empires as nation-states: two principles, one practice?" *Theory and Society* 39(2) (March 2010): 119-143.
- Kuokkanen, Rauna. "Indigenous Women in Traditional Economies: The Case of Sámi Reindeer Herding." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 34(3) (2009): 499–504.
- Laboucan-Massimo, Melina. "Rights and Roots: Addressing a New Wave of Colonialism." *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the Blockades*. Edited by Leanne Simpson and Kiera Ladner. Winnipeg Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2010.
- Ladner, Kiera L. "Taking the Field: 50 Years of Indigenous Politics in the *CJPS*." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(1) (2017): 163-179.
- . "Up the Creek: Fishing for a New Constitutional Order." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38(4) (Dec. 2005), 923-953.
- LaDuke, Winona. *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2015 [1999].
- . *To Be a Water Protector: The Rise of the Wiindigo Slayers*. (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020).
- LaDuke, Winona, and Deborah Cowen. "Beyond Wiindigoo Infrastructure." *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 119(2) (April 2020).
- Laforest, Guy. *Interpreting Quebec's Exile Within the Federation: Selected Political Essays*. Wellington: Peter Lang, 2014.
- Lane, Dorothy. "'Dominion from Sea to Sea': Christianity, Imperialism, and the Trope of Conversion." In *A Sea for Encounters: Essays Towards a Postcolonial Commonwealth*. Edited by Stella Borg Barthet. New York: Rodopi, 2009. 177-192.
- Larsen, Soren C, and Jay T Johnson. *Being Together in Place: Indigenous Coexistence in a More than Human World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.
- Lasswell, Harold D. "The Garrison State." *American Journal of Sociology* 46(4) (January 1941): 455-468.
- Lauesen, Torkil. *Riding the Wave: Sweden's Integration into the Imperialist World System*. Montréal: Kersplebedeb Publishing, 2021.

- Lawrence, Bonita, and Enakshi Dua. "Decolonizing Anti-Racism." *Social Justice* 32(4) (2005): 120-143.
- Laxer, James. *Staking Claims to a Continent: John A Macdonald, Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis and the Making of North America*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2016.
- Le Bon, Gustave. *The Crowd*, (New York: Viking Compass, 1960 [1895]).
- Levitt, Kari. *Silent Surrender: The Multinational Corporation in Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1970.
- Lewis, Avi. "Social Democracy and the Left in Canada: Past, Present, and Future." In *Party of Conscience: The CCF, The NDP, and Social Democracy in Canada*. Edited by Roberta Lexier, Stephanie Bangarth, and Jon Weier. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2018.
- Linebaugh, Peter. *Stop, Thief! The Commons, Enclosures, and Resistance*. Oakland: PM Press, 2014.
- Linebaugh, Peter, and Marcus Rediker. *The Many Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Atlantic*. London: Verso, 2000.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Lyons, Scott Richard. *X-Marks: Native Signatures of Assent*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- Lowe, Lisa. *The Intimacies of Four Continents*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2015.
- Lowman, Emma Battell, and Adam J. Barker. *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood, 2015.
- Lukacs, Martin. *The Trudeau Formula: Seduction and Betrayal in an Age of Discontent*. Montréal: Black Rose Books, 2019.
- Luxemburg, Rosa. *The Accumulation of Capital*, trans. Agnes Schwartzschild. New York: Routledge, 2003 [1913].
- Mackenzie, Catriona, and Natalie Stoljar, Editors. *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and Social Self*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Mackey, Eva. *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land and Settler Decolonization*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2016.
- Macpherson, CB, Editor. *Property: Mainstream and Critical Positions*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Madokoro, Laura, Francine McKenzie, and David Meren, Editors. *Dominion of race: Rethinking Canada's international history*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2017.
- Magnusson, Warren. "Decentring the State, Or Looking for Politics." In *Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice*. Edited William Carroll. Toronto: Garamond, 1992.
- Maher, Geo. *Anticolonial Eruptions: Racial Hubris and the Cunning of Resistance*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2022.

- . *Spirals of Revolt: Study and Struggle to Abolish the Present*. New York: Common Notions, 2022.
- Majid, Anouar. *We Are All Moors: Ending Centuries of Crusades against Muslims and Other Minorities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.
- Mallory, JR. "The Five Faces of Federalism." In *The Future of Canadian Federalism*. Edited by Paul-Andre Crepeau and CB MacPherson. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965. 1-15.
- Manuel, Arthur, and Grand Chief Ronald M Derrickson. *Unsettling Canada: A National Wake-Up Call*. Toronto: Between the Lines Books, 2015.
- Manuel, George, and Michael Posluns. *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019 [1974].
- Maracle, Lee. *My Conversations with Canadians*. Toronto: BookThug, 2017.
- Marcuse, Herbert. *An Essay on Liberation*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.
- Marquis, Greg. *The Vigilant Eye: Policing Canada from 1867 to 9/11*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2016.
- Marr, Lucille. "Breaking Down Barriers: MCC Ontario and Ontario Native Communities, 1967-1999." *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 19 (2001).
- Massad, Joseph. "Against Self-Determination." *Humanity* 9(2) (2018). Online.
- Memmi, Albert. "The Mythical Portrait of the Colonized." In *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1991 [1957]. 79-89.
- Massie, Merlie. *Forest Prairie Edge: Place History in Saskatchewan*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2014.
- Mau, Søren. *Mute Compulsion: A Marxist Theory of the Economic Power of Capital*. London: Verso, 2022.
- Maynard, Robyn. *Policing Black Live: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present*. Halifax: Fernwood Press, 2017.
- Maynard, Robyn, and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson. *Rehearsals for Living*. Toronto: Penguin Random House, 2022.
- Mays, Kyle T. *An Afro-Indigenous History of the United States*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2021.
- McAlevey, Jane. *A Collective Bargain: Unions, Organizing, and the Fight for Democracy*. New York: Harper Collins, 2021.
- McQuaig, Linda. *Holding the Bully's Coat: Canada and the U.S. Empire*. Toronto: Random House, 2007.
- McVeigh, Robbie, and Bill Rolston. "*Anois ar theacht an tSamhraidh*": *Ireland, Colonialism and the Unfinished Revolution*. Belfast: Beyond the Pale Books, 2021.
- Mensah, Joseph, and Christopher J Williams. *Boomerang Ethics: How Racism Affects Us All*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2017.

- Miliband, Ralph. *Parliamentary Socialism: A Study in the Politics of Labour*. London: Merlin Press, 1961.
- . *The State in Capitalist Society*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2009 [1969].
- Miller, Robert J. *Native America, Discovered and Conquered: Thomas Jefferson, Lewis & Clark, and Manifest Destiny*. London: Praeger, 2006.
- Miller, Robert J, Jacinta Ruru, Larissa Behrendt, and Tracey Lindberg. *Discovering Indigenous Lands: The Doctrine of Discovery in the English Colonies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Million, Dian. *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013.
- Mills, C Wright. *Listen, Yankee: The Revolution in Cuba*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.
- . *The Power Elite*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 [1956].
- Mills, Sean. *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties Montreal*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010.
- Monaghan, Jefferey. "Mounties in the Frontier: Circulations, Anxieties, and Myths of Settler Colonial Policing in Canada." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 47(1) (Winter 2013): 122-148.
- Monture-Angus, Patricia. *Thunder in My Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1995.
- Moon, Barbara. *The Canadian Shield*. Toronto: Natural Science of Canada ltd., 1970.
- Morden, Michael. "Across the Barricades: Non-Indigenous Mobilization and Settler Colonialism in Canada." *Canadian Political Science Review* 8(1) (2014).
- Morefield, Jeanne. "Empire's Handyman: Jans Smuts and the Politics of International Holism." In *Empires Without Imperialism: Anglo-American Decline and the Politics of Deflection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014. 171-200.
- Moreton-Robinson, Aileen. *Talkin' Up to the White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2021 [2000].
- . *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2015.
- Morton, FL, and Rainer Knopff. *The Charter Revolution and the Court Party*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000.
- Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Being Singular Plural*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Nath, Nisha. "Defining Narratives of Identity in Canadian Political Science: Accounting for the Absence of Race." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 44(1) (2011): 161-193.
- Naylor, James. *The Fate of Labour Socialism: The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the Dream of a Working-Class Future*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016.
- Neigh, Scott. *Resisting the State: Canadian History through the Stories of Activists*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2012.

- Neocleous, Mark. *A Critical Theory of Police Power: The Fabrication of Social Order*. London: Verso, 2021.
- Nichols, Robert. *Theft is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2020.
- Nishime, Leilani, and Kim D Hester Williams, Editors. *Racial Ecologies*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2018.
- Nkrumah, Kwame. *Neo-Colonialism the Last Stage of Imperialism*. New York: Humanities Press International, 1965.
- Noël, Alan. "Studying Your Own Country: Social Scientific Knowledge for Our Times and Places." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 47(4) (December 2014).
- Norrgard, Chantal. "Indigenous Labor, Settler Colonialism, and the History of the Fraser River Fisherman's Strike of 1893." *Native American and Indigenous Studies* 7(2) (Fall 2020): 114-144.
- Olson, Joel. *The Abolition of White Democracy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.
- Osterweil, Vicky. *In Defense of Looting: A Riotous History of Uncivil Action*. New York: Bold Type Books, 2019.
- Parnaby, Andrew. "'The best men that ever worked the lumber': Aboriginal Longshoremen on Burrard Inlet, BC, 1863-1939." *The Canadian Historical Review* 87(1) (March 2006): 53-78.
- Pasternak, Shiri. *Grounded Authority: The Algonquins of Barriere Lake Against the State*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.
- . "Jurisdiction and Settler Colonialism: Where Do Laws Meet?" *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 29(2) (2014): 145-161.
- . "How Capitalism will Save Colonialism: The Privatization of Reserve Lands in Canada." *Antipode* 47(1) (January 2015), 179-196;
- Pasternak, Shiri, Katie Mazer, and DT Cochrane. "The Financing Problem of Colonialism: How Indigenous Jurisdiction is Valued in Pipeline Politics." In *Standing with Standing Rock: Voices from the #NODAPL Movement*. Edited by Nick Estes and Jaskiran Dhillon. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019.
- Pasternak, Shiri, Kevin Walby, and Abby Stadnyk, Editors. *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle: Police Abolition in Canada*. Toronto: Between the Lines Books, 2022.
- Perry, Adele. *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001.
- Pineda, Erin R. *Seeing Like an Activist: Civil Disobedience and the Civil Rights Movement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.
- Povinelli, Elizabeth. *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

- Prashad, Vijay. *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*. New York: New Press, 2007.
- . *Red Star Over the Third World*. London: Pluto Press, 2017.
- Quan, HLT. "Emancipatory social inquiry: Democratic anarchism and the Robinsonian method." *African Identities* 11(2) (2013).
- . "Foreword." In *An Anthropology of Marxism*. By Cedric J Robinson. London: Pluto Press, 2019 [2001].
- Raibmon, Paige. *Authentic Indians: Episodes of Encounter from the Late-Nineteenth-Century Northwest Coast*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Rana, Aziz. *The Two Faces of American Freedom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- Rancière, Jacques. *Staging the People: The Proletarian and His Double*. London: Verso Books, 2011.
- Randell-Moon, Holly. "Body, Crown, Territory: Geocorpographies of the British Monarchy and White Settler Sovereignty." In *Security, Race, Biopower: Essays on Technology and Corporeality*. Edited by Holly Randell-Moon and Ryan Tippett. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016. 41-60.
- Razack, Sherene. *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008.
- . "‘It Happened More Than Once’: Freezing Deaths in Saskatchewan." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 26(1) (2014), 51-80.
- . "Memorializing Colonial Power: The Death of Frank Paul." *Law & Social Inquiries* 37(4) (Fall 2012), 908–932.
- Red Nation, The. *The Red Deal: Indigenous Action to Save Our Earth*. Brooklyn: Common Notions, 2021.
- Rediker, Marcus. *The Slave Ship: A Human History*. New York: Penguin Books, 2007.
- . *Villains of All Nations: Atlantic Pirates in the Golden Age*. New York: Penguin Books, 2005.
- Regan, Paulette. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2010.
- Rhodes Must Fall, Oxford. *Rhodes Must Fall: The Struggle to Decolonize the Racist Heart of Empire*. London: Zed Books, 2018.
- Rich, Sylvia. "Police Violence as Organizational Crime." *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 37(1) (December 21, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.1017/cls.2021.27> (accessed December 21, 2021).
- Richardson, Boyce. *Strangers Devour the Land*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing, 1991.
- Riker, William H. *Federalism: Origin, Operation, Significance*. Toronto: Little, Brown, and Co., 1964.

- Rioux, Marcel. *Quebec in Question*. Translated by James Boake. Toronto: James Lorimer & Co., 1978.
- Ritskes, Eric. "The Terms of Engagement with Indigenous Nationhood." In *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement*. Edited by The Kino-nda-niimi Collective. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2014.
- Roberts, Neil. *Freedom as Marronage*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015.
- Robinson, Cedric J. *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2020 [1983].
- . *The Terms of Order: Political Science and the Myth of Leadership*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016 [1980].
- Rodney, Walter. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Verso, 2018 [1972].
- Russell, Peter H. *Canada's Odyssey: A Country Based on Incomplete Conquests*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.
- . *Constitutional Odyssey: Can Canadians Become a Sovereign People?* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- . *Sovereignty: The Biography of a Claim*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2021.
- Rutherford, Scott. *Canada's Other Red Scare: Indigenous Protest and Colonial Encounters during the Global Sixties*. Montréal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2020.
- Ryerson, Stanley. *Unequal Union: Roots of Crisis in the Canadas, 1815-1873*. Toronto: Progress Books, 1975 [1968].
- Said, Edward W. "Michael Walzer's 'Exodus and Revolution': A Canaanite Reading." *Grand Street* 5(2) (Winter 1986): 86-106.
- Salaita, Steven. *Inter/Nationalism: Decolonizing Native America and Palestine*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016.
- Peter H Sawchuk, "Anticolonialism, Labor, and the Pedagogies of Community Unionism: The Case of Hotel Workers in Canada," in *Breaching the Colonial Contract*, edited by Arlo Kempf, (Toronto: Springer, 2009): 159-178.
- Schmalz, Peter S. *The History of the Saugeen Indians*. Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1977.
- Scott, Frank R. *Essays on the Constitution: Aspects of Canadian Law and Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- . "The Permanent Bases of Canadian Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs* 10(4) (July 1932), 617-631.
- Scott, James C. *The Art of Not Being Governed: An Anarchist History of Upland Southeast Asia*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- . *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Scott, Julius S. *The Common Wind: Afro-American Currents in the Age of the Haitian Revolution*. London: Verso, 2018.

- Scott-Samuel, Alex, et. al. "The Impact of Thatcherism on Health and Well-Being in Britain." *International Journal of Health Services* 44(1) (2014): 53-71.
- Shantz, Jeff. "They Have Always Been Military: On So-Called Militarized Policing in Canada." *Journal of Social Justice* 6 (2016): 1-26.
- Sharma, Nandita. *Home Economics: Nationalism and the Making of 'Migrant' Workers in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006.
- . *Home Rule: National Sovereignty and the Separation of Natives and Migrants*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2020.
- Sharma, Nandita, and Cynthia Wright. "Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States." *Social Justice* 35(3) (2008-2009): 120-138.
- Sharpe, Christina. *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2016.
- Shipley, Tyler A. *Canada in the World: Settler Capitalism and the Colonial Imagination*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020.
- Shipley, Tyler. "The New Canadian Imperialism and the Military Coup in Honduras." *Latin American Perspectives* 40(5) (September 2013).
- Siegfried, André. *The Race Question in Canada*. New York: D Appleton and Co., 1907.
- Simon, Joshua. *The Ideology of Creole Revolution: Imperialism and Independence in American and Latin American Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Simpson, Audra. *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2014.
- Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resurgence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.
- . "Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation." *Decolonization* 3(3) (2014): 1-25.
- . *This Accident of Being Lost*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2017.
- Singh, Jakeet. "Recognition and Self-Determination: Approaches from Above and Below." In *Recognition versus Self-Determination: Dilemmas in Emancipatory Politics*. Edited by Avigail Eisenberg et. al. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014. 47-74.
- Sinwell, Luke, with Sipiwe Mbatha. *The Spirit of Marikana: The Rise of Insurgent Trade Unionism in South Africa*. London: Pluto Press, 2016.
- Smallwood, Stephanie E. *Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Smith, Charles W, and Alison Braley-Rattai. "Class Struggle Goes to Court: Workers' Rights and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*." In *Rethinking the Politics of Labour in Canada*, 2nd Edition. Edited by Stephanie Ross and Larry Savage. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2021. 210-228.
- Smith, Keith D. *Liberalism, Surveillance, and Resistance: Indigenous Communities in Western Canada, 1877-1927*. Athabasca: Athabasca University Press, 2009.

- Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, 2nd Edition. London: Zed Books, 2012 [1999].
- Snelgrove, Corey, Rita Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel. "Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations." *Decolonization* 3(2) (2014): 1-32.
- Stanley, Anna. "Aligning against Indigenous jurisdiction: Worker savings, colonial capital, and the Canada Infrastructure Bank." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 37(6) (2019), 1138-1156.
- Stanley, George FG. "A Footnote to History: Was Louis Riel an American Citizen?" *Canadian Historical Review* 29(1) (March 1948): 40-43.
- Stanley, Timothy J. "Commemorating John A. Macdonald: Collective Remembering and the Structure of Settler Colonialism in British Columbia." *BC Studies* 204, (Winter 2019/2020).
- Stark, Heidi Kiiwentinepinesiiik. "Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land." *Theory & Event* 19(4) (2016): online.
- Starblanket, Gina. "Constitutionalizing (In)justice: Treaty Interpretation and the Containment of Indigenous Governance." *Constitutional Forum* 28(1) (2019): 13-24.
- Stewart, Iain. "Commandeering Time: The Ideological Status of Time in the Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer." *Australian Journal of Politics & History* 57(3) (2011): 389-402.
- Stewart-Harawira, Makere. *The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization*. London: Zed Books, 2005.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008.
- Storey, Kenton. "Violence and Eviction on Vancouver Island." In *Settler Anxiety at the Outposts of Empire: Colonial Relations, Humanitarian Discourses, and the Imperial Press*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2016. 39-69.
- Swain, Stacie. "Cracking the Settler Colonial Concrete: Theorizing Engagements with Indigenous Resurgence Through the Politics from Below." In *Democratic Multiplicity: Perceiving, Enacting and Integrating Democratic Diversity*. Edited by James Tully, et al. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming. 234-258.
- Tabar, Linda, and Chandni Desai. "Decolonizing is a Global Project: From Palestine to the Americas." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 6(1) (2017): i-xix.
- Táíwò, Olúfẹ̀mí O. "Being-in-the-Room Privilege: Elite Capture and Epistemic Deference." *The Philosopher* 108(4) (Autumn 2020), <https://www.thephilosopher1923.org/essay-taiwo> (accessed January 5, 2022).
- . *Elite Capture: How the Powerful Took Control Over Identity Politics (And Everything Else)*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2022.
- . *Reconsidering Reparations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022.
- . "States Are Not Basic Structures: Against State-Centric Political Theory." *Philosophical Papers* 48(1) (2019): 59-82.

- Taylor, Keeanga-Yamahtta. *Race for Profit: How Banks and the Real Estate Industry Undermined Black Homeownership*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2019.
- Thompson, Debra. "Is Race Political?" *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 41(3) (September 2008), 525-547.
- Tseghay, Daniel. "Idle No More, the Black experience, and why it is that what we say about others reveals so much about ourselves." In *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement*. Edited by The Kino-nda-niimi Collective. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2014.
- Toews, Owen. *Stolen City: Racial Capitalism and the Making of Winnipeg*. Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2018.
- Tully, James. "Deparochializing Political Theory and Beyond: A Dialogue Approach to Comparative Political Thought." *Journal of World Philosophies* 1(1) (Winter 2016).
- . "Reconciliation Here on Earth." In *Resurgence and Reconciliation: Indigenous-Settler Relations and Earth Teachings*. Edited by Michael Asch, John Borrows, and James Tully. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2018. 83-129.
- . *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Tungohan, Ethel. "The Transformative and Radical Feminism of Grassroots Migrant Women's Movement(s) in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(2) (2017): 479-494.
- Tungohan, Ethel, et al. "After the Live-In Caregiver Program: Filipina Caregivers' Experiences of Graduated and Uneven Citizenship." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 47(1) (2015): 87-105.
- Turpel, Mary Ellen. "Patriarchy and Paternalism: The Legacy of the Canadian State for First Nations Women." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 6(1) (1993)174-192.
- Umeeek [E Richard Atleo]. *Principles of Tsawalk: An Indigenous Approach to Global Crisis*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011.
- Umeeek [E Richard Atleo]. *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth Worldview*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- . *The World Turned Inside Out: Settler Colonialism as a Political Idea*. London: Verso, 2022.
- Vimalassery, Manu, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein. "Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing." *Theory & Event* 19(4) (2016), online.
- Voyles, Traci Brynne. *Wastelanding: Legacies of Uranium Mining in Navajo Country*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015.
- Wadewitz, Lissa K. *The Nature of Borders: Salmon, Boundaries, and Bandits on the Salish Sea*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012.
- Walcott, Rinaldo. *On Property*. Windsor, ON: Biblioasis, 2021.
- Walia, Harsha. *Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism, and the Rise of Racist Nationalism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2021.

- Watkin, Christopher. "A Different Alterity: Jean-Luc Nancy's 'Singular Plural.'" *Paragraph* 30(2) (2007): 50-64.
- Whitaker, Reg. "Drifting Away from the Edge of Empire: Canada in the Era of George W. Bush." In *Empire's Law: The American Imperial Project and the 'War to Remake the World'*. Edited by Amy Bartholomew. London: Pluto Press, 2006.
- . *A Sovereign Idea: Essays on Canada as a Democratic Community*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1992.
- Whitaker, Reg, Gregory S Kealey, and Andrew Parnaby. *Secret Service: Political Policing in Canada from the Fenians to Fortress America*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012.
- Williams, Kayanesenh Paul. *Kayanerenkó:wa: The Great Law of Peace*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 2018.
- Wilm, Julius. *Settlers as Conquerors: Free Land Policy in Antebellum America*. Berlin: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2018.
- Wolfe, Patrick. "Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native." *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4) (December 2006).
- Wolff, Richard D. *Democracy at Work: A Cure for Capitalism*. Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2012.
- Yusoff, Kathryn. *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019.
- Zinn, Howard. "Secrecy, Archives, and the Public Interest." *The Midwestern Archivist* 2(2) (1977): 14-26.

Primary Sources:

- All India Democratic Women's Association. *The Invisible Despair of Women in Hindi*, 2021. <https://www.aidwaonline.org/index.php/aidwa-booklet-invisible-despair-women-hindi> (accessed May 16, 2022).
- Alston, Philip, and UN, Human Rights Council, Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights. "Climate change and poverty: report of the Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights." Geneva: UN, July 17, 2019, <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/41/39> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Âpihtawikosisân. "Beyond Territorial Acknowledgement." âpihtawikosisân: Law. Language. Culture. September 23, 2016. <https://apihtawikosisan.com/2016/09/beyond-territorial-acknowledgments/> (December 23, 2021).
- Arrowsmith, Emily. *Promoting Careers in Skilled Trades to Indigenous Youth in Canada*. Ottawa: Canadian Apprenticeship Forum, 2019.
- Barkwell, Lawrence J. "The Victoria Voltigeurs." Louis Riel Institute. 2008. <https://www.metismuseum.ca/resource.php/07418> (accessed June 7, 2022).
- Bland, Douglas L. *Time Bomb: Canada and the First Nations*. Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2014.
- . *Uprising: A Novel*. Toronto: Dundurn, 2013.

- Brody, Hugh, and Nigel Markham. *Hunters and Bombers*. From the National Film Board, 1991. https://www.nfb.ca/film/hunters_and_bombers/ (accessed April 20, 2021).
- Butler Burke, Nora. "Building a 'Canadian' Decolonization Movement: Fighting the Occupation at 'Home.'" Montréal, August 20, 2004. theanarchistlibrary.org (accessed April 5, 2022).
- Campbell, W Wilfred. "Imperialism in Canada." The Empire Club of Canada Addresses. Toronto, November 23, 1904. <http://speeches.empireclub.org/62387/data?n=2> (accessed May 11, 2022).
- Campt, David W. *The White Ally Toolkit Workbook*. I AM Publications, 2018.
- Canada's Building Trades Unions. *Build Together: Indigenous Allyship*. Build Together. February 2018. www.buildtogether.ca (accessed December 23, 2021).
- "Electoral History of BC." Elections BC, 2022. <https://elections.bc.ca/voting/outreach-and-education/electoral-history-of-bc/> (accessed May 12, 2022).
- Gehl, Lynn "Ally Bill of Responsibilities." <https://www.lynngehl.com/ally-bill-of-responsibilities.html> (accessed January 5, 2022).
- Hanover, George III. *The Royal Proclamation*. London, 1763.
- Heritage Canada. "Canada 150 at a Glance." May 7, 2018. <https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/anniversaries-significance/2017/canada-150/at-a-glance.html#a4> (accessed April 7, 2021).
- Hermann, Lee-Anne. Twitter Post. May 19, 2022. <https://twitter.com/HermannCAN/status/1527172514803339267?s=20&t=jkSJMGEFWUMRTU3gtGz6TkA> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- Hampton, Fred. "Power Anywhere Where There's People." Illinois Chapter of the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense. 1969. <https://www.marxists.org/archive/hampton/1969/misc/power-anywhere-where-theres-people.htm> (accessed March 23, 2022).
- Harvard Book Store. "Where Do We Go From Here: A Fundraiser for Black Lives." YouTube, July 13, 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Er2jE4B9kDA&list=PLzAJnb13TW7PMssHaaUzTkiue5KvcT6WC&index=24> (accessed December 15, 2021).
- Haymarket Books. "Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism, and Racist Nationalism." YouTube, February 11, 2021. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WRZNfkgSrXo> (accessed May 16, 2022).
- Haymarket Books. "Study and Struggle Critical Conversation #3: Abolition Must Be Red." YouTube, November 9, 2021. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E2OWObx5J9A> (accessed January 20, 2022).
- "History." 407 ETR, 2022. <https://407etr.com/en/highway/corporate/background-information1.html> (accessed May 18, 2022).
- Horn, Bernd. *On Hybrid Warfare*. Ottawa: Canadian Special Operations Forces Command, 2016.
- Human Rights Watch. "Honduras: Events of 2020." <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2021/country-chapters/honduras> (accessed May 9, 2022).

- “Indigenous Ally Toolkit.” Montréal Urban Aboriginal Strategy Network, 2019. <http://reseaumtlnetwork.com/resources/> (December 23, 2021).
- Indigenous Environmental Network, Oil Change International, and Indigenous Environmental Network. *Indigenous Resistance Against Carbon*. Washington, DC: Oil Change International, 2021.
- Indigenous Women’s Working Group. *Towards a New Relationship: Tool Kit for Reconciliation/Decolonization of Social Work Practice at the Individual, Workplace, and Community Level*. Vancouver: British Columbia Association of Social Workers, 2016.
- Is the Crown at War With Us?* online, directed by Alanis Obomsawin, (National Film Board, 2002).
- Kanehsatake: 270 Years of Resistance*. Directed by Alanis Obomsawin. National Film Board, 1993.
- Keefer, Tom. *Mutiny on the HMS Capital: The Two Row Wampum as a Guide to Decolonization and Social Transformation on Turtle Island*. N.P., 2014. <https://yorku.academia.edu/TomKeefer> (accessed April 5, 2022).
- Keeshig-Tobias, Polly. *The Illustrated History of the Chippewas of Nawash*. Neyaashiinigmiing: Chippewas of Nawash, 1996.
- Kucheran, Robert. “We Can Do Better For Our Indigenous Peoples.” Canada’s Building Trades Unions, June 21, 2022. <https://buildingtrades.ca/we-can-do-better-for-our-indigenous-peoples/> (accessed March 23, 2022).
- Lambton, John. *Report on the Affairs of British North America*. London, 1839.
- Le Guin, Ursula K. “A Left-Handed Commencement Speech,” (Mills College, 1983), <https://www.ursulakleguin.com/lefthand-mills-college> (accessed May 20, 2022).
- Lenin, VI. *What is to be done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*. Brooklyn: Wellred Books, 2018 [1902].
- “LGBT Ally Toolkit.” Amnesty International. www.amnestyusa.org/lgbt (accessed December 16, 2021).
- Linebaugh, Peter. *Lizard Talk; Or, Ten Plagues and Another*. Jamaica Plain, MA: Midnight Notes, 1989.
- Llud, editor. *Social War on Stolen Native Land*. Vancouver: Black Banner Distro, 2016. blackbannerdistro.wordpress.com (accessed April 5, 2022).
- “Many solidarity actions have been held to support the Gidimt’en and wider Wet’suwet’en community.” Gidimt’en Checkpoint (N/D). <https://www.yintahaccess.com/solidarity-actions> (accessed April 13, 2022).
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. In *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. Edited by David McLelland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- “Men as Allies Toolkit: Standing Up for Women.” Women’s Fund Rhodes Island. www.wfri.org (December 16, 2021).

- Office of the Premier. "Reconciliation legislation fosters greater economic certainty." BC Gov News, October 24, 2019. <https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2019PREM0116-002041> (May 6, 2022).
- Parliament of the United Kingdom. *The British North America Act*. 19th Parl. of the United Kingdom, 1867.
- Parliamentary Select Committee on Aboriginal Tribes. *Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aboriginal Tribes: Reprinted, with comments, by the 'Aborigines Protection Society.'* 13th Parliament of the United Kingdom, 1837, online.
- The People's Forum NYC. "Manu Karuka on Hybrid Wars." YouTube, November 5, 2019. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0OQyV-7tWSc&list=WL&index=65> (accessed April 7, 2022).
- Prashad, Vijay. "Hybrid Wars Are Destroying Democracies: The Thirty-Fourth Newsletter." Tricontinental, August 22, 2019. <https://thetricontinental.org/newsletterissue/hybrid-wars-are-destroying-democracies-the-thirty-fourth-newsletter-2019/> (accessed April 7, 2022).
- Protect the Inlet. "Visit the spiritual resistance to #StopKM at Kwekwecnewtxw." 2019. <https://web.archive.org/web/20190730151506/https://protecttheinlet.ca/structure/> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Secwepemc Women's Warrior Society and Tiny House Warriors. *Women's Declaration Against Trans Mountain Man Camps*. Secwepemcul'ecw Assembly, November 2017. www.secwepemculecw.org (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Sinclair, Murray. "I am not at all impressed by acts of destruction such as this." Facebook, July 1, 2021. <https://www.facebook.com/Sincmurr> (accessed September 27, 2021).
- Singh, Jagmeet. Twitter Post, February 24, 2020. <https://twitter.com/theJagmeetSingh/status/1231980031905234944?s=20&t=2uxA9dFDzwNIF9cS09MqhQ> (accessed April 1, 2022).
- Social Justice Chair. "Beyond Pipelines and Prisons: Infrastructures of Abolition with Ruth Wilson Gilmore & Winona LaDuke." YouTube, October 26, 2020. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xT5eTVQAc2g> (accessed April 21, 2022).
- Stuart, Charles II. *The Royal Charter for Incorporating The Hudson's Bay Company*. London, 1670.
- Strickland, Sean. "Statement by Canada's Building Trades Unions on Trans Mountain Expansion Project." Canada's Building Trades Unions, February 18, 2022. <https://buildingtrades.ca/statement-by-canadas-building-trades-unions-on-trans-mountain-expansion-project/> (accessed March 23, 2022).
- . "CBTU Statement on Cancellation of Keystone XL." Canada's Building Trades Unions, January 21, 2021. <https://buildingtrades.ca/cbtu-statement-on-cancellation-of-keystone-xl/> (accessed March 23, 2022).
- The Pass System: Life Under Segregation in Canada*. Directed by Alex Williams. V-Tape, 2016. <http://thepasssystem.ca/> (accessed June 29, 2022).

- “Raise Your Voice: A Trans Ally Toolkit.” American Civil Liberties Union. www.aclu-mo.org/trans (accessed December 16, 2021).
- tawinikay. “Autonomously and With Conviction: A Métis Refusal of State-Led Reconciliation.” Guelph, October 12, 2018. theanarchistlibrary.org (accessed April 5, 2022).
- tawinikay. *Reconciliation is Dead: A Call for Revolt After the Raid*. Aphikona Distro, 2020. <https://aphikonadistro.org/> (accessed April 5, 2022).
- Symons, Thomas HB. *To Know Ourselves: The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies* 1-2. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975.
- Tsleil-Waututh Nation Sacred Trust. “Live at the Trans Mountain Pipeline Announcement Press Conference.” Facebook, June 18, 2019. <https://www.facebook.com/630937800297791/videos/612471812592081> (May 25, 2022)
- Tsleil-Waututh Nation Sacred Trust. “Tsleil-Waututh Nation Stands with Nation Member Will George Upon His 28-Day Jail Sentence.” May 11, 2022. <https://twnsacredtrust.ca/tsleil-waututh-nation-stands-with-nation-member-will-george-upon-his-28-day-jail-sentence/> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- “Treaty 7 Indigenous Ally Toolkit.” Calgary Foundation and Montréal Indigenous Community Network, Autumn 2019. www.calgaryfoundation.org (December 23, 2021)..
- Trudeau, Justin. “Speech to the Calgary Petroleum Club.” Liberal Party of Canada, October 30, 2013. <https://liberal.ca/liberal-party-canada-leader-justin-trudeaus-speech-calgary-petroleum-club/> (May 25, 2022).
- Tudor, Henry VIII. *Act in Restraint of Appeals*. London, 1533.
- UN General Assembly. Resolution 1514(XV): *Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples*. December 14, 1960. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/declaration-granting-independence-colonial-countries-and-peoples> (accessed April 20, 2022)
- Unist’ot’en Camp. “All eyes on Wet’suwet’en: International call for week of solidarity.” *Canadian Dimension*, January 8, 2020. <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/all-eyes-on-wetsuweten-international-call-for-week-of-solidarity> (accessed April 13, 2022).
- United Kingdom. *House of Lords Debates*. February 23, 1865.
- United Kingdom. *House of Commons Debates*. August 5, 1869.
- United Kingdom. *House of Commons Debates*. November 20, 1931.
- United Kingdom. *House of Commons Debates*. November 24, 1931.
- United Kingdom. *House of Commons Debates*. February 23, 1982.
- Verso Books. “Walter Rodney’s Russian Revolution.” YouTube, May 29, 2018. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v71Pa-xRhRQ> (accessed April 25, 2022).
- “Victoria Pioneer Rifle Corps.” BC Black History Awareness Society. <https://bcblackhistory.ca/learning-centre/information-sources/the-military-and-police/> (accessed June 7, 2022).

- "Violence on the Land, Violence on Our bodies: Building an Indigenous Response to Environmental Violence." Women's Earth Alliance and Native Youth Sexual Health Network, 2016.
- Vowel, Chelsea. "An Open Letter to 'Angry Settlers.'" *Âpihtawikosisân*, February 26, 2020. apihtawikosisan.com (accessed April 5, 2022).
- Waite, PB. Editor. *The Confederation Debates in the Province of Canada 1865*. McClelland and Stewart: Toronto, 1963.
- "Wet'suwet'en Supporter Toolkit 2020." Unist'ot'en Camp. <https://unistoten.camp/supportertoolkit2020/> (accessed April 13, 2022)
- Woodward, Jon. "Canada deported man to torture in Sri Lanka: affidavit." CTV News, October 8, 2013. <https://bc.ctvnews.ca/canada-deported-man-to-torture-in-sri-lanka-affidavit-1.1489741> (accessed May 12, 2022).
- "World has entered stage of 'vaccine apartheid'-WHO head." Reuters, May 17, 2021. <https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/world-has-entered-stage-vaccine-apartheid-who-head-2021-05-17/> (accessed May 17, 2022).
- Xhopakelxhit. *Everyone Calls Themselves an Ally Until it is Time to Do Some Real Ally Shit*. Ancestral Pride, 2014. warriorpublications.wordpress.com (accessed April 5, 2022).
- Zig Zag. *Colonization and Decolonization: A Manual for Indigenous Liberation in the 21st Century*. Vancouver: Warrior Publications, 2011. warriorpublications.wordpress.com (accessed April 5, 2022).

Popular Media:

- Abas, Malak. "Indigenous Leaders Advocate for Dialogue in Wake of Protest." *Winnipeg Free Press*, July 2, 2021.
- Ahmad, Aalya. "Randcuffed?" *Our Times* (December 12, 2018), <https://ourtimes.ca/article/randcuffed> (accessed March 22, 2022).
- "Activists topple statue of Sir John A Macdonald in downtown Montreal." CBC News, August 29, 2020. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/defund-police-protest-black-lives-matter-1.5705101> (accessed September 30, 2021).
- Albo, Greg. "Canada: Challenging Stephen Harper's Imperialist Agenda." Global Research, November 18, 2013. <http://www.globalresearch.ca/canada-challenging-stephen-harpers-imperialist-agenda/5358559> (accessed March 12, 2017).
- . "Empire's Ally: Canadian Foreign Policy." *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/December 2006).
- Alook, Angele, Sheila Block, and Grace-Edward Galabuzi. *A Disproportionate Burden: COVID-19 Labour Market Impacts on Indigenous and Racialized Workers in Canada*. (Toronto: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2021), <https://policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/disproportionate-burden> (accessed June 7, 2022).

- Anderson, Scott. "Paving Over Peace? Canuck-built Road Helps Israel Cement Control." *NOW Magazine* (May 30, 2002). <https://nowtoronto.com/news/paving-over-peace> (accessed May 18, 2022).
- Ashdown, Nick, and Niall McGee. "In a Turkish forest, resistance grows to a Canadian company's gold-mining project." *The Globe and Mail* (August 26, 2019). Online.
- "'Astonishingly poor response': Industry watchdog criticize BC company after deaths of 4 Burkina Faso miners." CBC News (May 26, 2022). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/burkina-faso-miners-deaths-1.6466253> (June 13, 2022).
- Baldwin, James. "An Open Letter to My Sister, Miss Angela Davis." *The New York Review* (November 19, 1970). <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1971/01/07/an-open-letter-to-my-sister-miss-angela-davis/> (accessed February 24, 2022).
- Barrera, Jorge. "Land Back movement leader flagged by police as 'violent.'" CBC News (November 24, 2021). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/police-williams-wetsuweten-1.6261838> (accessed December 2, 2021).
- . "RCMP arrest 14, clear road on Wet'suwet'en territory in ongoing dispute over land rights, pipeline." CBC News (November 18, 2021). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/rcmp-wet-suwet-en-pipeline-resistance-1.6254245> (accessed December 17, 2021).
- Barzelai, Larry, Warren Bell, and Melissa Lem. "Canada is at a crossroads and the Wet'suwet'en are in its crosshairs." *National Observer* (January 21, 2022). <https://www.nationalobserver.com/2022/01/21/opinion/canada-crossroads-and-wetsuweten-are-its-crosshairs> (accessed April 3, 2022).
- Bingley, Matthew. "Toronto officials, police under fire for tactics used to clear homeless encampments." *Global News* (July 22, 2021). <https://globalnews.ca/news/8052972/lamport-stadium-park-encampment-toronto-police/> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- Blackstock, Cindy. "The Government Spied on Me Without a Warrant." *The Toronto Star* (July 14, 2016). https://www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2014/06/21/the_government_spied_on_me_without_a_warrant.html (accessed December 20, 2021).
- Blanchfield, Mike. "Quiet Canadian diplomacy helped Guaido's anti-Maduro movement in Venezuela." *The National Post* (January 26, 2019). <https://nationalpost.com/news/world/quiet-canadian-diplomacy-helped-guaidos-anti-maduro-movement-in-venezuela> (accessed May 9, 2022).
- Boothby, Lauren. "More than 200 people arrested at pipeline protests in Burnaby." *Burnaby Now* (May 30, 2018). <https://www.burnabynow.com/local-news/more-than-200-people-arrested-at-pipeline-protests-in-burnaby-3076245> (May 25, 2022).
- Brady, Jeff. "2 Years After Standing Rock Protests, Tensions Remain But Oil Business Booms." *NPR* (November 29, 2018). <https://www.npr.org/2018/11/29/671701019/2-years-after-standing-rock-protests-north-dakota-oil-business-is-booming> (accessed May 25, 2022).

- Brown, Beth. "Judge orders crew flights to go ahead this week at Nunavut mine blockade." CBC News (February 10, 2021). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/judge-orders-crew-flights-to-go-ahead-this-week-at-nunavut-mine-blockade-1.5908563> (accessed July 28, 2021).
- . "Protestors move away from Nunavut's Mary River airstrip." CBC News, (February 11, 2021). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/protesters-move-away-from-mary-river-airstrip-1.5910360> (accessed July 28, 2021).
- Bulowski, Natasha. "That makes 17 — another insurer cuts ties with Trans Mountain pipeline." *The Toronto Star* (April 26, 2022). <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2022/04/26/that-makes-17-another-insurer-cuts-ties-with-trans-mountain-pipeline.html> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- "Burkina Faso investigates BC mine company after flood leaves 8 trapped underground." CBC News (May 2, 2022). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/burkina-faso-zinc-mine-trevali-vancouver-bc-1.6438261> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- Camfield, David. Host. "Dialectics Demystified, w/ David McNally." Victor's Children (podcast) (October 15, 2021). <https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/episode-9-dialectics-demystified-w-david-mcnally/id1556511995?i=1000538689732> (accessed June 27, 2022).
- Campbell, Deborah. "Foreign Correspondent." *The Globe and Mail* (January 25, 2022). <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/rob-magazine/foreign-correspondent/article4130246/> (accessed May 18, 2022).
- Casey, Liam. "Toronto's dossier on homeless people 'dystopian,' says advocate as privacy watchdog makes inquiry." CBC News (May 24, 2022). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/encampment-city-of-toronto-homeless-resident-profiles-1.6463612> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- CBC News. "Ministers answer questions on Trans Mountain expansion approval." YouTube video (June 18, 2019). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nQjdlNxtPzE&t=5s> (accessed May 24, 2022).
- . "Trudeau cabinet approves Trans Mountain pipeline expansion project." YouTube video (June 18, 2019). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MF0t-hZRhEk> (accessed May 24, 2022).
- "Chaos erupts again as Toronto official, officers clear homeless encampment at Lamport Stadium." Global New (July 21, 2021). <https://globalnews.ca/video/8048142/chaos-erupts-again-as-toronto-officials-officers-clear-homeless-encampment-at-lamport-stadium> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- Chung, Emily. "How much are taxpayers really subsidizing Canada's fossil fuel industry?" CBC News (March 9, 2022). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/science/fossil-fuel-subsidies-expaliner-1.6371411> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Ciccariello-Maher, George. "Blaming 'Outside Agitators' is a Centuries-Old Ploy." *The Wall Street Journal* (June 7, 2020). <https://www.wsj.com/articles/blaming-outside-agitators-is-a-centuries-old-ploy-11591560877> (accessed April 27, 2022).

- Connolly, Amanda. "Canadian military budget will grow by \$8B as policy review seeks to reset defence vision." *Global News* (April 7, 2022). <https://globalnews.ca/news/8743608/canada-budget-defence-spending-plans/> (accessed April 8, 2022).
- "Covax: Canada defends taking vaccines from sharing scheme." *BBC News* (February 4, 2021). <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-55932997> (accessed May 17, 2022).
- Craig, Asher, Tatiana Flessas, Jonathan Jones, Sarah Keenan, and Luke McDonagh. "Occupying the Pedestal: Cultural heritage, protest, and the law." *LSE: Public Lectures and Events*. Podcast audio, October 28, 2020.
- Dean, Dave. "75% of the World's Mining Companies Are Based in Canada." *Vice News* (July 9, 2013). <https://www.vice.com/en/article/wdb4j5/75-of-the-worlds-mining-companies-are-based-in-canada> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- Dobson, Jim. "The Shocking Doomsday Maps Of The World And The Billionaire Escape Plans." *Forbes* (June 10, 2017). <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jimdobson/2017/06/10/the-shocking-doomsday-maps-of-the-world-and-the-billionaire-escape-plans/?fbclid=IwAR39IXcW0ALY813wqxAYaHb-vYLLceQOcy9ZB8REJNMvqZgcvPyO5UfTpk4&sh=372ef8d14047> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Draus, Alicia. "Wet'suwet'en rail blockade could impact food prices in Atlantic Canada." *Global News* (February 17, 2020). <https://globalnews.ca/news/6560568/wetsuweten-rail-blockade-food-prices-atlantic-canada/> (accessed April 3, 2022).
- Du Bois, WEB. "The African Roots of War." *Atlantic Monthly* 115 (May 1915).
- Democracy Now! "Just Out of Jail, Winona LaDuke Decries Militarized Crackdown on Enbridge Line 3 Pipeline Protests." *YouTube* (July 23, 2021). <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KRwjWJzwNls> (accessed June 17, 2022).
- Engler, Yves. "The Lima Group is Falling Apart." *Canadian Dimension* (August 10, 2021). <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/the-lima-group-is-falling-apart> (accessed May 9, 2022).
- "Fact Sheet: MV Sun Sea Migrants." *Canada Border Service Agency* (August 23, 2010). <https://web.archive.org/web/20120507032509/http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/media/facts-faits/089-eng.html> (accessed May 12, 2022).
- Fenton, Anthony. "Canada's Contribution to 'Democracy Promotion.'" *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/December 2006).
- Flanagan, Ryan. "Why are Indigenous people in Canada so much more likely to be shot and killed by police?" *CTV News*, (June 19, 2020).
- Freeman-Maloy, Daniel. "Organizing the Canada-Israel Alliance." *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/December 2006).
- Forester, Brett. "Is Marc Miller's vow to 'give land back' all sizzle, no steak? These analysts say yes." *APTN News* (October 28, 2021). <https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/miller-land-back-all-sizzle-no-steak-analysts-say-yes/> (accessed November 4, 2021).

- Garrett, Bradley L. “Weapons rooms, fake windows and a \$3m price tag: inside a luxury doomsday bunker.” *The Guardian* (August 1, 2020). <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2020/aug/01/3m-price-tag-inside-luxury-doomsday-bunker> (May 25, 2022).
- Green, Alex V. “Canada is fake: What Americans think of as their friendly neighbor to the north, if they think of it at all, is a scam.” *The Outline* (February 19, 2020). <https://theoutline.com/post/8686/canada-is-fake?zd=2&zi=wyagduct> (May 25, 2022).
- Gonick, Cy. “Is Canada an Imperialist State?” *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/December 2006).
- Gordon, Stephen. “In Canada, the nationalism is as likely to form on the left as on the right.” *The National Post* (February 21, 2017). <https://nationalpost.com/opinion/stephen-gordon-in-canada-the-nationalism-is-as-likely-to-form-on-the-left-as-on-the-right> (accessed May 9, 2022).
- Gouldhawke, Mike. “Land as a Social Relationship,” *Briarpatch* 49(5) (September/October 2020).
- Green, Melanie. “Meet the self-described ‘sinister seniors’ taking a stand against Trans Mountain — and going to jail for it.” *The Toronto Star* (August 24, 2018). <https://www.thestar.com/vancouver/2018/08/20/meet-the-self-described-sinister-seniors-taking-a-stand-against-trans-mountain-and-going-to-jail-for-it.html> (accessed May 24, 2022).
- Haslett, Tobi. “Magic Actions: Looking back on the George Floyd rebellion.” *N+1 Magazine* 40 (Summer 2021). <https://www.nplusonemag.com/issue-40/politics/magic-actions-2/> (accessed September 30, 2021).
- Hayes, Molly. “Data analysis reveals three-quarters of Toronto cops reside outside the city.” *The Globe and Mail* (January 8, 2019). <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/toronto/article-data-analysis-reveals-three-quarters-of-toronto-cops-reside-outside/> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- Hindustan Times. “Watch: Kenyan envoy to UN stuns the world; Gives history lesson to Russia at Ukraine meet.” Youtube (February 23, 2022). https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=78ec1_fzepc (accessed April 21, 2022).
- Horn, Kahentinettha. “Caledonia’s ‘Lord of the Flies’ Strategy at Six Nations.” *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/December 2006).
- Hosgood, Amanda Follett. “African Mine Disaster Turns Spotlight on Canadian Mining Firms.” *The Tyee* (May 10, 2022). <https://thetyee.ca/News/2022/05/10/African-Mine-Disaster-Spotlight-Canadian-Mining-Firms/> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- “How Statues are Falling Around the World.” *The New York Times* (June 24, 2020). <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/24/us/confederate-statues-photos.html> (accessed September 30, 2021).
- Ignatieff, Michael. “The American Empire; The Burden,” *The New York Times Magazine* (January 5, 2003). <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/05/magazine/the-american-empire-the-burden.html> (May 9, 2022).

- Impelli, Matthew. "54 Percent of Americans Think Burning Down Minneapolis Police Precinct Was Justified After George Floyd's Death." *Newsweek* (June 6, 2020). <https://www.newsweek.com/54-americans-think-burning-down-minneapolis-police-precinct-was-justified-after-george-floyds-1508452> (accessed September 30, 2021).
- Ip, Stephanie, and Patrick Johnston. "Kinder Morgan halts non-essential work on Trans Mountain pipeline and sets drop-dead deadline." *Vancouver Sun* (April 9, 2018). <https://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/kinder-morgan-to-halt-its-spending-on-trans-mountain-pipeline-due-to-b-c-opposition> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Ismi, Asad. "U.S., Canada side with fanatical coup regime in Bolivia." *Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives* (March 2, 2020). <https://policyalternatives.ca/publications/monitor/us-canada-side-fanatical-coup-regime-bolivia> (accessed May 9, 2022).
- Jacobson, Kate. Host. "Operation Solidarity, 1983: An (Almost) B.C. General Strike." *Alberta Advantage Podcast* (December 14, 2020). <https://albertaadvantagepod.com/2020/12/14/operation-solidarity-1983-an-almost-b-c-general-strike/> (December 16, 2021).
- Johnson, Tommy. "Deep Roots and Conflict in Oaxaca." *Canadian Dimension* 41(1) (January/February 2007).
- Kay, Jonathan. "The Rise and (Possible) Fall of Justin Trudeau Show the Perils of Woke Governance." *Quillette*, (March 7, 2019). <https://quillette.com/2019/03/07/the-rise-and-possible-fall-of-justin-trudeau-show-the-perils-of-woke-governance/> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Lavoie, Joanna. "East York hospital decries 'despicable symbol of racism' in construction area." *Toronto.com* (June 12, 2020). https://www.toronto.com/news/crime/east-york-hospital-decries-despicable-symbol-of-racism-in-construction-area/article_23561991-8ca5-5abb-8c04-d1d1ea2175fb.html? (accessed March 22, 2022).
- Leck, Sebastian. "The head of the statue of Egerton Ryerson now on spike at Land Back Lane in Caledonia, Ont." *CBC News*, June 10, 2021. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/egerton-ryerson-statue-caledonia-land-back-lane-1.6059513> (accessed September 30, 2021).
- Little, Simon. "Video shows man pushing board into truck's path as it drives through B.C. highway blockade." *Global News*, February 11, 2020. <https://globalnews.ca/news/6539253/video-plywood-truck-bc-highway-blockade/> (accessed April 4, 2022).
- Lum, Zi-Ann. "Trudeau Cabinet approves C\$10B loan guarantee for TMX." *Politico* (May 10, 2022). <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/05/10/trudeau-cabinet-approves-c-10b-loan-guarantee-for-tmx-00031522> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Malik, Abdul. "Jack Layton is the NDP's third rail." *Canadian Dimension* (September 1, 2020). https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/jack-layton-is-the-ndps-third-rail?fbclid=IwAR25L3eTOZP1_8mZABHpZ7k-dm_ziU_DOYlweU4OzqYCKi2_OoRFdJL0TUQ; (accessed May 24, 2022).
- Markusoff, Jason. "The rise of Alberta's unapologetic petro-patriots." *Macleans Magazine*, July 15, 2019. <https://www.macleans.ca/news/canada/the-rise-of-albertas-unapologetic-petro-patriots/> (accessed May 25, 2022).

- Mas, Susana. "Trudeau lays out plan for new relationship with indigenous people." CBC News. (December 5, 2015). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/justin-trudeau-afn-indigenous-aboriginal-people-1.3354747> (May 25, 2022).
- Matas, Robert. "Film suggests Dosanjh 'manufactured a crisis.'" *Globe and Mail* (April 29, 2000). <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/film-suggests-dosanjh-manufactured-a-crisis/article4163252/> (accessed April 5, 2022).
- McKay, Ian, and Martin Lukacs. "The stormy future of Canadian liberalism: An interview with Ian McKay, Canada's renegade historian of liberalism." *The Breach* (October 13, 2021). <https://breachmedia.ca/the-stormy-future-of-canadian-liberalism/?fbclid=IwAR25g7TocyjSdMR25ftiwxf2jX9RMxPG-z9h-ISQqEL0zFO7jPGGySd6kdg> (accessed December 3, 2021).
- McKendrick, Devon. "Investigation ongoing after Queen Victoria, Queen Elizabeth II statues toppled at Manitoba Legislature." CTV News Winnipeg, July 2, 2021, <https://winnipeg.ctvnews.ca/investigation-ongoing-after-queen-victoria-queen-elizabeth-ii-statues-toppled-at-manitoba-legislature-1.5493852> (accessed September 27, 2021).
- McMahon, Sean F. "Canadian War-Crimes Profiteering." Washington Report on Middle East Affairs (December 2011). <https://www.wrmea.org/011-december/anada-calling-canadian-war-crimes-profiteering.html> (accessed May 18, 2022).
- Mitter, Siddhartha. "All Statues are Local: The Great Toppling of 2020 and the Rebirth of Civic Imagination." *The Intercept*, July 19, 2020. <https://theintercept.com/2020/07/19/confederate-statues-monuments-local/> (accessed September 30, 2021).
- Morin, Brandi. "'No One is Going to Believe You': When the RCMP Abuses Indigenous Women and Girls." *Al Jazeera* (December 29, 2021). <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/longform/2021/12/29/no-one-will-believe-you-when-the-rcmp-abuses-indigenous-girls> (accessed January 14, 2022).
- . "On the front lines of 'the war within Canada's borders,'" *Al Jazeera* (November 25, 2021). <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2021/11/25/on-the-front-lines-of-the-war-within-canadas-borders> (accessed December 2, 2021).
- Mosleh, Omar. "'They came to destroy and create fear': Indigenous protester says men attacked Trans Mountain protest camp." *The Star* (April 22, 2020). <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2020/04/22/they-came-to-destroy-and-create-fear-indigenous-protester-says-men-attacked-trans-mountain-protest-camp.html> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Moss, Neil. "Continued dawdling on vaccine waiver position leaves NDP and advocates 'extremely frustrated.'" *The Hill Times* (May 4, 2022). <https://www.hilltimes.com/2022/05/04/continued-dawdling-on-vaccine-waiver-position-leaves-ndp-and-advocates-extremely-frustrated/359702> (accessed May 17, 2022).
- Neckoway, Ramona. "Dam(n) Development: The Production of Hydroelectricity on Cree Territory." *Canadian Dimension* 41(1) (January/February 2007).

- “Night hunting ‘becoming a race war,’ says Premier Brian Pallister.” CBC News, January 20, 2017. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/night-hunting-brian-pallister-race-war-1.3944949> (accessed September 27, 2021).
- Patterson, Brent. “Human rights defenders call on Canada to end support to Colombian police and army.” NB Media Co-op (May 14, 2021). https://nbmediacoop.org/2021/05/14/human-rights-defenders-call-on-canada-to-end-support-to-colombian-police-and-army/?fbclid=IwAR2YmyCoqZ_E1Cfd78o92ggXAS8pfF3vDjUaBble4TVli5VJmdpo2sHrUoU (accessed April 25, 2022).
- Powell, Naomi, Emily Jackson, and Julia Mastroianni. “‘Potential catastrophe’: Rail blockades disrupt supply chains for food — which may lead to grocery shortages.” *Financial Post* (February 14, 2020). <https://financialpost.com/transportation/rail/potential-catastrophe-rail-blockades-disrupt-supply-chains-for-food-which-may-lead-to-grocery-shortages> (accessed April 3, 2022).
- Perreux, Les, Eric Atkins, and Eric Andrew-Gee. “Industry groups warn rail protests are hurting supply chain.” *The Globe and Mail* (February 12, 2020). <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-retailers-and-manufacturers-brace-for-shutdowns-as-pipeline-protests/> (accessed April 3, 2022).
- Petras, James. “The Soaring Profits of the Military – Industrial Complex and Casualties.” *Canadian Dimension* (June 24, 2014). canadiandimension.com (April 5, 2022).
- Petz, Sarah. “Statues of queens topples at Manitoba legislature will be restored, premier says.” CBC News, July 7, 2021. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/pallister-queen-statues-manitoba-1.6093151> (accessed September 27, 2021).
- Piché, Gabrielle. “Probe Continues into Toppled Statues.” *Winnipeg Free Press*, August 12, 2021.
- Polewski, Lisa. “Protesters arrested at residential development in Caledonia: OPP.” Global News, (August 5, 2020). <https://globalnews.ca/news/7253109/protesters-arrested-caledonia-opp/> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Podur, Justin. “Canada for anti-imperialists.” *Colours of Resistance*. <http://www.coloursofresistance.org/446/canada-for-anti-imperialists/> (accessed March 4, 2017).
- Postmedia Editorial. “Trudeau needs to leave his social justice warrior cape at home.” *Toronto Sun*, (May 22, 2018). <https://torontosun.com/opinion/editorials/editorial-trudeau-needs-to-leave-his-social-justice-warrior-cape-at-home> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Barnaby Raine and David Camfield, “Is the Enemy of My Enemy My Friend?” *The Breach* (October 22, 2021), <https://breachmedia.ca/is-the-enemy-of-my-enemy-my-friend/> (accessed April 22, 2022).
- Rickford, Russell. “Toppling statues as a decolonial ethic.” *Africa is a Country*, July 28, 2020. <https://africasacountry.com/2020/07/toppling-statues-as-a-decolonial-ethic> (accessed September 30, 2021).
- Robertson, David A. “Pallister has shattered his government's relationship with Indigenous people.” *The Global and Mail*, July 24, 2021.

- Rocca, Ryan. "City of Toronto spent nearly \$2M to clear 3 homeless encampments, repair parks." *Global News* (September 17, 2021). <https://globalnews.ca/news/8199534/city-of-toronto-homeless-encampment-clearing-costs/> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- Rosenthal, Tracey. "Inside LA's Homeless Industrial Complex." *The New Republic* (May 19, 2022). <https://newrepublic.com/article/166383/los-angeles-echo-park-homeless-industrial-complex> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- "Ryerson University to change its name amid reckoning with history of residential schools." *CBC News*, August 26, 2021. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/ryerson-university-name-change-1.6154716> (accessed September 30, 2021).
- Saraiva, Augusta. "Toppling Statues Isn't Enough in Latin America." *Foreign Policy* (August 10, 2020). https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/08/10/latin-america-protest-colonial-statues-monuments-indigenous-rights/?utm_source=pocket_mylist (accessed October 20, 2021).
- Schalk, Owen. "Canadian mining and the tragedy in Burkina Faso." *Canadian Dimension* (May 26, 2022). <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/canadian-mining-and-the-tragedy-in-burkina-faso> (accessed June 13, 2022).
- . "Debunking the myth of Canada's non-involvement in the Iraq war." *Canadian Dimension* (March 13, 2022). <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/debunking-the-myth-of-canadas-non-involvement-in-the-iraq-war> (accessed May 9, 2022).
- Shook, Jarrod. "The Canadian carceral state: What is to be done? Ask prisoners!" *Canadian Dimension* (January 5, 2019). <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/the-canadian-carceral-state-what-is-to-be-done-ask-prisoners> (accessed November 3, 2021).
- Sinclair, Murray. "Premier seeks to divide province with incendiary comments on vaccine, First Nations." *CBC News*, December 5, 2020. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/opinion-sinclair-pallister-vaccine-first-nations-1.5828578> (accessed September 27, 2021).
- Sinclair, Niigaan. "Vandalism is in the eye of the beholder." *Winnipeg Free Press*, July 2, 2021.
- Smith, Charlie. "RCMP arrest Unist'ot'en matriarchs during ceremony to honour missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls." *The Georgia Straight*, (February 10, 2020). <https://www.straight.com/news/1358106/rcmp-arrest-unistoten-matriarchs-during-ceremony-honour-missing-and-murdered-indigenous> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Starblanket, Gina, and Dallas Hunt. "How the death of Colten Boushie became recast as the story of a knight protecting his castle." *The Globe and Mail* (February 13, 2018). Online.
- Spurr, Ben. "Crosstown LRT builder showed 'implicit bias' when it fired Black worker, says labour board." *Toronto Star* (April 1, 2022). <https://www.thestar.com/amp/news/gta/2022/04/01/crosstown-lrt-builder-showed-implicit-bias-when-it-fired-black-worker-says-labour-board.html> (accessed April 3, 2022).
- "Statue of Egerton Ryerson, toppled after Toronto rally, 'will not be restored or replaced.'" *CBC News*, June 6, 2021. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/statue-of-egerton-ryerson-brought-down-1.6055676> (accessed September 30, 2021).

- “Stranded Baffinland mine workers pen open letter to protestors, say they support Inuit.” CBC News (February 11, 2021). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/baffinland-protestors-open-letter-1.5910951> (accessed July 28, 2021).
- “Supply chain warnings grow louder as rail blockades persist.” BNN Bloomberg (February 12, 2020). <https://www.bnnbloomberg.ca/supply-chain-warnings-grow-louder-as-rail-blockades-persist-1.1388989> (accessed April 3, 2022).
- Táiwò, Olúfẹ̀mi O. “Selective Conscience: John Rawls’s Doctrine of Fairness.” *The Nation* (November 27, 2021). <https://www.thenation.com/article/society/john-rawls-shadow-of-justice/> (accessed May 5, 2022).
- Teitel, Emma. “Multi-storey underground basements for Toronto’s rich? That’ll only dig us all deeper into our climate change hole.” *The Toronto Star* (October 6, 2021). <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/star-columnists/2021/10/06/multi-storey-underground-basements-for-torontos-rich-thatll-only-dig-us-all-deeper-into-our-climate-change-hole.html> (May 25, 2022).
- Thurton, David. “Canada spent \$18B on financial supports for the fossil fuel industry last year: report.” CBC News (April 15, 2021). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/fossil-fuel-subsidy-canada-1.5987392> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Tunney, Catharine. “Jim Carr says military comments not a threat to pipeline protesters.” CBC News, (December 2, 2016). <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/jim-carr-protests-pipeline-military-1.3878258> (accessed May 25, 2022).
- Walia, Harsha. “‘Land is a Relationship’: In conversation with Glen Coulthard on Indigenous nationhood.” *Rabble* (January 20, 2015). <https://rabble.ca/columnists/land-relationship-conversation-glen-coulthard-on-indigenous-nationhood/> (accessed April 11, 2022).
- Westoll, Nick. “New association aims to end systemic anti-Black racism in Canada’s construction industry.” *Global News* (February 1, 2021). <https://globalnews.ca/news/7612305/afro-canadian-contractors-association-construction-industry-racism/> (March 22, 2022).
- Wilkins, Carolyn A. “A Look Under the Hood of Canada’s Job Market.” Bank of Canada (January 31, 2019). <https://www.bankofcanada.ca/2019/01/look-under-hood-canadas-job-market/> (accessed June 21, 2022).
- Wittnebel, Joel. “Bradford Bypass Threatens Ancient Indigenous Site ‘more significant than 95 percent of all historic/archaeological sites in Canada.’” *The Pointer* (January 23, 2022). https://thepointer.com/article/2022-01-23/bradford-bypass-threatens-ancient-indigenous-site-more-significant-than-95-percent-of-all-historic-archaeological-sites-in-canada?fbclid=IwAR2YL7pVQ0-tTeosn5UkuY5zAxBbMpfWNLsW0SxgIL8-QhM1jLFL_dRck (accessed May 18, 2022).
- Yazzie, Melanie K. “Traumatic Monologues: On the Therapeutic Turn in Indigenous Politics.” *The Baffler* (59), (September 2021). <https://thebaffler.com/outbursts/traumatic-monologues-yazzie?fbclid=IwAR3hYHPzfKH-idRNsQLeTY3LhNFpqpAI1MdATVE2A6JMKI46vgi5FGzKw9w> (accessed October 20, 2021).
- Zivitz, Noah. “Trans Mountain expansion price tag hits \$21.4B, Feds cut off funding.” BNN Bloomberg (February 18, 2022). <https://www.bnnbloomberg.ca/trans-mountain->

[expansion-price-tag-hits-21-4b-as-construction-drags-on-1.1725621](#) (accessed May 25, 2022).

Court Cases:

Canadian Federal Court of Appeal, *Tsleil-Waututh Nation v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2018.

Court of Appeal for Ontario, *Chippewas of Sarnia Band v. Canada (Attorney General)*, 2000.

Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, *Madzimbamuto v Lardner-Burke*, 1968.

Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, *St. Catherine's Milling and Lumber Company vs. The Queen*, 1888.

Supreme Court of British Columbia, *Thomas and Saik'uz First Nation v. Rio Tinto Alcan Inc.*, 2022.

Supreme Court of Canada, *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia*, 1997.

Supreme Court of Canada, *Reference re Secession of Quebec*, 1998.

Supreme Court of Canada, *Tsilhqot'in v. British Columbia*, 2014.

Supreme Court of the United States, *Cherokee Nation vs. Georgia*, 1831.

Unpublished Theses/Dissertations:

LeBlanc, Deanne Aline Marie. *Identifying the Settler Denizen within Settler Colonialism*. Unpublished thesis: the University of Victoria, 2014.

Leighton, James Douglas. *The Development Of Federal Indian Policy In Canada, 1840-1890*. Unpublished dissertation: the University of Western Ontario, 1975.

Gray, Laura. *Trans Mountain 1953: Public Response in Alberta and British Columbia*. Unpublished thesis: the University of Victoria, 2019.

Michaud-Ouellet, Joëlle Alice. *On the Relationship between Vulnerability and Sovereignty in Québécois Settler Self-Determination and the Shift to a Relational Conception of the Self as Treaty Partner*. Unpublished dissertation, the University of Victoria, 2019.

Roy, Audrey Jane. *Sovereignty and Decolonization: Realizing Indigenous Self-Determination at the United Nations and in Canada*. Unpublished thesis: the University of Victoria, 2001.

Táiwò, Olúfẹmi O. *Autobiography*. Unpublished dissertation: University of California Los Angeles, 2018.

Notes

Introduction Notes:

¹ Stuart Hall. *The Hard Road to Renewal: Thatcherism and the Crisis of the Left*, (London: Verso, 1990), 130.

² “Chaos erupts again as Toronto official, officers clear homeless encampment at Lamport Stadium,” Global News (July 21, 2021), <https://globalnews.ca/video/8048142/chaos-erupts-again-as-toronto-officials-officers-clear-homeless-encampment-at-lamport-stadium> (accessed June 13, 2022). Matthew Bingley, “Toronto officials, police under fire for tactics used to clear homeless encampments,” Global News (July 22, 2021), <https://globalnews.ca/news/8052972/lamport-stadium-park-encampment-toronto-police/> (accessed June 13, 2022).

³ Ryan Rocca, “City of Toronto spent nearly \$2M to clear 3 homeless encampments, repair parks,” Global News (September 17, 2021), <https://globalnews.ca/news/8199534/city-of-toronto-homeless-encampment-clearing-costs/> (accessed June 13, 2022). Liam Casey, “Toronto’s dossier on homeless people ‘dystopian,’ says advocate as privacy watchdog makes inquiry,” CBC News (May 24, 2022), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/encampment-city-of-toronto-homeless-resident-profiles-1.6463612> (accessed June 13, 2022).

⁴ Molly Hayes, “Data analysis reveals three-quarters of Toronto cops reside outside the city,” *The Globe and Mail* (January 8, 2019), <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/toronto/article-data-analysis-reveals-three-quarters-of-toronto-cops-reside-outside/> (accessed June 13, 2022).

⁵ Tracey Rosenthal, “Inside LA’s Homeless Industrial Complex,” *The New Republic* (May 19, 2022), <https://newrepublic.com/article/166383/los-angeles-echo-park-homeless-industrial-complex> (accessed June 13, 2022).

This is a dictate which the very structure of the wage-economy makes impossible anyway. Whether it is as a consequence of so-called ‘structural unemployment’ (which in post-industrial Canada is roughly 6% of ‘working-aged’ people), the social construction of disability precluding whole groups of people from employment, or the contradictions that emerge around whether any particular household relies on either waged or unwaged reproductive labour, many people do not and cannot *work* for wages—though everyone is involved in certain forms of *labour* as a matter of their being in the world. Carolyn A Wilkins, “A Look Under the Hood of Canada’s Job Market,” Bank of Canada (January 31, 2019), <https://www.bankofcanada.ca/2019/01/look-under-hood-canadas-job-market/> (accessed June 21, 2022).

⁶ Beatrice Adler-Bolton and Artie Vierkant, *Health Communism: A Surplus Manifesto*, (Toronto: Penguin Random House, 2022).

⁷ “Burkina Faso investigates BC mine company after flood leaves 8 trapped underground,” CBC News (May 2, 2022), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/burkina-faso-zinc-mine-trevali-vancouver-bc-1.6438261> (accessed June 13, 2022).

⁸ Owen Schalk, “Canadian mining and the tragedy in Burkina Faso,” *Canadian Dimension* (May 26, 2022), <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/canadian-mining-and-the-tragedy-in-burkina-faso> (accessed June 13, 2022). “‘Astonishingly poor response’: Industry watchdog criticize BC company after deaths of 4 Burkina Faso miners,” CBC News (May 26, 2022), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/burkina-faso-miners-deaths-1.6466253> (June 13, 2022).

⁹ Amanda Follett Hosgood, “African Mine Disaster Turns Spotlight on Canadian Mining Firms,” *The Tyee* (May 10, 2022), <https://thetyee.ca/News/2022/05/10/African-Mine-Disaster-Spotlight-Canadian-Mining-Firms/> (accessed June 13, 2022). Dave Dean, “75% of the World’s Mining Companies Are Based in Canada,” *Vice News* (July 9, 2013), <https://www.vice.com/en/article/wdb4j5/75-of-the-worlds-mining-companies-are-based-in-canada> (accessed June 13, 2022).

¹⁰ Emphasis mine. Lee-Anne Hermann, *Twitter Post* (May 19, 2022), <https://twitter.com/HermannCAN/status/1527172514803339267?s=20&t=jkSJMGEFWUMRTU3gtGz6TkA> (accessed June 13, 2022).

¹¹ It is worth noting, for instance, that the maximalist implications of this particular struggle—amounting to a challenge to the entire edifice of the settler social order—are precisely what the First Nations sought to *avoid* by making a claim of tort. Kent writes that although the “plaintiffs say they are not challenging Crown sovereignty *per se*, they are nonetheless challenging the efficacy of legislation, licenses, and contracts issued or made by the Crown in a tort lawsuit against a non-government entity” (*para* 199). As he notes in his account of the case’s procedural history, whereas the First Nations sought to restrict this dispute to a matter solely of torts, Rio Tinto found all too willing co-defendants in both the province of British Columbia and the government of Canada (*para* 38). Indeed, it was in the supposed crawlspace between Rio Tinto and the governments that delegated authority to it to dam the Nechako River that Justice Kent was able to find the legal straightjacket to bind him against the clear principles of justice demanded by all the other facts of the case. The Italian anti-fascist Antonio Gramsci once remarked that in a moment of revolutionary upheaval “when the State trembled, a sturdy structure of civil society was at once revealed. The State was only an outer ditch, behind which there stood a powerful system of fortresses and earthworks.” Quoted in, Stuart Hall, “Gramsci’s Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity,” *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10(2) (1986): 17.

¹² Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resurgence*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017), 67.

¹³ Cedric J Robinson, *The Terms of Order: Political Science and the Myth of Leadership*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016 [1980]). HLT Quan, “Foreword,” in *An Anthropology of Marxism*, by Cedric J Robinson, (London: Pluto Press, 2019 [2001]).

¹⁴ James C Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999). Warren Magnusson, “Decentering the State, Or Looking for Politics,” in William Carroll, editor, *Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice*, (Toronto: Garamond, 1992). Olúfẹ̀mi Táíwò, “States Are Not Basic Structures: Against State-Centric Political Theory,” *Philosophical Papers* 48(1) (2019): 59-82. Erin R Pineda, *Seeing Like an Activist: Civil Disobedience and the Civil Rights Movement*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).

¹⁵ Kiera L Ladner, “Taking the Field: 50 Years of Indigenous Politics in the *CJPS*,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(1) (2017): 163-179. Jeff Corntassel, “Life Beyond the State: Regenerating Indigenous International Relations and Everyday Challenges to Settler Colonialism,” *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* (1) (2021): 71-97. J Kēhaulani Kauanui, “The Politics of Indigeneity, Anarchist Praxis, and Decolonization,” *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* (1) (2021): 9-42. Hermann Amborn, *Law as Refuge of Anarchy: Societies without Hegemony or State*, trans. by Adrian Nathan West, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2019 [2016]). Joseph Massad, “Against Self-Determination,” *Humanity* 9(2) (2018): online.

¹⁶ Philip Abrams, “Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State (1977),” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1(1) (March 1988): 76.

¹⁷ *ibid.*, 79.

¹⁸ Stuart Hall, “Race, Articulation, and Societies Structured in Dominance (1980),” in *Essential Essay Vol. 1: Foundations of Cultural Studies*, edited by David Morley, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018): 305-345.

¹⁹ Joyce Green, “Canaries in the Mines of Citizenship: Indian Women in Canada,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 34(4) (2001): 715–716.

²⁰ Yasmeen Abu-Laban and Christina Gabriel, *Selling Diversity: Immigration, Multiculturalism, Employment Equity, and Globalization*, (Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2002). Rauna Kuokkanen, “Indigenous Women in Traditional Economies: The Case of Sámi Reindeer Herding,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 34(3) (2009): 499–504. Leigh Binford, *Tomorrow We’re All Going to the Harvest: Temporary Foreign Workers Programs and Neoliberal Political Economy*, (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2013). Manu Karuka, *Empire’s Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2019).

- ²¹ Robin DG Kelley, "The Rest of Us: Rethinking Settler and Native," *American Quarterly* 69(2) (June 2017): 267-276.
- ²² Robyn Maynard, *Policing Black Live: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present*, (Halifax: Fernwood Press, 2017): 32.
- ²³ Heidi Kiiwentinepinesik Stark, "Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land," *Theory & Event* 19(4) (2016): online.
- ²⁴ Janine Brodie, "Politics on the Boundaries: Restructuring and the Canadian Women's Movement," 8th Annual Robarts Lecture, (York University, Toronto, March 1, 1994). Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*, (Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2004).
- ²⁵ Cedric J Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2020 [1983]).
- ²⁶ Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Mask: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014). Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, "Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation," *Decolonization* 3(3) (2014): 1-25.
- ²⁷ Robin DG Kelley, *Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002). Nick Estes, *Our History is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, and the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance*, (London: Verso, 2019).
- ²⁸ HLT Quan, "Emancipatory social inquiry: Democratic anarchism and the Robinsonian method," *African Identities* 11(2) (2013): 120.
- ²⁹ CLR James, "Every Cook Can Govern: A Study of Democracy in Ancient Greece and its Meaning for Today," in *A New Notion: Two Works by CLR James*, edited by Noel Ignatiev, (Oakland: PM Press, 2010): 129-155.
- ³⁰ Steven Salaita, *Inter/Nationalism: Decolonizing Native America and Palestine*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016). Jen Gobby, *More Powerful Together: Conversations with Climate Activists and Indigenous Land Defenders*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020). Nick Estes, Ruth Wilson Gilmore, and Christopher Loperena, "United in Struggle," North American Congress on Latin America (August 24, 2021), <https://nacla.org/news/2021/07/28/nick-estes-ruth-gilmore-united-struggle> (accessed June 23, 2022). Fred Burrill, "The Settler Order Framework: Rethinking Canadian Working-Class History," *Labour/Le Travail* 83 (Spring 2019): 173-197.
- ³¹ Makere Stewart-Harawira, *The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization*, (London: Zed Books, 2005). Adom Getachew, *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019). Moon-Ho Jung, *Menace to Empire: Anticolonial Solidarities and the Transpacific Origins of the US Security State*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2022).
- ³² Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015). Moon-Ho Jung, *Cane and Coolies: Race, Labour, and Sugar in the Age of Emancipation*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2008). George Manuel and Michael Posluns, *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019 [1974]).
- ³³ Olufémi Táíwò, *Reconsidering Reparations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 20.
- ³⁴ *ibid.*, 33-51. Ruth Wilson Gilmore, "Fatal Couplings of Power and Difference: Notes on Racism and Geography," in *Abolition Geography: Essays Towards Liberation*, edited by Brenna Bhandar and Alberto Toscano, (London: Verso, 2022): 132-153.
- ³⁵ Winona LaDuke, *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2015 [1999]). John Borrows, "'Landed' Citizenship: An Indigenous Declaration of Interdependence," in *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002): 138-158. Glen Coulthard, "Place against Empire: Understanding Indigenous Anti-Colonialism," *Affinities* (November 2010), online. Umeek [E Richard Atleo], *Principles of Tsawalk: An Indigenous Approach to Global Crisis*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011). Shiri Pasternak, *Grounded Authority: The Algonquins of Barriere Lake Against the State*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press,

2017). Dina Gilio-Whitaker, *As Long as the Grass Grows: The Indigenous Fight for Environmental Justice, From Colonization to Standing Rock*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 2019).

³⁶ Adam J Barker and Jenny Pickerill, “Radicalizing Relationships To and Through Shared Geographies: Why Anarchists Need to Understand Indigenous Connections to Land and Place,” *Antipode* 45(5) (November 2012): 1705-1725. Soren C Larsen and Jay T Johnson, *Being Together in Place: Indigenous Coexistence in a More than Human World*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

³⁷ Democracy Now!, “Just Out of Jail, Winona LaDuke Decries Militarized Crackdown on Enbridge Line 3 Pipeline Protests,” YouTube (July 23, 2021), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KRwjWJzwNls> (accessed June 17, 2022).

³⁸ Winona LaDuke and Deborah Cowen, “Beyond Wiindigoo Infrastructure,” *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 119(2) (April 2020): 255.

³⁹ Alan Noël, “Studying Your Own Country: Social Scientific Knowledge for Our Times and Places,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 47(4) (December 2014): 659-660.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*, 653.

⁴¹ Yasmeen Abu-Laban, “Narrating Canadian Political Science: History Revisited,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(4) (2017): 895-919.

⁴² Noël, “Studying Your Own Country,” 662.

⁴³ *ibid.*, 661.

⁴⁴ Kevin Bruyneel, “Political Science and the Study of Indigenous Politics,” (May 17, 2012), <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2061662> (accessed November 12, 2021). Glen S Coulthard, “Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the ‘Politics of Recognition’ in Canada,” *Contemporary Political Theory* 6 (2007): 437-460. Shiri Pasternak, “Jurisdiction and Settler Colonialism: Where Do Laws Meet?” *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 29(2) (2014): 145-161. Gina Starblanket, “Constitutionalizing (In)justice: Treaty Interpretation and the Containment of Indigenous Governance,” *Constitutional Forum* 28(1) (2019): 13-24.

⁴⁵ Rita Dhamoon, *Identity/Difference Politics: How Difference is Produced, and Why It Matters*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009). Nisha Nath, “Defining Narratives of Identity in Canadian Political Science: Accounting for the Absence of Race,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 44(1) (2011): 161-193. Owen Toews, *Stolen City: Racial Capitalism and the Making of Winnipeg*, (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2018). Ethel Tungohan, “The Transformative and Radical Feminism of Grassroots Migrant Women’s Movement(s) in Canada,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(2) (2017): 479-494.

⁴⁶ Estes, et al., “United in Struggle.” Karuka, *Empire’s Tracks*.

⁴⁷ Abrams, “Studying the State,” 80.

⁴⁸ While the few Canadianists who persist in engaging these methods have recently attempted to rectify these shortcomings, largely by subsuming Indigenous peoples as a “third pillar” of Canada, their efforts have been both largely mechanistic in their understanding of racial regimes and also something of an apologetics for the state. Peter H Russell, *Canada’s Odyssey: A Country Based on Incomplete Conquests*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017).

⁴⁹ Umeek [E Richard Atleo], *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth Worldview*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004). Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* 2nd Ed., (London: Zed Books, 2012 [1999]). See also the following conversation between David Camfield and David McNally for a consideration on the ways in which dialectical methods may also resonate here: David Camfield, host, “Dialectics Demystified, w/ David McNally,” Victor’s Children (podcast) (October 15, 2021), <https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/episode-9-dialectics-demystified-w-david-mcnally/id1556511995?i=1000538689732> (accessed June 27, 2022).

Chapter One Notes:

¹ WB Gallie, “Essentially Contested Concepts,” *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 56 (1955-1956): 167-198.

² See, for example: Thomas HB Symons, *To Know Ourselves: The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies 1-2* (Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975). Barbara Moon, *The Canadian Shield*, (Toronto: Natural Science of Canada Ltd., 1970). David Johnston, *The Idea of Canada: Letters to a Nation*, (Toronto: Penguin Random House, 2019).

³ This latter point can, as I discuss in Chapters Three to Five, lead to conceptual inflation—such as overdetermining the normative relationship between citizenship within a polity and affinity for said social order or reducing the processes of state-building to singular and uncontradictory logics—where it is unwarranted or, perhaps, unhelpful. In short, such conceptual inflation makes it difficult to see that it is at once possible to be *in* a social order and *against* it, and that this is potentiated by the internal contradictions subtended within any given social order.

⁴ Janet Ajzenstat and Peter J Smit, *Canada's Origins: Liberal, Tory, or Republican?* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press, 1995). Seymour Martin Lipset, *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*, (New York: Routledge, 1990). James Tully, *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995). FL Morton and Rainer Knopff, *The Charter Revolution and the Court Party*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000). Michael Jackson, *The Canadian Kingdom: 150 Years of Constitutional Monarchy*, (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2018). Peter H Russell, *Canada's Odyssey: A Country Based on Incomplete Conquests*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017).

⁵ My usage of 'face' here is borrowed from the method deployed by two other scholars, one of Canadian federalism and the other of American imperialism. In the first, the invocation of federalism's "faces" is meant to capture the fact that federalism "is different things to different people" and that this "is not the result of widespread error but of simple fact, for political institutions that accommodate diversity will reflect the dimensions which are vital to the actors who work them" (Mallory 1). The second usage, however, notes the "two faces of American freedom": on the one hand its relatively capacious scope of civic empowerment for an in-group which is, on the other hand, always predicated on the constitutive oppression of various out-groups (Rana 1-14). I intend both meanings: (1) the refusal of privileged god's eye view and (2) attention towards the internal contradictions of social relations. JR Mallory, "The Five Faces of Federalism," in *The Future of Canadian Federalism*, edited by Paul-Andre Crepeau and CB MacPherson, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965): 1-15. Aziz Rana, *The Two Faces of American Freedom*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010).

⁶ The only mention of Indigenous peoples within the territories claimed by Canada in the November/December 2006 issues is in Kahentinetha Horn's regular "Indian Country" column, which was interestingly printed on the page opposite the special insert. Seemingly, in the minds of the copyeditors the colonization of Indian country is not relevant to their conceptualization of imperialism. Kahentinetha Horn, "Caledonia's 'Lord of the Flies' Strategy at Six Nations," *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/December 2006), 16.

⁷ Indeed, even the sole article in this issue (which is *again* outside the special focus insert on Indigenous peoples) that highlights Indigenous issues outside the territorial jurisdiction claimed by Canada does not develop substantive linkages between the dispossession of Indigenous peoples in Oaxaca and the dispossession of Indigenous peoples in/by Canada. Nor does this article make efforts to explore the role that the Canadian state or Canadian corporations may play in the Oaxaca conflict—this despite the fact that the previous issue had focused so closely on Canadian involvement in Latin America. Tommy Johnson "Deep Roots and Conflict in Oaxaca," *Canadian Dimension* 41(1) (January/February 2007), 12-13.

⁸ Sherene Razack, *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008). Nandita Sharma, *Home Economics: Nationalism and the Making of 'Migrant' Workers in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006). Owen Toews, *Stolen City: Racial Capitalism and the Making of Winnipeg*, (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2018).

⁹ This Manichaeism is what Bruyneel, following Ashcroft, calls the "imperial binary": a presently hegemonic way of conceptualizing the world wherein dichotomies "feed the habit of 'enclosure' in order to make sense of a contingent world." Which is to say, that the drawing of a line between inside and outside is a way of forcibly inscribing fixity and meaning, and that whoever draws the line retains the capacity to render its significance. Kevin Bruyneel, *The Third Space of Sovereignty: The Postcolonial Politics of U.S.-Indigenous Relations*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 7.

¹⁰ George Manuel and Michael Posluns, *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019 [1974]). Ruth Wilson Gilmore, *The Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007). Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015).

¹¹ The settler colonial studies framework has been a powerful methodological approach for understanding, as Hardt and Negri have elsewhere described, how “[c]olonial law operates primarily around... boundaries, both in that it supports their exclusionary function and in that it applies differently to the subjects on the two sides of the divide.” Settler colonial studies has also been quite effective at exploring the structural differentiation of law on variously situated subjects *within* the boundaries of the state. However, what this literature has neglected in its analyses is that the “boundaries protecting this pure European space are continually under siege,” that the state is not now, nor has it ever been an unperforated container. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000), 125.

¹² This reflects a broader problem within global struggles for justice that construct themselves through the state-form without deliberate and concerted attention to their internationalist commitments. Amongst left tendencies, social democrats in the imperial core have been paradigms of this myopic state-centric theory of social justice, much to the detriment of their comrades of other tendencies and, even more so, for the people of the Third World. Klaus Gietinger, trans. by Loren Balhorn, *The Murder of Rosa Luxemburg*, (London: Verso, 2019). Torkil Lauesen, *Riding the Wave: Sweden’s Integration into the Imperialist World System*, (Montréal: Kersplebedeb Publishing, 2021).

¹³ Olúfẹ̀mí O Táíwò, “States Are Not Basic Structures: Against State-Centric Political Theory,” *Philosophical Papers* 48(1) (2019): 59-82. Olúfẹ̀mí O Táíwò, “Selective Conscience: John Rawls’s Doctrine of Fairness,” *The Nation* (November 27, 2021), <https://www.thenation.com/article/society/john-rawls-shadow-of-justice/> (accessed May 5, 2022).

¹⁴ WEB Du Bois, “The African Roots of War,” *Atlantic Monthly* 115 (May 1915), 709. For a more meticulous discussion of how the modest egalitarianism of European and American welfare states were built on and through a global transference of wealth, see: Gurminder K. Bhambra, “Colonialism, Postcolonialism and the Liberal Welfare State,” *New Political Economy* 23(5) (2018), 574-587.

¹⁵ In presenting these two faces of Canada, I want to be clear from the outset, however, that I don’t intend to offer this as *the* singular legacy of marxist anti-imperialist thought, and to further clarify that by orthodox marxism, I don’t necessarily mean to assert that this is even the dominant way in which anti-imperialist practitioners have mobilized marxism within their struggles. Rather, what I have in mind is the dominant strand of marxist thought as it has been developed specifically within the Canadian academy—and the academy of the imperial core more generally—wherein there has been an unfortunate tendency towards workerism, productivism, and what is often called class-reductionism (but is more accurately a myopic economism) in the usage of marxist methods. By contrast, the actual history of marxist struggles has found its greatest vibrancy in the struggles that are often most opaque to academics within the imperial core—in the decolonization movements, the Black liberation struggle, and the women’s movements amongst the global poor. My usage of “orthodox” then, should not be taken as a commentary on who is or is not ‘properly’ a student/practitioner of this tradition of thought, but rather as an inflection point meant to distinguish the scholarly literatures under review here from the more heterodox living traditions of struggle on the ground around the world. Vijay Prasad, *Red Star Over the Third World*, (London: Pluto Press, 2017). Mike Gonzalez, *In the Red Corner: The Marxism of José Carlos Mariátegui*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2019). The Red Nation, *The Red Deal: Indigenous Action to Save Our Earth*, (Brooklyn: Common Notions, 2021). Joshua Bloom and Waldo E Martin, Jr, *Black Against Empire: The History and Politics of the Black Panther Party*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016 [2013]). George Ciccariello-Maher (Geo Maher), *Building the Commune: Radical Democracy in Venezuela*, (London: Verso, 2016). All India Democratic Women’s Association, *The Invisible Despair of Women in Hindi*, (2021) <https://www.aidwaonline.org/index.php/aidwa-booklet-invisible-despair-women-hindi> (accessed May 16, 2022).

Relatedly, I struggled for some time on a descriptor that felt like it captured this group of Canadianist marxist anti-imperialists in their (very) loose self-identification. As the discussion that follows highlights, there are serious antagonisms within and between the various tendencies that are being lumped together here for my own analytical purposes. In feedback on a draft of this chapter, Rita Dhmoon prompted me to offer a bit more clarity on this matter, and suggested in particular that what might be most clearly at stake here is the whiteness of this tendency. On the whole, this is an important insight in at least two interrelated senses: first that many—though, importantly, not all—

of these scholars and activists picking up marxist anti-imperialism are positioned as white settlers. Secondly, while many of them study Canada predominantly in the context of the Canadian state's imperialist posture towards the Third World, race—though never fully absent—is more often treated as a second-order or epiphenomenal component of these processes. That said, the fact that I have also included several racialized scholars and activists within this tendency gives me reason for pause before flatly labelling the tendency as white marxism, as this would constitute its own form of erasure. Rather, I think the more apt description might be to note that these scholars deploy a eurocentric marxism—in the sense of eurocentrism described by Samir Amin, albeit stretched to include the 'little Europes' being built in/through white settler contexts. In coining the term, Amin's description of eurocentrism primarily focused not on cultural chauvinism (as the term has come to be used colloquially today)—though he certainly recognized this reality—but rather he aimed to dismantle the guiding presumption within much marxist thought that the development of capitalist social relations is a process *endogenous* to European societies. It is perhaps paradoxical that this tendency of Canadianist marxist anti-imperialism should suffer from such eurocentricity—after all, its focus is very squarely on the dynamic interrelationships between Canada (as part of the imperial core) and the Third World. Nevertheless, I believe it is an apt descriptor for at least two reasons, both of which become more apparent in the discussion that follows in this chapter. The first, is that Canada is taken largely as a *fait accompli*, the 'internal' contestations over the very existence of Canada, led by the Indigenous peoples of North America are obscured or absented, thereby reifying the project of presenting Canada as a little Britain. Secondly, the reliance on an at least implied historical telos means that even as many authors describe vital anti-imperialist struggles against Canada from outside the imperial core, more often than not the impression remains that Canada is the primary mover in this conflict—the agent of history, again, is constituted through eurocentrism. Given all this, then, in addition to being unified under the heading 'Canadianist' marxist anti-imperialism, I invite readers to always consider an implied 'eurocentric' as a further descriptor, though I refrain from adding it for fear of adjectival fatigue. Samir Amin, *Eurocentrism: Modernity, Religion, and Democracy A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism*, trans. Russell Moore and James Membrez, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2009 [1988]).

¹⁶ In this sense, the marxist critique of empire fails to do exactly what Byrd says is so crucial: to “temporalize” the birth of Canadian imperialism to the birth of the settler colony itself. By her account empire finds its formative logics in the settler colony's “assumption of European colonialist agendas that sought to appropriate indigenous lands, knowledges, presences, and identities.” Thus, far from being an optional or novel element to Canadian statecraft, imperialism was the always already operative imperative of Canada as such. Jodi Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011), xiii.

¹⁷ This is a discussion to which I return in section three of this chapter and again in Chapter Four, where I discuss worldmaking 'from below.' The dangers of state-centric internationalism—or campism, as it more commonly referred to—are well documented (indeed, while serious, they also form much of the fodder for a certain caricatured and rabid red-baiting), and so I do not belabour the point here. I only want to suggest, as a matter of principle that those who concern themselves with collective liberation as the work of political struggle cannot be satisfied with either an unthinking commitment to 'actually existing socialism' in the form of support for any regime that claims that label for itself, nor with a knee-jerk commitment to 'global solidarity' that somehow always embraces street movements while reflexively rebuffing the shortcomings of all state actors without regard for the specificities of either formation. The work is much more difficult than either stance permits, and requires constant political education and reevaluation based on concrete circumstances.

For more on these debates consider: Rohini Hensman, *Indefensible: Democracy, Counterrevolution, and the Rhetoric of Anti-Imperialism*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2018). Vincent Wong, “‘The Main Enemy is at Home’ Breaks Down for Migrants,” *Midnight Sun* (April 13, 2022), <https://www.midnightsunmag.ca/the-main-enemy-is-at-home-breaks-down-for-migrants/> (accessed June 2, 2022). Barnaby Raine and David Camfield, “Is the Enemy of My Enemy My Friend?” *The Breach* (October 22, 2021), <https://breachmedia.ca/is-the-enemy-of-my-enemy-my-friend/> (accessed April 22, 2022).

¹⁸ Bruyneel, *Third Space*, xxii.

¹⁹ This is evident in: Ralph Miliband, *The State in Capitalist Society*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2009 [1969]). Philip Abrams, “Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State (1977),” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1(1) (March 1988): 58-89. Stefano Harney, *State Work: Public Administration and Mass Intellectuality*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).

²⁰ Manuel and Posluns, *The Fourth World*.

²¹ For examples of earlier literature, see: Werner Biermann and Reinhart Kössler, "The Settler Mode of Production: The Rhodesian Case," *Review of African Political Economy* 7(18) (1980): 106–16. Arghiri Emmanuel, "White Settler Colonialism and the Myth of Investment Imperialism," *New Left Review* 73 (1972), 35-57. Kenneth Good, "Colonialism and Settler Colonialism: A Comparison," *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 33(3) (1979), 339-351.

Robin DG Kelley offers an important intervention on the consequences of silencing this tradition in the contemporary literature, writing that "By eliding settler colonialism in Africa," settler colonial studies today "not only fails to account for labor regimes in which the native is simultaneously 'eliminated' and exploited; it forecloses a discussion of what it means to *decolonize* settler societies. In Algeria, Kenya, and Mozambique, decolonization involved the withdrawal of settlers who had never intended to leave, whereas in Zimbabwe and South Africa the white settler population continues to exist but no longer rules" (Kelley 271). Robin DG Kelley, "The Rest of Us: Rethinking Settler and Native," *American Quarterly* 69(2) (2017), 267-276.

²² Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*, (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2010), 11.

²³ Edward Cavanagh and Lorenzo Veracini, "Definition," *Settler Colonial Studies Blog* (2010), <https://settlercolonialstudies.org/about-this-blog/> (accessed March 3, 2017).

²⁴ Patrick Wolfe, "Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native," *Journal of Genocide Research* 8(4) (December 2006), 388.

²⁵ Emma Battell Lowman and Adam J. Barker, *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*, (Halifax: Fernwood, 2015), 27. Through this sentiment, Lowman and Barker echo Wolfe's contention when he writes that "[s]ettler colonialism destroys to replace." While this seems to be a central contention within Wolfe's work, it is an aspect of his argument that is often obscured in secondary treatments that focus only on settler colonization's destructive elements. Wolfe, "Elimination of the native," 388.

In Chapter Two I attempt to complicate this somewhat, by drawing out a more fulsome picture of the gradual transition away from the British Empire and towards Canadian settler imperialism. Suffice to say here, this process of shifting identification from the imperial metropole to the settler state is hardly as binary as Lowman and Barker might suggest, and the traces of lingering affect imprint themselves in both constitutional documents and political culture. See for examples, Article 7 of the *Statute of Westminster* (1931). Carl Berger, *The Sense of Power: Studies in the Ideas of Canadian Imperialism, 1867-1914*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970). Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860-1900*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

²⁶ Lowman and Barker, *Settler*, 31. Those of a more marxist bent, which may include Wolfe himself, have often equated this process of land dispossession to the concept of primitive accumulation. Stewart-Harawira puts this quite plainly, attributing the "deterritorialization of indigenous peoples' territories and the dismantling of their social and political structures to capitalism's need for territorial expansion." While I remain broadly sympathetic to this assertion, I am also unconvinced that materialist arguments alone can account for the ways in Indigenous peoples have been so thoroughly and aggressively racialized. Makere Stewart-Harawira, *The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization*, (New York: Zed Books, 2005), 69.

²⁷ Bruyneel, *Third Space*, xiv.

²⁸ Wolfe, "Elimination of the native," 388.

²⁹ Gilmore, *The Golden Gulag*, 28.

Commentators have long noted that the cisheteropatriarchal logics of Indian status have been designed, and redesigned (in the face of constant struggles by Indigenous peoples, their supporters, international institutions, and Canada's own courts), so as to ensure that status is a diminishing commodity. That is, so that the number of people recognized and owed rights by the Canadian state on the basis of being legally recognized as "Indians" is gradually reduced to zero. Likewise, the deliberate policies of starvation pursued by the Canadian state in its conquest of the prairies are no less shocking for how well they've been documented. Mary Ellen Turpel, "Patriarchy and Paternalism:

The Legacy of the Canadian State for First Nations Women,” *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 6(1) (1993)174-192. James Daschuk, *Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation and the Loss of Indigenous Life*, (Regina: University of Regina Press, 2013).

³⁰ Eric Ritskes, “The Terms of Engagement with Indigenous Nationhood,” in *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement*, The Kino-nda-niimi Collective, editors, (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2014), 259. Similarly, Lisa Ford observes that through the production of a “territorial space emptied of indigenous people and their laws”, settler colonization seeks to emulate in North America the Westphalian imaginary of a homogeneous ethnic community where jurisdiction, territory, and sovereignty are made conceptually indistinguishable—“a perfect territorial sovereignty.” Lisa Ford, *Settler Sovereignty: Jurisdiction and Indigenous People in America and Australia 1788-1836*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 25.

³¹ While the Supreme Court of Canada has sought to deny the historic (and, by extension, ongoing) application of terra nullius in the colonization of what is presently Canada (see *Tsilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia* [2014], at para. 69), John Borrows argues forcefully that “Canadian law still has terra nullius written all over it” (emphasis mine, 702). Documents like the Royal Charter of the Hudson’s Bay Company (1670) ring with the language of terra nullius, as Charles II of England granted with the stroke of a pen “all the Landes Countryes and Territoryes upon the Coastes and Confynes of the Seas Streights Bayes Lakes Rivers Creekes and Soundes aforesaid which are not now actually possessed by any of our Subjectes or by the Subjectes of any other Christian Prince or State” to a company of wealthy Englishmen. It is this sweeping assertion of the Crown’s allodial title that eventually forms the basis of Canadian sovereignty claims throughout so-called Rupert’s Land after its sale by the HBC. John Borrows, “The Durability of Terra Nullius: Tsilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia,” *UBC Law Review* 48(3) (2015): 701-742. Charles Stuart II, *The Royal Charter for Incorporating The Hudson's Bay Company*, (London, 1670).

For further discussions of the Doctrine of Discovery see: Robert J Miller, *Native America, Discovered and Conquered: Thomas Jefferson, Lewis & Clark, and Manifest Destiny*, (London: Praeger, 2006). Robert J Miller, Jacinta Ruru, Larissa Behrendt, and Tracey Lindberg, *Discovering Indigenous Lands: The Doctrine of Discovery in the English Colonies*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

³² This is perhaps nowhere more succinctly summarized than in the much vaunted *Delgamuukw v British Columbia* (1997) decision, wherein the Supreme Court, after having found Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en title to be intact proceeded to enumerate the reasons for which a “general” public interest could override their title by mere act of legislature—no treaties required. These include all the trappings of a bourgeois economy: “the development of agriculture, forestry, mining, and hydroelectric power, the general economic development of the interior of British Columbia, protection of the environment or endangered species, the building of infrastructure and the settlement of foreign populations” (para 165).

³³ Todd Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2010), 90.

³⁴ Regan, *Unsettling*, 6. As evidence of the violence inherent in settler colonial nation-building, Davies makes the astute observation that Macdonald’s and Laurier’s National Policy “meant something very different for the original inhabitants of this ‘nation’: dispossession, reserves, and a forced agricultural existence.” Establishing the nation of Canada has always meant the attempted disestablishment of the Indigenous peoples into whose territories the settler colony extends. Barrie Davies, “‘We Hold a Vaster Empire than Has Been’: Canadian Literature and the Canadian Empire,” *Studies in Canadian Literature* 14(1) (1989), <https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/SCL/article/download/8092/9149?inline=1> (accessed May 16, 2022).

³⁵ Adam J. Barker, “Locating Settler Colonialism,” *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 13(3) (Winter 2012). Victoria Freeman, “‘Toronto Has No History! ’Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, and Historical Memory in Canada’s Largest City,” *Urban History Review* 38(2) (Spring 2010). Holly Randell-Moon, “Body, Crown, Territory: Geocorpographies of the British Monarchy and White Settler Sovereignty,” in *Security, Race, Biopower: Essays on Technology and Corporeality*, Holly Randell-Moon and Ryan Tippett, eds., (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 41-60. Sherene Razack, “Memorializing Colonial Power: The Death of Frank Paul,” *Law & Social Inquiries* 37(4) (Fall 2012), 908–932.

³⁶ Melina Laboucan-Massimo, "Rights and Roots: Addressing a New Wave of Colonialism," *This is an Honour Song: Twenty Years Since the Blockades*, edited by Leanne Simpson and Kiera Ladner, (Winnipeg Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2010).

³⁷ Ramona Neckoway, "Dam(n) Development: The Production of Hydroelectricity on Cree Territory," *Canadian Dimension* 41(1) (January/February 2007), 41.

Indigenous land defenders, however, very often cut straight to the heart of the contradiction of extractive capitalism, by noting that the mega-project—dams, highways, pipelines, etc.—that are justified as necessary 'critical infrastructure' that will bring employment and prosperity, are in fact destructive of and parasitic on the non-capitalist critical infrastructures that they defend. Berry patches, freshwater rivers, moose herds, wild salmon runs, these are the sort of critical infrastructures which have both sustained and are sustained by Indigenous peoples, and it is in their relationships with these more-than-human beings that modes of self-determination have been deliberately developed over generations. Robin Wall Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge, and the Teachings of Plants*, (Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 2013).

³⁸ A lot of excellent and very recent work is being conducted on this precise topic. Of particular scholarly note is Voyles' *Wastelanding*, wherein she makes the case that the wasteland is the conceptual apparatus by which settler society can render Indigenous territories either appropriable or disposable, as suits the particular needs of the moment. Similarly, the community work of the Native Youth Sexual Health Network has produced the report "Violence on the Land, Violence on Our Bodies," which carefully details the intimate connection that exists between the destruction of the ecology and the violence that is done to Indigenous peoples—in particular to Indigenous women and girls. Finally, Simpson's book of poetry, *This Accident of Being Lost*, offers a moving, artistic account of what Indigenous resurgence means in the age of ecocide. Traci Brynne Voyles, *Wastelanding: Legacies of Uranium Mining in Navajo Country*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015). "Violence on the Land, Violence on Our bodies: Building an Indigenous Response to Environmental Violence," Women's Earth Alliance and Native Youth Sexual Health Network, 2016. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *This Accident of Being Lost*, (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2017).

³⁹ Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 75 and 94.

⁴⁰ While some have attempted to bring both psychoanalysis and structural critique together, generally by using a Butlanean mode of analysis, these efforts have often felt far from successful. Phil Henderson "Imagoed communities: The psychosocial space of settler colonialism," *Settler Colonial Studies* 7(1) (2017), 40-56.

⁴¹ Eva Mackey, *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land and Settler Decolonization*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2016), 4.

⁴² *ibid.*, 3.

⁴³ *ibid.*, 33. Some scholars have made the link between their approach to settler colonialism and psychoanalysis quite explicit. As Daniel Tseghay writes, the process of settler colonization is "just individual psychology writ large, Canada, as a whole, is doing what immature individuals—all of us at our most immature—do best." This move to psychologize settler colonization, does offer some explanatory power of settler responses to Indigenous peoples, it also may obscure some of the more sedimented structures of power that persist even in light of good intentions. Daniel Tseghay, "Idle No More, the Black experience, and why it is that what we say about others reveals so much about ourselves," in *The Winter We Danced: Voices from the Past, the Future, and the Idle No More Movement*, The Kinnda-niimi Collective, editors, (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2014), 292.

While Mackey's focus is primarily on 'certainty' as an affective state of being that settlers rely on their institutions to assure for them through the elimination of Indigenous self-determination, certainty is also a keyword in the political economy driving the Canadian state's reconciliation project. Amongst the most important social consequences of the Supreme Court of Canada's recognition of the existence of Aboriginal title in the *Calder* decision (1973) was a profound sense of uncertainty amongst the business elite. The possibility of future cases proving extant Aboriginal title where the Crown had presumed the right to lease land or resources threatened to undermine the core principle underpinning business confidence: an expected return on investment. Not only did this central concern for profitability put the lie to the supposed 'general' interests that were at stake (see *fn* 32), it also generated an enormous response from all levels of settler government to ensure 'certainty' would prevail and business confidence be restored.

A particularly striking example of this occurred when, following British Columbia's adoption of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the Office of the Premier issued a press release celebrating that the "new legislation aims to create further *certainty for investment* and reaffirms B.C. as a world-class destination providing opportunities *for business*." Office of the Premier, "Reconciliation legislation fosters greater economic certainty," BC Gov News (October 24, 2019), <https://news.gov.bc.ca/releases/2019PREM0116-002041> (May 6, 2022).

⁴⁴ Lowman and Barker, *Settler*, 39. Lowman and Barker carry their discussion of this claim through three interrelated themes (appropriation and extraction; racism and violence; and national myths) and they stress, at times, the importance of seeing the structural elements of these processes—which are characterized as both material and subjective. There is, however, also a relatively volitional edge to the language by which they frame this reproduction of settler colonialism, in which "people participate in and perpetuate these systems" (ibid.). Without ever forgetting the importance of agency, and the capacity for each and every person to act in solidarity with Indigenous peoples and against colonizing interests, I also nevertheless want to ask what the conditions of anti-colonial organizing are that will make anti-colonial struggle appear as viable course of action to more and more people—even those who presently might see themselves as a beneficiary of, or invested in, the colonial order. Rather than merely identify *that* people are complicit, a more fruitful question might be how do we struggle to make responsible and reciprocal relationships not only possible but the default.

⁴⁵ *ibid.*, 24.

⁴⁶ Thanks to John Borrows for prompting this observation in his feedback on an earlier draft of this chapter. John raised the all-important question of how the tenor of this project might be received by those who don't presently, or perhaps explicitly reject the call to, see themselves in the appellation 'settler.' My answer, such as it is, was twofold: in the first instance recognizing that a commitment to polyvocality in scholarship includes making space to speak and write in a way that reflects my own commitments, as just one part of an ongoing conversation in which no particular word is final. The second point came to me somewhat later, but it reduces down to a relatively simple formula offered by Olúfẹ̀mi Táíwò, as he rejects the necessity of "extracted speech" in academic writing—that is, speech that occurs because they're things we think "we have to say because of a power structure that often lurks in the background." Against this, Táíwò writes persuasively that "as a person who has rarely read a mainstream book on any political subject that structures itself around the very specific objections of Pan-Africanist materialist thinkers, I can confidently assure skeptical readers that learning from a philosophical text does not require that its author answer the specific questions or objections that match your particular political inclinations" (7-8). Thus, while I hope that those who reject my interpellation of them as settlers continue to read past this parting of ways, I also believe that there are other conversations that are central to this project and that those ought to be conducted in the terms by which the discussants best understand one another. Olúfẹ̀mi O Táíwò, *Reconsidering Reparation*, (Oxford: University of Oxford Press, 2022).

On this point, I also want to clarify that there is no theory of so-called 'false consciousness' lurking behind any of my discussion—it is a concept which I largely reject as unhelpful analytically and politically. As intimated in my unfolding critique of settler colonial studies, this is because I generally caution against the shift of scholarship—particularly for us outside of psychology and adjacent fields—towards consciousness, the psyche, etc., especially on in the form of mass-psychology. But I also think that the question of 'false' or 'true' consciousness misses the more fundamental point, which is the question of what people *do* with whatever consciousness they might have. I don't think consciousness is 'false' if it manifests in actions that reproduce colonial relations, as the claim that it's false risks making the real consequences, personal benefits to the perpetrator, and social transformations that it enables appear somehow effervescent. Rather than true or false consciousness I prefer to think in terms of alignment or articulation with or against a variety of modes of social relations, and that what some call 'false consciousness' a manifestation of the ontological totality of colonial modes of relating and are true within those relations. And, counter-intuitively, from the perspective that begins with consciousness, someone with racist or colonial beliefs may actually still act in ways that advance liberation struggles—indeed, if we actually take seriously what it means to acknowledge that subjectivities are formed in and by our existing racist/colonial social order, we can see that this includes *all* who have struggled for freedom throughout history. The question then becomes, not the pursuit of morally pure critical consciousnesses, but an assessment of the consequences of such actions—in one sense, this requires us to begin from the concrete rather than the abstract.

⁴⁷ Emphasis mine. Regan, *Unsettling*, 4.

⁴⁸ Combahee River Collective, “The Combahee River Collective Statement,” in *How We Get Free: Black Feminism and The Combahee River Collective*, Keeanga-Yamaahata Taylor (ed.), (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2017). eBook.

⁴⁹ Kelley, “The Rest of Us.” Corey Snelgrove, Rita Dhamoon, and Jeff Corntassel, “Unsettling settler colonialism: The discourse and politics of settlers, and solidarity with Indigenous nations,” *Decolonization* 3(2) (2014): 1-32. J Kēhaulani Kauanui, “‘A Structure, Not an Event’: Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity,” *Lateral* 5(1) (2016), online. Manu Vimalassery, Juliana Hu Pegues, and Alyosha Goldstein, “Introduction: On Colonial Unknowing,” *Theory & Event* 19(4) (2016), online.

⁵⁰ Wolfe, “Elimination of the native,” 399.

While some scholars of the commons are intent on folding settler colonial contexts neatly into their frameworks, they tend to miss this central historical development in class formation. It matters a great deal in terms of the possibility of finding justice in the commoning of land that, unlike the European peasantry from which they were largely drawn, settlers in the colonies are the *beneficiaries* of enclosures. Their experience was not of dispossession, but of a racialized and gendered redistribution that favoured them against Indigenous peoples. Moreover, it has been productive of a social order in which all presently dominant incentive structures tilt towards the maintenance of white possession (see *fn* 43).

Peter Linebaugh, *Stop, Thief! The Commons, Enclosures, and Resistance*, (Oakland: PM Press, 2014). Craig Fortier, *Unsettling the Commons: Social Movements Against, Within, and Beyond Settler Colonialism*, (Winnipeg: ARP Books, 2017).

⁵¹ Emphasis mine. Barker, “Locating Settler Colonialism.”

⁵² Natalie JK Baloy, “Spectacles and spectres: settler colonial spaces in Vancouver,” *Settler Colonial Studies* (2015). Sherene Razack, “‘It Happened More Than Once’: Freezing Deaths in Saskatchewan,” *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 26(1) (2014), 51-80.

⁵³ Linda Freeman, *The Ambiguous Champion: Canada and South Africa in the Trudeau and Mulroney Years*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 16-19.

⁵⁴ Emphasis mine. Lowman and Barker, *Settler*, 38.

⁵⁵ Emphasis mine. Mackey, *Unsettling*, 12.

⁵⁶ Lissa K Wadewitz, *The Nature of Borders: Salmon, Boundaries, and Bandits on the Salish Sea*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012). Merlie Massie, *Forest Prairie Edge: Place History in Saskatchewan*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2014). Ian Kalman, *Framing Borders: Principle and Practicality in the Akwesasne Mohawk Territory*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2021).

⁵⁷ Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 115-146.

⁵⁸ For important examples of Indigenous internationalisms see: Robert A. Innes, *Elder Brother and the Law of the People: Contemporary Kinship and the Cowessess First Nation*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2013); A. Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus*; Manuel and Posluns, *The Fourth World*. And for discussions of other traditions of internationalism, see: CLR James, *A History of Pan-African Revolt*, (Oakland: PM Press, 2012 [1938]); Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Atlantic*, (London: Verso, 2000); Julius S. Scott, *The Common Wind: Afro-American Currents in the Age of the Haitian Revolution* (London: Verso, 2018).

⁵⁹ As Bruyneel makes very clear, despite the state’s best efforts at enclosure and containment, in “resistance to this colonial rule, indigenous political acts work across across American spatial and temporal boundaries.” Bruyneel, *Third Space*, xvii.

⁶⁰ Phil Henderson, “Transcending Boundaries: All the Parts are in Conversation with Each Other,” *Active History* (February 23, 2018), <https://activehistory.ca/2018/02/transcending-boundaries-all-the-parts-are-in-conversation-with-each-other/> (accessed May 6, 2022).

⁶¹ Bruyneel, *Third Space*, 25.

⁶² Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, in *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*, David McLelland, ed., (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 224. Gordon makes almost explicit reference to this passage when he writes that “Canadian capital is driven by a *logic of expansion*.” Emphasis mine. Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, 10

⁶³ Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, 9. This follows in a long tradition of anti-imperialist critique focusing on the exploitation of labour and land facilitating ever-expanding capital accumulation, see for example: Rosa Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital*, trans. Agnes Schwartzschild, (New York: Routledge, 2003 [1913]); Manuel and Posluns, *Fourth World*; Kwame Nkrumah, *Neo-Colonialism the Last Stage of Imperialism*, (New York: Humanities Press International, 1965); Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, (London: Verso, 2018 [1972]).

⁶⁴ For what it’s worth, even scholars with close affinities to the Canadian state’s security apparatuses suggest that the claim to “middlepowerhood” is more rhetorical than actual. As Adam Chapnick—now a professor at the Royal Military College of Canada—argues, this has been a nonpartisan rhetorical strategy of the Canadian power elite to “justify the attainment of disproportionate influence in international affairs” (188). Far from anything benign then, the disarming claim to middlepowerhood is itself a strategy of rule. Adam Chapnick, “The Canadian Middle Power Myth,” *International Journal* 55(2) (Spring 2000): 188-206.

⁶⁵ Importantly, Shipley does introduce some ambiguity to his thinking when he describes Canada as a “secondary imperialist power, one that replicates and adapts the familiar dynamics of U.S. imperialism to its own advantage.” While I am unclear as to whether he intended it as such, Shipley may be gesturing towards a more complex understanding of imperialism not as unipolar, but as a multipolar system wherein a variety of competing powers vie with and against one another. While he may be thinking of imperialism in this way, much of the rest of his argument lapses back into a unipolar conceptualization of empire. Emphasis mine. Tyler Shipley, “The New Canadian Imperialism and the Military Coup in Honduras,” *Latin American Perspectives* 40(5) (September 2013), 45 and 47.

⁶⁶ Anthony Fenton, “Canada’s Contribution to ‘Democracy Promotion,’” *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/December 2006), 28.

A primary example of this has been Canada’s loud championing of the so-called “Lima Group” and, in particular, the rather embarrassing and lingering debacle of Global Affairs Canada’s 2019 decision to be among the first governments in the world to “recognize” Juan Guaidó as interim president of Venezuela, despite a total absence of any democratic legitimacy to his claim. To this day, even as the consensus around regime change within the Lima Group crumbles as many of its most reactionary cognate governments are toppled in elections, Canada continues to support the fantasy Guaidó regime. A similar story could be told of Canada’s role in the 2019 Christian-supremacist coup that was successful in toppling Evo Morales’ government in Bolivia, only to be turned back in a wave of popular and Mapuche-led revolts against the regime. Mike Blanchfield, “Quiet Canadian diplomacy helped Guaido’s anti-Maduro movement in Venezuela,” *The National Post* (January 26, 2019), <https://nationalpost.com/news/world/quiet-canadian-diplomacy-helped-guaidos-anti-maduro-movement-in-venezuela> (accessed May 9, 2022). Yves Engler, “The Lima Group is Falling Apart,” *Canadian Dimension* (August 10, 2021), <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/the-lima-group-is-falling-apart> (accessed May 9, 2022). Asad Ismi, “U.S., Canada side with fanatical coup regime in Bolivia,” *Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives* (March 2, 2020), <https://policyalternatives.ca/publications/monitor/us-canada-side-fanatical-coup-regime-bolivia> (accessed May 9, 2022).

⁶⁷ Michael Ignatieff, “The American Empire; The Burden,” *The New York Times Magazine* (January 5, 2003), <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/05/magazine/the-american-empire-the-burden.html> (May 9, 2022).

⁶⁸ Linda McQuaig, *Holding the Bully’s Coat: Canada and the U.S. Empire*, (Toronto: Random House, 2007), 16.

⁶⁹ Daniel Freeman-Maloy, “Organizing the Canada-Israel Alliance,” *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/December 2006), 23.

⁷⁰ McQuaig generally skates past the matter of Canada's refusal to join America's war on Iraq in 2003 by emphasizing both the strong support shown for the war on Afghanistan and what she characterizes as the rather meek objections that were voiced to the invasion of Iraq. McQuaig, *Bully's Coat*, 2.

Importantly, this puts her in stark contrast to someone like Whitaker who—despite otherwise being of a similar mind to McQuaig regarding Canada's subservience to American empire—holds up Canada's refusal to attack Iraq as a “strikingly independent position for a country that had until that point seemed on an inevitable trajectory toward closer... integration with the American superpower.” This is a critical distinction as these authors use their analysis to suggest the direction Canada's place *in* empire is tending: towards further embedding (McQuaig) or towards a disembedding (Whitaker). Reg Whitaker, “Drifting Away from the Edge of Empire: Canada in the Era of George W. Bush,” in *Empire's Law: The American Imperial Project and the War to Remake the World*, edited by Amy Bartholomew, (London: Pluto Press, 2006), 265.

⁷¹ Justin Podur, “Canada for anti-imperialists,” Colours of Resistance, <http://www.coloursofresistance.org/446/canada-for-anti-imperialists/> (accessed March 4, 2017).

⁷² *ibid.*

For harrowing account of the consequences that accrue due to Canada's integration within the military alliances of the imperial core, see Hugh Brody and Nigel Markham's documentary *Hunters and Bombers*. Maybe more than any other film, this shows that the two faces of the Canadian are a single Janus-faced project of empire, as it details the NATO flight training runs over Innu territory and the massive disruption this is causing to the Indigenous peoples of the north and their more-than-human kin. Hugh Brody and Nigel Markham, *Hunters and Bombers*, from the National Film Board, https://www.nfb.ca/film/hunters_and_bombers/ (accessed April 20, 2021).

⁷³ David Harvey, *The New Imperialism*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 39.

Indeed, an author like Whitaker identifies Canada's ‘drift’ away from American empire as a response to that country's increasing tendency to pursue “economic policies that are seen as self-destructive and radically dysfunctional” within the international order that sustains empire. Whitaker, “Drifting Away,” 281.

⁷⁴ Shipley, “New Canadian Imperialism,” 56.

⁷⁵ *ibid.*, 52.

⁷⁶ Human Rights Watch, “Honduras: Events of 2020,” <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2021/country-chapters/honduras> (accessed May 9, 2022).

⁷⁷ Stephen Gordon, “In Canada, the nationalism is as likely to form on the left as on the right,” *The National Post* (February 21, 2017), <https://nationalpost.com/opinion/stephen-gordon-in-canada-the-nationalism-is-as-likely-to-form-on-the-left-as-on-the-right> (accessed May 9, 2022).

⁷⁸ Ultimately, this is the answer that the *Canadian Dimensions* special issue settles on to the titular question of “Canada: A New Imperial Power?” In his own piece, editor Cy Gonick closes the special feature by arguing that Canada may act imperially, but it is “only as a second-tier member of U.S.-led collective imperialism”—a distinction that I am sure will be of great comfort to the many victims of Canada's bombs and minings corporations. Cy Gonick, “Is Canada an Imperialist State?” *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/December 2006), 46.

Similarly, this image of Canada in suspended sovereignty is often used by leftist civil society organizations as a rhetorical device in their public engagement. For instance, the Council of Canadians, in the early 2000s, held a series of cross-Canada events under the title of “Canada: Country or Colony?” wherein the concern was not—as settler colonial studies might hope—to discuss Canada's position as a settler colony, but rather as a client state of America. In particular, it was intended to focus on the threat to Canadian sovereignty posed by free trade. Podur, “Canada for anti-imperialists.”

⁷⁹ Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, 16.

⁸⁰ See, for example: Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, (New York: Grove Press, 2004 [1961]). Nkrumah, *Neo-Colonialism*. Joshua Simon, *The Ideology of Creole Revolution: Imperialism and Independence in American and Latin*

American Political Thought, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017). Adom Getachew, *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019). Nandita Sharma, *Home Rule: National Sovereignty and the Separation of Natives and Migrants*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2020). Harsha Walia, *Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism, and the Rise of Racist Nationalism*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2021).

⁸¹ Jerome Klassen, *Joining Empire: The Political Economy of the New Canadian Foreign Policy*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 25.

⁸² Emphasis mine. *ibid.*

⁸³ Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, 55. What is really interesting about this observation by Gordon is that—despite its apparent profundity in analyzing Canada’s current place in the world—it is a relatively banal historical observation. It strikes me as bizarre to think that any serious critique of imperialism in 1900 would have objected to calling Belgium or France imperial powers simply because Britain was the unassailable global hegemon at the time. Indeed, as we will see in Chapter Two, enthusiasts of empire like W Wilfred Campbell and Winston Churchill had no difficulty in identifying Canada as an imperialist power in its own right even at the height of British power.

⁸⁴ Emphasis mine. Klassen, *Joining Empire*, 5-6.

⁸⁵ Todd Gordon and Jeffery R Webber, *Blood of Extraction: Canadian Imperialism in Latin America*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2016), 15-16.

⁸⁶ *ibid.*, 16 and 72-74.

⁸⁷ Amongst the implicated state apparatuses, Gordon and Webber include: the Prime Minister’s Office, Foreign Affairs, the Canadian International Development Agency, National Defence, Natural Resources Canada, and Health Canada. *ibid.*, 19.

⁸⁸ Nkrumah, *Neo-Colonialism*. Demba Moussa Dembélé, “Thomas Sankara: an endogenous approach to development,” (October 25, 2013), <https://www.thomassankara.net/thomas-sankara-an-endogenous-approach-to-development/?lang=en> (June 2, 2022).

⁸⁹ Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, 38.

⁹⁰ Stuart Hall, “Race, Articulation and Societies Structured in Dominance (1980),” in *Selected Writings on Race and Difference*, edited by Paul Gilroy and Ruth Wilson Gilmore, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2021): 195-245. Nate Holdren, “The Disabling Power of Law and Market,” in *Injury Impoverished: Workplace Accidents, Capitalism, and Law in the Progressive Era*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020): 137-174.

⁹¹ Shipley, “New Canadian Imperialism,” 53-56.

⁹² Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, 240-253.

⁹³ Whitaker, “Drifting Away,” 265-281.

Of course, while the Canadian government’s rhetoric was very publicly agonistic towards the war, the declassification of back-channeled diplomatic correspondences and a careful accounting of military support (both state-led and privately manufactured), clearly shows that—just as in the case of Vietnam—Canada was more than happy to assist in, and to profit off of, the American-led war against the people of Iraq. Owen Schalk, “Debunking the myth of Canada’s non-involvement in the Iraq war,” *Canadian Dimension* (March 13, 2022), <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/debunking-the-myth-of-canadas-non-involvement-in-the-iraq-war> (accessed May 9, 2022).

⁹⁴ Howard Adams, *Prison of Grass: Canada from a Native Point of View* 2nd Edition, (Toronto: Fifth House Books, 1995 [1975]).

⁹⁵ Klassen, *Joining Empire*, 7.

⁹⁶ By colonialism, Klassen (and his interpretation of Lenin) mean the direct conquest of the territories and populations of one people by another for the purposes of extracting raw materials, labour, and wealth. *ibid.*, 50.

⁹⁷ Shiri Pasternak, "How Capitalism will Save Colonialism: The Privatization of Reserve Lands in Canada," *Antipode* 47(1) (January 2015), 179-196; Anna Stanley, "Aligning against Indigenous jurisdiction: Worker savings, colonial capital, and the Canada Infrastructure Bank," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 37(6) (2019), 1138-1156. Glen Coulthard, "Place against Empire: Understanding Indigenous Anti-Colonialism," *Affinities* (November 23, 2010).

⁹⁸ Klassen, *Joining Empire*, 54.

⁹⁹ Eduardo Galeano, *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent*, trans. Cedric Belfrage, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1997 [1973]). Nick Ashdown and Niall McGee, "In a Turkish forest, resistance grows to a Canadian company's gold-mining project," *The Globe and Mail* (August 26, 2019), online.

¹⁰⁰ Donald Creighton, *The Empire of the St. Lawrence*, (Toronto: MacMillan, 1970). David Ciepley, "Is the U.S. Government a Corporation? The Corporate Origins of Modern Constitutionalism," *American Political Science Review* 111(2) (May 2017): 418-435.

¹⁰¹ Emphasis mine. Greg Albo, "Canada: Challenging Stephen Harper's Imperialist Agenda," Global Research, November 18, 2013, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/canada-challenging-stephen-harpers-imperialist-agenda/5358559> (accessed March 12, 2017).

¹⁰² Greg Albo, "Empire's Ally: Canadian Foreign Policy," *Canadian Dimensions* 40(6) (November/ December 2006), 22.

¹⁰³ Cedric Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* 3rd Edition, (University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 2021 [1983]), 3.

¹⁰⁴ Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body, and Primitive Accumulation*, 2nd ed., (Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2014 [2004]). Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014). See also *fn* 90.

¹⁰⁵ Robinson, *Black Marxism*, 121-122.

¹⁰⁶ Robert Nicoles, *Theft is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2020), 96.

¹⁰⁷ WEB Du Bois, "The Souls of White Folks," in *Darkwater: Voices from Behind the Veil*, (New York: Dover Thrift Editions, 1999 [1920]). Robin DG Kelley, *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists during the Great Depression*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015 [1990]).

¹⁰⁸ The Care Collective, *The Care Manifesto: The Politics of Interdependence*, (London: Verso, 2020); Federici, *Caliban*.

¹⁰⁹ Peter H Sawchuk, "Anticolonialism, Labor, and the Pedagogies of Community Unionism: The Case of Hotel Workers in Canada," in *Breaching the Colonial Contract*, edited by Arlo Kempf, (Toronto: Springer, 2009): 159-178. Tanya Basok, Danièle Bélanger, and Eloy Rivas, "Reproducing Deportability: Migrant Agricultural Workers in South-western Ontario," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(9) (2014): 1394-1413.

¹¹⁰ Ethel Tungohan, et al., "After the Live-In Caregiver Program: Filipina Caregivers' Experiences of Graduated and Uneven Citizenship," *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 47(1) (2015): 87-105.

¹¹¹ Holdren, *Injury Impoverished*, 138-152.

¹¹² Sharma, *Home Economics*.

¹¹³ Cole Harris, "How Did Colonialism Dispossess? Comments from an Edge of Empire," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 94(1) (2004), 173.

¹¹⁴ Joyce Green, "Canaries in the Mines of Citizenship: Indian Women in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 34(4) (December 2001), 716.

¹¹⁵ Gordon, *Imperialist Canada*, 16.

¹¹⁶ *ibid.*, 11.

¹¹⁷ *ibid.*, 404. That said, this sort of careful attention was largely absent in Gordon's more recent book, *Blood of Extraction*, co-authored with Webber. Given the enormity of scholarship that exists around the imperialism of Canada's 'domestic' extraction practices the lack of substantive linkages that might explain the (massively disproportionate) scale of Canada's involvement in the extraction of wealth from territories in Latin America was striking.

Indeed, Gordon and his co-author seem to have lapsed into a historicism, especially evident in the subsection of chapter one, entitled "Imperialism without Colonies." In this section they align with Meiksins Wood's emphasis on capital's deterritorialization. They write that "when we look around the world today *we do not see* the same proliferation of territorial conquests and rule by colonizers over the colonized as in centuries past." While they may have tempered this somewhat by marking a lack of *proliferation*—i.e. an *increasing* number of colonies—they certainly do very little to suggest that they recognize the *perpetuation* of such (settler) colonies in the present. In fact they actually seem to disavow the contemporary relevance of such formations when they write that "Colonialism, understood as the 'political control of peoples and territories by foreign states, whether accompanied by significant permanent settlement ('settler colonies') or not is a *marginal feature* of contemporary world politics." This despite the fact that their very object of study—Canada—and the global hegemon—America—both represent such formations. All emphases mine. Gordon and Webber, *Blood of Extraction*, 5.

¹¹⁸ Emphasis mine, Tyler A Shipley, *Canada in the World: Settler Capitalism and the Colonial Imagination*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020), 53.

¹¹⁹ *ibid.*

¹²⁰ Nick Estes, Ruth Wilson Gilmore, and Christopher Loperena, "United in Struggle," North American Congress on Latin America (August 24, 2021), <https://nacla.org/news/2021/07/28/nick-estes-ruth-gilmore-united-struggle> (accessed June 23, 2022).

¹²¹ Neil Moss, "Continued dawdling on vaccine waiver position leaves NDP and advocates 'extremely frustrated,'" *The Hill Times* (May 4, 2022), <https://www.hilltimes.com/2022/05/04/continued-dawdling-on-vaccine-waiver-position-leaves-ndp-and-advocates-extremely-frustrated/359702> (accessed May 17, 2022). "Covax: Canada defends taking vaccines from sharing scheme," BBC News (February 4, 2021), <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-55932997> (accessed May 17, 2022).

¹²² "World has entered stage of 'vaccine apartheid'-WHO head," Reuters (May 17, 2021), <https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/world-has-entered-stage-vaccine-apartheid-who-head-2021-05-17/> (accessed May 17, 2022).

¹²³ Du Bois, "The African Roots of War," 709.

¹²⁴ This is not a novel observation on my part; the great scholar of the commons and history 'from below,' Peter Linebaugh, made similar observations in his *Lizard Talk* (1989) pamphlet—written to contextualize the emergence of radical grassroots campaigns amidst state abandonment of poor, queer, and racialized communities during the AIDS epidemic. Linebaugh writes, brilliantly, "We have learned from our history that the more we commingle and converse, the more we eat each others food, sleep with each other, and deal with one another's shit, the stronger we become... the microparasites that destroy us appear as godsend to the macroparasites [the ruling classes], until they threaten, or until we threaten, to get 'out of control'... We must take power ourselves for justice's and our own live's sake." Peter Linebaugh, *Lizard Talk; Or, Ten Plagues and Another*, (Jamaica Plain, MA: Midnight Notes, 1989), 52.

Chapter Two Notes:

¹ Emphasis mine. W Wilfred Campbell, "Imperialism in Canada," The Empire Club of Canada Addresses (Toronto, November 23, 1904), <http://speeches.empireclub.org/62387/data?n=2> (accessed May 11, 2022).

The Empire Club was itself founded only the year before Campbell's speech, towards the end of 1903 and in response to the growing debates amongst the Dominion elite as to the future of their state's position within the British

Empire. Lieutenant Colonel James Mason—a veteran of both Fenian suppression and the ethnic cleansing of the North West at the massacre of Métis families in Batoche—was the major driving force behind the formation of this society, with the vision of countering the nationalist and continentalist tendencies of the rival Canada Club. With its schedule of weekly luncheon addresses and a membership capped initially at 500 men, the Empire Club quickly established itself as a place in which the power elite of the city and the Dominion writ large moved. Indeed, very symbolically given the club’s commitment to empire, its first honorary President was none other than the Right Honourable Lord Strathcona, Donald Smith, the rail-magnate and Canadian High Commissioner to the United Kingdom, most famous for having driven the “Last Spike” of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Craigellachie in 1885. His inept swing of the hammer—carefully choreographed for the papers to erase all of the 14,000 Chinese labourers who actually built the rail, at the cost of at least 600 lives—sealed the east-west corridor, thereby rapidly accelerating Canada’s conquest of the continent. Campbell’s predecessor’s on the podium included university chancellors and principals, members of parliament, diplomats, and other such powerful men of the empire. William Clark, ed., *Empire Club Speeches: Being Speeches Delivered Before the Empire Club of Canada During its Session of 1903-1904*, (Toronto: William Briggs, 1904).

² Within the canon of Canadian Political Science, the methods of historical institutionalism have typically been used in ways that are infused with a methodological nationalism. Thus, even as these methods have been important rebukes of Political Science’s general and increasing tendency towards ahistorical or transhistorical accounts of the state-form, they have nevertheless maintained a normative commitment to the state that presumes its validation or future-redemption through various liberal-democratic teleologies (enfranchisement, the development/extension of rights, multiculturalism, reconciliation, liberal humanitarianism, etc.). I attempt to put these methods to different uses, that aim to thoroughly politicize and denaturalize the very existence of the Canadian state, by infusing my historical institutionalist approach with lessons drawn from Indigenous Studies, scholarship on critical race theory, anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles, and a presumption that the state is only one historically contingent form amongst many possible forms of political organization.

³ Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015), 7. See also, Philip Abrams, “Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1(1) (March 1988), 58-89.

⁴ Lowe, *Four Continents*, 8.

⁵ Krishan Kumar, “Colony and Empire, Colonialism and Imperialism: A Meaningful Distinction?” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 63(2) (2021), 296.

For my own part, I take empire and imperialism to be merely different syntactic conjugations of the same process described by Kumar here and elsewhere (see also *fn6*). While I am aware of scholarship that seeks to separate these concepts—such as postmodernists who describe empire without imperialism (Hardt and Negri), and marxists who point to imperialism without empire (Harvey)—one of the central contentions of this chapter and the previous is that such formulations tend to rely a political ontology that naturalizes the state through the erasure of, or minimized significance attached to, the claims and struggles of domestically subjected populations (of which Indigenous peoples in North America represent a paradigmatic case). Further, they also rely on conceptual divisions between the political and the economic in order to problematize rule/domination as empire only in the case of the latter, while offering altogether distinct critiques of it in the case of the former—see my discussion of this at the end of section two in the previous chapter. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2000). David Harvey, *The New Imperialism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

⁶ Emphasis mine, *ibid.*, 293. A similar point was also recently raised in conversation between Harsha Walia and Robin DG Kelley, see: Haymarket Books, “Border and Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism, and Racist Nationalism,” YouTube (February 11, 2021), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WRZNfkgSrXo> (accessed May 16, 2022).

Interestingly, in a footnote Kumar seems to be somewhat disparaging of scholars who have taken up the language of settler imperialism thus far and as such I suspect he may be somewhat hostile towards my own mobilization of the term here (Kumar, “Colony and Empire,” 293 *fn14*). Nevertheless, I think I have sufficiently evidenced above the necessity of studying the specific imperial model of *settler* rule over distinct peoples (wherein the metropole and the colony share a territorial space, and populations/governance is sharply racialized). Moreover, though, my usage also seems to be in keeping with some of Kumar’s other important work on the imperial nature of statecraft generally—surely the case of settler states marks an even more striking example of this interrelationship than do even the most fraught cases of western European states that Kumar examines in light of ‘domestic’ separatist

movements. Krishan Kumar, “Nation-states as empires, empires as nation-states: two principles, one practice?” *Theory and Society* 39(2) (March 2010): 119-143.

⁷ Aziz Rana, *The Two Faces of American Freedom*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010), 3.

⁸ *ibid.*, 7.

⁹ *ibid.*, 9. These observations are also shared by Gerald Horne in his many books on the American Revolutionary era, its antecedents, and its aftermaths. Gerald Horne, *The Counter-Revolution of 1776: Slave Resistance and the Origins of the United States of America*, (New York: New York University Press, 2014); Gerald Horne, *The Apocalypse of Settler Colonialism: The Roots of Slavery, White Supremacy, and Capitalism in Seventeenth-Century North America and the Caribbean*, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2018); Gerald Horne, *The Dawning of the Apocalypse: The Roots of Slavery, White Supremacy, Settler Colonialism, and Capitalism in the Long Sixteenth Century*, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2020).

¹⁰ Indeed, this has been explicit US State Department doctrine for the better part of eighty years now. As George Kennan described in his so-called “long telegram” the necessity of America adopting every policy necessary to ensure that their preponderant power—expressed not only in military terms, but also in control over the world’s natural resources—be maintained in the face of a rebuilding Soviet Union, which was itself partially aligned with the rising tide of anti-colonial struggles in the Third World. “George Kennan's ‘Long Telegram’,” February 22, 1946, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, National Archives and Records Administration, Department of State Records (Record Group 59), Central Decimal File, 1945-1949, 861.00/2-2246; reprinted in US Department of State, ed., *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1946, Volume VI, Eastern Europe; The Soviet Union* (Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office, 1969), 696-709. <https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/116178> (accessed May 9, 2022).

¹¹ Byrd, *Transit of Empire*, xv.

¹² *ibid.*, xxii-xxiii.

¹³ *ibid.*

¹⁴ Emphasis mine. *ibid.*, xviii-xix. I see this as having striking and very important parallels to the argument advanced by Anouar Majid, in terms of how the figure of “the Moor” becomes a constitutive other in the formation of an occidental self through the so-called reconquista and into the age of European global imperialism. Anouar Majid, *We Are All Moors: Ending Centuries of Crusades against Muslims and Other Minorities*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012).

¹⁵ Norbert Finzsch, “The intrusion therefore of cattle is by itself sufficient to produce the extirpation of the native race’: social ecological systems and ecocide in conflicts between Hunter–Gatherers and commercial stock farmers in Australia,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 7(2) (2008), 165.

¹⁶ Julius Wilm, *Settlers as Conquerors: Free Land Policy in Antebellum America*, (Berlin: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2018), 21.

¹⁷ This recursive process is nicely exemplified by the relatively well documented, but all too-seldom reflected upon fact that until well into the 19th Century—the Age of Imperialism—European aristocrats very often depended upon hiring mercenaries from outside of their respective jurisdictions in order to maintain a martial force and assert their capacity to rule. Cedric Robinson notes: “Loyalty to the state of the monarchy from the exploited ranks of the lower classes was rare. In any case, not one state of the sixteenth or seventeenth century was reliant on such identification between the masses and their rulers. The soldiers of the armies of France, Spain, England, Holland, Prussia, Poland, Sweden, and at first Russia were either alien to the states for which they fought and policed or very marginal to them” (23). The significance of this fact is that it evidences the role of imperial projection in solidifying the supposedly ‘internal’ relations of a polity, through the promise of modest redistributions of plunder and the construction of an Other with whom the polity is collectively in tension. Cedric Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*, 3rd Edition, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2021 [1983]), 10-24.

- ¹⁸ Kumar, "Nation-states as empires." Perry Anderson, *Lineages of the Absolutist State*, (London: Verso, 2013 [1974]). Robert Bartlett, *The Making of Europe: Conquest, Colonization and Cultural Change, 950-1350*, (London: Penguin Books, 1993).
- ¹⁹ Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 170 and 174.
- ²⁰ Heidi Kiiwentinepinesik Stark, "Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land," *Theory & Event* 19(4) (2016): online.
- ²¹ Michael Asch, *On Being Here to Stay: Treaties and Aboriginal Rights in Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014), 59-65.
- ²² Emphasis mine, Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 176-177. See for example, Hugh Brody and Nigel Markham, *Hunters and Bombers*, from the National Film Board, https://www.nfb.ca/film/hunters_and_bombers/ (accessed April 20, 2021).
- ²³ Jane Burbank and Frederick Cooper, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), 251-286.
- ²⁴ Rana, *Two Faces*, 11. See also: Horne, *Counter-Revolution*.
- ²⁵ Rana, *Two Faces*, 25.
- ²⁶ Heritage Canada, "Canada 150 at a Glance," May 7, 2018, <https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/anniversaries-significance/2017/canada-150/at-a-glance.html#a4> (accessed April 7, 2021).
- ²⁷ Peter H Russell, *Canada's Odyssey: A Country Based on Incomplete Conquests*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 9.
- ²⁸ John Borrows, *Recovering Canada: The Resurgence of Indigenous Law*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002). See also: Harold Cardinal, *The Unjust Society: The Tragedy of Canada's Indians*, (Edmonton: MG Hurtig, 1969). Kiera L Ladner, "Up the Creek: Fishing for a New Constitutional Order," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38(4) (Dec. 2005), 923-953.
- ²⁹ See: Alan Cairns, "The Judicial Committee and its Critics," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 4(3) (Sept. 1971), 301-345. James Laxer, *Staking Claims to a Continent: John A Macdonald, Abraham Lincoln, Jefferson Davis and the Making of North America*, (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2016); Frank R Scott, "The Permanent Bases of Canadian Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs* 10(4) (July 1932), 617-631.
- ³⁰ Frank R Scott, *Essays on the Constitution: Aspects of Canadian Law and Politics*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), 246.
- ³¹ Borrows, *Recovering Canada*, 96
- ³² Stephen Brooks, *Canadian Democracy*, 6th edition, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 95.
- ³³ Hayden King, "The Problem with 'Indigenous Peoples': Re-Considering International Indigenous Rights Activism," in *More Will Sing Their Way to Freedom: Indigenous Resistance and Resurgence*, edited by Elaine Coburn, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2015). Joseph Massad, "Against Self-Determination," *Humanity* 9(2) (Summer 2018): 161-191. Jeanne Morefield, "Empire's Handyman: Jans Smuts and the Politics of International Holism," in *Empires Without Imperialism: Anglo-American Decline and the Politics of Deflection*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014): 171-200.
- ³⁴ In many ways, 1867 can be used to mark the pivot-year in the Canadian transition from "ancient constitution" models, with their polyvocal theories of authority to the "victorious modern language of constitutional uniformity" in which political authority speaks with/through one voice. James Tully, *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 58-59.
- ³⁵ Alain Beaulieu, *The Congress at Niagara in 1764: Historical context and meaning of the British-Aboriginal Negotiations*, (Ottawa: Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, 2017).
- ³⁶ George Hanover III, *The Royal Proclamation*, (London, 1763).

Importantly, here, while the Royal Proclamation clearly recognizes something like the *jurisdiction* of Indigenous peoples as having primacy over settler designs for land acquisition—at least until such time as treaties were entered into by the Crown’s representatives and the nations in question—there is nevertheless a clear assertion of the fact that *sovereignty* is considered the sole property of the Crown. This is a bait and switch that is replete throughout the 20th and 21st Century development of Aboriginal title jurisprudence by the Supreme Court of Canada, in which the courts juxtapose the “prior occupation” of lands by Indigenous peoples to the sovereignty of the Crown (see *Delgamuukw v British Columbia* [1997]). Here, Indigenous jurisdiction is treated as simply usufructuary, and Crown sovereignty becomes allodial. For a discussion of the distinction between jurisdiction and sovereignty, see: Shiri Pasternak, *Grounded Authority: The Algonquins of Barriere Lake Against the State*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

³⁷ Parliamentary Select Committee on Aboriginal Tribes, *Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Aboriginal Tribes: Reprinted, with comments, by the ‘Aborigines Protection Society.’* 13th Parl. of the United Kingdom, 1837, online.

³⁸ Canada, Georges Erasmus, and René Dussault, *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples* vol. 1, (Ottawa: The Commission, 1996), 130-138.

³⁹ As Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiiik Stark and Jefferey Monaghan both document, the North-West Mounted Police were effectively constituted as a colonizing force, and subsequent to the destruction of mass-organized resistance of Indigenous peoples in 1885, were flooded into the region to pacify, surveil, and contain the nations whose territories settlers were busily usurping. Stark, “Criminal Empire.” Jefferey Monaghan, “Mounties in the Frontier: Circulations, Anxieties, and Myths of Settler Colonial Policing in Canada,” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 47(1) (Winter 2013): 122-148.

⁴⁰ Howard Adams, *Prison of Grass: Canada from a Native Point of View* 2nd Edition, (Toronto: Fifth House Books, 1995 [1975]). Chris Andersen, “Métis”: *Race, Recognition, and the Struggle for Indigenous Peoplehood*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014). James Daschuk, *Clearing the Plains: Disease, Politics of Starvation, and the Loss of Aboriginal Life*, (Regina: University of Regina Press, 2013). Gord Hill, *The 500 Years of Resistance Comic Book*, (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2010). Adele Perry, *On the Edge of Empire: Gender, Race, and the Making of British Columbia, 1849-1871*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001). Keith D Smith, *Liberalism, Surveillance, and Resistance: Indigenous Communities in Western Canada, 1877-1927*, (Athabasca: Athabasca University Press, 2009).

⁴¹ Russell, *Odyssey*, 90-121. Allan Greer, *The Patriots and the People: The Rebellion of 1837 in Rural Lower Canada*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993).

⁴² Adams, *Prison of Grass*.

⁴³ John Lambton, *Report on the Affairs of British North America*, (London, 1839).

⁴⁴ Lorenzo Veracini, *The World Turned Inside Out: Settler Colonialism as a Political Idea*, (Verso: London, 2021), 8.

⁴⁵ Importantly, as Michael Asch notes, the fact that this gradual shifting of certain forms of imperial authority was well under way throughout the 19th Century, does not mean that every single person within the chain of authority submitted to it immediately. Asch points to Lord Dufferin’s (the third Governor General of the Dominion of Canada) often cantankerous relationship with the politicians of his day over the issues of Indigenous territorial rights, which were in view squarely within his prerogative as the Crown’s representative. Asch, *On Being Here to Stay*, 158-160.

⁴⁶ James Douglas Leighton, *The Development Of Federal Indian Policy In Canada, 1840-1890*, (unpublished dissertation: the University of Western Ontario, 1975), 185.

⁴⁷ Parliament of the United Kingdom, *The British North America Act*, 19th Parl. of the United Kingdom, 1867, sect. 91, art. 24.

A notable and highly consequential exclusion here is the Métis nation, which as a result of the racial logics that enabled settlement through the stripping of Indigenous peoples’ political autonomy were treated not as ‘Indians’ to be palliatively managed into legal extinction, but as ‘half-breeds’ or racially degraded whites in need of discipline. Thus, rather than objects of settler government, Métis are initially treated as subjects in need of subjugation—it is this (il)logic that explains how Louis Riel, a Métis nationalist with American citizenship, was tried and hanged as a *traitor* to the Crown for his role in resisting Canada’s imperial conquest of Red River. George FG Stanley, “A Footnote to

History: Was Louis Riel an American Citizen?" *Canadian Historical Review* 29(1) (March 1948): 40-43. Andersen, "Métis".

⁴⁸ Scott, *Essays*, 11-13 and 159. D Michael Jackson, *The Canadian Kingdom: 150 Years of Constitutional Monarchy*, (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2018).

⁴⁹ James WJ Bowden, "'Dominion': A Lament," *The Dorchester Review* (Autumn/Winter 2015), 58-64; Dorothy Lane, "'Dominion from Sea to Sea': Christianity, Imperialism, and the Trope of Conversion," in *A Sea for Encounters: Essays Towards a Postcolonial Commonwealth*, edited by Stella Borg Barthet, (New York: Rodopi, 2009), 177-192.

⁵⁰ The notion that the English Crown was an imperial body, and that its sovereignty thus knew no necessary, a priori temporal (ie earthly) bounds, was established as a consequence of the Reformation and Henry VIII's split with the Church of Rome. In declaring the termination of papal authority over the English Crown, Henry asserted for the first time that "it is manifestly declared and expressed that this realm of England is an empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and king having the dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown of the same." In this way, the Reformation claimed for the English Crown the same temporally unbounded authority previously reserved for the Pope—the presumed authority by which the Doctrine of Discovery had been promulgated over the course of the past century. This doctrine of Erastianism remains the essential transitional point in the apparently secular nature of the Canadian state's claim to allodial title over land to this day. See, Henry Tudor VIII, *Act in Restraint of Appeals*, (London, 1533).

⁵¹ Psalms 72: 8-9 (King James Version).

⁵² For a more thorough discussion of Christian supremacist logics at the root of modern European and settler imperialism, see Majid, *Moore's*; and for a more particular discussion of the complications of pursuing liberation and maintaining in-group freedom through a project of state-building and conquest, see Edward W Said, "Michael Walzer's 'Exodus and Revolution': A Canaanite Reading," *Grand Street* 5(2) (Winter 1986), 86-106.

⁵³ Russell, *Odyssey*, 147.

⁵⁴ PB Waite, ed., *The Confederation Debates in the Province of Canada 1865*, (McClelland and Stewart: Toronto, 1963), 81.

⁵⁵ *ibid.*, 60,

⁵⁶ United Kingdom, *House of Commons Debates*, August 5, 1869.

For discussions of the centrality of mobility to many Indigenous modes of governance, see: John Borrows, "Physical Philosophy: Mobility and Indigenous Freedom," in *Freedom and Indigenous Constitutionalism*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016): 19-49. David A Chang, *The World and All the Things Upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016).

⁵⁷ United Kingdom, *House of Lords Debates*, February 23, 1865. United Kingdom, *House of Commons Debates*, August 5, 1869, (Edward Cardwell).

⁵⁸ United Kingdom, *House of Commons Debates*, July 1, 1864.

⁵⁹ Waite, *Confederation Debates*, 60.

⁶⁰ *ibid.*, 56.

⁶¹ Stanley Ryerson, *Unequal Union: Roots of Crisis in the Canadas, 1815-1873*, (Toronto: Progress Books, 1975 [1968]), 309.

⁶² *ibid.*, 311.

⁶³ Guy Laforest, *Interpreting Quebec's Exile Within the Federation: Selected Political Essays*, (Wellington: Peter Lang, 2014); Joëlle Alice Michaud-Ouellet, *On the Relationship between Vulnerability and Sovereignty in Québécois Settler Self-Determination and the Shift to a Relational Conception of the Self as Treaty Partner*, (unpublished dissertation, the University of Victoria, 2019); Marcel Rioux, *Quebec in Question*, trans. James Boake, (Toronto: James Lorimer & Co., 1978).

⁶⁴ Waite, *Confederation Debates*, 50-51.

⁶⁵ Russell, *Odyssey*, 133.

⁶⁶ Supreme Court of Canada, *Reference re Secession of Quebec*, 1998, <https://canlii.ca/t/1fqr3> (accessed April 22, 2021).

⁶⁷ Importantly, Riker's account fully absents Indigenous peoples from its implied history of North America. Both in the topically significant exclusion of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy as a (if not *the*) primary example of a federal polity, but also because he does not account for Indigenous peoples at all in his narrative of American expansion. Indeed, Riker is crystal clear that federalism in fact *facilitated* America's continental conquests, but this cannot rise to the level of empire-building for Riker because: (1) he ignores the existence let alone the political autonomy of Indigenous peoples; and (2) because white settlers were able to be admitted to the republic as constitutionally protected states, a fact which is taken as evidence of a non-imperial process. William H Riker, *Federalism: Origin, Operation, Significance*, (Toronto: Little, Brown, and Co., 1964), 1-25.

⁶⁸ Peter Russell's recent treatise on the development of the claim to sovereignty stands out in this regard amongst Canadianist literature. While he adopts a more historically defensible account of sovereignty's development, noting in particular that the redistribution of sovereignty from the Imperial metropolises to settlers constitutes a major hinge-point in the worsening plight for Indigenous peoples in North America and Oceania, he nevertheless acknowledges this while simultaneously shielding federalism as the institutional articulating pin that made the hinge-point possible in Canada. This is dramatized in the book by a chapter split in which Russell's excellent critique of "Settler Sovereignty" is immediately and without commentary followed up by a chapter on how "Federalism Takes the Sting Out of Sovereignty." While Russell argues in this chapter for Canada to expand its federal arrangement to include "treaty federalism," he lacks an account first of the fact that federalism was arrived at as an institutional framework that not only excluded Indigenous peoples as constitutional actors, but facilitated their subjugation to settler rule. And, secondly, given the relatively stymied nature of the modern treaty process, the de facto abrogation of unfulfilled historic treaties, and the generalized constitutional intransigence amongst the various governments of Canada towards reform, Russell's laudable call for moving towards treaty federalism lacks a mechanism by which this will be achieved in a manner that actually advances Indigenous peoples' demands. Peter H Russell, *Sovereignty: The Biography of a Claim*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2021), 71-98.

⁶⁹ Karen E Fields and Barbara J Fields, *Racecraft: The Soul of Inequality in American Life*, (London: Verso, 2014 [2012]).

⁷⁰ For clarification on the distinct framing of 'racial' and 'racialist,' see Robin DG Kelley's foreword to the updated edition of *Black Marxism*. Robinson, *Black Marxism*, xi-xxxiii.

⁷¹ "Electoral History of BC," Elections BC (2022), <https://elections.bc.ca/voting/outreach-and-education/electoral-history-of-bc/> (accessed May 12, 2022). Iyko Day, *Alien Capital: Asian Racialization and the Logic of Settler Colonial Capitalism*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016). Brenna Bhandar, *Colonial Lives of Property: Law, Land, and Racial Regimes of Ownership*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018).

⁷² Rita Kaur Dhamoon, Davina Bhandar, Renisa Mawani, and Satwinder Kaur Bains, eds., *Unmooring the Komagata Maru: Charting Colonial Trajectories*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019).

⁷³ Thank you to Rita Dhamoon for pointing towards this heinous timeline.

⁷⁴ "Fact Sheet: MV Sun Sea Migrants," Canada Border Service Agency (August 23, 2010), <https://web.archive.org/web/20120507032509/http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/media/facts-faits/089-eng.html> (accessed May 12, 2022). Jon Woodward, "Canada deported man to torture in Sri Lanka: affidavit," CTV News (October 8, 2013), <https://bc.ctvnews.ca/canada-deported-man-to-torture-in-sri-lanka-affidavit-1.1489741> (accessed May 12, 2022). Nadia Hasan, et al., "Borders, Boats, and Brown Bodies: Reading Tamil 'Irregular Arrivals' through the History of the Komagata Maru," in *Unmooring the Komagata Maru*, 121-140.

⁷⁵ Cole Harris, *Making Native Space: Colonialism, Resistance, and Reserves in British Columbia*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2002).

⁷⁶ *The Pass System: Life Under Segregation in Canada*, directed by Alex Williams, (V-Tape, 2016), <http://thepasssystem.ca/> (accessed June 29, 2022).

⁷⁷ Robin Jarvis Brownlie, *A Fatherly Eye: Indian Agents, Government Power, and Aboriginal Resistance in Ontario, 1918-1939*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003).

⁷⁸ Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*. Kyle T Mays, *An Afro-Indigenous History of the United States*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 2021). Robyn Maynard and Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *Rehearsals for Living*, (Toronto: Penguin Random House, 2022).

⁷⁹ Rita Dhamoon, *Identity/Difference Politics: How Difference Is Produced, and Why It Matters*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010). Debra Thompson, "Is Race Political?" *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 41(3) (September 2008), 525-547.

⁸⁰ Nisha Nath, "Defining Narratives of Identity in Canadian Political Science: Accounting for the Absence of Race," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 44(1) (March 2011), 181-182. For a truly classic set of examples of analysts inverting the flow of power, see Tom Flanagan, *First Nations? Second Thoughts*, (Montréal: McGill-Queen's Press, 2000). Frederick Lee Morton and Rainer Knopff, *The Charter Revolution and the Court Party*, (Peterborough: Broadview Press, 2000).

⁸¹ Ryerson, for instance, (erroneously) suggests that in terms of contemporary Indigenous perspectives on the emergence of this settler empire there is only "Silence. The answer is unrecorded." Ryerson, *Unequal*, 18. Russell, similarly terse, describes the Indigenous experience of the move to Confederation under the title of "Aboriginal Canada Gets Left Out." Russell, *Odyssey*.

⁸² The distinction that I'm trying to draw here owes much to Adom Getachew's argument that Third World nations have never been *excluded* from the world system, but rather were unequally integrated within it so as to facilitate domination and exploitation by the imperial core. Adom Getachew, *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019).

⁸³ See also: André Siegfried, *The Race Question in Canada*, (New York: D Appleton and Co., 1907).

⁸⁴ Laura Madokoro, Francine McKenzie, and David Meren, eds., *Dominion of race: Rethinking Canada's international history*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2017). Walia, *Border and Rule*.

⁸⁵ Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2015).

⁸⁶ Emphasis original, Joel Olson, *The Abolition of White Democracy*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), xxiv.

⁸⁷ Kevin Bruyneel, "Exiled, Executed, Exalted: Louis Riel, *Homo Sacer* and the Production of Canadian Sovereignty," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 43(3) (September 2010): 711-732.

⁸⁸ Sean Mills, *The Empire Within: Postcolonial Thought and Political Activism in Sixties Montreal*, (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010).

⁸⁹ United Kingdom, *House of Commons Debates*, November 20, 1931, (Leo Amery). United Kingdom, *House of Commons Debates*, November 24, 1931, (Leo Amery).

⁹⁰ Robbie McVeigh and Bill Rolston, "*Anois ar theacht an tSamhraidh*": *Ireland, Colonialism and the Unfinished Revolution*, (Belfast: Beyond the Pale Books, 2021).

⁹¹ United Kingdom, *House of Commons Debates*, November 20, 1931, (Winston Churchill).

⁹² Among the most dramatic examples of this reversal on the principles of settler self-rule and constitutional whiteness was the decision by the British Parliament to assert its sovereign Crown prerogative *against* the apartheid regime of Southern Rhodesia. In 1965, the white supremacist government of Ian Smith issued the *Unilateral Declaration of Independence*, declaring Southern Rhodesia an independent state within the Commonwealth under the continued sovereignty of Queen Elizabeth II. In effect, Smith's declaration claimed for Southern Rhodesia full Dominion status, whereas it had previously been in a state of self-rule akin to Canada's prior to the *Statute of Westminster* (1931). While

the British Parliament and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (JCPC) expressed little by way of overt disdain for the actual apartheid system of white minority rule that the settlers sought to establish in Southern Rhodesia—having granted precisely this arrangement to South Africa thirty years prior and to Canada in 1867—the fact that Smith’s assertion of settler sovereignty came at the apex of the decolonization struggle in Africa, made clear the impossibility of Britain at once accepting white minority rule in Southern Rhodesia while still maintaining working relations with newly independent democratic states on the continent, such as Ghana. Thus, the *Southern Rhodesia Act* (1965), passed by the British Parliament only days after the *Declaration of Independence*, enacted a vital reversal to the racial regime of explicit and constitutionalized white supremacy that underpinned the Empire since 1867 by, in the words of the JCPC, removing “from Rhodesia the power to legislate for itself.” See, Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, *Madzimbamuto v Lardner-Burke*, 1968.

While by no means a simply analogous situation (especially given the divergent attitudes towards settler sovereignty), it is also worth noting that in debates over the *Canada Act* (1982)—the British legislation that severed the remaining authority of the Imperial Parliament over the Dominion by patriating the Canadian Parliament’s *Constitution Act* (1982)—several members of parliament in London countenanced the possibility of amending the bill or else withholding their consent over concerns that its treatment of Aboriginal rights might represent a dereliction of the British Parliament’s duties towards Indigenous peoples. For instance, in a sentiment that echoes much of the discussion in this chapter, Labour MP Bruce George warned against the possibility of fully discharging responsibility for Aboriginal title to the Canadian government: “our predecessors, the Select Committee on Aborigines, in 1837 warned the House against conferring powers on provincial legislatures to deal with Indians. They cannot be relied upon. The closer the provincial legislature is to the Indians, the greater the likelihood that Indian land will be stolen and the greater opportunity for local politicians to take away the Indian people’s diminishing rights.” Presciently, George later remarked in this same debate that the burgeoning Canadian extractive industry “clearly shows that the provinces have their eyes on the resources on and under the surface of aboriginal lands. Should we pass this legislation, that will assist them in acquiring the land that they covet.” Even Ulster Unionist Party MP Enoch Powell, among the most infamous racists and white nationalists of mid-20th Century Britain, noted that the wording on Aboriginal rights could “open a loophole to the meaning and interpretation of their rights being limited by subsequent judicial or legislative action.” The *Constitution Act* was, in George’s estimation, the pathway towards a “process of paper genocide.” While the *Canada Act* was passed, Labour MP George Robertson summed it up as less a moral victory for the democratization or supposedly postcolonial future awaiting the settler polity, and more a matter of realpolitik on the part of his Parliamentary colleagues: “One must be conscious not only of our past responsibility... to the Commonwealth, but of the fact that we are concerned about our future relationship with the sovereign Government of Canada and with its people... We must not be seen to be seeking to interfere with or to patronize their democratic rights or processes... Our attitude is, perhaps, ambivalent.” United Kingdom, *House of Commons Debates*, February 23, 1982.

⁹³ “History,” 407 ETR (2022), <https://407etr.com/en/highway/corporate/background-information1.html> (accessed May 18, 2022).

⁹⁴ Joel Wittnebel, “Bradford Bypass Threatens Ancient Indigenous Site ‘more significant than 95 percent of all historic/archaeological sites in Canada,’” *The Pointer* (January 23, 2022), https://thepointer.com/article/2022-01-23/bradford-bypass-threatens-ancient-indigenous-site-more-significant-than-95-percent-of-all-historic-archaeological-sites-in-canada?fbclid=IwAR2YL7pVQ0-tTeosn5UkuY5zAxhNbbMpFWNLsW0SxgIL8-QhM1jLFL_dRck (accessed May 18, 2022).

⁹⁵ Deborah Campbell, “Foreign Correspondent,” *The Globe and Mail* (January 25, 2022), <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/rob-magazine/foreign-correspondent/article4130246/> (accessed May 18, 2022). Scott Anderson, “Paving Over Peace? Canuck-built Road Helps Israel Cement Control,” *NOW Magazine* (May 30, 2002), <https://nowtoronto.com/news/paving-over-peace> (accessed May 18, 2022). Sean F McMahon, “Canadian War-Crimes Profiteering.” *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs* (December 2011), <https://www.wrmea.org/011-december/anada-calling-canadian-war-crimes-profiteering.html> (accessed May 18, 2022).

Interlude Notes:

¹ The connection between an imperial project and settler democracy is more than merely incidental here, and has deeper symbolic resonance than the placement of the Empress' statue on prominent display at the entrance to the Legislature housing a government which continues to sit in the name of Victoria's descendants. As detailed by the Visitor Tour Program Manager for the Manitoba Legislature, the commissioning of this particular statue engaged the settler public in a broad fundraising drive that capped private donations at no more than \$5.00 per person, thereby drawing as broad a swath of the public into the financing of this statue as possible. A democracy of dollars, if you will. Vanessa Gregg, email to the author, September 13, 2021.

Moreover, erected through mass-settler fundraising in 1904, this statue could be viewed as a monument to thirty years of self-government for white settlers in Manitoba. The devolution of full provincial autonomy as stipulated in the *British North America Act* (1867) came to the Legislature in Winnipeg not with the passage of the *Manitoba Act* (1870), but with the production of a securely white demographic majority in the province in 1874. As Owen Toews details, John A Macdonald conceived of this explicit project of colonization and demographic transformation as the essential prerequisite for 'democratic' transition. Owen Toews, *Stolen City: Racial Capitalism and the Making of Winnipeg*, (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2018), 44-45.

Finally, the notion that the toppling of these particular statues—or any given statue for that matter—is undertaken with 'ease,' should only be interpreted here as a comment on the physical act itself; as in, how surprisingly easy it was to bring down the statue given the length of its tenure. In a very real sense, there is *nothing* easy about the work that goes into building a community confident enough its capacity to assert itself against the symbols of the constituted regime. Moreover, given the immediate response of that constituted power to criminalize and pathologize those who do assert themselves, maintaining that confidence through the onslaught of opprobrium, pacification, and the mobilization of coercive carceral power is nothing short of remarkable in itself. Devon McKendrick, "Investigation ongoing after Queen Victoria, Queen Elizabeth II statues toppled at Manitoba Legislature," CTV News Winnipeg, July 2, 2021, <https://winnipeg.ctvnews.ca/investigation-ongoing-after-queen-victoria-queen-elizabeth-ii-statues-toppled-at-manitoba-legislature-1.5493852> (accessed September 27, 2021). Gabrielle Piché, "Probe Continues into Toppled Statues," *Winnipeg Free Press*, August 12, 2021.

² Niigaan Sinclair, "Vandalism is in the eye of the beholder," *Winnipeg Free Press*, July 2, 2021.

³ Sarah Petz, "Statues of queens topples at Manitoba legislature will be restored, premier says," CBC News, July 7, 2021, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/pallister-queen-statues-manitoba-1.6093151> (accessed September 27, 2021).

⁴ *ibid.* Malak Abas, "Indigenous Leaders Advocate for Dialogue in Wake of Protest," *Winnipeg Free Press*, July 2, 2021.

⁵ Emphasis mine. Abas, "Indigenous Leaders."

⁶ Pallister is quite clear what he envisions with reconciliation, saying that he's "excited to work on" a project of reconciliation that means moving "equality of opportunity forward." This constitutes what can only be described as a relatively *thin* conception of reconciliation, as it not only adopts the classical/neo-liberal theory of equality as equal opportunity (contrasted to other liberal conceptions such as equality of outcome), but it is entirely mute on the question of the normative grounds through which this notion of equality is constituted. Petz, "Statues of queens." See also: Richard JF Day, *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000). Elizabeth Povinelli, *The Cunning of Recognition: Indigenous Alterities and the Making of Australian Multiculturalism*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002). Rita Dhamoon, *Identity|Difference Politics: How Difference is Produced, and Why it Matters*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2009).

⁷ "Night hunting 'becoming a race war,' says Premier Brian Pallister," CBC News, January 20, 2017, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/night-hunting-brian-pallister-race-war-1.3944949> (accessed September 27, 2021). Murray Sinclair, "Premier seeks to divide province with incendiary comments on vaccine, First Nations," CBC News, December 5, 2020, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/opinion-sinclair-pallister-vaccine-first-nations-1.5828578> (accessed September 27, 2021). David A Robertson, "Pallister has shattered his government's relationship with Indigenous people," *The Global and Mail*, July 24, 2021.

⁸ Deployed in this manner, 'reconciliation' becomes an exemplary case of what Sara Ahmed calls the "national rod" that disciplines willful, unruly, or revolting subjects—condescended to for their alleged childlike lack of deference to authority. Sara Ahmed, *Willful Subjects*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014), 129-131. Given it's repeated usage

to criticize and curtail the supposed *disorder* of these community-led direct actions, ‘reconciliation’ can also be productively read as what Cedric Robinson calls a “term of order.” That is, an organizing intellectual discourse, a component part of the public culture of a community, that is meant to legitimize the given order of things in the face of serious challenge. Cedric J Robinson, *The Terms of Order: Political Science and the Myth of Leadership*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016 [1980]), 7-13.

Indeed, many who criticized those involved in this action resorted to a pathologizing language, that focused on the sense of hurt, anger, or helplessness that those who criticize the actions presume *must* have been at the root. In a very few instances, outside agitation—the constant watchword of reactionaries dismissing radical political actors within their own communities—was also implied. The possibility of the crowd finding collective self-actualization, strength, or empowerment through these actions seems not even to be suggestible. On the pathologizing of Indigenous resistance, see Dian Million, *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights*, (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013). Melanie K Yazzie, “Traumatic Monologues: On the Therapeutic Turn in Indigenous Politics,” *The Baffler* (59), (September 2021), <https://thebaffler.com/outbursts/traumatic-monologues-yazzie?fbclid=IwAR3hYHPZfkH-idRNsQLeTY3LhNFpgpAII MdATVE2A6JMKl46vgi5FGzKw9w> (accessed October 20, 2021).

⁹ Murray Sinclair, “I am not at all impressed by acts of destruction such as this,” Facebook, July 1, 2021, <https://www.facebook.com/Sincmurr> (accessed September 27, 2021).

This is to say nothing on the prior question of whether anger, and a desire to be avenged, are not *entirely* appropriate responses from colonized peoples to the ongoing conditions of domination and exploitation that produce degradation and social deprivation. Much has been written by anti-colonial scholars on this topic, see for example: Frantz Fanon, “Colonial War and Mental Disorders,” in *The Wretched of the Earth*, (New York: Grove Press, 2004 [1961]), 181-234. Glen Sean Coulthard, “Seeing Red: Reconciliation and Resentment,” in *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 105-130. Max Haiven, “Toward a materialist theory of revenge,” in *Revenge Capitalism: The Ghosts of Empire, the Demons of Capital, and the Settling of Unpayable Debts*, (London: Pluto Press, 2020), 16-43. Myisha Cherry, *The Case for Rage: Why Anger is Essential to Anti-Racist Struggle*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021).

For a discussion of the trope and political usages of the ‘outside agitator’ accusation, please see: George Ciccariello-Maher, “Blaming ‘Outside Agitators’ is a Centuries-Old Ploy,” *The Wall Street Journal* (June 7, 2020), <https://www.wsj.com/articles/blaming-outside-agitators-is-a-centuries-old-ploy-11591560877> (accessed April 27, 2022).

¹⁰ Nichole E Grant and Timothy J Stanley, “Reading the Wallpaper: Disrupting Performances of Whiteness in the Blog ‘Stuff White People Like,’” in *The Critical Youth Studies Reader*, Awad Ibrahim and Shirley Steinberg, eds., (New York: Peter Lang, 2014), 172-183.

¹¹ I don’t dwell with this question here, as much has been written already on the politics of crowds, beginning perhaps with Gustave Le Bon’s infamous *The Crowd* (1895), a cornerstone of what is now largely regarded as the spurious methods of ‘mass psychology.’ More compelling material has been written by scholars like CLR James, who took the masses and crowd action as essential actors in anti-colonial struggle; or by Cedric Robinson, whose *Terms of Order* (1980) details how much of the canon of Political Science has been an attempt to superimpose hierarchical and centripetal theories of political organizing onto mass movements, effectively stripping the masses of their political agency in absentia of some structure of leadership. Vicky Osterweil’s *In Defense of Looting* (2019), is a recent and worthy contribution to this theorizing of mass direct action. Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd*, (New York: Viking Compass, 1960 [1895]). CLR James, *A History of Pan-African Revolt*, (Oakland: PM Press, 2012 [1938]). Robinson, *Terms of Order*. Vicky Osterweil, *In Defense of Looting: A Riotous History of Uncivil Action*, (New York: Bold Type Books, 2019).

¹² Timothy J Stanley, “Commemorating John A. Macdonald: Collective Remembering and the Structure of Settler Colonialism in British Columbia,” *BC Studies* 204, (Winter 2019/2020), 99.

In an article for the Intercept detailing many of the iconoclastic community-led direction actions in the summer of 2020, Siddhartha Mitter drives this point home: “the temptation to dismiss the fall of the statues as merely symbolic belittles the testimony of people moved and gratified by the disappearance of objects whose presence expressed their past and present exclusion and subjugation. It also makes less and less sense the closer one gets to the ground: to the town squares, city streets, and rural roads where none of these monuments landed by chance, and where

each plays a part in shaping property values, the allocation of public resources, and differential experiences of personal safety.” Siddhartha Mitter, “All Statues are Local: The Great Toppling of 2020 and the Rebirth of Civic Imagination,” *The Intercept*, July 19, 2020, <https://theintercept.com/2020/07/19/confederate-statues-monuments-local/> (accessed September 30, 2021).

¹³ “Statue of Egerton Ryerson, toppled after Toronto rally, ‘will not be restored or replaced,’ CBC News, June 6, 2021, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/statue-of-egerton-ryerson-brought-down-1.6055676> (accessed September 30, 2021). “Ryerson University to change its name amid reckoning with history of residential schools,” CBC News, August 26, 2021, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/ryerson-university-name-change-1.6154716> (accessed September 30, 2021).

¹⁴ Sebastian Leck, “The head of the statue of Egerton Ryerson now on spike at Land Back Lane in Caledonia, Ont.,” CBC News, June 10, 2021, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/egerton-ryerson-statue-caledonia-land-back-lane-1.6059513> (accessed September 30, 2021).

¹⁵ “Activists topple statue of Sir John A Macdonald in downtown Montreal,” CBC News, August 29, 2020, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/montreal/defund-police-protest-black-lives-matter-1.5705101> (accessed September 30, 2021).

¹⁶ Mitter, “All Statues are Local.”

While I remain focused on the community-led toppling of statues here, the events following George Floyd’s murder should be carefully studied by all who express concern that direct action—especially assertive or militant actions—exacerbates community tensions. Among the most profound achievements of the uprisings of 2020, what Tobi Haslett calls the “magic actions” of the revolts, is undoubtedly the dismantling of the Third Precinct of the Minneapolis Police Department. Prior to these events on May 28, torching a police depot would likely have stood as the imagined—though unimaginable—limit-case of the thesis that militant direct action creates a fractious civic environment. However, the force of the unimaginable bursting into reality revealed something truly remarkable. In surveys conducted immediately after the siege of the precinct, as many as 54% of Americans indicated they saw the actions as justified. By contrast, and to the degree to which either polls or electoral results should be taken as real or unfiltered gauges of general opinion, no presidential candidate has received this much public support since the mid-1980s. The broad support may have been produced not *in spite* of the militancy of these actions, but perhaps *as a direct consequence* of how boldly and directly they confronted constituted power. Tobi Haslett, “Magic Actions: Looking back on the George Floyd rebellion,” *N+1 Magazine* 40 (Summer 2021), <https://www.nplusonemag.com/issue-40/politics/magic-actions-2/> (accessed September 30, 2021). Matthew Impelli, “54 Percent of Americans Think Burning Down Minneapolis Police Precinct Was Justified After George Floyd’s Death,” *Newsweek* (June 6, 2020), <https://www.newsweek.com/54-americans-think-burning-down-minneapolis-police-precinct-was-justified-after-george-floyds-1508452> (accessed September 30, 2021).

¹⁷ While I focus here on relationships of anti-imperialist resistance within the imperial core, it is *crucial* to see that these connections extend far beyond that as well. As in the imperial core, the historical trajectories that culminate in community-led direct actions elsewhere emerge within context-specific crises, movements, and struggles. As Augusta Saraiva notes, Latin America has been embroiled in longstanding struggles over control of commemorations within the common space of the cities, dating back to at least 1992 and Indigenous-led resistance to quincentenary celebrations of Columbus’ brutal initiation of the conquest of the Americas. Augusta Saraiva, “Toppling Statues Isn’t Enough in Latin America,” *Foreign Policy* (August 10, 2020), https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/08/10/latin-america-protest-colonial-statues-monuments-indigenous-rights/?utm_source=pocket_mylist (accessed October 20, 2021).

¹⁸ Asher Craig, Tatiana Flessas, Jonathan Jones, Sarah Keenan, and Luke McDonagh, “Occupying the Pedestal: Cultural heritage, protest, and the law,” *LSE: Public Lectures and Events*, podcast audio, October 28, 2020. “How Statues are Falling Around the World,” *The New York Times* (June 24, 2020), <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/24/us/confederate-statues-photos.html> (accessed September 30, 2021). Abas, “Indigenous Leaders.”

¹⁹ Rhodes Must Fall, Oxford, *Rhodes Must Fall: The Struggle to Decolonize the Racist Heart of Empire*, (London: Zed Books, 2018).

²⁰ Russell Rickford, “Toppling statues as a decolonial ethic,” *Africa is a Country*, July 28, 2020, <https://africasacountry.com/2020/07/toppling-statues-as-a-decolonial-ethic> (accessed September 30, 2021).

²¹ I’m indebted to Mark Leier for helping me track down the actual origins of this quote which, while often attributed, seems to be rarely cited. C Wright Mills, *Listen, Yankee: The Revolution in Cuba*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1960), 54. Mills’ aphorism is born out by a careful engagement with Gerald Horne’s and CLR James’ historical studies. Gerald Horne, *The Counter-Revolution of 1776: Slave Resistance and the Origins of the United States of America*, (New York: New York University Press, 2014). CLR James, *World Revolution, 1917-1936: The Rise and Fall of the Communist International*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017[1937]).

²² Jodi A Byrd, *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011).

²³ Geo Maher, *Spirals of Revolt: Study and Struggle to Abolish the Present*, (New York: Common Notions, 2022).

Chapter Three Notes:

¹ Jarrod Shook, “The Canadian carceral state: What is to be done? Ask prisoners!” *Canadian Dimension* (January 5, 2019), <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/the-canadian-carceral-state-what-is-to-be-done-ask-prisoners> (accessed November 3, 2021). Ruth Wilson Gilmore, “What Is to be Done?” *American Quarterly* 63(2) (June 2011): 245-265. VI Lenin, *What is to be done? Burning Questions of Our Movement*, (Brooklyn: Wellred Books, 2018 [1902]).

² The assertion that ‘there is no alternative’ has most often been credited to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who frequently used it as a political slogan to insist on the necessity of brutal austerity regimes that stripped state revenue from sectors associated with care-work, often reallocating it to coercive state institutions. Thatcher’s supposedly immovable monetarist policies have been associated with a marked widening in both financial inequality, and in the social determinants of health as measured between the poorest and wealthiest Britons. While hardly inevitable, Thatcher’s program launched what is often called the ‘neoliberal revolution,’ bringing to the imperial core techniques of social disarticulation that had long been tested in the Third World—particularly in Africa and Latin America. Claire Berlinski, *There Is No Alternative: Why Margaret Thatcher Matters*, (New York: Basic Books, 2008). Stuart Hall, “The Great Moving Right Show,” in *Selected Political Writings: The Great Moving Right Show and Other Essays*, edited by Sally Davison, David Featherstone, Michael Rustin, and Bill Schwarz, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017 [1979]): 172-186. Alex Scott-Samuel, et. al, “The Impact of Thatcherism on Health and Well-Being in Britain,” *International Journal of Health Services* 44(1) (2014): 53-71. David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005). Kwame Nkrumah, *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, (New York: Humanities Press, 1965). Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, (Toronto: Random House, 2007).

Importantly, though, the effects of this doctrine were well presaged by the actual genesis of its slogan. “There is no alternative,” has its origins in the writings of Herbert Spencer. Fully enmeshed within his racist social darwinist theories, Spencer’s assertion that there is no alternative is a crystallization of his dictum that the ‘survival of the fittest’ is ensured through vicious competition of all against all—in effect, austerity policies seek to create a world in which Spencer’s combative individualism is the prevailing social condition. Iain Stewart, “Commandeering Time: The Ideological Status of Time in the Social Darwinism of Herbert Spencer,” *Australian Journal of Politics & History* 57(3) (2011): 389-402.

In a recent interview with *The Breach*, historian Ian McKay noted that the hegemony of the liberal order in Canada rests on precisely this denial of the possibility of alternative. The “philosophy of rule in Canada” is, in McKay’s words, an effort to “freeze social struggle, to contain its dynamics, to equilibrate contending forces. All the while, liberals react with incredulity to the thought they defend a coherent ideological orientation: to them, this is ‘just the way things work.’” Indeed, as was made apparent in the previous chapters, this naturalizing attitude has done immense ideological work to obscure the imperial formations that are so central to the Canadian project—something which McKay himself fails to grasp in this interview, lapsing instead into a variant of left-nationalism that posits Canada as colonized colonizer. Ian McKay and Martin Lukacs, “The stormy future of Canadian liberalism: An interview with Ian McKay, Canada’s renegade historian of liberalism,” *The Breach* (October 13, 2021), <https://breachmedia.ca/the-stormy-future-of-canadian->

[liberalism/?fbclid=IwAR25g7TocvjSdMR25ftiwx2jX9RMxPG-z9h-ISQqEL0zFO7jPGGySd6kdg](https://www.liberalism.com/?fbclid=IwAR25g7TocvjSdMR25ftiwx2jX9RMxPG-z9h-ISQqEL0zFO7jPGGySd6kdg) (accessed December 3, 2021).

³ Cedric J Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition*, 3rd Edition. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1.

The concept of an ‘imperial mode of living’ is of relatively recent prominence, even as it names a long-standing system of social relations. It is concisely defined as a “mode of living that depends upon the worldwide exploitation of nature—and wage and non-wage labour—while simultaneously externalizing the social and ecological consequences arising from” that mode of living (Brand and Wissen 4-5). Importantly, such a mode of living functions not merely through domination—though it must always retain the capacity to dominate in order to reproduce itself as a mode of living—but also through enticement towards participation. This notion of imperialism as a mode of living is conversant with Robinson’s deep concern for understanding the “ontological totality,” by which the masses orient themselves in the world (Robinson 168). Ulrich Brand and Markus Wissen, *The Imperial Mode of Living: Everyday Life in the Ecological Crisis of Capitalism*, (London: Verso, 2021).

⁴ I struggle with the proper wording here, fearing to give any undue primacy to the imperial mode of living, and have landed on ‘otherwise’ only in the hopes that it is a better descriptor than ‘alternative.’

Robert Nichols, *Theft is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2020), 87 and 92.

⁵ Nichols, *Theft*, 110-115.

As one recent report details, the assertion of Indigenous rights, the struggles of land/water defenders, and the exercise of Indigenous governance systems are calculated to have stopped or delayed projects with a total greenhouse gas pollution profile equivalent to 25% of America and Canada’s combined annual national emissions. Given the severity of the climate crisis, and the direct impact that each additional ton of carbon has on worsening the situation, these are nothing short of victories in defence of life itself—incomplete though they may be. Indigenous Environmental Network, Oil Change International, and Indigenous Environmental Network, *Indigenous Resistance Against Carbon*, (Washington, DC: Oil Change International, 2021).

⁶ Manu Karuka, “Black and Native Visions of Self-Determination,” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3(2) (Fall 2017): 90.

⁷ Brett Forester, “Is Marc Miller’s vow to ‘give land back ’all sizzle, no steak? These analysts say yes,” APTN News (October 28, 2021), <https://www.aptnnews.ca/national-news/miller-land-back-all-sizzle-no-steak-analysts-say-yes/> (accessed November 4, 2021).

The disingenuous nature of Miller’s comments was only further evidenced in just the few short weeks following his appointment, when the RCMP’s Community-Industry Response Group oversaw the third violent invasion of the Wet’suwet’en nation’s yintah, enforcing a civil injunction against the Gidimt’en clan’s jurisdiction on behalf of the Coastal GasLink project. Not only were heavily armed officers and snipers deployed, but following the removal of the land/water defenders a Gidimt’en tiny home was burned to the ground. Brandi Morin, “On the front lines of ‘the war within Canada’s borders,’” Al Jazeera (November 25, 2021), <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2021/11/25/on-the-front-lines-of-the-war-within-canadas-borders> (accessed December 2, 2021).

⁸ It is, however, a very on-brand exercise on the part of the Trudeau government, using the language of social justice in order to stabilize fundamentally unjust power relations. Martin Lukacs has gone so far as to call this the “Trudeau formula,” which is concisely defined as a “formula of changeless change,” deliberately meant to short-circuit the possibility of “more radical options” through the false promise of piecemeal reform that leaves underlying systems largely untouched. This is discussed more fully in Chapter Five. Martin Lukacs, *The Trudeau Formula: Seduction and Betrayal in an Age of Discontent*, (Montréal: Black Rose Books, 2019): 11-17.

⁹ Mike Gouldhawke, “Land as a Social Relationship,” *Briarpatch* 49(5) (September/October 2020): 12-13.

Gouldhawke’s account is echoed throughout the “Land Back” special issue of *Briarpatch*. Nickita Longman asserts that “Land Back needs to happen so all other aspects of Indigenous livelihood can return with it,” she continues, broadening the significance of the movement, “Land Back means nourishing our relationship to all things on the land” (5). Likewise, Cree Elder Jo-Ann Saddleback notes that land back doesn’t “mean ‘this is my territory, don’t come here.’ It meant ‘I have the inalienable right to protect this land’” (4). Moreover, she’s explicit that land back is an

inter-nationalist struggle, arguing that “we’re talking about menistik, the whole island, all of North, Central, and South America” (ibid.). Molly Swain and Chelsea Vowel reiterate the stakes of Saddleback’s second point when they write that Indigenous “governance and care for the land will be always already constrained by the state, for as long as the state lasts (hopefully not that much longer)” (21). *Briarpatch* 49(5) (September/October 2020).

Importantly, while it is well beyond the scope of this chapter, the call to action that ‘land back’ represents is one that is truly global in its scope—emerging in nearly every context in which empire has worked to structure the dispossession and alienation of peoples from their relations with the land. Stasja Koot and Bram Büscher, “Giving Land (Back)? The Meaning of Land in the Indigenous Politics of the South Kalahari Bushman Land Claim, South Africa,” *Journal of Southern African Studies* 45(2) (2019): 357-374.

¹⁰ I’ve chosen here to describe ‘land back’ as a call to action, rather than a demand, as I believe this more precisely describes how I’ve seen it articulated and how I’ve come to understand its radical potential. The distinction being, that whereas a demand is made *to* or *of* a constituted authority, a call to action understands that power is built *by* and *through* collective struggle. Land back, then, is not a demand *per se*—or at least, we shouldn’t be limited to thinking of it as a demand—but rather it calls forth for collective action in and against the state.

¹¹ As discussed in Chapter Two, drawing from Robinson’s notion of the ‘racial regime’ we can see that relatively few of the specifics of how the interrelations of an historic bloc is composed are fixed or transhistorical. Instead they shift and recompose over time, often in response to resistance, but also in order to accommodate the expansionary logics of domination: so, as Robinson details, Anglo-Saxon supremacy slowly morphs into the concept of Englishness, which further develops into nationalist conceptions of whiteness and intra-European solidarity in the modern era of global imperialism. In Canada, the constitutional whiteness that was foundational to the state-building project has undergone its own recompositions in the post-war era. While certainly nothing close to the post-racial, or socially just political program that liberal commentators often characterize it as, multiculturalism—first as a federal policy and later as a constitutionalized principle in its own right—has reshaped the racial regime in Canada in significant ways. This is perhaps most apparent in elite spaces, that have committed themselves to a *representational* politics of diversity—see, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson’s discussion of the 2015 Trudeau Cabinet reveal, which claimed to be most diverse in Canadian history (presaging the Biden Administration’s later efforts to build a Cabinet that ‘looks like America’) (Simpson 228-230). But as others have long noted, this often amounts to merely “selling diversity” as part of a repackaged image of Canada (Abu-Laban and Gabriel), even as the greater proportion of racialized people (especially racialized women) continue to live under conditions of hyper-exploitation and organized social abandonment (Alook, Block, and Galabuzi)—to say nothing of the extractive and expropriative relationship that Canadian multiculturalism served to accelerate in the state’s relationship towards highly specialist professionals in the Third World (Anwar).

Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017). Yasmeen Abu-Laban and Christina Gabriel, *Selling Diversity: Immigration, Multiculturalism, Employment Equity, and Globalization*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002). Angele Alook, Sheila Block, and Grace-Edward Galabuzi, *A Disproportionate Burden: COVID-19 Labour Market Impacts on Indigenous and Racialized Workers in Canada*, (Toronto: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2021), <https://policyalternatives.ca/publications/reports/disproportionate-burden> (accessed June 7, 2022). Arif Anwar, “Canadian Immigration Policy: Micro and Macro Issues with the Points Based Assessment System,” *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 46(1) (2014): 169-179.

¹² The literature on property is vast, and deserving of consideration that is not possible in the space available here. But a few comments are essential, given the conversation that is to follow. In his study of European bourgeois political theorists, CB Macpherson notes that property is a particular type of “enforceable claim to some use or benefit of something” and that while “the threat of force is invoked only as an instrument that is thought to be necessary to guarantee a right... it is an enforceable claim only because and in so far as the prevailing ethical theory holds that it is a necessary human right.” Here, property is understood fundamentally as a *relational* claim, and one that produces the necessity of a state that is the enforcer, and aggregation, of such claims. CB Macpherson, editor, *Property: Mainstream and Critical Positions*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978): 3-5.

Scholars subsequent to Macpherson, however, have noted what is obvious as a matter of historic fact: that the claim to private property in its European, bourgeois trajectories, has most often been made *against* other relational claims. It has meant the destruction of practices of commoning, in order to enclose land as discrete parcels that can be then used for high-intensity agricultural production. The production of a gender binary and simultaneous dispossession

of people coded as women to entomb them within the domestic sphere, securing through a regime of cisheteropatriarchy two crucial types of explicitly masculinized property: property in the home and property in women. As racial regimes shifted, incentivizing broader collaboration among and between the conflicting classes, ethnic, and national groups of western Eurasia, whiteness emerged as a fundamental pre-condition for recognition not only of anyone's *personal* propriety claims, but also the claims of whole nations and continents. Importantly, none of these processes were experienced sequentially or discretely; they are, rather, a tangle of cacophonous violence constitutive of the present property regimes. What is more, they have always been resisted; Macpherson's claim that property rests on a 'prevailing ethical theory' neglects the degree to which it is not only always a counter-claim, but to which those prevailing conditions rest on a widely appreciated threat of violent enforcement backing the counter-claim of private property. Peter Linebaugh, *Stop, Thief! The Commons, Enclosures, and Resistance*, (Oakland: PM Press, 2014). Silvia Federici, *Caliban and the Witch: Women, The Body and Primitive Accumulation*, (Brooklyn: Autonomedia, 2014 [2004]). Robinson, *Black Marxism*. Cheryl I Harris, "Whiteness as Property," *Harvard Law Review* 106(8) (June 1993): 1707-1791. Rinaldo Walcott, *On Property*, (Windsor, ON: Biblioasis, 2021). Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *The White Possessive: Property, Power, and Indigenous Sovereignty*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2015). Stella Dadzie, *A Kick in the Belly: Women, Slavery, and Resistance*, (London: Verso, 2020). Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, *Race for Profit: How Banks and the Real Estate Industry Undermined Black Homeownership*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2019). Robin DG Kelley, "'We Are Not What We Seem': Rethinking Black Working-Class Opposition in the Jim Crow South," *The Journal of American History* 80(1) (June 1993): 75-112.

¹³ Gina Starblanket and Dallas Hunt, "How the death of Colten Boushie became recast as the story of a knight protecting his castle," *The Globe and Mail* (February 13, 2018), online.

¹⁴ Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, "Criminal Empire: The Making of the Savage in a Lawless Land," *Theory and Event* 19(4) (2016), online. Jeffery Monaghan, "Mounties in the Frontier: Circulations, Anxieties, and Myths of Settler Colonial Policing in Canada," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 47(1) (Winter 2013): 122-148. Tyler A Shipley, "Conquest and Genocide" and "From Potlatch to the Residential Schools," in *Canada in the World: Settler Capitalism and the Colonial Imagination*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020): 37-98. Greg Marquis, *The Vigilant Eye: Policing Canada from 1867 to 9/11*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2016). Reg Whitaker, Gregory S Kealey, and Andrew Parnaby. *Secret Service: Political Policing in Canada from the Fenians to Fortress America*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012).

Importantly, too, these ongoing histories of policing are interwoven with the surveillance, criminalization, and incarceration of other non-white racialized communities. Historically, in what becomes eastern Canada—especially in Montréal and Nova Scotia—this included the broadly distributed social responsibility for surveillance and policing carried out by white people generally that was necessary to keep enslaved persons in bondage and to forcibly return self-emancipated Black people to enslavement (Maynard). In western Canada, especially in British Columbia, policing often targeted Asian—especially Chinese-descended—communities, and was carried out at the explicit behest of private interests such as railway conglomerates. Indeed, the geographical and temporal idiosyncrasies of racial regimes is quite evident when one considers the role of organizations like the Victoria Voltigeurs (a Métis regiment) and the Victoria Pioneer Rifle Corps (a largely Caribbean-descended military company) in policing Fort Victoria during the 1850s and 1860s, respectively. Lawrence J Barkwell, "The Victoria Voltigeurs," Louis Riel Institute (2008), <https://www.metismuseum.ca/resource.php/07418> (accessed June 7, 2022). "Victoria Pioneer Rifle Corps," BC Black History Awareness Society, <https://bcblackhistory.ca/learning-centre/information-sources/the-military-and-police/> (accessed June 7, 2022).

¹⁵ As just the most alarming statistic, in Canada, Indigenous persons are more than ten times as likely as non-Indigenous persons to be murdered by police. Ryan Flanagan, "Why are Indigenous people in Canada so much more likely to be shot and killed by police?" CTV News, (June 19, 2020).

One could also considered the highly gendered regimes of colonial violence that policing both structures and carries out. Attention was drawn to this during the Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls, but there have also been a number of high-profile cases recently brought to public attention wherein the police have functioned as an explicit organizing apparatus for sexualized violence against Indigenous women, girls, and femme folks. See Sylvia Rich, "Police Violence as Organizational Crime," *Canadian Journal of Law and Society* 37(1) (December 21, 2021), <https://doi.org/10.1017/cls.2021.27> (accessed December 21, 2021). See also, Brandi Morin, "'No One is Going to Believe You': When the RCMP Abuses Indigenous Women and Girls," Al Jazeera (December

29, 2021), <https://www.aljazeera.com/features/longform/2021/12/29/no-one-will-believe-you-when-the-rcmp-abuses-indigenous-girls> (accessed January 14, 2022).

¹⁶ Importantly, Howe and Monaghan make clear that this negotiated management tactic was only ever a superficial gloss of accommodation over the fundamental antagonism between the police and dissenting communities. Though, importantly, they do note that even as a mere gloss it was largely successful in engendering crucial shifts in *many* social movements, leading to the emergence of “professionalized norms of conduct in their [movement] mobilization strategies,” that were ultimately more amenable to policing and less disruptive of the status quo. Echoes of this reverberate in section three of this chapter. Miles Howe and Jeffery Monaghan, “Strategic Incapacitation of Indigenous Dissent: Crowd Theories, Risk Management, and Settler Colonial Policing,” *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 43(4) (2018): 328-329.

This also resonates with the arguments put forward by theorists of policing, who assert that policing constructs the very ‘order’ it claims to defend, through the maintenance of class rule (constructed, always, through regimes of racialization, gender, sexuality, and ability) (Neocleous). Frantz Fanon famously declared that the manichaeon world produced through colonization was maintained by a “dividing line” that was “represented by the barracks and the police station” (Fanon 3). Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, (New York: Grove Press, 2004 [1963]). Mark Neocleous, *A Critical Theory of Police Power: The Fabrication of Social Order*, (London: Verso, 2021).

¹⁷ Howe and Monaghan, “Strategic Incapacitation,” 338-339.

¹⁸ Quoted from CSIS report in Howe and Monaghan, Strategic Incapacitation, 338.

The continuity of these tactics post-Project SITKA, have been in evidence recently in the targeted campaign against spokespeople for 1492 Land Back Lane. Certainly, we can see through Howe and Monaghan’s work that these are, as yet, ill-fated efforts to disrupt inter-nationalist work through tactics of ‘strategic incapacitation.’ Jorge Barrera, “Land Back movement leader flagged by police as ‘violent,’” CBC News (November 24, 2021) <https://www.cbc.ca/news/indigenous/police-williams-wetsuweten-1.6261838> (accessed December 2, 2021).

Importantly, it is not only Indigenous community leaders with highly visible affiliations to land-defence and reclamation struggles who are targeted by the security apparatus. Cindy Blackstock, a widely regarded Gitksan scholar, advocate, and organizer, whose work has centred on demanding justice for Indigenous children systematically under-served by the Canadian government, has also been the target of intense surveillance by Aboriginal Affairs and the Department of Justice—both of whom were found by the Privacy Commissioner to have violated Blackstock’s right to privacy. Cindy Blackstock, “The Government Spied on Me Without a Warrant,” *The Toronto Star* (July 14, 2016), https://www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2014/06/21/the_government_spied_on_me_without_a_warrant.html (accessed December 20, 2021).

Crucially, this targeted effort to isolate and alienate those at the heart of movements against empire must be understood in its historical continuity. While less overt and indiscriminate in its violence, Project SITKA mirrors previous efforts by the Canadian security apparatus to disrupt Indigenous social movements throughout the Twentieth Century (Rutherford) and strategic incapacitation has ominous echoes of the targeted state-murders of Indigenous leadership as acts of violence foundational to the assertion of Canadian sovereignty throughout much of the prairies (Stark). Moreover, in SITKA there is an unmistakable reverberation of the infamous COINTELPRO program, which Ruth Wilson Gilmore describes as the “armed wing of the counterrevolution,” bent on smashing the social organs of “political, and therefore the social, revolution, annihilating much of the Third World left and its allies wherever there were” (Gilmore 252).

Scott Rutherford, *Canada’s Other Red Scare: Indigenous Protest and Colonial Encounters during the Global Sixties*, (Montréal & Kingston, McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2020). Stark, “Criminal Empire.” Gilmore, “What Is to Be Done?” See also, Joshua Bloom and Waldo E Martin Jr., *Black Against Empire: The History and Politics of the Black Panther Party*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016 [2013]). Moon-Ho Jung, *Menace to Empire: Anticolonial Solidarities and the Transpacific Origins of the US Security State*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2021).

¹⁹ As only one indicator of the resource mobilization nexus between state and industry, consider that between the first invasion of the Wet’suwet’en yintah on behalf of Coastal GasLink in 2019, but still prior to their most recent invasions in 2021, the RCMP have spent nearly \$20 million on just these operations. This accounts for none of the other policing

costs throughout the country during the 2020 Shutdown Canada movement, nor does it even include the most recent raids on Gidimt'en Checkpoint in late 2021 and early 2022. Jorge Barrera, "RCMP arrest 14, clear road on Wet'suwet'en territory in ongoing dispute over land rights, pipeline," CBC News (November 18, 2021), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/rcmp-wet-suwet-en-pipeline-resistance-1.6254245> (accessed December 17, 2021).

²⁰ James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783-1939*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009). Lorenzo Veracini, *The World Turned Inside Out: Settler Colonialism as a Political Idea*, (London: Verso, 2022).

²¹ In a lengthy paper on the question of liberation, Herbert Marcuse touches on this precise paradoxical, of needing to understand how to disarticulate those amongst the masses—forgetting elites—who are most immediately beneficiaries of empire. He writes: "the *external* revolution [of the Third World] has become an essential part of the opposition *within* the capitalist metropolises. However, the exemplary force, the ideological power of the external revolution, can come to fruition only if the internal structure and cohesion of the capitalist system begins to disintegrate. *The chain of exploitation must break at its strongest link.*" Emphasis mine, Herbert Marcuse, *An Essay on Liberation*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1969), 82.

I'd also like to extend a thank you to Dr. Corey Snelgrove, for pointing out that Glen Coulthard's theses on Indigenous resurgence and decolonization function as a call for Indigenous movements to struggle alongside other movements in order to facilitate the disarticulation of Canada's historic bloc. Coulthard writes: "The reality demands that we [Indigenous radicals] continue to remain open to, if not actively seek out and establish, relations of solidarity and networks of trade and mutual aid with national and transnational communities and organizations that are also struggling against the imposed effects of globalized capital, including other Indigenous nations and national confederacies; urban Indigenous people and organizations; the labour, women's, GBLTQ2S..., and environmental movements; and, of course, those racial and ethnic communities that find themselves subject to their own distinct forms of economic, social, and cultural marginalization." As Dr. Snelgrove puts it, Coulthard's strategy is to follow the "cracks" or contradictions within the settler imperial order. Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014), 173.

²² Kennan Ferguson, "Why Does Political Science Hate American Indians?" *Perspectives on Politics* 14(4) (December 2016): 1029-1038. Yann Allard-Tremblay and Elaine Coburn, "The Flying Heads of Settler Colonialism; or the Ideological Erasures of Indigenous Peoples in Political Theorizing," *Political Studies* (June 2021). Kevin Bruyneel, "Political Science and the Study of Indigenous Politics," (May 17, 2012), <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2061662> (accessed November 12, 2021).

²³ Kiera L Ladner, "Taking the Field: 50 Years of Indigenous Politics in the *CJPS*," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 50(1) (March 2017): 163-179. This, despite the fact that *CJPS* was founded in 1968, and came into its own amidst of the fomentation of resistance to Pierre Trudeau's White Paper policy domestically, the rise of Red Power the global decolonization struggles internationally, and the era of Canadian mega-constitutional politics in which Indigenous communities were able to shape the conversation in key ways. Given this context, *CJPS*' silence is in fact quite deafening.

²⁴ *ibid.*, 167.

²⁵ *ibid.*, 172-175

²⁶ Lynne Davis, Vivian O'Donnell, and Heather Shpuniarsky, "Aboriginal-Social Justice Alliances: Understanding the Landscape of Relationships through the Coalition for a Public Inquiry into Ipperwash," *International Journal of Canadian Studies* (36) (2007): 96.

²⁷ Michael Morden, "Across the Barricades: Non-Indigenous Mobilization and Settler Colonialism in Canada," *Canadian Political Science Review* 8(1) (2014): 46.

To be sure, what Morden names here is nothing new in terms of the dynamics of colonization—specifically and especially in contexts of intensive dispossession and settlement. As a set of examples specific to just one nation, in her history of the Chippewas of Nawash Polly Keeshig-Tobias illustrates that early settlers often accosted treaty representatives of the Crown like Laurence Oliphant, threatening violence as an incentive for him to open more territory for white settlement. Likewise, Peter Schmalz notes that it was landless squatters who led colonizing

incursions into the peninsular territories of the Saugeen Anishinaabek, which the Crown had vowed under the Imperial Proclamation of 1847 would belong to the Saugeen forever. Further, both Keeshig-Tobias and Schmalz are perhaps more helpful than Morden himself in terms of evidencing a history of how settler-led colonization that *exceeds* the designs of the state can become quickly reappropriated into state-craft. Polly Keeshig-Tobias, *The Illustrated History of the Chippewas of Nawash*, (Neyaashiinigmiing: Chippewas of Nawash, 1996). Peter S Schmalz, *The History of the Saugeen Indians*, (Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1977).

Rather, Morden's innovation is in his relatively careful attention to the interplay between structure and agency in critiquing the study of Canadian-Indigenous relations and the framework of settler colonialism as it's predominantly deployed. That said, I do find his account of "tripartite political dynamic," in which "surprising patterns of temporary alliances [emerge] between Indigenous peoples, state actors, and non-Indigenous counter-protesters," to reproduce an overly flattened account of Indigenous political agency (Morden 45). Surely, dynamics similar to the internal contestations that lead Morden to study the complex relations between non-elite settlers and the structures of settler imperialism must also be considered to be at play *within* Indigenous nations. In this regard, there's a continuation of the troubling tendency for scholars to depoliticize Indigenous peoples.

²⁸ Amar Bhatia, "We Are All Here to Stay? Indigeneity, Migration, and Decolonizing the Treaty Right to Be Here," *Windsor Yearbook of Access to Justice* 31(1) (2013): 41.

²⁹ I tackle much of this literature more fully in Chapter Four, because while some of these authors do situate themselves in dialogue with the alliance-building literature, their methods and political commitments mean that they orient more towards the decolonization/collective liberation tendency than towards the mainstream of reconciliation/allyship literatures. Nevertheless, as these tendencies are not discrete, reviewing the important contribution of these scholars in pushing the alliance-building literature beyond its initial and quite stark white settler/Indigenous binary is also appropriate. Chandni Desai, "Disrupting Settler-Colonial Capitalism: Indigenous Intifadas and Resurgent Solidarity from Turtle Island to Palestine," *Journal of Palestine Studies* 50(2) (2021): 43-66. Linda Tabar and Chandni Desai, "Decolonizing is a Global Project: From Palestine to the Americas," *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 6(1) (2017): i-xix. Jaskiran Dhillon, "Notes on Becoming a Comrade: Indigenous Women, Leadership, and Movement(s) for Decolonization," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 43(3) (2019): 41-54. Rita Kaur Dhamoon, "Relational Othering: critiquing dominance, critiquing the margins," *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 9(5) (2021): 873-892.

These scholars also help to push the methodological boundaries of Political Science writ large, as they correctly insist that the study of politics relies on a deracinated social imagination if it refuses to account for the fundamental organizing force that racial regimes have in shaping the basic idea of the political. Debra Thompson, "Is Race Political?" *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 41(3) (September 2008): 525-547. Nisha Nath, "Defining Narratives of Identity in Canadian Political Science: Accounting for the Absence of Race," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 44(1) (March 2011): 161-193. See also: David Theo Goldberg, *The Racial State*, (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2002). Bruyneel, "Political Science and the Study of Indigenous Politics."

³⁰ As Scott Neigh describes, a challenge of writing politics from below and of eschewing state-centricity in our conception of the political, is that "'the state' isn't an 'it' at all but a cluster of people and their practices that have been socially organized in a particular way." Thus one must always strive to understand how even acts that ostensibly resist the state can "become extensions of state practices, and... enmeshed in state relations," but also how the state 'contains' its own internal contestations (see fn27). Scott Neigh, *Resisting the State: Canadian History through the Stories of Activists*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2012): 16-18. Stefano Harney, *State Work: Public Administration and Mass Intellectuality*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).

³¹ Paulette Regan, *Unsettling the Settler Within: Indian Residential Schools, Truth Telling, and Reconciliation in Canada*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010), 4.

Even as I appreciate the basic ethical sentiment Regan expresses here, the underlying political theory is one that I find somewhat difficult, as it seems overly reliant on pluralist theories of the state that fail to account for any topographical disparities in the distribution of power within society. That is, it fails to account for *how* ordinary non-elite citizens can embody this responsibility by making the state responsive to their demands—especially where those demands may be at variance with the interests of those 'in' power. Well established literatures, notably C Wright Mills' work on the 'power elite'—tracking the multiple throttles that (for instance) corporate, military, and carceral

power-centres impose on ostensibly democratic processes—make almost no imprint here as Regan neglects to consider what it would entail to *struggle* to rearrange the distribution of social forces so that non-elites could *become* responsible actors. C Wright Mills, *The Power Elite*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000 [1956]). Olúfẹ̀mí O Táíwò, *Elite Capture: How the Powerful Took Control Over Identity Politics (And Everything Else)*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2022).

While I don't develop it explicitly in this chapter, the alliance-building literature suffers from a general under-theorization of the state, which is at least in part a consequence of its reliance on Settler Colonial Studies (see Chapter One). The state is under-theorized not only in terms of understanding the topography of power, but also in terms of how it must constantly strive to mediate competing and complementing interests that are produced as consequences of that topography. In a recent article by Davis, Denis, and Sinclair, the authors suggest that Settler Colonial Studies has gained purchase amongst a number of scholarly fields because it reveals that the “coherent logic of the state” is the project of “settler colonialism.” This is a persistent, guiding logic, for certain; however, to describe it as ‘coherent’ is ultimately undialectical, as it smooths over the multiple and incongruous relationships that are entangled within the state as simultaneously the most obvious manifestation of the ruling historic bloc and, consequently, a terrain of struggle. Ironically, it's these very contradictions that the alliance-building literature is so well positioned to spot. It's not enough to merely displace the state, it also needs to be understood as constituting a terrain of struggle so that it can be ultimately overcome and the course towards its abolition charted. Lynne Davis, Jeff Denis, and Raven Sinclair, “Pathways to Settler Decolonization,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 7(4) (2017): 393.

³² Contextually, it's clear that Epp is asking this in a manner that's distinct from the question of settler interiority which I critiqued Settler Colonial Studies for in Chapter One. I take Epp to be interested in the *political* question of how do we get settlers to articulate their interests in solidarity with the interests of Indigenous peoples (re)asserting self-determination. Roger Epp, *We Are All Treaty People: Prairie Essays*, (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2008), 126.

This has echoes with what I take to be one of James Tully's more recent lines of thought, though he importantly pushes what a project of reconciliation-from-below means beyond the somewhat anthropocentric terms in which Epp has framed it in this earlier work. See, James Tully, “Reconciliation Here on Earth,” in *Resurgence and Reconciliation: Indigenous-Settler Relations and Earth Teachings*, edited by Michael Asch, John Borrows, and James Tully, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2018), 83-129.

³³ Lynne Davis and Heather Yanique Shpuniarsky, “The Spirit of Relationships: What We Have Learned about Indigenous/Non-Indigenous Alliances and Coalitions,” in *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, edited by Lynne Davis, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 346.

³⁴ Avril Bell, *Relating Indigenous and Settler Identities: Beyond Domination*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 7-8.

³⁵ Lynne Davis, “Introduction,” in *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, edited by Lynne Davis, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 5.

³⁶ Davis, O'Donnell, and Shpuniarsky, “Aboriginal-Social Justice Alliances,” 103-119.

³⁷ Lucille Marr, “Breaking Down Barriers: MCC Ontario and Ontario Native Communities, 1967-1999,” *Journal of Mennonite Studies* 19 (2001): 81.

I find Marr's work to be especially compelling both in its particularities and in what it evidences as the potential of the alliance-building literature at large, as it shows the importance of the distinct traditions through which communities can arrive at a politics of solidarity. Moreover, Marr shows us that those traditions must be accounted for in developing theories of alliance-building projects, that a culturally deracinated alliance is a contradiction in terms. Finally, Marr's full argument in the article, which tracks the deepening relationships between the MCCO and Indigenous peoples, evidences that there's no static positions when it comes to alliance-building—groups can move into and out of solidarity with each other.

³⁸ Davis, O'Donnell, and Shpuniarsky, “Aboriginal-Social Justice Alliances,” 114.

³⁹ Emphasis mine. As Bell writes, her gloss on the struggle to decolonize settler-Indigenous relations is largely a *struggle* to interrupt what she calls the “will to mastery and certainty” in settlers, in favour of “the possibilities of relations of mutuality.” Drawing from Psychology-informed literatures, Bell argues that the “desire to be in control”

is not one that's easily abandoned, because it informs a sense that "we can act effectively in the world." Her formulation is helpful, as I think it reveals the slippage within this scholarship between a number of possible ways of thinking about being in control that actually ought to be held apart. Considered as a largely psychic phenomenon control, here, could mean both the will to mastery as a form of colonial domination and also the capacity to act as a self-determining agent. This conflation, I will argue in section three of this chapter, is both unhelpful and yet largely constitutive of the framework of 'allyship.' Bell, *Indigenous and Settler Identities*, 173-174.

⁴⁰ Kevin FitzMaurice, "Are White People Obsolete? Indigenous Knowledge and the Colonizing Ally in Canada," in *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships*, edited by Lynne Davis, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 352-353.

FitzMaurice's account here, like many others within the alliance-building literature owes a debt to Anne Bishop's earlier work on allyship—which they are largely applying to the context of settler-Indigenous relations. In particular, though, there is an interesting tendency to cite merely the first of Bishop's two major works, *Becoming an Ally*. As Bishop herself notes, on its own this text is overly focused on allyship as an individuated process of unlearning harmful beliefs and actions (Bishop 2015, 3). For this reason, she expanded her oeuvre with a second companion book, *Beyond Token Change*, the subtitle of which indicates important moves in her thinking: *Breaking the Cycle of Oppression in Institutions*. While still, to my mind, somewhat constrained—as it describes oppression as being *in* institutions, thereby obscuring the oppression *of* institutions themselves—the relative paucity of citations to this text which was also published prior to the emergence of the alliance-building literature, speaks volumes as to the in-built limitations of the theory of allyship undergirding the literature. Anne Bishop, *Becoming an Ally: Breaking the Cycle of Oppression in People* 3rd Edition, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2015 [1994]). Anne Bishop, *Beyond Token Change: Breaking the Cycle of Oppression in Institutions*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2005).

⁴¹ Olufémi O Táíwò, *Reconsidering Reparations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022): 70-98.

⁴² Emphasis mine. Davis, O'Donnell, and Shpuniarsky, "Aboriginal-Social Justice Alliances," 110.

⁴³ Harvard Book Store, "Where Do We Go From Here: A Fundraiser for Black Lives," YouTube (July 13, 2020), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Er2jE4B9kDA&list=PLzAJnbl3TW7PMssHaaUzTkiue5KvcT6WC&index=24> (accessed December 15, 2021).

⁴⁴ Epp, *Treaty People*, 8. See also, Roger Epp, "The Political De-skilling of Rural Communities," in *Writing Off the West: Globalization, Governments, and the Transformation of Rural Communities*, edited by Roger Epp and Dave Whitson, (Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2001), 301-324.

Many commentators besides Epp have also noted this widespread phenomenon of deskilling. Considering the achievements of "Operation Solidarity," a mass movement against the government of British Columbia's attempt to impose austerity in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Kate Jacobson notes that the tactics which were considered both common and highly effective at that time are now widely viewed as outside the acceptable repertoire of social movements today. This, in spite of the fact that Operation Solidarity's tactics were avowedly non-violent at all times—at their most incendiary they included such relatively benign actions as holding mass demonstrations in front of the homes of government ministers. Having personally witnessed remonstrations between comrades within a shared movement for engaging in precisely these tactics on a much smaller scale, I too found the contrast between historically-situated responses quite revealing. Kate Jacobson, host, "Operation Solidarity, 1983: An (Almost) B.C. General Strike," Alberta Advantage Podcast (December 14, 2020) <https://albertaadvantagepod.com/2020/12/14/operation-solidarity-1983-an-almost-b-c-general-strike/> (December 16, 2021).

⁴⁵ The following are merely a broad sampling, for each struggle or identity group centred in any particular toolkit one is likely to find dozens of alternative toolkits. However, they do share a striking similarity in form, in that each tends to address itself to allies conceived of—à la FitzMaurice—as extrinsic to the cause or struggle to which they are seeking to ally themselves. See for examples, David W Camp, *The White Ally Toolkit Workbook*, (I AM Publications, 2018). "Men as Allies Toolkit: Standing Up for Women," Women's Fund Rhodes Island, www.wfri.org (December 16, 2021). "LGBT Ally Toolkit," Amnesty International, www.amnestyusa.org/lgbt (accessed December 16, 2021). "Raise Your Voice: A Trans Ally Toolkit," American Civil Liberties Union, www.aclu-mo.org/trans (accessed December 16, 2021).

⁴⁶ Ultimately, political education must be regarded as almost a good in itself; as Stuart Hall reminds us, "political consciousness [is] neither stable nor 'given'. It [is] made—made, changed, remade—from one period to another, and

in the praxis of men [sic]... Such forms of consciousness did not ‘happen’. They were achieved, carried at great personal cost sometimes lost amidst great personal distress, in the active lives of men and women” and non-binary folks. Stuart Hall, “Political Commitment,” in *Selected Political Writings: The Great Moving Right Show and Other Essays*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017), 90.

⁴⁷ Jack Halberstam, *The Queer Art of Failure*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2011), 1-26. Stuart Hall, “Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities,” in *Culture, Globalization, and the World System*. edited by Anthony D. King, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991), 41-68.

⁴⁸ For materials on activist archives see: Kelly Lytle Hernández, *City of Inmates: Conquest, Rebellion, and the Rise of Human Caging in Los Angeles, 1771-1965*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017). Howard Zinn, “Secrecy, Archives, and the Public Interest,” *The Midwestern Archivist* 2(2) (1977): 14-26. For materials on archives and power see: Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2015). Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

⁴⁹ Indeed, the selection of the toolkits themselves was driven by the fact that each was shared across at least one network of activists with which I have connections. By way of listing some examples for each, Lynn Gehl’s “Ally Bill of Responsibility” has been hosted online by the Unist’ot’en Camp, the University of Windsor’s Aboriginal Education Centre, and the Sexual Assault Centre of Edmonton. *Build Together: Indigenous Allyship*, authored by the Canadian Building Trades Union, has been shared by the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades; and the BC Association of Social Workers’ “Towards a New Relationship” has been shared by the Creative City Network of Canada, the Kettle and Stony Point First Nation, and a variety of social worker colleges and associations. The Catalyst Project’s document “Indigenous Justice for Environmental Movements has been shared by the Climate Reality Project and the Farm to School Coalition NC. “Treaty 7 Indigenous Ally Toolkit,” authored jointly by the Calgary Foundation and the Montréal Indigenous Community Network has been shared by the Indigenous Rights and Resource Governance Group, Forward Housing, and the Alberta Teachers of English as a Second Language. Finally, and likely the most widely shared document, is the “Indigenous Ally Toolkit” authored by the Montréal Urban Aboriginal Community Strategy Network (the same group that co-authored the Treaty 7 document), this toolkit has been featured in several CBC stories, by the Canadian Medical Association, the BC Museums Association, and the Centre for Community Organizations. In each case, these are just a few of the civil society organizations that are sharing these toolkits, which is to say nothing of their distribution through more informal/community-based networks; ultimately, my hope is that this evinces to the reader that these documents are of significance both on their own terms as theoretical texts, but also for the clear scope of travelling they’ve done between and within community groups. Moreover, this broad distribution of these toolkits may indicate a greater degree of social purchase than much paywalled academic writing has.

⁵⁰ Canada’s Building Trades Unions, *Build Together: Indigenous Allyship*, Build Together (February 2018), www.buildtogether.ca (accessed December 23, 2021), 8. “Treaty 7 Indigenous Ally Toolkit,” Calgary Foundation and Montréal Indigenous Community Network (Autumn 2019) www.calgaryfoundation.org (December 23, 2021), 1. “Indigenous Ally Toolkit,” Montréal Urban Aboriginal Strategy Network (2019) <http://reseauumtlnetwork.com/resources/> (December 23, 2021), 4.

⁵¹ Emphasis mine. Trades Union, *Building Together*, 8.

⁵² Emphasis mine. “Indigenous Ally Toolkit,” Montréal Urban Aboriginal Strategy Network, 4.

⁵³ Emphasis mine. “Treaty 7,” Calgary Foundation, 4.

⁵⁴ The BCASW’s toolkit also takes on the importance of speech acts in a far more literal manner. As it is aimed at other members of the social worker profession, *Towards a New Relationship*, ventures into some workplace-specific didacticism that is not as common amongst the more generic toolkits. This includes a section in the toolkit on “Practicing Cultural Safety,” in which the subsection on “Communication” coaches readers on communication-strategies that are intended to curb the, perhaps, overbearing presence of the social worker in ways that enable Indigenous ‘clients’ to more fully control the conversation. Indigenous Women’s Working Group, *Towards a New*

Relationship: Tool Kit for Reconciliation/Decolonization of Social Work Practice at the Individual, Workplace, and Community Level, (Vancouver: British Columbia Association of Social Workers, 2016), 6.

⁵⁵ Trades Union, *Building Together*, 5. “Treaty 7,” Calgary Foundation, 2.

⁵⁶ Indeed, the full-scale question of ownership over land is skirted in many places where it feels quite pertinent. For instance, in the Montréal toolkit, workplaces and organizations are called upon to “practice good allyship by... Recognizing that Indigenous peoples have ownership, control, access, and possession of their information, knowledge, experiences, and stories” (6). The recognition of this intellectual and cultural property is *vital*, especially in an era in which Indigenous culture is increasingly commodified for profits that often accrue to non-Indigenous peoples. However, the silence of this toolkit on the topic of land ownership is striking here, and worth considering given how much profit is extracted by a (overwhelmingly settler) rentier class. The question of the political implications of land acknowledgements—or, more often, the aversion of these implications—has been made starkly apparently within academia (where such acknowledgements are often rote) as a consequence of COVID-19. With the move to online lectures and seminars, I’ve most often seen speakers inviting attendees to do the work for themselves of finding out the history of colonization pertaining to the territories in which they are located. Not only does this further atomize the collective work of political education, it also elides the more immediate fact that digital space is itself constructed and maintained through ongoing processes of global dispossession. A territorial acknowledgement for online events needs to consider the colonial forces that ripped cobalt from the Congo in order to craft our processing devices, or that stripped copper from Amazonia in order to conduct the electrical currents of our virtual meetings, just as much as it must consider the human toll extracted at every step of the way.

For more extensive discussions of territorial acknowledgements, and their *potential* as highly politicized speech acts, please see: âpihtawikosisân, “Beyond Territorial Acknowledgement,” âpihtawikosisân: Law. Language. Culture. (September 23, 2016), <https://apihtawikosisan.com/2016/09/beyond-territorial-acknowledgments/> (December 23, 2021). Lee Maracle, “Who Gets to Draw the Maps: In and Out of Place in British Columbia,” in *Memory Serves: Oratories*, edited by Smaro Kamboureli, (Edmonton: NeWest Press, 2015): 65-84.

⁵⁷ Lynn Gehl, “Ally Bill of Responsibilities,” <https://www.lynngehl.com/ally-bill-of-responsibilities.html> (accessed January 5, 2022).

⁵⁸ Trades Union, *Building Together*, 1-2.

⁵⁹ “Indigenous Ally Toolkit,” Montréal Urban Aboriginal Strategy Network, 5.

The Catalyst Project and the BCASW toolkits stand as important exceptions to this tendency, though for distinct reasons. In the case of the Catalyst toolkit, they stress not guilt, but the importance of recognizing that alliances between environmentalist groups and Indigenous peoples are about *building power together*. This is in stark contrast to the general theory of power that underpins the allyship discourse. By contrast, in the BCASW toolkit, guilt is displaced in favour of the clientele relationship between the social worker/reader as would-be ally, which predominates.

⁶⁰ Gehl places considerable emphasis on this notion of ‘critical thought.’ In her seventh responsibility, she continues to emphasize the importance of allies engaging in self-reflection, here noting that it is essential if one is to “avoid the trap of naively following a leader or for that matter a group of leaders.” By this, I take her to be indicating an irreducible decisionary power that remains at the heart of the ally-relationship. Other authors, have noted that this fact is often clouded by the rise of what they call “epistemic deference,” or the tendency to defer all decisionary power to whomever is deemed sufficiently (though often arbitrarily) representative of the group which the allies seek to support (Táíwò). This deference is often strongly linked to discourses of allyship, for reasons that should be apparent given the theory of the ally as fundamentally extrinsic to the struggle itself. See, Olúfẹ̀mi O Táíwò, “Being-in-the-Room Privilege: Elite Capture and Epistemic Deference,” *The Philosopher* 108(4) (Autumn 2020), <https://www.thephilosopher1923.org/essay-taiwo> (accessed January 5, 2022).

However, there’s also a certain hermeneutic of suspicion that animates Gehl here; one that might be cause for some pause in terms of the political theory that it implies. Take, as the best example, the eighth responsibility Gehl lists. She writes that in striving to “remain critical thinkers” and to learn from others in a movement/coalition, allies also “cannot assume that all people are critical thinkers.” Just as much as a mystified commitment to the wisdom of the crowd is unhelpful, so too is the implication that there are critical thinkers or lone-geniuses who—perhaps cadre-like—have an innately better grasp of the political conditions of a movement. Here, it becomes possible to see the

significance of having shifted from thinking in the realm of political consciousness and political education as *part of a liberatory struggle*, to emphasizing the allegedly fixed commitments and critical capacities of the masses as necessarily reactionary. Lynn Gehl, “Ally Bill of Responsibilities.”

⁶¹ As the BCASW goes on to explain, this impetus was then channeled into a document which they hope will have a number of nested uses, that range on the scale of their intended interventions. The document directs the reader that it can be used “both individually as a self-reflective and professional development exercises” (a point to which I return below), as well as “with groups to assist in engaging others in dialogue.” Indigenous Women’s Working Group, *New Relationship*, 2-3.

⁶² “Treaty 7,” Calgary Foundation, 5. This dialogical addendum to the process of self-reflection is echoed in Gehl’s toolkit, where she suggests that the fourth responsibility of would-be allies is to be “aware of their privileges and *openly discuss them*. This action will also serve to challenge larger oppressive power structures,” emphasis mine. Setting aside whatever skepticism one might have that merely discussing the realities of privilege is sufficient to challenge the structures of power in any meaningful sense, it might also be worthwhile to consider the practicality of this sort of advice within movement spaces, as it might be taken as encouragement to engage in some deeply egocentric and antisocial behaviours by parading one’s own relative comfort in front of others.

⁶³ *ibid.*

⁶⁴ *ibid.*, 3. “Indigenous Ally Toolkit,” Montréal Urban Aboriginal Strategy Network, 2.

⁶⁵ Trades Union, *Building Together*, 3.

⁶⁶ Wendy Brown, “Rights and Losses,” *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995): 96-134.

⁶⁷ Emphasis mine. *ibid.*, 1. Indigenous Women’s Working Group, *New Relationship*, 3.

⁶⁸ This is not meant to be dismissive of those recompositions, only to recognize the consequences of their partialness. Though, I am admittedly *very* sympathetic to Táiwò’s argument when he writes that many of these recompositions amount to questions of “being-in-the-room privilege,” whereby genuinely more just norms of interpersonal interactions are established in elite spaces, even while still “holding fixed most of the facts about the rooms [in which power is exercised] themselves.” He continues, forcefully:

Doing better than the epistemic norms we’ve inherited from a history of explicit global apartheid is an awfully low bar to set. The facts that explain who ends up in which room shape our world much more powerfully than the squabbles for comparative prestige between people who have already made it into the rooms. And when the conversation is about social justice, the mechanisms of the social system that determine who gets into which room often just *are* the parts of society we aim to address. For example, the fact that incarcerated people cannot participate in academic discussions about freedom that physically take place on campus is intimately related to the fact that they are locked in cages.

Ultimately, I read Táiwò here to be productively engaging with the real limitations of settling for *recomposition* rather than struggling towards *abolition*, as the former more often “entrenches a politics unbecoming of anyone fighting for freedom rather than for privilege, for collective liberation rather than mere parochial advantage.” Táiwò, “Being-in-the-Room Privilege.”

⁶⁹ “Treaty 7,” Calgary Foundation, 5.

In the case of the BCASW, this general species of action is represented in a manner that’s more germane to the toolkit’s intended audience. In the section on “Decolonizing Your Workplace,” the toolkit encourages readers, along with “coworkers and management” to ask a number of questions, including: “Does your organization have an over or under representation of Indigenous people in terms of *clients* and staff? If there is under-representation, what is being done to address it?” (emphasis mine, 7). On the most generous reading, this question expresses a laudable desire to equally serve the communities in which social workers are embedded, and if it were focused only on the removal of barriers to access—ie. the financial barrier implied by the *client* relationship—there would be little cause for any serious pause. However, as it is presented here, this question reads as being more concerned with the internal

logics and priorities of the social work profession than with the interests of Indigenous peoples—or any other marginalized community for that matter. It implies that the goal *ought to be* the equitable *representation* of all demographics amongst social workers' clientele, rather than the abolition of the conditions under which interventions by social workers are typically considered necessary. The more pertinent and precise question, then, is whether Indigenous peoples can access social worker support barrier-free when they see it as an appropriate option, and whether people are empowered to address the conditions that are seen to necessitate such interventions.

⁷⁰ Matt James, “A Carnival of Truth? Knowledge, Ignorance and the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission,” *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 6(2) (July 2012): 182-204. Rachel George, “Inclusion is Just the Canadian Word for Assimilation: Self-Determination and the Reconciliation Paradigm in Canada,” in *Surviving Canada: Indigenous Peoples Celebrate 150 Years of Betrayal*, edited by Kiera Ladner and Myra Tait, (Winnipeg: Arbeiter Ring Publishing, 2017): 49-62.

Notably, though, this call treats the mere act of inclusion as a palliative, failing to theorize the workplace as *itself* a site of exploitation wherein—even if all other things are equal, which we cannot expect to be the case given what we know of racial capitalism’s value-extraction methods—the condition of work within capitalist social relations is such that an Indigenous worker (like all workers) will be stripped of their self-determination both on the job site and over the full value produced by their labour, as the surplus is invariably expropriated by their employer (likely, the very person to whom this appeal for inclusion is addressed) in the form of privatized profit. Given that this form of ‘soft’ exploitation is preferable to the abject destitution that exclusion from the realm of labour produces in a bourgeois society (Marx called this the ‘mute compulsion’ of a market society), it’s little surprise that inclusion is a vital demand. But this relatively unproblematized stance towards the workplace is at once evidence of the lack of a *social* theory of allyship that I discuss below, as well as further evidence of the failure to think the question of articulation and incommensurabilities when describing the process of allyship and alliance-building: can a vision of self-determination be meaningfully articulated with the dictatorship of capital? What would such articulation implicate one in, if the realities of racial/colonial capitalism as a *global* system of relations is brought firmly into view?

⁷¹ “Treaty 7,” Calgary Foundation, 5.

⁷² Carolyn Stirling, “Decolonize This - Settler Decolonization and Unsettling Colonialism: Insights from Critical Ethnographies with Indigenous and Allied Educator-Activists in Aotearoa/New Zealand, the United States of America and Canada,” (PhD Diss., State University at New York-Buffalo, 2014), 389.

⁷³ Bell, *Indigenous and Settler Identities*, 179-180.

While Bell is certainly in good company alongside Levinas, and his primary interpreter Derrida, this school has not been without its critics—many of them quite forceful. Jean-Luc Nancy, who stands as perhaps the most institutionally towering figure, criticized Levinas for having ontologized alterity to the point that *relationality* became nearly impossible. Against this, Nancy posits not the dyadic ‘*I/Thou*,’ but the singular plural ‘*We*.’ Thereby displacing the Levinasian commitment to ethics as first politics, in favour of what he calls the unity of existence: “Being cannot *be* anything but being-with-one-another, circulating in the *with* and as the *with* of this singularly plural coexistence.” Jean-Luc Nancy, *Being Singular Plural*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 3. See also, Christopher Watkin, “A Different Alterity: Jean-Luc Nancy’s ‘Singular Plural,’” *Paragraph* 30(2) (2007): 50-64.

In a more sharply political vein, Joseph Mensah and Christopher J Williams have argued that anti-racist frameworks that rely exclusively “on the ethics of *altruism* and *social justice*”—the other-centric framework of Levinas—are overly “narrow and, consequently, ineffective, since it neglects the *self-interest* of the majority.” Against this they propose the concept of “boomerang ethics,” as a method by which to account for the dialectical framework of relationality wherein “the interest of the individual and that of the collective are inseparable, and a commitment to the good of all has to be a guiding principle in our actions as much as possible”; moreover, to understand how “the effects of racism [can redound] on members of the majority and the concomitant need to incorporate their self-interest in our anti-racist efforts.” This should not be taken to mean that the ‘boomerang’ implies a shared condition, but rather that a social theory of racism necessitates understanding it in its social totality. Further, it necessitates understanding how liberation can be achieved through a conception of freedom not for me and you, but for a we that is constructed in and throughout collective struggle. Joseph Mensah and Christopher J Williams, *Boomerang Ethics: How Racism Affects Us All*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2017): 5-8. See also, Olúfemi O Táiwò, “Autobiography,” (unpublished dissertation: University of California Los Angeles, 2018). James Baldwin, “An Open Letter to My Sister,

Miss Angela Davis,” *The New York Review* (November 19, 1970), <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1971/01/07/an-open-letter-to-my-sister-miss-angela-davis/> (accessed February 24, 2022).

⁷⁴ Ronald Inglehart, *The Silent Revolution: Changing Values and Political Styles Among Western Publics*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1977).

⁷⁵ Harvard Book Store, “Where Do We Go From Here,” YouTube.

Fred Moten, discussing Chairman Fred Hampton’s theory of *coalition*, has eloquently established a point very similar to what Taylor makes here. Coalition, upon Moten’s reading of Hampton, “emerges out of your recognition that it’s fucked up for you, in the same way that we’ve already recognized that it’s fucked up for us. I don’t need your help. I just need you to recognize that this shit is killing you, too, however much more softly, you stupid motherfucker, you know?” Evidently, this theory of coalition is in sharp contrast with the account of allyship that Bell offers us. Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study*, (Brooklyn: Minor Compositions, 2013): 140-141.

⁷⁶ Emphasis mine, Jodi Dean, *Comrade: An Essay on Political Belonging*, (London: Verso, 2019), 18.

⁷⁷ Haymarket Books, “Study and Struggle Critical Conversation #3: Abolition Must Be Red,” Youtube (November 9, 2021), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=E2OWObx5J9A> (accessed January 20, 2022).

Chapter Four Notes:

¹ This quote appears again and again throughout scholarship and activist literatures that work to conceptualize the contours of anti-racist, anti-colonial, or anti-imperialist struggle. It is, very often, attributed to the Murri activist Lilla Watson, in large part because it featured as the guiding principle of her lauded 1985 address to the UN Decade for Women Conference in Nairobi. However, as Joanne Barker points out, for her own part, Watson has consistently expressed that these words should not be attributed solely to her; rather, they express an ethos of struggle for collective liberation that was itself defined by the collective production of knowledge through the activist groups with whom Watson was deeply engaged. I’ve attributed the words here in the manner that Watson has suggested is most appropriate both to their origins and the political vision that they carry. Joanne Barker, *Red Scare: The State’s Indigenous Terrorist*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2022), 124.

This sentiment also echoes the words of Keeanga-Yamahtta Taylor, quoted in the previous chapter. Like Watson, Taylor is herself drawing from an ethos of collective struggle and theorizing—which Cedric Robinson helpfully named the Black Radical Tradition. In particular, her words recall a sentiment expressed by the great freedom fighter Fannie Lou Hamer in her 1971 address to the founding meeting of the National Women’s Political Caucus in Washington DC, wherein she intoned that: “Nobody’s free until everybody’s free.” Taken together, these arguments engender a theory of freedom and of liberation that upends the standard notions of liberal political theory, in which the freedom of the individual finds its limitation in others. By contrast, what Watson, Taylor, and Hamer offer is a window into an ethos in which the freedom of the individual finds not its limit, but rather its fulfillment and actualization in relationship with others. Maegan Parker Brooks and Davis W Houck, *The Speeches of Fannie Lou Hamer: To Tell it Like it Is*, (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2011): 134-139.

² Tully suggests that this notion of “power-over” is foundational to the canonical origins of what is often called Western political theory, as derived from Socrates through Plato. Plato’s Socrates insisted on the necessity of grounding legitimate authority in the polis with those who held pure forms of knowledge, which are available only to those elite who have the leisurely time to discover said forms (explicitly *not* to the hoi polloi, women, children, or enslaved people who not only made up the bulk of the city, but also quite literally built and reproduced its daily life). Thus, Tully suggests, that in Socrates’ account as “the few possess this general knowledge over... it legitimates the use of power-over the many.” Importantly, though, Tully suggests that this is a “parochial” theory as it is at extreme variance with the “lifeworld” of the polis and the participatory coexistence that makes it possible—this reality of life as defined by “power-with,” in Tully’s account, is merely “eclipsed” rather than destroyed. Nevertheless, the assertion of authorized power-over is a persistent and perniciously parasitic mode of conceptualizing social organization. James Tully, “Deparochializing Political Theory and Beyond: A Dialogue Approach to Comparative Political Thought,” *Journal of World Philosophies* 1(1) (Winter 2016): 55-56.

³ It is for these reasons that it is essential to follow Stuart Hall's constant attention to the question of articulation as the conditions of possibility for analyzing structure. Whereas traditional structuralism has tended to reify its own objects by treating them as largely dehistoricized *fait accompli*, Hall's method and the concept of the 'historic bloc' in particular, with which I was preoccupied throughout Section One of this dissertation, offer a compelling way to see structure as the relatively persistent but fully mutable relationships of power that constantly recompose themselves in an effort to prevail in a given time or location. This method has been increasingly deployed at multiple scales and to compelling effect in recent scholarship. See, Erin R Pineda, "An Entire World in Motion," in *Seeing Like and Activist: Civil Disobedience and the Civil Rights Movement*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021): 53-90. Olúfemi O Táiwò, "Reconsidering World History," *Reconsidering Reparations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022): 14-68.

⁴ Cedric J Robinson, *The Terms of Order: Political Science and the Myth of Leadership*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016 [1980]).

⁵ Emily Arrowsmith, *Promoting Careers in Skilled Trades to Indigenous Youth in Canada*, (Ottawa: Canadian Apprenticeship Forum, 2019).

For further examples of the degree to which racism is an all-too ubiquitous experience on construction-sites in Canada—which is to say nothing of its occurrence in the context of a gentrifying (read: ethnic cleansing) construction boom led by otherwise unproductive surpluses in global capital and made a reality through the exploited labour of an increasingly racialized and migratory working class—please see the following examples: Joanna Lavoie, "East York hospital decries 'despicable symbol of racism' in construction area," *Toronto.com* (June 12, 2020), https://www.toronto.com/news/crime/east-york-hospital-decries-despicable-symbol-of-racism-in-construction-area/article_23561991-8ca5-5abb-8c04-d1d1ea2175fb.html? (accessed March 22, 2022). Nick Westoll, "New association aims to end systemic anti-Black racism in Canada's construction industry," *Global News* (February 1, 2021), <https://globalnews.ca/news/7612305/afro-canadian-contractors-association-construction-industry-racism/> (March 22, 2022). Ben Spurr, "Crosstown LRT builder showed 'implicit bias' when it fired Black worker, says labour board," *Toronto Star* (April 1, 2022), <https://www.thestar.com/amp/news/gta/2022/04/01/crosstown-lrt-builder-showed-implicit-bias-when-it-fired-black-worker-says-labour-board.html> (accessed April 3, 2022).

⁶ Canada's Building Trades Unions, *Build Together: Indigenous Allyship*, Build Together (February 2018), www.buildtogether.ca (accessed December 23, 2021), 3.

⁷ Rita Kaur Dhamoon, "Racism as a Workload and Bargaining Issue," *Socialist Studies* 14(1) (2020): online.

For considerations of how strongly at odds this is with traditions of labour organizing led by predominantly racialized workers, please see: Chantal Norrgard, "Indigenous Labor, Settler Colonialism, and the History of the Fraser River Fisherman's Strike of 1893," *Native American and Indigenous Studies* 7(2) (Fall 2020): 114-144. Andrew Parnaby, "'The best men that ever worked the lumber': Aboriginal Longshoremen on Burrard Inlet, BC, 1863-1939," *The Canadian Historical Review* 87(1) (March 2006): 53-78. Robin DG Kelley, *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists During the Great Depression*, 25th Anniversary Ed., (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015 [1990]).

⁸ Rita Dhamoon, "A Feminist Approach to Decolonizing Anti-Racism: Rethinking Transnationalism, Intersectionality, and Settler Colonialism," *Feral Feminisms* 4 (Summer 2015): 20-37. Ruth Wilson Gilmore, *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2007).

⁹ This is a particularly stark elision in the case of the CBTU, as capital and the state very often direct the labour of construction workers to projects that advance the "infrastructures of empire" (Cowen). Indeed, this almost exclusive focus on the interpersonal manifestations of racism has produced deep contradictions in how the social unionism of the CBTU operates.

The CBTU's contradictory approach to anti-racist social unionism can be traced through the following press-releases: Sean Strickland, "Statement by Canada's Building Trades Unions on Trans Mountain Expansion Project," Canada's Building Trades Unions (February 18, 2022), <https://buildingtrades.ca/statement-by-canadas-building-trades-unions-on-trans-mountain-expansion-project/> (accessed March 23, 2022). Robert Kucheran, "We Can Do Better For Our Indigenous Peoples," Canada's Building Trades Unions (June 21, 2022), <https://buildingtrades.ca/we-can-do-better-for-our-indigenous-peoples/> (accessed March 23, 2022). Sean Strickland, "CBTU Statement on

Cancellation of Keystone XL,” Canada’s Building Trades Unions (January 21, 2021), <https://buildingtrades.ca/cbtu-statement-on-cancellation-of-keystone-xl/> (accessed March 23, 2022).

And for scholarly material that tracks the role of collaborationist working class institutions in enabling the advancement of colonial dispossession led by the state and capital, see: Deborah Cowen, “Following the infrastructures of empire: notes on cities, settler colonialism, and method,” *Urban Geography* 41(4) (2020): 469-486. Anna Stanley, “Aligning against Indigenous jurisdiction: Worker savings, colonial capital, and the Canada Infrastructure Bank,” *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 37(6) (2019): 1138-1156.

¹⁰ In Canada, this is part of the workplace compromise generally referred to as the “Rand Formula.” Initiated in 1946 as a result of arbitration between the United Automobile Workers and Ford Motors in Windsor, ON, the Rand Formula is a suite of principles that have guided post-war labour relations in Canada. While it forms the basis of legal recognition for unions, and has done much to regularize labour relations, the Rand Formula has also been thoroughly criticized for having legislatively curtailed the scope of action available for unions to engage in class struggle under threat of state and tort censures of various sorts. As Aalya Ahmad argues: “when all actions are governed by labour legislation, which unions dutifully obey and employers cynically manipulate, it becomes more and more obvious with each concessionary or status-quo contract, with each contrived lockout and back-to-work order, that legalized strikes are less and less effective, especially when union leaders must submit and bring members back to work under threat of heavy financial penalties, not only to their organizations but to themselves personally.” For discussions of the limits that labour law has imposed on the efficacy of unions, please see: Aalya Ahmad, “Randcuffed?” *Our Times* (December 12, 2018), <https://ourtimes.ca/article/randcuffed> (accessed March 22, 2022). David Camfield, *Canadian Labour in Crisis: Reinventing the Workers’ Movement*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2011). Judy Fudge and Eric Tucker, *Labour Before the Law: The Regulation of Workers’ Collective Action in Canada, 1990-1948*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001). Judy Fudge and Eric Tucker, eds., *Work on Trial: Canadian Labour Law Struggles*, (Toronto: The Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History, 2010). Craig Heron, *The Canadian Labour Movement*, (Toronto: James Lorimer and Company, 1996). Charles W Smith and Alison Braley-Rattai, “Class Struggle Goes to Court: Workers’ Rights and the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*,” in *Rethinking the Politics of Labour in Canada*, 2nd Ed., edited by Stephanie Ross and Larry Savage, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2021): 210-228.

As noted above (*fn 7*), this effort to legislatively curtail the political horizon towards which organized labour is struggling has been contested—in particular, it has been challenged most consistently by those unionists who find themselves at greatest disadvantage as a consequence of racial capitalism’s logics of ableism, cisheteropatriarchy, and white supremacy. Further, there are numerous competing visions for organized labour that push for it to (once again) be about something more than the management of collective agreements and grievances between discrete employers and the workers they employ. These range from arguments for greater “workplace democracy,” through to “social unionism”; and expand still further to encompass visions of unions as the engines of class struggle or, alternatively, as the extant structures around which the governance of production and distribution in a new society can be (re)built within the shell of the old. Considering these accounts in any sort of depth, much less working through how they may or may not articulate with decolonization struggles in contexts where dominant social power accrues to a settler population—itsself characterized by processes of internal diremption and radically uneven distributions of social power—is *well* beyond the scope of this project. But it is research I intend to pursue as a core theoretical problem for my next major project. For competing theories of the political agenda that organized labour ought to inherit please see, Richard D Wolff, *Democracy at Work: A Cure for Capitalism*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2012). Jane McAlevey, *A Collective Bargain: Unions, Organizing, and the Fight for Democracy*, (New York: Harper Collins, 2021). Joe Burns, *Class Struggle Unionism*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2022). Ralph Darlington, *Radical Unionism: The Rise and Fall of Revolutionary Unionism*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2013). Luke Sinwell with Siphwe Mbatha, *The Spirit of Marikana: The Rise of Insurgent Trade Unionism in South Africa*, (London: Pluto Press, 2016).

¹¹ This is not just a core principle of unionism, but rather underpins a number of liberatory struggles. Amongst its clearest articulations was a speech by Chairman Fred Hampton of the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense, which the Party later published and circulated as a pamphlet. Entitled “Power Anywhere Where There’s People,” Hampton’s 1969 address at the Olivet Church in Chicago crucially theorizes the capacity of ordinary people to self-organize in order to take control of their communities and to advance their social welfare in ways that were otherwise foreclosed by the white power structures. For Hampton, this is *the* form of building power-with that is necessary to build and sustain emancipatory political projects. Fred Hampton, “Power Anywhere Where There’s People,” Illinois Chapter of

the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense (1969), <https://www.marxists.org/archive/hampton/1969/misc/power-anywhere-where-theres-people.htm> (accessed March 23, 2022).

If one desires a distinction between unionism and Hampton's theory of people power, it *might* be found in the fact that the power created through union organizing exists *inside* the processes of production. Therefore, if it can be harnessed in an assertion of autonomous worker-power against the bosses, the effect can be more devastating and insurmountable from the perspective of capital than any kind of 'external' shock. Importantly, though, Black radical thinkers in the lineage of Hampton have challenged this, but showing that the 'surplussed populations' of post-industrialism (disproportionately racialized people) *are*, in fact, internal to the regime of accumulation. Gilmore, *Golden Gulag*.

¹² "Stranded Baffinland mine workers pen open letter to protestors, say they support Inuit," CBC News (February 11, 2021), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/baffinland-protestors-open-letter-1.5910951> (accessed July 28, 2021). Beth Brown, "Judge orders crew flights to go ahead this week at Nunavut mine blockade," CBC News, (February 10, 2021), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/judge-orders-crew-flights-to-go-ahead-this-week-at-nunavut-mine-blockade-1.5908563> (accessed July 28, 2021). Beth Brown, "Protestors move away from Nunavut's Mary River airstrip," CBC News, (February 11, 2021), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/protesters-move-away-from-mary-river-airstrip-1.5910360> (accessed July 28, 2021).

¹³ Olúfẹ̀mí O Táíwò, "States Are Not Basic Structures: Against State-Centric Political Theory," *Philosophical Papers* 48(1) (2019): 59-82.

¹⁴ If it is helpful for the reader to consider the precise format of each document, I've broken them down as outlined in-text here. The zines include: Zig Zag, *Colonization and Decolonization: A Manual for Indigenous Liberation in the 21st Century*, (Vancouver: Warrior Publications, 2011), warriorpublications.wordpress.com (accessed April 5, 2022). Xhopakelxhit, *Everyone Calls Themselves an Ally Until it is Time to Do Some Real Ally Shit*, (Ancestral Pride, 2014), warriorpublications.wordpress.com (accessed April 5, 2022). tawinikay, *Reconciliation is Dead: A Call for Revolt After the Raid*, (Aphikona Distro, 2020), <https://aphikonadistro.org/> (accessed April 5, 2022).

The pamphlets include: Tom Keefer, *Mutiny on the HMS Capital: The Two Row Wampum as a Guide to Decolonization and Social Transformation on Turtle Island*, (N.P., 2014), <https://yorku.academia.edu/TomKeefer> (accessed April 5, 2022). Llund, ed., *Social War on Stolen Native Land*, (Vancouver: Black Banner Distro, 2016), blackbannerdistro.wordpress.com (accessed April 5, 2022).

The transcribed speeches include: Nora Butler Burke, "Building a 'Canadian' Decolonization Movement: Fighting the Occupation at 'Home,'" (Montréal, August 20, 2004), theanarchistlibrary.org (accessed April 5, 2022). tawinikay, "Autonomously and With Conviction: A Métis Refusal of State-Led Reconciliation," (Guelph, October 12, 2018), theanarchistlibrary.org (accessed April 5, 2022).

The blog post is found at: Chelsea Vowel, "An Open Letter to 'Angry Settlers,'" *âpihtawikosisân* (February 26, 2020), apihtawikosisan.com (accessed April 5, 2022).

¹⁵ Importantly, this is meant to situate rather than elevate any or all of these texts. Beyond a doubt, they reflect in at least some ways the specific preoccupations of the communities with which I've been engaged and are therefore not meant to be taken as *the* canon of such materials. Rather, as was discussed in the previous chapter, this is an activist archive representative of intellectual materials used in collective struggle at a particular time, in a particular place, and—importantly—amongst grassroots actors who have joined together because they share certain broad political commitments. Most directly, the texts included here were shared within a number of distinct but overlapping movements working in solidarity with Indigenous land/water defenders—including, but not limited to, movements acting in solidarity with Ma'amtigila, 'Namgis, Secwepemc, and/or Wet'suwet'en struggles. For the most part, these movements were based in Metulia/Victoria, BC, with the period of greatest intensity for my own involvement in organizing activity being from 2017 to 2020. As such, some of the most pressing issues for these groups revolved around how to take action most effectively in Victoria in solidarity with frontlines that were often hundreds of miles away. Or, conversely, how to create and maintain frontlines *in* Victoria that extend the work of other frontlines. More consideration of at least one of these solidarity movements is discussed at some length in Chapter Five of this dissertation.

¹⁶ While it served as the catalyst for Vowel's really excellent intervention, it's important to critically evaluate Singh's statement here—something Vowel, understandably, doesn't attend to in her blog post. I take this as important for two

reasons; the first being that Singh, as the NDP leader, is ostensibly the voice of progressives within Canadian parliamentary politics and his words therefore stand as something of a bellwether to the commitments of that tendency. Secondly, and more pressingly, Singh leads the federal wing of the party which was in government in British Columbia at the time of the invasions, as such, whatever he was willing to say or not say had a heightened degree of meaning.

Notably, Singh's statement refuses to name any culpable actor on the ground carrying out the invasion. Indeed, the direct ways in which the RCMP's actions manifest colonial tactics within a broader context of settler imperialism is quickly replaced by a value neutral suggestion that what is at stake on the yintah is a repetition of "history that divides people." An abstract division, then, is what Singh appears to see as the problem here. Moreover, he even seems to offer an exculpatory equivalency, suggesting that "Everyone involved—from the hereditary chiefs to the CEOs—are looking to find a peaceful de-escalation" (emphasis mine). Given that the RCMP's actions are being taken to enforce a civil injunction on untreated lands—which is to say, lands on which Aboriginal title remains primary, even by the standards of Canadian law—it beggars belief to suggest that the CEOs of TC Energy or the RCMP officers could somehow be treated as benign or neutral actors in this situation. In its own way, Singh's tweet is engaged in a process of settler myth-making that, while admittedly less belligerent than Claude's, is certainly just as pernicious. Jagmeet Singh, Twitter Post (February 24, 2020), <https://twitter.com/theJagmeetSingh/status/1231980031905234944?s=20&t=2uxA9dFDzwNIF9cS09MqhQ> (accessed April 1, 2022).

For an example of what vigilante violence against these solidarity blockades often looks like please see Simon Little's reporting with Global News. Notable in the incident on which Little is reporting is the usage of a truck as a means of threatening blockaders. This no doubt echoes the moves in several jurisdictions throughout North America to remove criminal liability for drivers who strike activists blockading roadways; yet another important reminder of the dialectical relationship between state orchestrated violence and vigilante revanchist movements. Simon Little, "Video shows man pushing board into truck's path as it drives through B.C. highway blockade," Global News (February 11, 2020), <https://globalnews.ca/news/6539253/video-plywood-truck-bc-highway-blockade/> (accessed April 4, 2022).

¹⁷ Unless otherwise indicated, all quotations over the next four paragraphs are drawn from Vowel, "Letter to 'Angry Settlers.'"

The tactic of blockading critical infrastructure was largely pursued in an effort to cause both economic pain to the business classes who were financing and profiting off of the invasion of the yintah and to create a crisis of governance for the political elite by causing major disruptions to everyday life. On both accounts this tactic was a stunning success, something which was not lost on major media outlets or the business press in particular. While the memory of it has likely been eclipsed by the much larger crises in global logistics that were brought on by the COVID-19 pandemic, in early 2020 Canadians were already being inundated with hand-wringing articles about the fragility of 'supply chains' in the face of these solidarity blockades. Les Perreux, Eric Atkins, and Eric Andrew-Gee, "Industry groups warn rail protests are hurting supply chain," *The Globe and Mail* (February 12, 2020), <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/article-retailers-and-manufacturers-brace-for-shutdowns-as-pipeline-protests/> (accessed April 3, 2022). Alicia Draus, "Wet'suwet'en rail blockade could impact food prices in Atlantic Canada," Global News (February 17, 2020), <https://globalnews.ca/news/6560568/wetsuweten-rail-blockade-food-prices-atlantic-canada/> (accessed April 3, 2022). Naomi Powell, Emily Jackson, and Julia Mastroianni, "Potential catastrophe?: Rail blockades disrupt supply chains for food — which may lead to grocery shortages," *Financial Post* (February 14, 2020), <https://financialpost.com/transportation/rail/potential-catastrophe-rail-blockades-disrupt-supply-chains-for-food-which-may-lead-to-grocery-shortages> (accessed April 3, 2022). "Supply chain warnings grow louder as rail blockades persist," BNN Bloomberg (February 12, 2020), <https://www.bnnbloomberg.ca/supply-chain-warnings-grow-louder-as-rail-blockades-persist-1.1388989> (accessed April 3, 2022).

Importantly, the very notion of what constitutes 'critical infrastructure' is at stake in anti-imperialist struggles like the one on the yintah. Spokespeople for both the Unist'ot'en and Gidimt'en camps have consistently made clear that for them the land, the waters, and the more-than-human relations of the territories constitute their critical infrastructure. Larry Barzelai, Warren Bell, and Melissa Lem, "Canada is at a crossroads and the Wet'suwet'en are in its crosshairs," *National Observer* (January 21, 2022), <https://www.nationalobserver.com/2022/01/21/opinion/canada-crossroads-and-wetsuweten-are-its-crosshairs> (accessed April 3, 2022).

¹⁸ For some general considerations of the ways in which anti-colonial struggle is almost always treated by settlers or others situated as (relative) elites within the imperial world system as *threat*, as *irrational*, or even as *barbarous* action,

please consult some of the following texts. Lee Maracle, "Meeting the Public," in *My Conversations with Canadians*, (Toronto: BookThug, 2017): 7-20. Eva Mackey, "Defending Expectations," in *Unsettled Expectations: Uncertainty, Land and Settler Decolonization*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2016): 78-100. Kenton Storey, "Violence and Eviction on Vancouver Island," in *Settler Anxiety at the Outposts of Empire: Colonial Relations, Humanitarian Discourses, and the Imperial Press*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2016): 39-69. Geo Maher, *Anticolonial Eruptions: Racial Hubris and the Cunning of Resistance*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2022). Lorenzo Veracini, "Consciousness," in *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010): 75-94. Albert Memmi, "The Mythical Portrait of the Colonized," in *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1991 [1957]): 79-89.

¹⁹ Indigenous feminists have, for instance, noted that while the social order of settler imperialism is rife with a generalized misogyny and cisheteropatriarchy, Indigenous women are made the targets of a degree and kind of sexist violence that other women are not. Patricia Monture-Angus, *Thunder in My Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 1995). Aileen Moreton-Robinson, *Talkin' Up to the White Woman: Indigenous Women and Feminism*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2021 [2000]). Joyce Green, ed., *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2007).

Similarly, while the emergence of an environmental crisis that is so world-spanning in its scope as to have defined a geological epoch—the so-called Anthropocene—seems to indicate the emergence of a truly totalizing moment of shared ecological catastrophe, many scholars have provided crucial interventions detailing how white supremacy and settler imperialism structure the distribution of the penalties arising from this context. Leilani Nishime and Kim D Hester Williams, eds., *Racial Ecologies*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2018). Kathryn Yusoff, *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019).

²⁰ Importantly, though, Claude's tweet is itself evidence that this sense of near-ubiquitous precarity can just as easily—perhaps even moreso—lead to an aggressive reinvestment in, and rancorous defence of, dominant social relationship. The task of pushing one way or another, as always, is a matter of political struggle.

Vowel's account here resembles a recent formulation developed by Robert Nichols through his engagement with traditions of what he calls "Indigenous structural critique" (see Chapter Three for a more extended discussion). Nichols proposes that the process of settler-led dispossession can be "usefully conceived as a historical process of diremption within systemic alienation" (92); or as a "system of *impersonal domination*"—wherein there is often no direct or discretely identifiable 'dominator'—"with *internal division*" (emphasis original, 97), in which the ruled are sundered from one another through processes of uneven integration that distribute penalties and benefits along hierarchies of ability, gender, race, sex and sexuality, etc. Robert Nichols, *Theft is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2020). It is also, unmistakably evocative of Marx and Engel's notion that the dialectical method shows us how a social order produces its own 'gravediggers.' Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, (New York: Washington Square Press, 1967 [1848]), 79.

²¹ tawinikay echoes this sentiment, extending Vowel's insights to include even those who are propertied. Pointing to the principle of allodial title and eminent domain, tawinikay suggests that the dispossession of Indigenous peoples "should come as no surprise to Canadians who are paying attention. States operate on the illusion of rights. The government has the right to seize your property too" (tawinikay, "With Conviction"). While it has been suggested by some that the limited nature of property rights in Canada potentiates an ambiguity within the law that can be used to pursue justice claims of various sorts, by contrast tawinikay suggests that the state form itself—as a manifestation of dominant bourgeois social relations—means that the state is most likely to abrogate property in ways consistent with the reproduction of already-dominant relations of power.

²² See, George Ciccariello-Maher, *Decolonizing Dialectics*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017).

²³ Gord Hill, *The 500 Years of Resistance Comic Book*, (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2010). Gord Hill, *The Anti-Capitalist Resistance Comic Book*, (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2012). Gord Hill, *The Antifa Comic Book: 100 Years of Fascism and Antifa Movements*, (Vancouver: Arsenal Pulp Press, 2018). A more text-heavy companion piece to the *500 Years of Resistance Comic Book* is also available, see: Gord Hill, *500 Years of Indigenous Resistance*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2010).

²⁴ Zig Zag, *Colonization and Decolonization*, 23. In their essay, "Towards Unsettling Paths," the settler anarchist Llund makes a similar point, developing it in direct opposition to what they perceive as the present dominance in movement

spaces of allyship discourses, which interpellates the “ally [as] the selfless martyr who is overcoming their privilege and stepping down to help the oppressed.” By contrast Llund, perhaps echoing Zig Zag (who has several pieces in Llund’s compiled pamphlet), argues that a “common enemy” is the basis “for a relationship of struggle” that is not rooted in altruism or saviour complexes (Llund, in *Social War*, 38).

Llund’s position here may lose some of the analytical power that Zig Zag’s attention to social *systems* maintains. Whereas Llund’s account seems to conjure up images of easily identifiable and discretely responsible actors, Zig Zag seems better positioned to at once capture the possibility of such immediately culpable figures, while simultaneously situating that in the context of a social order that produces forms of “mute compulsion” that reproduce dominant relations of power through social alienation. Søren Mau, *Mute Compulsion: A Marxist Theory of the Economic Power of Capital*, (London: Verso, 2022).

²⁵ Zig Zag, *Colonization and Decolonization*, 23. Importantly, just as Zig Zag notes that understanding the internal divisions amongst settlers is core to developing a social theory of anti-colonial struggle, he and others in this archive also offer vital reminders that Indigenous communities are not politically or socially homogenous spaces either. Whereas the allyship toolkits in the previous chapter almost unswervingly produced an essentialized and, therefore, relatively apolitical image of Indigenous peoples, many of the documents in this archive offer a more granular and politically astute assessment. Xhopakelxhit, for instance, writes that just as “many settlers do not even care or can fathom giving up their privilege on this continent,” many Indigenous persons “are happy with the colonial status quo and only want to secure their rights as far as they can still shop at star bucks [*sic*] and use power” (Xhopakelxhit, *Ally Shit*, 3). Xhopakelxhit points to the importance of a critique of commodity fetishism, in which the market goods that appear to us as consumers as if they are neutral objects in fact contain horror stories of exploitation and dispossession at every stage of their journey to the consumer. Equal access to goods produced within a radically unequal world system, such as that which makes Starbucks possible, is *not* synonymous with liberation. Moreover, despite a somewhat caustic tenor, Xhopakelxhit’s critique of collaborationism is an important reminder that decolonization is ultimately a *political* struggle and, as such, not everyone will attach themselves to it—even if it is a project that is *for everyone*. Solidarities are, therefore, built *not* predetermined—especially not by the diremptive categories of presently dominant power relations, even if that shared experience *potentiates* solidarity. tawinikay echoes this politicized account of solidarity in her *Reconciliation is Dead* zine, writing that solidarity is built by finding “those that have kept the fire alive in their hearts, those who would rather keep fighting than accept the reconciliation carrot” (tawinikay, *Reconciliation is Dead*, 8). Finally, Zig Zag also maps out similar complexities in terms diremptive processes within Indigenous communities (Zig Zag, 15-19).

²⁶ Moreover, I read Zig Zag as developing what I would call a *materialist* account of diremption, in which he is primarily concerned with the internal divisions within the social order of settler imperialism in terms not only of who benefits and in what concrete ways relative to others, but also of who rules or commands. So for instance, Zig Zag asserts that there exists within settler society a “ruling class, which organizes and directs the system of exploitation, oppression, and control” through their ability to leverage the social power that is “the government and corporations” (Zig Zag, 23). Within this activist archive, however, others adopt what I would describe as a more *idealist* account; such as in Nora Butler Burke’s speech, where she asserts that: “All people living in Canada have been distorted by colonialism” (Butler Burke). While she doesn’t elaborate upon what is meant by ‘distorted,’ it carries the valence of an anti-colonial critique that is primarily moral in its orientation, rather than political—a distinction which shouldn’t imply an intrinsic preference for either method, only an acknowledgement that they do, in fact, enunciate different projects.

²⁷ Emphasis mine. Zig Zag quotes throughout this paragraph can be found at Zig Zag, *Colonization and Decolonization*, 20-23.

Zig Zag also implies a helpful formula that makes the distinction between ‘society’ and the ‘social’ quite clear. While often treated as synonymous, Zig Zag uses society in a way that interpellates all those discrete and related individuals and collectives who live within the social order. Whereas he is clear that society contains a number of internal divisions that produce contradictions potentially of use to anti-colonial struggle, Zig Zag is also adamant that the social order of settler imperialism—in its totality—is the target of that struggle. He writes: “Decolonization... requires the dismantling of the colonial government and its entire social system upon which control & exploitation are based. Decolonization, then, is a *revolutionary struggle aimed at transforming the entire social system*” (emphasis

original, 20). The distinction, here, is between actors and structures, in which the relative agency of the former and their contradictory relationships with the latter, potentiate a dialectical opening.

²⁸ Importantly, this is not a wholly novel observation. Indeed, it bares a resemblance to arguments by no less a figure of Canadiana than Northrop Frye, when he suggested that as the Canadian literary scene emerged in “the defensive isolation of our scattered pioneer communities,” it developed a “garrison mentality.” While Frye had in mind that the martialism of this mentality was largely metaphorical—engendered in his estimation by the supposed alienation of humanity from their natural environment, a characteristic assumption of much post-Enlightenment thought—this particular gloss is only made possible by Frye’s thorough absenting of Indigenous peoples from significance in the account that he provides of Canadian history. It is a garrison *mentality*, rather than a martial society, only because the actual warlike posture of many settler communities towards Indigenous peoples is erased from view. Northrop Frye, “Conclusion to a Literary History of Canada,” *The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination*, (Toronto: Anansi, 1971): 213-51.

Similarly, an even older and highly influential sociological literature postulated the emergence of a world system comprised of “garrison states” in the aftermath of the Second World War. Recognizing that this was not itself an entirely new development, but rather an amplification of certain constitutive elements of the state-form, Harold D Lasswell nevertheless suggested that the reorganization of life towards production for total war was likely to be a persistent character of particularly American society following the cessation of formal hostilities. This thesis later became popularized as the “military industrial complex” that was acknowledged as central to America maintaining its preponderance of global power. Critiques of Canadian militarism—typically of the anti-imperialist marxist tendency discussed in Chapter One—have drawn similar conclusions here too. Harold D Lasswell, “The Garrison State,” *American Journal of Sociology* 46(4) (January 1941): 455-468. James Petras, “The Soaring Profits of the Military – Industrial Complex and Casualties,” *Canadian Dimension* (June 24, 2014), canadiandimension.com (April 5, 2022). For a more recent intervention on these questions see: Jodi Kim, *Settler Garrison: Debt Imperialism, Militarism, and Transpacific Imaginaries*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2022).

While working on this chapter, the martialism of the Canadian social order seems poised to be amplified yet again, as the minority Trudeau Liberal government—with support from the NDP—propose an \$8 billion dollar expansion in federal spending on Canada’s war-making capacities. Notably, the NDP’s support for this massive increase in militarist spending was bought for the relatively paltry price of a means-tested dental care program, which will be phased in only gradually. Amanda Connolly, “Canadian military budget will grow by \$8B as policy review seeks to reset defence vision,” *Global News* (April 7, 2022), <https://globalnews.ca/news/8743608/canada-budget-defence-spending-plans/> (accessed April 8, 2022).

²⁹ Emphasis original, Zig Zag, *Colonization and Decolonization*, 1.

³⁰ Butler Burke, “‘Canadian’ Decolonization Movement.”

³¹ See: *Kanehsatake: 270 Years of Resistance*, online, directed by Alanis Obomsawin, (National Film Board, 1993). Robert Matas, “Film suggests Dosanjh ‘manufactured a crisis,’” *Globe and Mail* (April 29, 2000), <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/film-suggests-dosanjh-manufactured-a-crisis/article4163252/> (accessed April 5, 2022). *Is the Crown at War With Us?* online, directed by Alanis Obomsawin, (National Film Board, 2002). See also: *Hunters and Bombers*, online, directed by Hugh Brody and Nigel Markham, (National Film Board, 1991).

³² Unless indicated otherwise, all quotations in the next five paragraphs are drawn from Keefer, *Mutiny on the HMS Capital*.

For more detail on the Kaswentha see: Susan M Hill, “Teyohahá;ke—Two Roads,” in *The Clay We Are Made Of: Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2017): 79-131. John Borrows, “Wampum at Niagara: Canadian Legal History, Self-Government, and the Royal Proclamation,” in *Aboriginal and Treaty Rights in Canada*, edited by Michael Asch, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1998): 155-172. And, to situate the Kaswentha in the broader realm of Haudenosaunee legal orders, please see: Kayanesenh Paul Williams, *Kayanerenkó:wa: The Great Law of Peace*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 2018).

³³ In particular, while Keefer is a powerful and effective critic of the settler social order, I think his account of Indigenous social orders relies on Rousseauian tropes of Indigenous nations as “organic and harmonious.” Indeed, Keefer’s account of Haudenosaunee social life is explicitly indebted to the work of Lewis Henry Morgan, as

interpreted through Marx, and thus bears the imprint of 19th Century anthropology's assumptions about supposedly pre- or apolitical societies. I do not, however, think that this reductive account of Indigenous social orders necessarily undermines Keefer's account of the *settler* social order. Rather than abandoning Keefer, what feels necessary here is to push his own method further to investigate the actual social relations of Indigenous nations. Importantly, this shortcoming in Keefer is rectified elsewhere in this activist archive, principally by Indigenous authors who, after all, are better placed to work through these matters (see *fn* 25).

³⁴ While distinct from the Atlantic triangle in absolutely vital ways—the most pressing of which was the absence of chattel slavery as its core organizing principle—a similar dramatization of the barbarism of empire was played out in the Pacific, with the power of European empires cresting here throughout the 19th Century and well into the 20th. In particular, the circuits of empire accelerated their extraction of human life throughout the Pacific in response to the closure of the trade of enslaved African peoples in the Atlantic. As Moon-Ho Jung details, thousands of Asian labourers were impressed into diaspora to ensure a glut of hyper-exploitable workers in the imperial core and the Caribbean. Moon-Ho Jung, *Coolies and Cane: Race, Labour, and Sugar in the Age of Emancipation*, (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 2008). For more on the trajectories of imperialism in the Pacific see, Rita Kaur Dhamoon, Davina Bhandar, Renisa Mawani, and Satwinder Kaur Bains, eds., *Unmooring the Komagata Maru: Charting Colonial Trajectories*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019).

³⁵ Keefer himself draws upon the vital work of Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, who suggest evocatively that the mutinous and motley crews of these vessels for war and plunder, alongside their piratical counterparts (often escapees of impressment and enslavement themselves), constitute the subjects of a “hidden history of the revolutionary Atlantic.” A revolutionary hydrarchy that had to be quashed through the combined efforts of allied territorial powers whose relations with one another were otherwise more commonly characterized by warlike postures. Here again, articulation and collaboration are the basis by which power-with is constructed in order to be exerted as power-over the seas. Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: The Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*, (London: Verso, 2012 [2000]). See also: CLR James, *A History of Pan-African Revolt*, (Oakland: PM Press, 2012 [1938]). Marcus Rediker, *Villains of All Nations: Atlantic Pirates in the Golden Age*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2005). Neil Roberts, *Freedom as Marronage*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015). Christina Sharpe, *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016). Julius S Scott, *The Common Wind: Afro-American Currents in the Age of the Haitian Revolution*, (London: Verso, 2018). Tiffany Lethabo King, *The Black Shoals: Offshore Formations of Black and Native Studies*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2019).

³⁶ Marcus Rediker, *The Slave Ship: A Human History*, (New York: Penguin Books, 2007). Stephanie E Smallwood, *Saltwater Slavery: A Middle Passage from Africa to American Diaspora*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008).

³⁷ Zig Zag, *Colonization and Decolonization*, 2.

³⁸ The People's Forum NYC, “Manu Karuka on Hybrid Wars,” Youtube (November 5, 2019), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0OQyV-7tWSc&list=WL&index=65> (accessed April 7, 2022). Karuka's comments were delivered as part of the People's Forum conference: “Holding the Future Hostage: A Conference on Hybrid Wars, Sanctions, and Solidarity.” Recordings of many of the attendees speaking on hybrid warfare can be accessed here: https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLlpc6eFEed8osEzCl8Ld_bpgfT2gRqYuD0 (accessed April 7, 2022). See also, Manu Karuka, “Hunger Politics: Sanctions as Siege Warfare,” in *Sanctions as War: Anti-Imperialist Perspectives on American Geo-Economic Strategies*, edited by Stuart Davis and Immanuel Ness, (Boston: Koninklijke Brill, 2022): 51-62.

Similarly, researchers at the Tricontinental: Institute for Social Research, which assiduously studies the global system of imperialism from the position of the Third World, have also sought to draw attention to how the emergence of the hybrid warfare doctrine has threatened to turn back democratic upsurges around the world. See, Vijay Prashad, “Hybrid Wars Are Destroying Democracies: The Thirty-Fourth Newsletter,” Tricontinental (August 22, 2019), <https://thetricontinental.org/newsletterissue/hybrid-wars-are-destroying-democracies-the-thirty-fourth-newsletter-2019/> (accessed April 7, 2022).

³⁹ Bernd Horn, *On Hybrid Warfare*, (Ottawa: Canadian Special Operations Forces Command, 2016), 16-17.

⁴⁰ Horn, *Hybrid Warfare*, 45. While Horn's attention is directed by statist understandings of the international, his account of hybrid war resonates with other seasoned members of Canada's security apparatuses who write about the

disavowed international relationships between Canada and Indigenous nations (and, though even more thoroughly erased as a form of internationalism within this literature, between Indigenous nations themselves). For instance Douglas L Bland, a retired lieutenant colonel, professor emeritus, and former chair of defence studies at Queen's University, has written two volumes—in the form of a fever-dream “thriller” and an ostensibly sober analysis—wildly speculating on the possibility of violent Indigenous uprisings across Canada. For his part, Bland asserts that the notion of “addressing the underlying grievances”—which he believes produce the conditions which potentiate a conflagration—is ultimately an “incoherent” project and impossible to pursue. In short, Bland rejects reconciliation, reparations, or restitution (in even the relatively narrow sense of repair), as fantastical projects. Given this, he recommends that the security apparatuses of the state engage in what is identifiable as a form of hybrid war to “degrade or diminish” the capacities of Indigenous communities to engage in feasible resistance to ongoing colonization (though he assiduously avoids this word). Among other things he calls for dramatically increased policing on-reserve (see Bland, *Time Bomb*, Chapter 8). Douglas L Bland, *Time Bomb: Canada and the First Nations*, (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2014). Douglas L Bland, *Uprising: A Novel*, (Toronto: Dundurn, 2013).

Moreover, in a manner that parallels Canada's reliance on police as a paramilitary force in advancing its project of continental imperialism, policing has been one of Canada's primary forms of power projection globally too. Whereas the American settler empire has been far more open in the use of explicitly military power, Canadian martialism more often travels under the signification of policing—a less overtly martial technology, when viewed from the perspective of those with relative social power (esp. personal property). Among the primary methods of projecting police power throughout the world has been a deliberate push to emphasize Canadian expertise in police training—expertise derived through an explicitly colonial project. As such, Canadian police have worked beside and trained police forces throughout the world, honing their capacity to suppress popular movements in order to defend property—often property held by Canadian capital. Tyler A Shipley, *Canada in the World: Settler Capitalism and the Colonial Imagination*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020), 401-410 and 422. Jerome Klassen, “Armoured Neoliberalism: The Power Bloc and the New Imperial State,” in *Joining Empire: The Political Economy of the New Canadian Foreign Policy*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2014): 183-219. Jeff Shantz, “They Have Always Been Military: On So-Called Militarized Policing in Canada,” *Journal of Social Justice* 6 (2016): 1-26. Brent Patterson, “Human rights defenders call on Canada to end support to Colombian police and army,” NB Media Co-op (May 14, 2021), https://nbmediacoop.org/2021/05/14/human-rights-defenders-call-on-canada-to-end-support-to-colombian-police-and-army/?fbclid=IwAR2YmyCoqZ_E1Cfd78o92ggXAS8pfF3vDjUaBble4TVli5VJmdpo2sHrUoU (accessed April 25, 2022).

⁴¹ People's Forum, “Karuka on Hybrid Wars,” Youtube.

⁴² Keefer, *Mutiny on the HMS Capital*. This echoes a similar conversation between Glen Coulthard and Harsha Walia in 2015, where they too interrogate the contemporary meaning of the Kaswentha. Like Keefer, they suggest that a social theory of the ship leads to the conclusion that it's designed purpose for extraction, dispossession, and exploitation has produced an imbalance in the relations of power that necessitates fundamental transformation before something like the nation-to-nation ethos of the Kaswentha can be meaningful again. But they differ from Keefer in their description of the global crises produced by the ship. Keefer describes an impending ‘waterfall,’ and may thereby inadvertently naturalize or reify an historical inevitability to this present catastrophe. By contrast, Coulthard responds to Walia's question about the treaty ethos by noting that “the state's economic, legal and political institutions... have destroyed the river and eroded the riverbank. Under such conditions, ‘recognizing’ the legitimacy of the colonial ship's right of travel is an impossibility and we need to start orienting our struggles toward a different goal.” The difference is subtle, but important; if it is the ship and not the river itself that produced the current crisis—and we have every reason to believe this is the case—then the possibility of travelling down the river together remains, but only if the source of the destruction is itself dismantled and a vessel of less destructive qualities is built, a project that itself will likely have to be pursued in sustained dialogue given what has preceded it. Harsha Walia, “‘Land is a Relationship’: In conversation with Glen Coulthard on Indigenous nationhood,” Rabble (January 20, 2015), <https://rabble.ca/columnists/land-relationship-conversation-glen-coulthard-on-indigenous-nationhood/> (accessed April 11, 2022).

⁴³ Keefer's focus on the necessity of mutiny aboard the ship of empire resonates in important ways with insights offered by Herbert Marcuse and discussed in the previous chapter. In short, Marcuse and Keefer are both arguing that

the “chain of exploitation must break at its strongest link”—or perhaps, that the ship of empire cannot plunder if its crew is in open revolt, see Chapter Three *fn* 21.

⁴⁴ Keefer’s metaphorical preference here may imply the more orthodoxly marxist leanings to his own political theory when contrasted with the rest of this archive.

⁴⁵ tawinikay, “Autonomously and With Conviction.”

⁴⁶ tawinikay, *Reconciliation is Dead*, 8. This echoes her words in an earlier speech, which is also included in this activist archive in its transcribed version. There she also draws upon the Kaswentha, suggesting it envisions “an equal distribution of power” between settlers and Indigenous peoples, as the basis upon which each can pursue “healthy relationships, acting from their own ideas and history.” Importantly, though, for this to be achievable in tawinikay’s view, it requires “an anarchy of my people and the anarchy of settler (also my people) [to be] enacted here, together, side by side.” This is the sort of autonomy in struggle that compels tawinikay’s vision of decolonization, pursued against the state and corporate elite who currently govern. tawinikay, “Autonomously and With Conviction.”

⁴⁷ Xhopakelxhit, *Ally Shit*, 9.

⁴⁸ This account of autonomy as being in a productive, dialectical tension with an irrevocably relational social world has resonances with both feminist debates and the tendency of autonomism. Though, I suspect, it is not fully contained within either of these traditions—this is, ultimately, theoretical work deserving of a more expansive consideration elsewhere. See, Catriona Mackenzie and Natalie Stoljar, eds., *Relational Autonomy: Feminist Perspectives on Autonomy, Agency, and Social Self*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). Counter Power, *Organizing for Autonomy: History, Theory, and Strategy for Collective Liberation*, (Brooklyn: Common Notions, 2020).

⁴⁹ Unist’ot’en Camp, “All eyes on Wet’suwet’en: International call for week of solidarity,” *Canadian Dimension* (January 8, 2020), <https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/all-eyes-on-wetsuweten-international-call-for-week-of-solidarity> (accessed April 13, 2022).

Unist’ot’en also provides materials on its website to aid supporters in developing their solidarity networks and tactics to be in-line with the goals and objectives of the camp itself. “Wet’suwet’en Supporter Toolkit 2020,” Unist’ot’en Camp, <https://unistoten.camp/supportertoolkit2020/> (accessed April 13, 2022).

⁵⁰ While extensive, this catalogue actually stops just as solidarity actions began spreading as an exponential rate. So the impressiveness of what’s captured here is only surpassed by the even broader scope of what followed. “Many solidarity actions have been held to support the Gidimt’en and wider Wet’suwet’en community,” Gidimt’en Checkpoint (N/D), <https://www.yintahaccess.com/solidarity-actions> (accessed April 13, 2022).

⁵¹ Emphasis mine. tawinikay, *Reconciliation is Dead*, 4.

Appropriately, in the zine this quotation appears immediately beneath an image of Freda Huson, spokesperson for the Unist’ot’en Healing Centre, dancing in full regalia. As she engaged in ceremony honouring the missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, and two-spirit people, heavily armed RCMP officers can be seen approaching in the background. Shortly after this photo was taken Huson was forcibly removed from her ancestral territories by armed officers of the Canadian state at the bequest of TC Energy. In such a context—which is repeated throughout the world built by settler imperialism—tawinikay’s words ring with forceful and righteous conviction.

Moreover, tawinikay’s framework here is distinctly relational in that she eschews entirely an anthropocentric viewpoint. Just as much as the expanded scope of relationally autonomous struggle is meant to free human communities from the death-making processes of settler imperialism, tawinikay remains unsatisfied if our horizon of struggle is limited to human emancipation. She writes, encouraging more people to take up the struggle of decolonization: “do it for the rivers and streams that weave themselves under the rails. Do it for the ancestors who saw the encroaching railroad as their coming demise” (tawinikay, *Reconciliation is Dead*, 7).

⁵² UN General Assembly, Resolution 1514(XV): *Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples*, (December 14, 1960), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/declaration-granting-independence-colonial-countries-and-peoples> (accessed April 20, 2022)

While the newly formed bloc of African states in the UN General assembly gave voice to the ineluctability of decolonization, compelling the adoption of Resolution 1514, I date a longer history of anti-imperialist struggle. My chosen hinge point is the beginning of the Haitian Revolution in 1791, the most successful revolt of enslaved people

against a European imperial power in history and one that created the conditions for decolonization struggles throughout the world thereafter. For this, Haitians have consistently been made to suffer at the hands of the imperial core—through invasions, the neocolonialism of debt-traps, political destabilization, and deliberate underdevelopment. Nevertheless, Haiti has been, and should remain, a byword for liberatory struggle. CLR James, *The Black Jacobin: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*, 2nd Ed., (New York: Vintage Books, 1989).

Moreover, should anyone doubt the reshaping of the world through anti-imperialist struggles, I pose as a simple fact that in 1957—the year in which my father was born—the UN had eighty-two member nations, today it has 193. The lifespan of a man not yet retired has seen a fundamental remaking—if not quite an upending—of the world system. For history that sheds light on the centrality of decolonization struggles to the 20th Century especially, and that recast the so-called Cold War from this perspective, see: Vijay Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, (New York: New Press, 2007).

⁵³ This so-called “salt water” thesis was proposed as part of an effort by settler states and their closest allies to stymie the legal applicability of the UN General Assembly’s declaration on *The Right of Peoples and Nations to Self-Determination* (Resolution 637[VII], 1952) within their assumed jurisdictions. Countering the so-called “Belgian thesis”—itself a cynical ploy to scuttle the declaration entirely by including implementation protocols that core imperial powers would view as a poison-pill—this principle asserts that the right to self-determination accrues only to such non-self-governing territories (colonies) which are separated from the imperial metropolises that exploit them by salt water. Although even this principle has been assiduously skirted in practice—see: the Arctic Archipelago, Christmas Island, Diego Garcia, Hawai’i, and Vancouver Island—it nevertheless was the fulcrum on which the survival of settler regimes were stabilized within international law. It is in an attempt to overcome the consequences of this exclusion that Indigenous peoples, particularly but not exclusively in the Americas and Oceania, were put on the trajectory towards the curtailed rights of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Audrey Jane Roy, “Sovereignty and Decolonization: Realizing Indigenous Self-Determination at the United Nations and in Canada,” (unpublished thesis: the University of Victoria, 2001).

⁵⁴ This retconning of the goals of Third World decolonization struggles is, it must be noted, largely aimed at breaking the internationalist solidarity that was once so critical to those movements. In short, the purpose of distorting the aims of these movements is to convince progressives, leftists, radicals, and others *in the imperial core* who might be otherwise sympathetic to the cause that it was somehow tainted from the beginning. This is not unique to just Third Worldist struggles, but rather a tactic deployed against all transformative movements. For those who live in the Third World decolonization, as a project still underway even despite the head-winds of the counterrevolution, is clearly understood as an expansive and capacious process. In recent comments to the UN Security Council, Kenya’s envoy, Martin Kimani, asserted that “Kenya and almost every African nation was birthed by the ending of empire. Our borders... were drawn in the distant colonial metropolises of London, Paris, and Lisbon, with no regard for the ancient nations they cleaved apart... At independence, had we chosen to pursue states on the basis of ethnic, racial, or religious homogeneity, we would still be waging bloody wars these many decades later. Instead, we agreed that we would settle for the borders that we inherited, but we would still pursue continental political, economic, and legal integration... not because our borders satisfied us, but because we wanted something greater, forged in peace.” *Hindustan Times*, “Watch: Kenyan envoy to UN stuns the world; Gives history lesson to Russia at Ukraine meet,” Youtube (February 23, 2022), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=78ec1_fzepc (accessed April 21, 2022).

⁵⁵ Adom Getachew, *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 1-5.

⁵⁶ Emphasis mine, Robin DG Kelley, “From the River to the Sea to Every Mountain Top: Solidarity as Worldmaking,” *Journal of Palestine Studies* 48(4) (2019): 72. Kelley’s insights here are very helpful, and in some very direct ways have contributed to the organization of Chapters 3 and 4 of this dissertation. While the texts of these two chapters are deeply interrelated, the distance that has been revealed by pulling them apart is crucial. My best attempts to theorize this as rooted in the distinct theories of power that each archive relies upon is nicely summed up in Kelley’s far more political and incisive assertion that “a vision of worldmaking rather than a politics of analogy [shared experience] or identity [shared essence] has been the real cement” binding Black and Palestinian struggles, it is a “catalyst for imagining revolution as opposed to plotting coalition” (73).

⁵⁷ See also: Shiri Pasternak, Kevin Walby, and Abby Stadnyk, eds., *Disarm, Defund, Dismantle: Police Abolition in Canada*, (Toronto: Between the Lines Books, 2022).

⁵⁸ Gilmore's comments were prompted during a conversation with Winona LaDuke, in which the moderator had asked them both to reflect on the "parallelisms" between decolonization and abolition, and how it might be possible to bring these struggles together. Social Justice Chair, "Beyond Pipelines and Prisons: Infrastructures of Abolition with Ruth Wilson Gilmore & Winona LaDuke," Youtube (October 26, 2020) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xT5eTVQAc2g> (accessed April 21, 2022). See also: Ruth Wilson Gilmore, *Change Everything: Racial Capitalism and the Case for Abolition*, edited by Naomi Murakawa, (Chicago: Haymarket Press, 2022).

⁵⁹ Sabotage Media, in *Social War*, edited by Llund, 4.

⁶⁰ Olúfẹ́mi O Táíwò, *Reconsidering Reparations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022), 87.

⁶¹ Emphasis original, *ibid.*, 74.

⁶² Emphasis mine, Arash Davari, "On Inexactitude in Decolonization," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 40(3) (2020): 628.

⁶³ Davari develops this generative critique of *Worldmaking After Empire* with a particular focus on the often contradictory relationships between Iran—then ruled by Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, the Shah—and the Third Worldist African leaders that Getachew highlights. In addition to being of interesting historical import, Davari also implies that by obscuring the centrality of popular social forces in both theorizing and practicing anti-colonial worldmaking, there is a risk that internationalism—that cornerstone principle of solidarity—becomes reduced to inter-statism. Indeed, he writes that the tacit alliances between African anti-imperialists and the Shah's regime "left Iranian opposition to the Shah little choice but to imagine a different world order" than the one pursued by Getachew's protagonists and that this goes some way to explaining the Iranian Revolution of 1979 (*ibid.*, 632). This, I would suggest, is an important lesson in studying worldmaking 'from below,' that the left within the imperial core continues to struggle with. Barnaby Raine and David Camfield, "Is the Enemy of My Enemy My Friend?" *The Breach* (October 22, 2021), <https://breachmedia.ca/is-the-enemy-of-my-enemy-my-friend/> (accessed April 22, 2022).

⁶⁴ Davari, "Inexactitude," 627.

⁶⁵ I have lingered here, perhaps overlong, considering the virtues of this activist archive *not* because I think it contains a complete program for success or even, necessarily, all the correct answers to the many questions that confront those who are committed to anti-imperialism today. Far from it. Rather, I want to uphold the enormity of what I think *is* achieved in these texts—both in themselves as intellectual refusals of imperial worldviews, but also in their role as catalysts for and within movements—as a way of resisting the all too easy move of the relatively comfortable academic slipping immediately into critique. As Vijay Prashad notes, this refusal to "spend even a minute celebrating" such achievements is very often rooted in the desire of such critics to remain personally "pure of the complexities of what it means to produce a [social] revolution." But, he continues, such purity is impossible: because even "when you move to the other side of history, when you open up a new epoch, you will still be stuck with your feet in clay. In all the contradictions of the past. And you're going to have to *struggle*, you're going to have to *learn to walk out of the clay*." If, therefore, I appear to be overly generous towards this particular activist archive it should be read not as deference, but rather as appreciation from one clay-footed person to another. Verso Books, "Walter Rodney's Russian Revolution," Youtube (May 29, 2018), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v71Pa-xRhRQ> (accessed April 25, 2022).

⁶⁶ Joel Olson, *The Abolition of White Democracy*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004).

⁶⁷ This archive brings alive the old slogan that "treason to whiteness is loyalty to humanity," which was popularized as the byline to the journal *Race Traitor* (1993-2005) edited by Noel Ignatiev. While White Studies has declined and become domesticated and defanged in the intervening decades, the approach of this archive centres on the proper work of not palliating whiteness but lancing it.

⁶⁸ Kelley, "River to the Sea," 71. See also: Robin DG Kelley, Jack Amariglio, and Lucas Wilson, "'Solidarity Is Not a Market Exchange': An *RM* Interview with Robin D. G. Kelley, Part 1," *Rethinking Marxism* 30(4) (2018): 568-598.

Robin DG Kelley, Jack Amariglio, and Lucas Wilson, “‘Solidarity Is Not a Market Exchange’: An *RM* Interview with Robin D. G. Kelley, Part 2,” *Rethinking Marxism* 31(2) (2019): 152-172.

⁶⁹ This particular conjuncture has been the topic of considerable scholarly debate—including some rather reductive critics of Indigenous self-determination. Bonita Lawrence and Enakshi Dua, “Decolonizing Anti-Racism,” *Social Justice* 32(4) (2005): 120-143. Nandita Sharma and Cynthia Wright, “Decolonizing Resistance, Challenging Colonial States,” *Social Justice* 35(3) (2008-2009): 120-138. Rita Kaur Dhamoon, “A Feminist Approach to Decolonizing Anti-Racism: Rethinking Transnationalism, Intersectionality, and Settler Colonialism,” *Feral Feminisms* 4 (Summer 2013): 20-37.

Chapter Five Notes:

¹ Among the most striking pieces of evidence that the Canadian state plays an absolutely central role in the maintenance, reproduction, and expansion of the fossil fuel infrastructures are the enormous subsidies provided to the industry. While the exact figure is difficult to pin down—and depends upon whether one's definition of a subsidy includes such things as direct cash transfers, tax cuts, and other incentive programs—there is a general recognition of the fact that it represents both an enormous expenditure of public monies *and* a significant drain on incoming revenues (due to declining royalties and taxation schemes). Some have placed the figure as high as \$18 billion dollars in just fiscal year 2020; this dwarfs, for instance, the entirety of federal government spending on housing and community amenities in the same fiscal year. David Thurton, “Canada spent \$18B on financial supports for the fossil fuel industry last year: report,” CBC News (April 15, 2021), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/fossil-fuel-subsidy-canada-1.5987392> (accessed May 25, 2022). Emily Chung, “How much are taxpayers really subsidizing Canada's fossil fuel industry?” CBC News (March 9, 2022), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/science/fossil-fuel-subsidies-explainer-1.6371411> (accessed May 25, 2022).

² Adam Barker and Russell Myers Ross, “Reoccupation and resurgence: indigenous protest camps in Canada,” in Gavin Brown, et. al, editors. *Protest Camps in International Context: Spaces, Infrastructures and Media of Resistance*, (Bristol: Policy Press, 2018). Jeff Brady, “2 Years After Standing Rock Protests, Tensions Remain But Oil Business Booms,” NPR (November 29, 2018), <https://www.npr.org/2018/11/29/671701019/2-years-after-standing-rock-protests-north-dakota-oil-business-is-booming> (accessed May 25, 2022). Omar Mosleh, “‘They came to destroy and create fear’: Indigenous protester says men attacked Trans Mountain protest camp,” *The Star*, (April 22, 2020), <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2020/04/22/they-came-to-destroy-and-create-fear-indigenous-protester-says-men-attacked-trans-mountain-protest-camp.html> (accessed May 25, 2022). Lisa Polewski, “Protesters arrested at residential development in Caledonia: OPP,” Global News, (August 5, 2020), <https://globalnews.ca/news/7253109/protesters-arrested-caledonia-opp/> (accessed May 25, 2022).

In the absence of further specification, I intend for the terms land/water defender to encompass both the Indigenous people(s) who are leading the defence of their nations’ territories *and* the non-Indigenous comrades who are working in solidarity with them in that struggle. This means that it can include even settlers who are actively engaged in solidarity work.

³ John Borrows, *Freedom and Indigenous Constitutionalism*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 52-55; Warren Magnusson, “Decentering the State, Or Looking for Politics,” in William Carroll, editor, *Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice*, (Toronto: Garamond, 1992), 101; Vicky Osterweil, *In Defense of Looting: A Riotous History of Uncivil Action*, (New York: Bold Type Books, 2020), 1-20.

⁴ Manu Karuka, *Empire’s Tracks: Indigenous nations, Chinese workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2019), 1-2.

Indeed, Karuka’s assessment that the state is a counter-formation is actually shared by that most paradigmatic and foundational theorist of the dominant political theory canon: Thomas Hobbes. In the *Leviathan*, Hobbes’ account of the emergence of a commonwealth or sovereign political authority is premised on the cession of social power and alternative multiplicitous forms of authority to a singular institutional body. The state is thus an expression of an historical bloc of articulated social forces. Whereas Hobbes’ account is ahistorical and laudatory of this consolidation, Karuka’s account of the actual history by which the American state asserted its supposedly singular authority evidences the immense and ongoing violence that is necessary to achieve the claim of sovereignty. Thomas Hobbes,

“Of Commonwealth,” in *Leviathan or The Matter, Forme and Power of a Commonwealth Ecclesiasticall and Civil* (London, 1668).

⁵ Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, xii.

⁶ *ibid.*, 20-37. Manu Karuka, “Black and Native Visions of Self-Determination,” *Critical Ethnic Studies* 3(2) (Fall 2017): 77-98. Soren C. Larsen, and Jay T. Johnson, *Being Together in Place: Indigenous Coexistence in a More than Human World*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).

⁷ What “Indigenous political authorities” means here should not be understood in reductively anthropogenic terms. As numerous Indigenous theorists have argued, the *territories* (which encompasses the land, waters, and more-than-human beings of a place) in and through which Indigenous peoples have emerged in co-constitutive relations produce their own forms of authority which are or ought to be socially determinative. These are sources of law that have been *learned, studied, and taught* by Indigenous theorists in an intergenerational project of developing systems of governance that are themselves responsible *to* the territories in which they are situated, rather than attempting to exert authority *over* them (as in the case of sovereignty claims). Thus, the ‘self’ in ‘Indigenous self-determination’ is always relational, produced and reproduced co-constitutively with others.

John Borrows, “Living between Water and Rocks: First Nations, Environmental Planning and Democracy,” *The University of Toronto Law Journal* 47(4) (Autumn 1997): 417-468. Basil H Johnston, *Honour Earth Mother*, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003). Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, “Land as pedagogy: Nishnaabeg intelligence and rebellious transformation,” *Decolonization* 3(3) (2014): 1-25. Gina Starblanket and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiiik Stark, “Towards a Relational Paradigm—Four Points for Consideration: Knowledge, Gender, Land, and Modernity,” in *Resurgence and Reconciliation: Indigenous-Settler Relations and Earth Teachings*, edited by Michael Asch, John Borrows, and James Tully, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018): 175-208.

⁸ James Tully, *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an age of diversity*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 71-78, 80.

⁹ Umeek (E Richard Atleo), *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth Worldview*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004). John Borrows, *Drawing Out Law: Spirit's Guide*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010). Robin Wall Kimmerer, *Braiding Sweetgrass: Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge, and the Teachings of Plants*, (Minneapolis: Milkweed Editions, 2013). Carwyn Jones, “A Māori Constitutional Tradition,” *New Zealand Journal of Public and International Law* 12(1) (2014). Kayanesenh Paul Williams, *Kayanerenkó:wa: The Great Law of Peace*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2018). Nick Estes, *Our History is the Future: Standing Rock versus the Dakota Access Pipeline, the Long Tradition of Indigenous Resistance*, (London: Verso Books, 2019). Jerry Fontaine, *Our Hearts Are as One Fire: An Ojibway-Anishinabe Vision for the Future*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2020).

¹⁰ See, for example, discussion on this topic in: Scott Richard Lyons, *X-Marks: Native Signatures of Assent*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010). Joanne Barker, ed., *Critically Sovereign: Indigenous Gender, Sexuality, and Feminist Studies*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2017). Gordon Christie, *Canadian Law and Indigenous Self-Determination: A Naturalist Analysis*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019).

¹¹ For discussions of racial capitalism as a cannibalistic economy, grounded in a variety of Indigenous epistemologies see: Jack D Forbes, *Columbus and Other Cannibals: The Wétiko Disease of Exploitation, Imperialism, and Terrorism*, (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2008 [1979]). Boyce Richardson, *Strangers Devour the Land*, (White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing, 1991). Umeek (E Richard Atleo), *Principles of Tsawalk: An Indigenous Approach to Global Crisis*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2012). Winona LaDuke, *To Be a Water Protector: The Rise of the Wiindigo Slayers*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2020).

¹² James Tully, “Foreword: A Canadian Tragedy,” in Sarah Marie Wiebe, *Everyday Exposure: Indigenous Mobilization and Environmental Justice in Canada's Chemical Valley*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2016), xiii.

¹³ Karuka, *Empire's Tracks*, 200.

¹⁴ For examples of the overriding centrality of capitalist ‘development,’ as codified into the jurisprudence on Aboriginal rights and title, see: Supreme Court of Canada, *Delgamuukw v British Columbia* (1997), para 165. Supreme Court of Canada, *Ktunaxa Nation v. British Columbia* (2017).

¹⁵ Martin Lukacs, *The Trudeau Formula: Seduction and Betrayal in an Age of Discontent*, (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 2019), 136.

¹⁶ Justin Trudeau, “Speech to the Calgary Petroleum Club,” Liberal Party of Canada, (October 30, 2013), <https://liberal.ca/liberal-party-canada-leader-justin-trudeaus-speech-calgary-petroleum-club/> (May 25, 2022).

¹⁷ Lukacs, *Trudeau Formula*, 95-101.

¹⁸ Melanie Green, “Meet the self-described ‘sinister seniors’ taking a stand against Trans Mountain — and going to jail for it,” *The Toronto Star* (August 24, 2018), <https://www.thestar.com/vancouver/2018/08/20/meet-the-self-described-sinister-seniors-taking-a-stand-against-trans-mountain-and-going-to-jail-for-it.html> (accessed May 24, 2022). Lauren Boothby, “More than 200 people arrested at pipeline protests in Burnaby,” Burnaby Now (May 30, 2018), <https://www.burnabynow.com/local-news/more-than-200-people-arrested-at-pipeline-protests-in-burnaby-3076245> (May 25, 2022).

In some instances, criminalization has been used in quite targeted ways—echoing the discussion of the security apparatuses’ usage of strategic incapacitation tactics against Indigenous movements from Chapter Three. Will George has himself been the target of a specious criminalization effort, during which he stood trial for the breach of Kinder Morgan’s injunction against demonstrations at their Burnaby Mountain facilities on untreated and occupied səłilwətaʔ territories. Alone amongst a number of defendants George was sentenced to twenty-eight days of imprisonment, a clear example of the state targeting Indigenous leadership within anti-colonial movements. Tsleil-Waututh Nation Sacred Trust, “Tsleil-Waututh Nation Stands with Nation Member Will George Upon His 28-Day Jail Sentence,” (May 11, 2022), <https://twnsacredtrust.ca/tsleil-waututh-nation-stands-with-nation-member-will-george-upon-his-28-day-jail-sentence/> (accessed May 25, 2022).

¹⁹ For another related example see: Stacie Swain, “Cracking the Settler Colonial Concrete: Theorizing Engagements with Indigenous Resurgence Through the Politics from Below,” in *Democratic Multiplicity: Perceiving, Enacting and Integrating Democratic Diversity*, edited by James Tully, et al., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming): 234-258.

²⁰ Secwepemc Women’s Warrior Society and Tiny House Warriors, *Women’s Declaration Against Trans Mountain Man Camps*. Secwepemcul’ecw Assembly, (November 2017), www.secwepemculecw.org (accessed May 25, 2022).

²¹ Crucially, though, recognizing the significance of this document as an example of the perspicacity of movement and grassroots theorizing is *not* the same thing as naively presuming that all of the actual people, groups, or social formations that produced it actually live up to these ideals at every step of the way. As I have suggested throughout this project, the pursuit of purity is the pursuit of an impossible and apolitical object. Instead, it is in precisely this inevitable gap between the world and its denizens in which we find ourselves and the one to which we aspire that the real *work* of political struggle is necessary—work that cannot become trapped in the cul-de-sacs of deference, disposability, or defeatism.

²² Protect the Inlet, “Visit the spiritual resistance to #StopKM at Kwekwecnewtxw,” (2019), <https://web.archive.org/web/20190730151506/https://protecttheinlet.ca/structure/> (accessed May 25, 2022).

²³ Robert Nichols, *Theft is Property! Dispossession and Critical Theory*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2020).

²⁴ Lukas, *Trudeau Formula*, 95-130.

²⁵ *ibid.*, 97.

²⁶ *ibid.*, 96; Catharine Tunney, “Jim Carr says military comments not a threat to pipeline protesters,” CBC News, (December 2, 2016), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/jim-carr-protests-pipeline-military-1.3878258> (accessed May 25, 2022).

²⁷ There has been a steady erosion of business confidence in this project that reaches far beyond just the extractive industries most directly involved. Under enormous pressure from the street-level resistance, shareholder campaigns, lobbying by First Nations, and the general crisis in the fossil fuel sector globally, seventeen insurance agencies have withdrawn their policy coverage of TMX over the past four years. Increasingly, it is state-backing alone that is securing and insuring the project’s survival, with the federal government approving an additional \$10 billion loan guarantee for the project.

Natasha Bulowski, “That makes 17 — another insurer cuts ties with Trans Mountain pipeline,” *The Toronto Star* (April 26, 2022), <https://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2022/04/26/that-makes-17-another-insurer-cuts-ties-with-trans-mountain-pipeline.html> (accessed May 25, 2022). Zi-Ann Lum, “Trudeau Cabinet approves C\$10B loan guarantee for TMX,” *Politico* (May 10, 2022), <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/05/10/trudeau-cabinet-approves-c-10b-loan-guarantee-for-tmx-00031522> (accessed May 25, 2022).

²⁸ Stephanie Ip and Patrick Johnston, “Kinder Morgan halts non-essential work on Trans Mountain pipeline and sets drop-dead deadline,” *Vancouver Sun* (April 9, 2018), <https://vancouver.sun.com/news/local-news/kinder-morgan-to-halt-its-spending-on-trans-mountain-pipeline-due-to-b-c-opposition> (accessed May 25, 2022).

²⁹ “Our History,” Trans Mountain, N.D., <https://www.transmountain.com/history> (accessed May 25, 2022).

Since state takeover of the project there has been a veritable explosion in the projected costs of the project, with some estimates reaching as high as \$21.4 billion needed to see it completed. While this has prompted the federal government to announce in early 2022 that it is turning the funding taps off, it nevertheless asserts that it remains committed to seeing the project completed—as evidenced by its continuing offer of billions in loans guarantees (see *fn27*). Noah Zivitz, “Trans Mountain expansion price tag hits \$21.4B, Feds cut off funding,” *BNN Bloomberg* (February 18, 2022), <https://www.bnnbloomberg.ca/trans-mountain-expansion-price-tag-hits-21-4b-as-construction-drags-on-1.1725621> (accessed May 25, 2022).

³⁰ Shiri Pasternak, Katie Mazer, and DT Cochrane, “The Financing Problem of Colonialism: How Indigenous Jurisdiction is Valued in Pipeline Politics,” in Nick Estes and Jaskiran Dhillon, editors, *Standing with Standing Rock: Voices from the #NODAPL Movement*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2019), 226.

³¹ Supreme Court of British Columbia, *Thomas and Saik’uz First Nation v. Rio Tinto Alcan Inc.* (2022), paras 198-204.

³² Pasternak, Mazer, and Cochrane, “Financing Problem,” 224.

³³ See Court of Appeal for Ontario, *Chippewas of Sarnia Band v. Canada (Attorney General)* (2000); and, for discussion of the case, Deanne Aline Marie LeBlanc, *Identifying the Settler Denizen within Settler Colonialism*, (Unpublished MA Thesis: the University of Victoria, 2014), 24-25.

³⁴ Emphasis original, Reg Whittaker, *A Sovereign Idea: Essays on Canada as a Democratic Community*, (Montréal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1992), 20.

³⁵ Alex V Green, “Canada is fake: What Americans think of as their friendly neighbor to the north, if they think of it at all, is a scam,” *The Outline* (February 19, 2020), <https://theoutline.com/post/8686/canada-is-fake?zd=2&zi=wyagduct> (May 25, 2022).

³⁶ Quotations from this press conference cited over the course of this chapter are all transcribed by the author from CBC’s live coverage, posted on their YouTube channels. CBC News, “Trudeau cabinet approves Trans Mountain pipeline expansion project,” YouTube video (June 18, 2019), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MF0t-hZRhEk> (accessed May 24, 2022). CBC News, “Ministers answer questions on Trans Mountain expansion approval,” YouTube video (June 18, 2019), <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nQjdlNxtPzE&t=5s> (accessed May 24, 2022).

³⁷ Susana Mas, “Trudeau lays out plan for new relationship with indigenous people,” *CBC News*. (December 5, 2015), <https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/justin-trudeau-afn-indigenous-aboriginal-people-1.3354747> (May 25, 2022).

³⁸ James M Griffin, “Petro-Nationalism: The Futile Search for Oil Security,” *The Energy Journal* 36(1) (2015): 25-41. Andreas Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel: On the Danger of Fossil Fascism*, (London: Random House, 2021).

³⁹ Peter H Russell, *Constitutional Odyssey: Can Canadians Become a Sovereign Peoples?* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992). Peter H Russell, *Canada’s Constitutional Odyssey: A Country Based on Incomplete Conquests*, (Toronto: University Press, 2017). Whittaker, *Sovereign Idea*. See also: Jacques Rancière, *Staging the People: The Proletarian and His Double*, (London: Verso Books, 2011).

⁴⁰ Irving Martin Abella, *Nationalism, Communism, and Canadian Labour: The CIO, the Communist Party, and the Canadian Congress of Labour 1935-1956*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973). Kari Levitt, *Silent Surrender: The Multinational Corporation in Canada*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1970). Jason Markusoff,

“The rise of Alberta's unapologetic petro-patriots,” *Maclean's Magazine*, (July 15, 2019), <https://www.macleans.ca/news/canada/the-rise-of-albertas-unapologetic-petro-patriots/> (accessed May 25, 2022).

In many ways, this convergence between left-liberals, social democrats, and fossil capital—especially within provincial legislatures—can be read as a continuity or logical outcome when the sort of left-nationalism discussed at length in Chapter One develops in a fossil fuel-rich jurisdiction. Among the most pressing examples of this convergence is the Alberta New Democratic Party's Rachel Notley and her 2015-2019 government. Far from pursuing the necessary energy transition by breaking with the decades long entrenchment of extractive industry under the Progressive Conservative Party, Notley became an increasingly verbose proponent of the fossil economy over the course of her tenure in office. Trevor W Harrison, “Petroleum, Politics, and the Limits of Left Progressivism in Alberta,” in *Alberta Oil and the Decline of Democracy in Canada*, edited by Meenal Shrivastava and Lorna Stefanick, (Edmonton: Athabasca University Press, 2015): 69-88. Shane Gunster, Darren Fleet, Robert Neubauer, “Challenging Petro-Nationalism: Another Canada Is Possible?” *Journal of Canadian Studies* 55(1) (Winter 2021): 57-87.

⁴¹ Lukacs, *Trudeau Formula*, 11-12.

⁴² Stephen Clarkson, *The Big Red Machine: How the Liberal Party Dominates Canadian Politics*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005).

⁴³ Charlie Smith, “RCMP arrest Unist'ot'en matriarchs during ceremony to honour missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls,” *The Georgia Straight*, (February 10, 2020), <https://www.straight.com/news/1358106/rcmp-arrest-unistoten-matriarchs-during-ceremony-honour-missing-and-murdered-indigenous-tawinikay>, “Reconciliation is Dead: A Strategic Proposal,” *It's Going Down*, (February 15, 2020), <https://itsgoingdown.org/reconciliation-is-dead-a-strategic-proposal/> (May 25, 2022).

At several points throughout this dissertation I have noted that the jurisprudential meaning of reconciliation—which has shaped much of what Aboriginal rights and title actually means in Canadian law today—is at deliberate variance with the common-sensical meaning of reconciliation. As the Supreme Court of Canada makes clear, reconciliation means the reconciling of Indigenous peoples' ‘prior occupancy’ of the territories claimed by Canada with the assertion of Crown sovereignty. Canada's assumption is that its allodial title is always to be treated as supreme, and Aboriginal rights and titles are treated as a derivative and subordinate species of right. See: *Delgamuukw v British Columbia* (1997), para 81.

⁴⁴ Jonathan Kay, “The Rise and (Possible) Fall of Justin Trudeau Show the Perils of Woke Governance,” *Quillette*, (March 7, 2019), <https://quillette.com/2019/03/07/the-rise-and-possible-fall-of-justin-trudeau-show-the-perils-of-woke-governance/> (accessed May 25, 2022). Postmedia Editorial, “Trudeau needs to leave his social justice warrior cape at home,” *Toronto Sun*, (May 22, 2018), <https://torontosun.com/opinion/editorials/editorial-trudeau-needs-to-leave-his-social-justice-warrior-cape-at-home> (accessed May 25, 2022).

⁴⁵ Avi Lewis, “Social Democracy and the Left in Canada: Past, Present, and Future,” in *Party of Conscience: The CCF, The NDP, and Social Democracy in Canada*, edited by Roberta Lexier, Stephanie Bangarth, and Jon Weier, (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2018); Abdul Malik, “Jack Layton is the NDP's third rail,” *Canadian Dimension* (September 1, 2020), https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/jack-layton-is-the-ndps-third-rail?fbclid=IwAR25L3eTOZP1_8mZABHpZ7k-dm_ziU_DOYlweU4OzqYCKi2_OoRfdJL0TUQ; (accessed May 24, 2022).

For broader and more theoretically informed accounts of this tendency, see also: James Naylor, *The Fate of Labour Socialism: The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and the Dream of a Working-Class Future*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016). Ralph Miliband, *Parliamentary Socialism: A Study in the Politics of Labour*, (London: Merlin Press, 1961).

⁴⁶ All quotes drawn from this press conference are transcribed by the author from the recording hosted on Sacred Trust's Facebook livestream. Tsleil-Waututh Nation Sacred Trust, “Live at the Trans Mountain Pipeline Announcement Press Conference,” Facebook (June 18, 2019), <https://www.facebook.com/630937800297791/videos/612471812592081> (May 25, 2022)

⁴⁷ James C. Scott, *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Failed*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).

⁴⁸ William K. Carroll, “Hegemony, Counter-Hegemony, Anti-Hegemony,” Keynote, Society for Socialist Studies, (Toronto: York University, 2006), 20.

⁴⁹ *ibid.*, 21.

⁵⁰ *ibid.*

⁵¹ Emma Battell Lowman and Adam J. Barker, *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2015). Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*, (Springer: New York, 2010). See for comparison: Jaskiran Dhillon, *Prairie Rising: Indigenous Youth, Decolonization, and the Politics of Intervention*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017).

⁵² Christie, *Canadian Law and Indigenous Self-Determination*, 342-383; Arthur Manuel, *Unsettling Canada: A National Wake-Up Call*, (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2015), 107-124. See also: Supreme Court of Canada, *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia* (1997). Supreme Court of Canada, *Reference re Secession of Quebec* (1998).

⁵³ Olufémi O Táiwò, “The Empire has No Clothes,” *Disputatio* 51 (2018): 305-330. See also: James C Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990). Robin DG Kelley, “‘We are not what we seem’: rethinking black working-class opposition in the Jim Crow South,” *Journal of American History* 80(2) (1993): 75-112.

⁵⁴ Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Mask: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2014). Audra Simpson, *Mohawk Interruptus: Political Life Across the Borders of Settler States*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2014). Manuel, *Unsettling Canada*, 2015. Leanne Betasamosake Simpson, *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom Through Radical Resistance*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017). Estes, *Our History*, 2019.

⁵⁵ Simpson, *Always Done*, 247.

⁵⁶ Carroll, “Hegemony,” 2006. Richard Day, *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*, (London: Pluto Press, 2005).

Carroll suggests that “anti-hegemonic” strategies are characterized by a skepticism towards “attempts to construct a general interest, to build unity,” and instead tend to valorize what he calls a “politics of dispersed singularities” (Carroll 30). For Carroll, though, this smacks of a strategy that is shot through with “real elements of contemporary hegemony—postmodern fragmentation, [and] possessive individualism,” which are perversely reified and upheld as a “lifestyle choice” that offers “a taste of anarchism” (Carroll 31). For his part, Day suggests that these strategies, drawing from autonomist theories, offer the necessary space to particularities and distinctions of social location which are all too often papered-over in counter-hegemonic struggles (Day 143-159). The autonomist bent that Day upholds is, in my mind, not up to the challenge of contesting settler imperialism on the necessary scale. Whereas the grassroots struggles highlighted in this chapter are tending towards mass struggle for the purposes of a social revolution, autonomist movements have more often sought to carve out spaces of exception, ‘away’ from empire. While potentially politically educational—as they enable some lived experience of freedom and collective self-determination on radically democratic grounds—they are nevertheless inadequate to overturn the dominant social order. This is because the strategy is premised on withdrawing or excluding oneself and one’s comrades/communities from the dominant social order, rather than in attempting to abolish or overturn it. If this dissertation is interested in what it means to pursue decolonization *in* and *against* settler imperialism, the autonomist tact might be described as striving to be *outside* and *apart* from the social order of settler imperialism.

⁵⁷ On geographic mobility see: Borrows, *Indigenous Constitutionalism*, 19-49. David A. Chang, *The World and All the Things upon It: Native Hawaiian Geographies of Exploration*, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 2016). Susan M Hill, *The Clay We are Made Of: Haudenosaunee Land Tenure on the Grand River*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2017). On cultural mobility see: Paige Raibmon, *Authentic Indians: Episodes of Encounter from the Late-Nineteenth-Century Northwest Coast*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005). Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, (London: ZED Books, 2012). Robert Alexander Innes, *Elder Brother and the Law of the People: Contemporary Kinship and Cowessess First Nation*, (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba, 2013). Lyons, *X-Marks*. Lee Maracle, *Memory Serves: Oratories*, (Edmonton: NeWest Press, 2015).

⁵⁸ Phil Henderson, “Like a Brick Through the Overton Window: Reorienting Our Politics from the House of Commons to the Tiny House,” in *Democratic Multiplicity: Perceiving, Enacting and Integrating Democratic Diversity*, edited by James Tully, et al., (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming): 259-280.

⁵⁹ Jakeet Singh, “Recognition and Self-Determination: Approaches from Above and Below,” in Avigail Eisenberg et al., editors, *Recognition versus Self-Determination: Dilemmas in Emancipatory Politics*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014), 47-74.

⁶⁰ For examples of the de jure subjugation of Indigenous political authority to the sovereignty of both the Canadian and American settler empires, respectively, please see: Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, *St. Catherine’s Milling and Lumber Company vs. The Queen*, (1888); Supreme Court of the United States, *Cherokee Nation vs. Georgia*, (1831).

⁶¹ This reflection was prompted by a deeper engagement with scholarly literatures of history ‘from below,’ in which the main actors are those self-emancipated enslaved peoples, anarchic/hydrarchic pirates, the revolting peasantries—in short, the people who are often considered to be without history, or whose struggles are lost to time in spite of the fact that they are the struggles most meaningful to most people alive today. See my discussion of attempting to move to a Political Science ‘from below’ in Chapter Three for more detail. See also: Peter Linebaugh and Marcus Rediker, *The Many Headed Hydra: The Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*, (London: Verso Books, 2012). Scott Neigh, *Resisting the State: Canadian History through the Stories of Activists*, (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2012).

That said, it was actually the speculative fiction author and anarchist Ursula K Le Guin who convinced me of the error in my initial assessment. In her commencement address to Mills College in 1983, Le Guin made the power of living, struggling, and being ‘from below’ quite palpable, saying at the close: “I hope you live without the need to dominate, and without the need to be dominated. I hope you are never victims, but I hope you have no power over other people. And when you fail, and are defeated, and in pain, and in the dark, then I hope you will remember that darkness is your country, where you live, where no wars are fought and no wars are won, but where the future is. Our roots are in the dark; the earth is our country. Why did we look up for blessing—instead of around, and down? What hope we have lies there. Not in the sky full of orbiting spy-eyes and weaponry, but in the earth we have looked down upon. Not from above, but from below. Not in the light that blinds, but in the dark that nourishes, where human beings grow human souls.” Ursula K Le Guin, “A Left-Handed Commencement Speech,” (Mills College, 1983), <https://www.ursulaklequin.com/left-hand-mills-college> (accessed May 20, 2022).

⁶² Quotes cited to this editorial throughout this chapter can be found here: Times Colonist Editorial, “Effective protests can be difficult. Just look at Saturday’s effort,” *Times Colonist*, (June 25, 2019), <https://www.timescolonist.com/opinion/editorials/editorial-effective-protests-can-be-difficult-just-look-at-saturday-s-effort-1.23866187?fbclid=IwAR2b-74zawQNMJNqJXBsek7oLgssUPAd2g18RIP1cmYIIItVAVX-bkkfgQ> (accessed May 25, 2022).

⁶³ Philip Alston, and UN, Human Rights Council, Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights, “Climate change and poverty: report of the Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights,” Geneva: UN, (July 17, 2019), <https://undocs.org/A/HRC/41/39> (accessed May 25, 2022).

⁶⁴ Among the most remarkable examples of how climate apartheid is developing can be seen in the shifting patterns of the the built environment of the global super-wealthy’s homes. This has included the purchasing of land, islands, and well situated buildings based on projections of water levels and severe weather patterns in a radically warmed climate. Outlets like *Forbes* and *The Guardian* have reported on this phenomenon as part of the bourgeoisie’s efforts to plan for their own survival in ‘doomsday’ scenarios. Somewhat less sensationalist but even more ubiquitous manifestations of the same trend have actually been noted to worsen the effects of climate on those who neighbour the homes of wealthy people. This is particularly associated with the rapidly accelerating phenomenon of the wealthy excavating multi-storey basement complexes beneath their homes, a practice which has been noted to exacerbate flooding in the immediate area. In each case, the built environment is being seized and (re)made to insulate the wealthiest from the consequences of a rapidly changing climate, brought on by the economic regime over which they exert the greatest degree of control and through which they derive their social power.

Jim Dobson, “The Shocking Doomsday Maps Of The World And The Billionaire Escape Plans,” *Forbes* (June 10, 2017), <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jimdobson/2017/06/10/the-shocking-doomsday-maps-of-the-world-and-the-billionaire-escape-plans/?fbclid=IwAR39IXcW0ALY813wqxAYaHb->

[vYLLceQOcy9ZB8REJNMvqZgcvPyO5UfTpk4&sh=372ef8d14047](https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2020/aug/01/3m-price-tag-inside-luxury-doomsday-bunker) (accessed May 25, 2022). Bradley L Garrett, “Weapons rooms, fake windows and a \$3m price tag: inside a luxury doomsday bunker,” *The Guardian* (August 1, 2020), <https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2020/aug/01/3m-price-tag-inside-luxury-doomsday-bunker> (May 25, 2022). Emma Teitel, “Multi-storey underground basements for Toronto’s rich? That’ll only dig us all deeper into our climate change hole,” *The Toronto Star* (October 6, 2021), <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/star-columnists/2021/10/06/multi-storey-underground-basements-for-torontos-rich-thatll-only-dig-us-all-deeper-into-our-climate-change-hole.html> (May 25, 2022).

⁶⁵ Philip Abrams, “Notes on the Difficulty of Studying the State (1977),” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 1(1) (1988): 58-89.

⁶⁶ Harsha Walia, *Border & Rule: Global Migration, Capitalism, and the Rise of Racist Nationalism*, (Chicago: Haymarket Books, 2021).

⁶⁷ Laura Gray, “Trans Mountain 1953: Public Response in Alberta and British Columbia,” (unpublished thesis: the University of Victoria, 2019), 19-21.

⁶⁸ Magnusson, “Decentring the State,” 1992; Scott, *Like a State*, 1998.