The Politics of Indigeneity, Anarchist Praxis, and Decolonization

J. Kēhaulani Kauanui*

At the time of this writing, the global COVID-19 pandemic has devastated the most vulnerable worldwide, while also revealing the challenges of governments and the range of approaches to responding to the crisis. For example, there have been stark contrasts between the ways in which the states of New Zealand, Japan, and Taiwan have managed to contain the spread of this novel coronavirus, unlike England, Brazil, and the United States.

In the U.S., the tensions between federal authority and that of state and local authorities has meant a piecemeal approach to handling public health matters. The mass suffering of countless people has exposed the settler colonial and racialized violence and socio-economic disparities that existed long prior to the outbreak. The Trump administration's gross mishandling of the pandemic: the lack of a coordinated response, combined denial, and downplaying of the virus's lethality – fueled by conspiracy theories that it is a hoax – has compounded the misery. And, as many have noted, Trump is not an aberration, but a manifestation of the American ethos more generally – the product of settler colonial genocide of Indigenous peoples and enslavement of Africans – still unfolding through the ongoing

*J. Kēhaulani Kauanui is Professor of American Studies and affiliate faculty in Anthropology at Wesleyan University, where she teaches courses on indigenous studies, critical race studies, settler colonial studies, and anarchist studies. She is the author of *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Duke University Press 2008) and *Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty: Land, Sex, and the Colonial Politics of State Nationalism* (Duke University Press 2018). She is also the editor of *Speaking of Indigenous Politics: Conversations with Activists, Scholars, and Tribal Leaders* (University of Minnesota Press 2018). Kauanui is one of the six co-founders of the Native American and Indigenous Studies Association (NAISA), established in 2008. She serves on the advisory board for the U.S. Campaign for the Academic and Cultural Boycott of Israel and is currently completing a book provisionally titled "Indigenous Implications: Decolonizing U.S. Palestine Solidarity Activism."

territorial dispossession and attempted elimination of Indigenous peoples and the perpetual devaluation of Black lives through the "afterlife of slavery," - "skewed life chances, limited access to health and education, premature death, incarceration, and impoverishment."[1]

Some theorize that the process of European settlement leading to the founding of the U.S. offers insights into the U.S. government – in all its manifestations, besides the Executive Office – and its fragmented response to the pandemic. For example, David Stasavage suggests that it is "a product of the way our country was first settled by Europeans, often in small communities amidst a vast wilderness where strong central control, either from England or from capitals of the colonies, simply wasn't feasible."[2] He continues, asserting that this "helped pave the way not only for an American tradition of rugged individualism but also for an early form of democracy – for free White males – based on local control with a weak center." Curiously, Stasavage also compares this form of decentralized governance to Indigenous modes prior to colonization. "There was nothing unique or miraculous about the pattern of early democracy in America," he writes. "Prior to European conquest, Native American societies in the woodlands of eastern North America had organized themselves along exactly the same lines…"[3] His attempt to graft a settler colonial development onto pre-colonial Indigenous lifeways is a common discursive practice taken up by white Americans in their attempt to indigenize themselves. And it is these sorts of false equivalencies that tend to be marshalled as a justification for libertarianism, as though it is part of an Indigenous lineage. However, there is an important flip side to the abdication of the federal government's refusal to coordinate any meaningful response to the COVID-19 crisis: many communities – including Indigenous ones – are urgently responding with forms of care that articulate to anarchist praxis, especially that of mutual aid. That is, survival work practiced alongside social movement demands for transformative change.[4]

Indigenous peoples have been hit particularly hard by the global pandemic, with the Navajo Nation – among (too) many others – suffering exorbitantly.[5] As early as May 2020, Navajo Nation surpassed the U.S. states of New York and New Jersey for the highest Co-

vid-19 infection rate per capita.[6] In October 2020, the proportional death toll from COVID-19 at Navajo Nation was higher than any U.S. state.[7] In early December 2020, amid the second wave of the pandemic, Navajo officials recorded a record-high seven-day average of new infections.[8] And by late January 2021, the death toll at Navajo Nation hit over 1,000 deaths.[9] This dire situation is related to structural forces rooted in colonialism. As media reports have highlighted, on the vast reservation (over 27,413 miles), hospitals and medical centers are few and far between, "along with high unemployment, poverty, and approximately one third of the population living without electricity or running water."[10] Moreover, 38% of people live below the poverty line, according to numbers from the 2010 U.S. Census, which is more than double the U.S. poverty rate of 15.1%.[11]

Diné (Navajo) individuals responded throughout, taking matters into their own hands after speculation of tribal government corruption with the way donations were being distributed (or not).[12] In Window Rock, Arizona, which is the location of the Navajo Nation government, Diné affiliated with the K'é Infoshop organized and have been continuously supplying elders, families, and the immunocompromised with food and medical provisions.[13] As detailed by Cecelia Nowell, "In the Navajo Nation, Anarchism Has Indigenous Roots," co-founders Brandon Benallie (Navajo and Hopi) and Radmilla Cody (Navajo and Black) began by setting up a tent outside of the Navajo Nation Museum and eventually moved to a permanent space.[14] Challenging the coercive extractive projects such as the Black Mesa coal mines and uranium mining on Navajo land, wrought by centuries of U.S. colonialism, the co-founders are lifting up traditional Diné principles in their organizing, which they note resonate with anarchist praxis.

On the one hand, Diné communities are engaged in anarchist practices from which settler anarchists could learn even as, on the other, one reason that they come so easily is precisely the fact that non-hierarchical systems of mutual care are already long-established modes of respectful relation in this community (and in many other Indigenous contexts). The name of the collective – K'é – refers to the

Diné kinship system, Bahe (Navajo) explains, and it also refers to an overarching philosophy about the interconnectivity of the entire universe, "these relationships that we have with one another and with the elements that exist in the world, whether that be the weather or the water or the animals."[15] And, Benallie notes, "because we never had chiefs; we didn't have a hierarchy. It was always horizontal."[16] Those with K'é Infoshop also draw connections between how hard the pandemic hit the Navajo and continuous colonial domination, lack of running water and infrastructure, and a difficult history of economic viability, given U.S. policies intended to pulverize the tribal nation. Benallie suggests that Diné kinship began to break down as the tribe tried to negotiate with the U.S. government, guided by business interests that facilitated the signing of oil, gas, and coal leases in the early twentieth century. The extractive nature of the political economy has also made for complicated issues between tribal government and Navajo citizens.[17] In a sense, the ways in which external forces restructured Diné society now resemble broader social conditions for settler society as well, even as Indigenous communities are themselves disproportionately affected by pandemic conditions as well. This historical legacy and the contemporary dynamics at play are why Diné anarchists like Benallie, Cody, and Bahe moved to organize their own efforts for pandemic relief – working outside of both tribal and federal government initiatives (or lack thereof) – which include a community food pantry, broad-based food distribution, and weekly solidarity meals with unsheltered community members. They also connect with related mutual aid projects, including the youth-led Navajo & Hopi Families COVID-19 Relief project.[18] The Navajo case highlights the ways in which practices of Indigenous renewal reverberate with anarchist praxis, all while resisting ongoing settler colonial domination – and in the context of the pandemic, no less.

This special issue of *Anarchist Developments in Cultural Studies* features enduring indigeneity and its challenges to U.S., Canadian, and Bolivian settler colonialism in critical conversation with anarchist politics, showing how settler anarchist practice has a lot to learn from Indigenous anarchist praxis. These conversations are often contentious. For example, while at a 2015 anarchist conference at Haver-

ford College, some audience members audibly balked as I offered a land acknowledgement prior to my presentation. I later learned that these loud obnoxious sighs did not reflect assertions that recognition of the place where we were in session – the homeland of the Lenape people – was relatively meaningless in comparison to "land back" initiatives (#landback). Far from it: the interruptions seemed to be knee-jerk reactions to any reference to what could be construed as territorial claims. In another example, at an anarchist studies conference on exile and enclosure held at Cornell University in 2016, a scholar tried to challenge my use of the term "stolen lands" to describe settler colonial expropriation of Indigenous territory – suggesting the term "stolen" was a misnomer since Indigenous peoples never owned the land in the first place. I pointed out that while Indigenous peoples may have never claimed possession in a Lockean sense, settler projects of land expropriation are not only forms of theft, they are genocidal. From there, the dialogue rapidly devolved into the person who challenged me insisting that "everyone is Indigenous to somewhere," thus attempting to render indigeneity meaningless as a social category.

As crucial context for the discussion of the distinctions between settler anarchist and Indigenous anarchist politics, I'll offer some working definitions of the concept of "indigeneity" and the analytic of "settler colonialism." I will then discuss competing notions of Indigenous sovereignty to ground an examination of how (non-Indigenous) anarchist activism in settler colonial contexts too often falls prey to the reproduction of settler colonial logics and practices (material and discursive), which in turn makes for tensions in solidarity work between (non-Indigenous) anarchist activists and Indigenous communities. Finally, I'll examine a few examples of Indigenous anarchist praxis, to show how they challenge settler colonialism at the root. My introduction closes with brief summaries of the line-up of articles in this special issue – all of which feature Indigenous activism that counters or otherwise contests settler colonial state power and statist forms of governance more generally.

Indigeneity and Settler Colonialism

Settler colonialism is a structure of domination that endures indigeneity, even as it holds out against it. This fact is important for thinking through decolonial anarchism and Indigenous sovereignty. The terms "Indigenous" and "indigeneity" – in relation to people(s) – emerge from colonial history and the settler colonial present, as well as critical responses to these social forces. Some may dismiss assertions of Indigenous identity as essentialist, assuming that claims to "indigeneity" are necessarily grounded in a belief in an underlying and unchanging 'essence.' But for Indigenous peoples, indigeneity is rooted in a distinct relationship to land, not merely being born in a particular place. The *Oxford English Dictionary* traces the etymology of the adjective "indigenous" to late Latin: *indigen-us*, meaning born in a country, native (<indigen-a a native), and defines the term as "born or produced naturally in a land or region; native or belonging naturally to (the soil, region, etc.)," as well as "inborn, innate, native", and "of, relating to, or intended for the native inhabitants."[19] That definition takes the geography of a country for granted. Yet, it can be reductive to use the term to refer to anyone born in a particular place. This emphasis on nativity or birth often leads to the assertion, such as the example mentioned above, that 'everyone is Indigenous to *some* place,' as if people are mobile flora or fauna. This common universalizing, whether intentional or not, can end up erasing the political history of specific Indigenous struggles over land claims. Moreover, it cannot account for the wide range of relations to region and nation on the part of the more than 476 million Indigenous people spread across 90 countries worldwide.[20]

Outside of Native American and Indigenous Studies, a range of academic fields and disciplines – including cultural studies– have privileged the framework of postcolonialism over settler colonialism. Importantly, postcolonial studies as a field is a critical response to the legacies of franchise colonialism and imperialism, one that offers sustained criticism concerning unfinished nationalist liberation movements in the Global South (formerly known as the Third World). Nonetheless, it cannot aptly be applied to the still colonized "Fourth World."[21] Coined in 1974 by George Manuel (Shuswap), the

"Fourth World" names the "Indigenous peoples descended from a country's aboriginal population and who today are completely or partly deprived of the right to their own territories and its riches."[22] This deprivation of Indigenous access to ancestral territories is the hallmark of settler colonial dispossession.

By definition, Indigenous challenges to the state always already entail confronting settler colonial domination. For example, contemporary U.S. federal laws that govern Indigenous peoples continue to be grounded in the doctrine of discovery, which is rooted in 15th century Papal bulls. The 1493 edict by the Pope established Christian dominion and subjugated non-Christian peoples by invalidating aboriginal land tenure in favor of the government whose subjects explored and occupied a territory whose inhabitants were not subjects of a European Christian monarch.[23] U.S. federal Indian law and policy have long been premised on Old Testament narratives of the "chosen people" and the "Promised land," as exemplified in the 1823 Supreme Court ruling *Johnson v. McIntosh*, a landmark decision that held that private citizens could not purchase lands from Indian tribes. The foundations of the court's opinion lay in the "discovery doctrine." Based on this ruling, the U.S. government considers tribal nations mere 'occupants' of their traditional homelands with collective "use rights" based on the court's invention of the concept of "aboriginal title."[24] But it is not just the U.S. government that maintains this legal fiction; *all* Euro-settler nations continue to use the doctrine to rationalize the conquest of Indigenous lands.[25]

In terms of settler colonialism as a social formation and analytic, here I draw on the work of Patrick Wolfe, who theorizes the concept as a model of domination that operates by "the logic of elimination of the native" because land acquisition is its central feature.[26] Drawing on the structural comparisons between the U.S., Australia, and Israel-Palestine, he differentiates settler colonialism from other forms of colonial processes such as franchise colonialism (e.g. the difference between Britain in North America and Britain in India).[27] As Wolfe argues, "Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay — inva-

sion is a structure, not an event." He notes "elimination refers to more than the summary liquidation of Indigenous peoples, though it includes that." As Wolfe explains, because settler colonialism "destroys to replace" it is "inherently eliminatory but not invariably genocidal."[28] Hence, he suggests that "structural genocide" avoids the question of degree and enables an understanding of the relationships between spatial removal (e.g., the "Trail of Tears," which was a series of forced relocations by the U.S. government of Southeastern tribes between 1830 and 1850); mass killings (e.g., the 1890 Wounded Knee Massacre, when the U.S. army killed nearly 300 Lakota); and coercive forms of biocultural assimilation (boarding schools, banning Indigenous languages, etc.).[29] In other words, elimination may entail violent exterminatory campaigns, but there are others ways to 'eliminate the native'.

Wolfe further explains that settler colonialism is a structure due to its "complex social formation and as continuity through time," meaning it is durable. Importantly, though, Wolfe does not claim that settler colonialism is "permanent"; rather, he shows how those who impose, create, and remake settler colonial societies make a bid for permanency. As I have written elsewhere, indigeneity itself is enduring; the operative logic of settler colonialism may be to "eliminate the native," but Indigenous people and peoples exist, resist, and persist.[30]

Settler colonial domination and Indigenous endurance can also be found throughout regions governed by states that were once Spanish colonies.[31] Shannon Speed (Chickasaw) has argued that Latin American states are also settler colonial states, that colonialism did not end with the former Spanish colonies declaring independence.[32] She suggests that some Latin Americanists have not taken up the analytic of settler colonialism because of the ways in which Wolfe's theory makes a firm distinction between land and labor (in relation to Native genocide and Black slavery, in the case of the U.S.). And with regard to the "logic of elimination of the native," Speed further explains that while some scholars have suggested that the distinction between the Anglophone and Hispanophone colonial processes in the Americas has been the assertion that because of racial mixing, Latin America was not characterized by white settlement.[33] However,

as she importantly points out, the argument that "in Latin America racial mixing led to a mixed-race population of Indigenous and Spaniard and that therefore colonizer and Native are genetically entwined and there is no racial separation of the two" is problematic.[34] She argues that the racial ideology of *mestizaje* advanced by *criollo* elites relied on a logic of elimination as they sought to consolidate "national identity in newly 'independent' states characterized by the presence of large and diverse populations who did not identify with the national polity…and who had been dispossessed of their lands."[35]

Indigenous Sovereignty

In an anarchist political milieu, with regard to Indigenous peoples and politics, there are often tensions over the concepts of peoplehood, sovereignty, nationalism and territorial governance. For example, the concept of Indigenous nationhood – common in relation to the U.S. and Canadian nation-states – is too often a sticking point for anarchists who may bristle over abidance to any notion of distinct peoplehood and find the language of Indigenous autonomy – more common in Latin American contexts as an expression of self-determination – more acceptable.[36] Yet for Indigenous peoples the assertion of nationhood is about survival *as peoples*, given the endurance of colonial domination, rather than a bid for state power (or as a form of separatism, patriotism, and xenophobia). Too often, non-Indigenous understandings of Indigenous sovereignty claims denounce them as retrograde ethnic nationalisms or dismiss assertions of indigeneity as a problematic form of identity politics. This fraught terrain begs for decolonial anarchist approaches that challenge settler colonialism in the quest to confront capitalism and statism.

Yet, it is the question of sovereignty perhaps more than any other difference that is a barrier for non-Native anarchists seeking to work more closely with Indigenous activists. Anarchists may take exception to insistence on Indigenous sovereignty, but the points of contention are often confused. Anarchists (who are non-Indigenous) may understand "sovereignty" as always already a form of domination through a state monopoly on the use of violence against its citizens. But Indigenous governance derived from Westphalian models

is not necessarily what Indigenous individuals are referring to when they articulate the concept of sovereignty in settler colonial contexts. Rather, they are often referring to their collective inherent authority to govern and assert their self-determination as polities.

Given its colonial history and baggage, "sovereignty" is undoubtedly a highly contested term, one debated within Indigenous communities as well as the broad field of Native American and Indigenous studies.[37] Some regard sovereignty as an irredeemably Western concept that is always already tied to statist forms of governance. Taiaiake Alfred (Kahnawake Mohawk) – who advances what he terms "anarcho-indigenism" – for example, insists that relying on the concept of sovereignty is a concession to state models.[38] He points to the models of self-governance afforded to Indigenous peoples in both U.S. and Canadian policy, urging instead on the need for the decolonization of Indigenous thinking about governance. And yet, that is precisely what many Indigenous people(s) mean by "sovereignty" in the first place – a point that demands an understanding of the contrast. Moreover, it should be noted that this form of settler colonial recognition and exercise of tribal sovereignty has been important for Native Nations to prevent further erosion of the limited land bases settler colonial governments have relegated Indigenous peoples to; off-reservation treaty access for hunting, fishing, gathering, and ceremonial rights; as well as cultural practices tied to specific places (e.g., sacred sites).

Speaking to the broader hemispheric context, it should be noted that Indigenous peoples' struggles with Latin American settler colonial states are not typically articulated through the framework of sovereignty. Rather, the language of autonomy, autogestión (self-management) and other forms of mobilization that de-center the state are most often utilized. Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera & Govand Khalid Azeez explain that the initial wave of Indigenous mobilization in Latin America in the 1970s and 1980s was driven by the framework of a "politics of recognition" – including its language of "rights" and self-governance without statist arrangements. But movements in the region today have since shifted to modes of what they term "revindicative autonomism" to reclaim a precolonial "sovereignty" of

sorts.[39] They point to the case study of Coordinadora Arauco Malleco, a major player in the "New Arauco War" in south-central Chile set on the complete recovery and reconstruction of Wallmapu (the ancestral territory of the Mapuche people and nation, located in southern Chile and Argentina).[40] In another example, Gaitán-Barrera and Azeez examine the Council of Miskitu Elders of the Communitarian Nation Mosquitia in Nicaragua, which has been described as "the epitome of denominated revindicative autonomism."[41] The movement focuses on its territorial component while rejecting the Western nation-state model of governance.

Of course, some forms of Indigenous government can also be read as inherently hierarchical. This reality may cause tensions between anarchist values such as reciprocity, respect, dialogism and flexibility of authority: these may exist simultaneously with seemingly ossified forms of domination and class oppression. However, in countless Indigenous contexts, these forms of governance are structured in ways meant to be consistently re-invigorated, negotiated, and challenged through ceremony – rather than as the static modes of hierarchy often wrought by colonial interventions.[42]

In their delineation of connections and encounters between anarchist and Indigenous thought Kahala Johnson (Kanaka Maoli) and Kathy E. Ferguson focus on the themes of temporality, states, law, and sovereignty. They discuss how (non-Indigenous) anarchists typically resist the language of sovereignty, "seeing it as irrevocably married to hierarchies and states."[43] Thus, such anarchists may find it alarming when Indigenous activists claim sovereignty for their communities. However, as they point out, anarchists address elements of sovereignty when dealing with questions of authority, decision making, and identity – while considering sovereignty as a formation or approach that protects the authority of states, owners of property, and patriarchy.[44] In turn, Johnson and Ferguson suggest that encounters with Indigenous struggles for sovereignty can enable anarchists to "rethink sovereignty as a plural and contested set of possibilities rather than always and only an alibi for the state."[45] Moreover, they identify some of the ways in which approaches to liberatory life ways resonate between the two, especially with regard to an emphasis on

autonomous communities, integral living, and prefigurative politics. Johnson and Ferguson take care in bringing the two together in relational terms: "Our aim is not to reduce Indigenous sovereignty to anarchist communities, nor to 'indigenise' anarchism to defend it in decolonisation struggles. More modestly, we are exploring points of contact in which meaningful and contentious conversations could emerge through the development of resonant relationships."[46] Keeping these distinctions in mind, I suggest that anarchist projects in settler colonial contexts that claim (or aim) to be decolonial necessarily entail engaging with Indigenous sovereignty.

Challenging Settler Colonial Anarchism

Perhaps not coincidentally, the majority of the few scholarly works bringing anarchist and Indigenous activism into conversation focus on the often fraught (or otherwise complicated) nature of solidarity politics across social differences between (non-Indigenous) anarchists and Indigenous activists.[47] Adam J. Barker and Jenny Pickerill examine how many anarchists have faced difficulties engaging in Indigenous solidarity "through unintentional (often unwitting) transgressions and appropriations."[48] They suggest that Indigenous activists and "anarchist Settler people" struggle to find common ground, but that settler colonial relations make for a complicated power dynamic. In turn, they suggest that deeper understandings by non-Indigenous anarchists of Indigenous peoples' theories and articulations of place-based relationships are critical to approaching solidarity work "in place and with respect."[49] The challenge, then, is how to engage in radical political work without reproducing settler colonial logics and practices.

A prime example of an anarchist political initiative that ended up reproducing settler colonial logics and practices can be found in the Occupy Wall Street (OWS) movement.[50] Widely understood as an anarchist project, at least in origin, it was emblematic of how globalization can influence activist developments across nation-state borders and entire geopolitical regions. Occupy further centered the call to "reclaim" the commons in demanding the return of that which was stolen through "the corrosive power of major banks and

multinational corporations over the democratic process."[51] And, while many of the on-the-ground practices at various Occupy locales relied on non-binding consensus-based collective decisions and direct actions, the rallying was to "occupy" and "reclaim" with little to no recognition of the history of settler colonial land expropriation that gave rise to the corporate plutocracy of the 1%. But what of a demographic that might be called 'the other one-percent' – Native Americans? Those Indigenous to what is known as lower Manhattan include the Manahatin, Lenape, and Munsee peoples, according to their respective histories.[52]

From the very start of OWS, Indigenous individuals pointed out how offensive the articulation of "occupy" claims were on two levels: to assert people "take back Wall Street" and "occupy" erased the actual legacy of colonial occupation of Indigenous peoples' lands, and the fact that Wall Street itself is built on dispossession. In fact, as Joanne Barker (Lenape) delineates, in the mid-1600s, the Dutch built the wall that used to stand on the site of "Wall Street," giving it its name.[53] They did so not only to keep out the English, but also to block Indigenous peoples from their own territory.[54] In other words, the "Wall Street" that is a gloss for the global-finance industry[55] arose from a history of the corporations formed during the early Dutch and English colonial periods consolidating Indigenous homelands as stolen property – dispossession furthered by U.S. settler colonialism that continued unabated. Activists who were part of OWS across the U.S. overwhelmingly treated the Indigenous critique of the use of the term "occupy" as though it was merely a bid for political correctness in response to some imperfect nomenclature.[56]

Several scholar-activists have produced sustained critiques of OWS that have bearing for this discussion as well. Adam J. Barker interrogates tactical occupations, noting how "the concerns of Indigenous peoples remain unaddressed; legacies of historical colonization and the dynamics of contemporary settler colonialism are powerfully entrenched." He contrasts how OWS, for example, sought to claim the spaces created by state power and corporate wealth, and spaces of urban poverty – whereas Indigenous occupations "seek to reclaim and reassert relationships to land and place submerged

beneath the settler colonial world."[57] Moreover, "the nationalistic, racialized content of Occupy movements in North America does not just leave Indigenous peoples out; it situates Occupy within a settler colonial dynamic, participating in the transfer of land and power to the hands of the settler colonial majority."[58] This, then, begs the question, what makes it different from any other settler occupation? Sandy Grande also critically examines the movement and its elision of Indigenous peoples in the deployment of the discursive trope and strategy of "occupation" as its central organizing principle. As she argues, "OWS reconstitutes (territorial) appropriation as the democratic manifest and fails to propose something distinct from or counter to the settler state. In so doing, the movement dissolves colonialism into capitalism by courting a limited and precarious equality predicated on (or more pointedly in exchange for) the 'elimination of the Native,'" thereby reproducing settler hegemony.[59] Adam Gary Lewis's critique of the Occupy movement challenges anarchist projects that occur on stolen Indigenous lands to integrate analysis of historical and contemporary colonization into their theory and practice and begin to explore what decolonizing relationships to land might look like. He suggests that the movement "shows the danger of experiments in alternative futures that risk reinscribing structures of settler colonialism if their underlying context on Indigenous land is not challenged." Lewis urges anarchists to look towards Indigenous theory and action that aims to construct prefigurative futures outside the state and capitalism as a necessary reference point that all radical projects need to defer to explicitly, in order to foster direct relational accountability to Indigenous laws and lifeways.[60] In *Unsettling the Commons*, Craig Fortier addresses the issue of anti-authoritarian organizers and the struggle for "the commons" within a range of settler colonial contexts. Fortier also interrogates the debate that took place within Occupy camps regarding what it means to claim "the commons" on stolen land, and urges that activists take up a political practice of "unsettling" by recognizing the incommensurability of political goals that claim access to space/territory on stolen land.[61]

Certainly few, if any, (non-Indigenous) anarchists involved in Occupy did not account for Indigenous sovereignty or settler colonialism in relation to the abuse of power by major banks and multinational

corporations, but the obvious should also be noted: not all those involved in the movement were anarchist. In other words, the problem cannot be fully attributed to anarchist oversight; rather, it is indicative of the normalization of settler colonialism that is endemic to society at large. Additionally, in cities across both the U.S. and Canada, some activists did intervene or otherwise reckon with the assumptions of the concept and practice of "occupy," acknowledging and in some cases asserting Indigenous sovereignty and decolonization as central to critically challenging the State-capitalist nexus. In the U.S. context, some cities rejected the "Occupy" logo, opting for alternative ways of framing the struggle. For example, in Oakland – after long engagement with some contention – the name was changed to "Decolonize Oakland," and in Honolulu there was "Deoccupy Honolulu," speaking to the Hawaiian struggle calling for the U.S. government to end its illegal occupation of Hawai'i. In Seattle, anarchists, the People of Color caucus, and others called for a new name, "Decolonize/Occupy Seattle" and passed a "decolonize" resolution in the General Assembly noting: "It ['Decolonize/Occupy Seattle'] emphasizes this is stolen native land, we're not trying to continue that colonial occupation, we're trying to end it."[62] In the Canadian context, this was the case in both Victoria and Vancouver. For example, Allan Antliff recounts that anarchists in Victoria "invited an Indigenous activist to speak about Indigenous sovereignty and decolonization at the first 'Occupy' inspired meetings in fall 2011 and initiated a conversation at the General Assembly that ended with the adoption of a new name – 'The People's Assembly of Victoria' – and the pointed rejection of the 'Occupy' label as colonialist."[63] He also relates that "a small group of conspiracy types broke off and tried to perpetuate 'Occupy Victoria' with no results – their efforts quickly dissipated into farce."[64] And, in Vancouver, anarchists immediately introduced Indigenous sovereignty and decolonization as foundational platforms of that city's "Occupy Together" movement.[65] Although these examples provide models for engagement, they tended to be more the exception than the rule.

If the quest to expropriate land as territory is the irreducible element in settler colonial political projects, then what does that mean when it comes to anarchists and other sorts of territorial practices? Carrie

Mott details the ways in which interpersonal conflict can pose a serious threat to Indigenous solidarity activism looking at a case study in southern Arizona along the U.S.-Mexico border between members of the Tohono O'odham Nation and non-Native anarchist activists (mostly white activists based in Tucson), whom she terms "settler activists."[66] She argues that "conflicts are often born of the challenges accompanying differentials in social privilege due to differences in race and ethnicity relative to white supremacist settler colonialism." As Mott shows, even when Non-Native activists are "aware of the ways white supremacist settler colonial society privileges particular identities while marginalizing others," such privileging is loaded with powerful emotions and histories that non-Native solidarity activists may not fully comprehend, especially the dense layers of trauma these processes evoke for Indigenous individuals. In another example, Adam Gary Lewis, looking at resistance efforts at Standing Rock against the Dakota Access Pipeline, examines struggles for Indigenous autonomy and decolonization to consider how anarchist can take an anti-colonial position beyond declaring one's opposition to colonialism.[67] He offers a take on how anarchists based in lands claimed by the U.S. and Canada can work for radical futures, given the context of both the ongoing structures of settler colonialism as well as Indigenous resurgence inextricably bound to relationships to land. In thinking through ways in which (non-Native) radical activists can engage in political resistance without recreating a settler colonial dynamic, he refers to the case of Standing Rock, where people deferred explicitly to the Great Sioux Nation whose land participants were on. But, beyond high profile campaigns and stand-offs that need and deserve support of all forms (funds, physical presence, solidarity actions, etc.), anarchist could be attentive to more localized struggles, the places where they are positioned. In other words, Lewis urges anarchist comrades to work with Indigenous peoples and communities already "engaged in resistance to capitalism, colonialism and the state, and who are reimagining and reinvigorating community-based resurgence connected to land."[68]

The challenge is how to engage in social experimentation and radical process without reproducing settler colonial violence (not just avoiding the logics, but countering the practices of elimination that target

Natives). Defying the logic of elimination means more than just an empty gesture of land acknowledgment; it can and should mean ending settler colonization. This also begs a series of questions as to what decolonization looks like in settler colonial contexts, where land is central to the struggle.

Indigenous anarchist praxis

As noted earlier, in 2005, Alfred coined the concept of "anarcho-indigenism," defining it as a commitment to Indigenous self-determination with an anarchist orientation.[69] That same year, an anarchist activist by the name "Aragorn!" wrote a piece titled, "Locating an Indigenous Anarchism," for *Green Anarchy*, an eco-anarchist, mostly anarcho-primitivist magazine.[70] He lays out what he sees as "first principles" for an Indigenous anarchism: everything is alive, the ascendance of memory, primacy on place as a politics of location, and relationality in a web of kinship. In presenting pan-Indigenous values as anarchist values, Aragorn! asks why there are not more Native people interested in anarchism, suggesting that part of the answer is that "anarchism is part of a European tradition so far outside of the mainstream that it isn't generally interesting (or accessible) to non-Westerners," and because many (if not most) "anarchists hold that race doesn't matter; that it is, at best, a tool used to divide" and fragment.[71] In response, Aragorn! suggests that abiding by the principles of self-determination and radical decentralization are important – along with three core principles within anarchism: direct action, mutual aid, and voluntary cooperation – to understand and respect "the fact that real living and breathing people do identify within racial and cultural categories and that this identification has consequences in terms of dealing with one another." He further points to the reality that some Indigenous people may not want to cohabitate with non-Native individuals as a direct result of "the creation of social norms and cultures that they would not feel comfortable in, in a truly decentralized social environment."[72] Aragorn! does not mention this discomfort could be a consequence of settler colonialism.[73] Nonetheless, in the end, he urges non-Native anarchists to cultivate Indigenous values and reshape their political standards.

In their study of how anarchists have drawn on anthropological materials for the purpose of advancing the anarchist cause, Andrew Robinson and Simon Tormey reference arguments developed in the journal *Green Anarchy* (2000-2009). As they note, "Indigenous issues figured prominently from a perspective which emphasized Indigenous peoples' ecological and anti-systemic claims alongside critiques of industrial civilization."[74] And while the coverage tended to refer to Indigenous peoples as 'pre-modern', and in ways that might romanticize Indigenous pasts, their point is that *Green Anarchy* is a prime example of anarchists "looking for evidence of alternative social logics and alternative ways of being in the world from the Western liberal frame."[75]

Johnson and Ferguson avoid the common default of suggesting either "'Indigenous people are really anarchists, after all' or 'anarchists are not really settlers, after all'," so as not to conflate or collapse the two.[76] Identifying several commonalities – including how anarchism and Indigenous politics both enact and embody their goals while resisting incorporation into hegemonic arrangements – they also point out that "state time" and "settler time" bracket anarchism and indigeneity as "untimely," yet in distinct ways.[77] As they put it, "Indigenous thinkers are discounted in hegemonic time as hopelessly nostalgic for a pristine but lost past, while anarchists are dismissed as hopelessly optimistic for a perfect but impossible future"[78]: yet, both refuse to be "temporal anomalies."[79] Of course, here Johnson and Ferguson are speaking to a long line of colonial discourses about Indigenous peoples as frozen in the past (an "authentic Native" can never be modern) [80] while anarchists are framed as too future-oriented and therefore not 'practical' enough in the present.

In anarchist contexts, when one mentions Indigenous peoples, one of the most common points of reference is the Zapatistas.[81] As many in anarchist (and other leftist) political milieus know, the Army of National Liberation – Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional (EZLN) – went public on January 1, 1994, releasing the First Declaration and Revolutionary Laws from the Lacandon jungle on the same day the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) came into effect. This effectively amounted to an EZLN declaration

of war on the Mexican government, which the Zapatistas considered illegitimate. They opted for armed struggle as part of their rebellion due to the lack of results that had been achieved through peaceful means of protest, and to defend themselves against the violence of the Mexican state. They formed the Caracoles structure of Zapatista governance, a popular assembly of several hundred families self-governing through consensus-based decision-making.[82] By 2019, the Zapatistas' autonomous zones were comprised of five regions, and they announced that they would extend their control with eleven more autonomous zones in Chiapas.[83] As a result, the EZLN controls a substantial amount of territory in Chiapas, adjacent to Oaxaca, the southernmost state of Mexico. The Zapatistas describe themselves as a decentralized organization that has no leader since political decisions are deliberated and decided in village assemblies that operate within over thirty rebel municipalities per zone (with anywhere from fifty to one-hundred communities, at least half a million people, engaging in a system of direct democracy).[84] Although the Zapatistas make no claim to be anarchists, their mode of self-governance and success at creating a functioning alternative society resemble earlier examples of anarchist-syndicalism in action, particularly in Spain.[85] Still, there are elements that some anarchists take exception to at play in these autonomous zones, including the role of liberation theology, Marxist underpinnings, and military hierarchy.

Non-Indigenous anarchists may cite the Zapatista struggle as 'cred' to claim they know Indigenous movements – yet these same anarchists may be less likely to engage in meaningful solidarity with Indigenous struggles closer to home in the U.S. and Canada, partly because these may not have the romantic allure of armed autonomist struggles. One example of a non-violent North American Indigenous movement that challenges state power through horizontal organizing centering Indigenous sovereignty is Idle No More (INM). Three First Nations women – Nina Wilson, Jessica Gordon, and Sylvia McAdam – and one non-Native ally, Sheelah McLean, founded INM in November 2012, calling for "refounded nation-to-nation relations based on mutual respect."[86] Although not explicitly anarchist, INM is a grassroots movement rather than a political organization, and it is comprised of members of First Nations, Métis and Inuit

peoples and their non-Aboriginal supporters in Canada. Most active throughout 2013, but still active, INM was a response to Canadian legislative abuses of Indigenous treaty rights and the dismantling of environmental protection laws by then-Prime Minister Stephen Harper and the Conservative federal government. With the savvy use of social media, INM rapidly grew into an inclusive, continent-wide network of urban and rural Indigenous activists working with non-Indigenous allies to build a movement for Indigenous rights and the protection of land, water, and sky.[87] As the vision statement articulates: "Idle No More calls on all people to join in a peaceful revolution which honours and fulfills Indigenous sovereignty and which protects the land, the water, and the sky. Colonization continues through attacks to Indigenous rights and damage and harm to all our relations. We must repair these violations, live the spirit and intent of the treaty relationship, work towards justice in action, and protect Mother Earth."[88] INM actions have been diverse, including round dances in public places such as shopping malls and outside of prisons – as well as blockades of rail lines to halt 'business as usual.' Adopting a range of actions, INM protests are intent on protesting the Canadian government's abuse of state power through ongoing settler colonial violence perpetrated against Indigenous peoples. Adam J Barker notes that Idle No More represents a renewed assertion of Indigenous sovereignty in opposition to settler colonization, one that was largely misunderstood in the broader Canadian political context because of its 'lack' of a center. As a horizontal, leaderless movement, INM "can tell us a lot about Indigenous activism, conservative politics, leftist resistance, and persistent settler colonialism in Canada."[89] Still, it is important to note that there are critiques of Idle No More from an anarchist Indigenous perspective – namely that it was not exactly all grassroots. For example, Zig Zag (aka Gord Hill) notes that "Indian Act chiefs and band councils, the Assembly of First Nations and its regional branches, Aboriginal service organizations, and organizations such as the Confederacy of Treaty 6 Chiefs, all contributed to the mobilization. . . None of these entities can be considered grassroots as they all receive funding and support from the colonial state." He also has challenged what he saw as the "imposition of pacifist doctrine," and the mandate for peaceful protest.[90]

A more recent development is the online resource, Indigenous Anarchist Federation (Federación Anarquista Indígena) (IAF-FAI). The platform "works to unite the unique anarchist struggle of Indigenous people in North America. It is a platform to share Indigenous anarchist ideas, struggles, philosophies, and challenges."[91] IAF-FAI contends that Indigenous peoples have been practicing anarchism long before Europeans, which is one of the issues that often arises when bringing indigeneity and anarchism into the same frame – finding points of connectivity and mutual legibility. However, it should go without saying that just because Indigenous peoples (with few exceptions) had stateless societies does not mean that one can generalize about their modes of governance when it comes to social hierarchies and authority. In any case, IAF-FAI notes that today, anarchism "is dominated by Euro-centric ideas about relations, culture, and spirituality," despite there being other models that emerge from Indigenous lifeways.[92] IAF-FAI explain that anarchists "in the so-called U.S. and Canada are predominantly white," and that this reality profoundly shapes their anarchism. In contrast, IAF-FAI suggests that that is not the case with anarchism in Latin America, which has been shaped beyond its European origins by the contributions and struggles of Indigenous anarchists. As a result, the IAF-FAI insists: "Anarchism in the Americas must reflect the Indigenous peoples' traditions that were displaced by the forces of colonialism, forced-religious conversion, militarism, and capitalism. We must be able to articulate an Anarchism that both speaks to the material realities of our relatives both living on the rez[93] and in diaspora, all while maintaining the diverse perspectives of our peoples' various cultures."[94]

Indigenous revitalization, then, can open different pathways for reconnecting with traditional water and land-based practices that contribute to resurgence's turning away from the state in ways that are generative, offering rich examples of what anarchists refer to as "prefigurative politics" – that is, "creating a new society within the shell of the old."

Summaries

The case studies presented here reflect initiatives and struggles vis-à-

vis state power imposed by the governments and hegemonic societies of the U.S., Canada, and Bolivia.[94] Herein, readers will encounter contributions that draw on and/or speak to the field of cultural studies, as well as settler colonial studies, anarchist studies, and Native American and Indigenous Studies. The contributors speak to themes of resistance while moving beyond the state – featuring generative projects that offer alternatives modes of liberation through decolonial anarchist praxis.

For non-Indigenous anarchists, and for those who are Indigenous but residing outside of their traditional homelands, the political and ethical challenge is to account for our respective relationships with the Indigenous people(s) on whose land we dwell and mobilize politically. In "Land and Liberty: Settler Acknowledgement in Anarchist Pedagogies of Place," Theresa Warburton opens up a broad and critical conversation about how anarchists in the U.S. have failed to reckon with settler colonialism. Highlighting the ways in which structures of settlement have been expressed in distinctly anarchist terms that obscure settler colonialism, "not through a *denial* of it but through its *acknowledgement*," she theorizes "settler anarchism," which she defines as a form of anarchist praxis that reformulates the structure of settlement using anarchist logics.[96] Moreover, she demonstrates how settler anarchism limits the ability to effectively confront the centrality of violence endemic to the structures of capitalism and the state. Moving beyond a critique of how many anarchists have not adequately dealt with the question of settlement – how they "have picked up and reproduced some of these tropes in our own spaces, since their origins are both deeply engrained and purposefully obstructed—much like settlement itself"[97] – Warburton proposes ways in which anarchist activists can be more attentive in challenging settler colonial domination through "land pedagogy" that leads to ethical accountability to Indigenous peoples. In conclusion, she reflects on how settler anarchists might draw on the work of Indigenous storytellers, activists, and intellectuals to reorient their own social locations with regard to place and politics – and as a result, better confront the structures of power. Her contribution goes beyond an abstract or merely theretical offering; as she puts it, her intervention is grounded in the ethics of "how we choose to live the

politics we espouse."[98]

Turning to new forms of Indigenous diplomacies and relational responsibilities in the context of Indigenous nationhood in "Life Beyond the State: Regenerating Indigenous International Relations and Everyday Challenges to Settler Colonialism," Jeff Corntassel (Cherokee) opens with resistance against a "natural" (fracked) gas pipeline being built by Coastal Gaslink Limited across the lands of the Wet'suwet'en peoples. After the Royal Canadian Mounted Police raided Unist'ot'en Camp checkpoints (the Unist'ot'en are a 'house' in the Gilseyhu clan, one of five clans making up the Wet'suwet'en Nation), Hereditary Chiefs of the Wet'suwet'en Nation proclaimed, "Reconciliation is Dead," exposing the raid as indicative of the lack of government accountability following the 2015 report issued by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) of Canada (and the Canadian government's abdication in not following up with any comprehensive federal plan or policies to implement the TRC's 'calls to action').[99] Corntassel launches his essay with this case study to highlight the ways in which Indigenous peoples subject to Canadian domination are exercising self-determination and protection of their lands and waters through direct action and a politics of resurgence by de-centering the state and its attendant heteropatriarchial institutions. He delves into three other examples to show how Indigenous peoples are practicing international relations to create new forms of solidarity – both across colonial borders and with and among other Indigenous peoples – without formal state involvement. These include: the 2015 Indigenous Women of the Americas Defenders of Mother Earth Treaty Compact; the 2015 Haida and Heiltsuk Treaty of Peace, Respect and Responsibility; and the 2020 Tyendinaga Mohawk blockade of the Via Rail in solidarity with the Wet'suwet'en. As he argues, this "turning away from the state is not just a literal positioning – it's just as much about the de-centering of state authority in everyday life as well as remembering and re-imagining life beyond the state based on honoring relational responsibilities."[100] As Corntassel shows, these modes of prioritizing the varied Indigenous relationships to land, community and culture also expose the illegitimacy of the state's authority.

Also included is an interview-style discussion, "Indigeneity, Sovereignty, Anarchy: a dialog with many voices," between author, carver, graphic artist, and anarchist sovereigntist Gord Hill (Kwakwaka'wakw) and anarchist activist Allan Antliff, co-founder of Wet'suwet'en Solidarity Victoria, the Victoria Anarchist Bookfair, and Camas Books and Info Shop. The two reflect on the impact of Indigenous knowledge and activism on the broader anarchist movement in 'Canada,' including non-Indigenous involvement in Indigenous struggles, from the 1980s to the present. They also examine a selective historical archive, highlighting Indigenous thought as it relates to anarchist principles and key individuals who have weighed in on the relationship between anarchy and indigeneity.

Turning to the Andes in "Anarchisms Otherwise: The Pedagogy of Anarco-Feminist Indigenous Critique," Macarena Gómez-Barris focuses on Indigenous and mestizo women laborers and social movement leaders in Bolivia dating from the Spanish colonial period into modernity. She opens with the crisis of rising rates of femicide throughout the Américas and how Indigenous and mestizo anarchist feminists are challenging the structures of gender and sexual violence in intimate settings as they are linked to authoritarian culture more broadly, in this case within the context of crushing neoliberalism. Pushing on the relationship between anarchism and feminism as a response, she shows how we can re-envision anarchism in order to stymie "the project of intimate, state, and corporate violence that depends upon the extraction of the female / sexed body for its expansion."[101] Drawing on a range of theories from U.S. Native Feminisms, Black feminisms and women of color feminism, as well as anarcho-Indigenous feminisms, she offers a case study of Mujeres Creando Comunidad (Women Creating Community), founded by Julieta Paredes, Maria Galindo and Monica Mendoza in 1985 – during the "transition to democracy" period in Bolivia. Connecting the onset of neoliberal privatization to the coercive power of intimidation and violence, the group offers a compelling example of political "practices of refusal" that characterize anarchist, feminist, Indigenous activisms. Gómez-Barris theorizes what she terms "anarchisms otherwise," which she defines as "modes of relationality that step across the masculine archive of anarchistic activity towards experi-

ential, embodied, and phenomenological modes of organizing below and against the activities of the state."[102] Importantly, though, as she shows, these modes go beyond denouncing colonial modes of governance and authority: they also offer decolonial ways of "reimagining and generating new worlds outside of the intimate, public, and state logics of coercion."[103]

Mary Tuti Baker (Kanaka Maoli) turns to mutual aid and community empowerment in her essay, "Gardens of Political Transformation: Hawaiian Indigenism and Anarchism Embodied." She explores the Indigenous Hawaiian concept of Aloha ʻĀina (love and stewardship of the land) through the case study of Hoʻoulu ʻĀina, a garden-farm operating under the auspices of Kokua Kalihi Valley Comprehensive Family Services, a non-profit based in a 'high needs' community in Honolulu. Baker argues Indigenous anarchist ideologies are important social structures that help to strengthen bonds between Indigenous and non-Indigenous social justice movements. She situates her claim by first addressing her positionality as a Kanaka Maoli (Native Hawaiian) researcher and focusing on place-based research grounded in gender decolonization that is often part of restoring Indigenous relationships to land. She examines four arenas of praxis that demonstrate the articulation of indigenism and anarchism within a Kanaka Maoli model for healthcare in Hawai'i. Baker offers an example of how people can work within existing structures that might look like run-of-the-mill social services, cultivating a space for land renewal projects and land-based pedagogy. These social practices are grounded in Hawaiian cultural frameworks that are inclusive – where everyone who participates can find a place of belonging, regardless of whether they are Indigenous or not – and contribute to the principle of mutual aid and community care, as well as possibilities for healing trauma. Moving beyond critiques of Western liberal democracies, Baker also shows the way that the Indigenous Hawaiian ideology of Aloha ʻĀina offers the potential to create conditions for radical social transformation, which may also bolster organized resistance, resurgence, and (non-statist) Indigenous nation-building.[104]

As these contributions show, critical attention to Indigenous peoples,

land, and sovereignty is not about romanticization (as some might caution in a cynical way) or harkening to some unsullied precolonial era. Rather, the works here delve into what forms of decolonization are possible in settler colonial contexts.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express warm and appreciative thanks to Rana Barakat, Lana Tatour, and Joseph Weiss for their willingness to read earlier versions of this introduction and offer critical feedback. Any errors that may remain are my sole responsibility. Mahalo nui loa to the contributors – Theresa Warburton, Jeff Corntassel, Macarena Gómez-Barris, Mary Tuti Baker, Gord Hill and Allan Antliff – for their brilliant thought-provoking work (and to Warburton, Corntassel, Gómez-Barris, and Baker for reading this introduction in draft form). I also want to extend my gratitude to Debra Yepa-Pappan for generously allowing her stunning visual art piece "Corn Maiden" to appear on the cover. Additional thanks also go to Warburton for extra support along the way, and to Allan Antliff (editor-in-chief of the journal), as we brought the project to fruition.

Notes

[1]Saidiya Hartman theorizes the "afterlife of slavery." Saidiya Hartman. 2006. *Lose Your Mother: A Journey Along the Atlantic Slave Route*, New York: Macmillan, 6.

[2] David Stasavage. 2020. "Covid-19 has exposed the weakness of America's federal government," *CNN*, July 1, https://www.cnn.com/2020/07/01/opinions/covid-19-america-federal-government-stasavage/index.html. Accessed October 2, 2020.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Dean Spade. 2020. *Mutual Aid: Building Solidarity During This Crisis (and the Next)*, London and New York City: Verso Press.

[5] Deidre McPhillips. 2020. "COVID-19's Tragic Effect on American Indians: A State-by-State Analysis," *U.S. News and World Report*, October 7, https://www.usnews.com/news/healthiest-communities/articles/2020-10-07/a-state-by-state-analysis-of-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-native-americans; Accessed October 7, 2020. Anya Zoledziowski. 2020. "Governments Worldwide Are Failing Indigenous Peoples During the Pandemic," July 14, https://www.vice.com/en/article/y3znqb/governments-worldwide-are-failing-indigenous-peoples-during-the-covid-pandemic. Accessed July 15, 2020.

[6] Hollie Silverman, Konstantin Toropin, Sara Sidner and Leslie Perrot. 2020. "Navajo Nation surpasses New York state for the highest Covid-19 infection rate in the U.S.," *CNN*, May 18, https://www.cnn.com/2020/05/18/us/navajo-nation-

infection-rate-trnd/index.html. Accessed May 19, 2020.
[7] Wyatte Grantham-Philips. 2020. "On the Navajo Nation, COVID-19 death toll is higher than any U.S. state. Here's how you can support community relief," *USA Today*, October 24, https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2020/10/24/covid-native-americans-how-to-help-navajo-nation/3652816001/. Accessed October 25, 2020. See also: Native News Online Staff. 2020. "Navajo Nation Surpasses 16,000 Covid-19 Cases on Saturday; Death Toll at 648," *Native News Online*, November 29, https://nativenewsonline.net/currents/navajo-nation-surpasses-16-000-covid-19-cases-on-saturday-death-toll-at-648; For daily statistics on positive cases of Covid-19 at Navajo, see Navajo Department of Health, "Dikos Ntsaaígíí-19 (COVID-19)," https://www.ndoh.navajo-nsn.gov/covid-19. Accessed November 29, 2020.
[8] Creede Newton. 2020. "Navajo Nation COVID vaccine roll-out begins as cases, deaths rise," *Al Jazeera*, December 17, https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2020/12/17/navajo-nation-covid-vaccine-rollout-begins-as-cases-deaths-rise. Accessed December 17, 2020.
[9] Arlyssa Becenti, "COVID deaths reach 1,000 on Navajo Nation, *Navajo Times,* January 28, 2021, https://navajotimes.com/reznews/covid-deaths-reach-1000-on-navajo-nation/.
[10] Rima Krisst. 2020. "Navajo-Hopi relief group seeks funding to sustain services," *Navajo Times*, November 25, https://navajotimes.com/reznews/navajo-hopi-relief-group-seeks-funding-to-sustain-services/. Accessed November 26, 2020.
[11] Megan Marples. 2020. "Navajo Nation faces devastating loss from Covid-19 pandemic," *CNN*, November 24, 2020, https://www.cnn.com/2020/11/24/health/navajo-nation-coronavirus-losses-wellness/index.html. Accessed November 26, 2020.
[12] Simone Perez and Paula Raos. 2020. "Coronavirus Is Devastating the Navajo Nation," *VICE*, July 20, https://www.vice.com/en/article/4ayq3p/coronavirus-is-devastating-the-navajo-nation. Accessed July 21, 2020.
[13] Cecilia Nowell. 2020. "In the Navajo Nation, Anarchism Has Indigenous Roots," *The Nation*, September 25, https://www.thenation.com/article/activism/anarchism-navajo-aid/. Accessed September 30, 2020.
[14] See the website for the K'é Infoshop to learn more. http://keinfoshop.org/. Accessed October 2, 2020.
[15] Nowell, Ibid.
[16] Ibid.
[17] Simone Perez and Paula Raos.
[18] To learn more about this project, one can look to the website: https://www.navajohopisolidarity.org/. Accessed October 2, 2020.
[19] *Oxford English Dictionary* 2011. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
[20] United Nations. n.d., "Background of International Day of the World's Indigenous Peoples, August 9," https://www.un.org/en/observances/indigenous-day/background. Accessed November 30, 2020. A definition proposed by UN Special Rapporteur Jose Martinez Cobo remains most influential today: indigenous peoples are "those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and

pre-colonial societies that have developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in those territories, or parts of them." United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1982. "Martínez Cobo Study," Chapter V, https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/publications/martinez-cobo-study.html. Accessed December 1, 2020. Jeff Corntassel (whose work is included in this issue) has also written on this topic, drawing on the work of Holm, et al (cited above) and articulating a broader Indigenous context. He notes the vast array of definitional standards for Indigenous peoples in international law. Corntassel offers a survey of Indigenous definitions developed by academicians in the field of nationalism/international law as well as practitioners from IGOs and NGOs, arguing that "a balance between self-identification and establishing a working definition of Indigenous peoples is possible. In turn, he suggests that utilizing a model of 'Peoplehood' to present "a new working definition of Indigenous peoples that is both flexible and dynamic." See Jeff Corntassel. 2003. "Who is Indigenous? Peoplehood and 'Ethnonationalist' Approaches to Rearticulating Indigenous Identity," *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, Spring, Vol 9(1): 75-100.

[21] Ella Shohat. 1992. "Notes on the 'Post-Colonial'," *Social Text*, 31/32: 99-113.

[22] George Manuel. 2018. *The Fourth World: An Indian Reality*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

[23] Steven Newcomb. 2008. *Pagans in the Promised Land: Decoding the Doctrine of Christian Discovery*, Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Baron Pineda. 2017. "Indigenous Pan-Americanism: Contesting Settler Colonialism and the Doctrine of Discovery at the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues," *American Quarterly*, 69 (4): 823-832; John Price and Nick XEMŦOLTW̲ Claxton. 2019/20. "Whose Land Is It? Rethinking Sovereignty in British Columbia," *The British Columbian Quarterly*, Winter 204: 115-138.

[26] Patrick Wolfe. 2006. "Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native," *Journal of Genocide Research*, December 8(4): 387–409.

[27] J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, Ed. 2018. "Interview with Patrick Wolfe," *Speaking of Indigenous Politics: Conversations with Activists, Scholars, and Tribal Leaders*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 343-360.

[28] Ibid, 387.

[29] Ibid, 403.

[30] J. Kēhaulani Kauanui. 2016. "'A Structure, Not an Event': Settler Colonialism and Enduring Indigeneity," *Emergent Critical Analytics for Alternative Humanities*, Spring 5(1), https://csalateral.org/issue/5-1/forum-alt-humanities-settler-colonialism-enduring-indigeneity-kauanui/. Accessed December 1, 2020.

[31] Emil Keme advocates renaming "America" and "Latin America" Abiayala, to refer to the entire continent. As he details, the concept comes from the cosmogony of the Guna people in the region of Guna Yala (or the land of the Guna), formally known as San Blas, in present-day Panama. He argues that renaming the continent is a necessary part of epistemic decolonization to bolster the establishment of In-

digenous peoples' autonomy and self-determination. Keme notes that while there are other alternatives, they are typically associated in relation to specific Indigenous geopolitical territories and peoples. Emil Keme (translated by Adam Coon). 2018. "For Abiayala to Live, the Americas Must Die: Toward a Transhemispheric Indigeneity," *Native American and Indigenous Studies*, Spring 5(1): 42-68.
[32] Shannon Speed. 2017. "Structures of Settler Capitalism in Abya Yala," *American Quarterly*, December 69(4): 783-790.
[33] Ibid, 787.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Tom Holm, J. Diane Pearson, and Ben Chavis offer the "Peoplehood Matrix," suggesting that Native American communities share four main components – language, sacred history, place or territory, and ceremonial cycles – which together "make up a complete system that accounts for particular behaviors of people indigenous to particular territories." Tom Holm, J. Dianne Pearson, and Ben Chavis. 2003. "Peoplehood: A Model for the Extension of Sovereignty in American Indian Studies," *Wicazo Sā Review*, Spring 18(1): 7-24.
[37] Drawing on prior work by Robert Warrior, I offer an overview of these differing accounts of sovereignty in J. Kēhaulani Kauanui. 2018. *Paradoxes of Hawaiian Sovereignty*, Durham: Duke University Press, 25-28.
[38] Taiaiake Alfred. 2005. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
[39] Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera & Govand Khalid Azeez. 2018. "Beyond recognition: autonomy, the state, and the Mapuche Coordinadora Arauco Malleco," *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies*, 13(2): 113-134.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Alejandra Gaitán-Barrera and Govand Khalid Azeez. 2015. "Regaining Precolonial Sovereignty: The Case of Miskitu Resistance," *Journal of Iberian and Latin American Research*, 21(3): 360-373.
[42] Thanks to Joseph Weiss for offering this important point.
[43] Kahala Johnson and Kathy E. Ferguson. 2019. "Anarchism and Indigeneity," *The Palgrave Handbook of Anarchism*, Carl Levy and Matthew S. Adams, Eds. New York: London: Palgrave Macmillan, 697-714, 707.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid ,708.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Richard Day and Sean Haberle. Sept-Oct 2006. "Anarchist-Indigenous solidarity at the Six Nations' barricade," *New Socialist: Ideas for Radical Change* 58: 26-27; Erica Michelle Lagalisse. Spring 2011. "Marginalizing Magdalena": Intersections of Gender and the Secular in Anarchoindigenist Solidarity Activism," *Signs* 36(3): 653-678; Adam J. Barker and Jenny Pickerill. 2012. "Radicalizing Relationships to and Through Shared Geographies: Why Anarchists Need to Understand Indigenous Connections to Land and Place," *Antipode* 44 (5): 1705–1725. Other works that have tracked and critically analyzed solidarity politics across social differences between anarchists and Indigenous activists include: Richard Day and Sean Haber-

le. Sept-Oct 2006. "Anarchist-Indigenous solidarity at the Six Nations' barricade," *New Socialist: Ideas for Radical Change* 58: 26-27; Glen Coulthard, Jacqueline Lasky, Adam Lewis, and Vanessa Watts, Eds. 2011. "Working Across Difference for Post-Imperial Futures: Intersections Between Anarchism, Indigenism and Feminism," *Affinities*. And, for a recent book of interviews with individuals speaking to Indigenous anarchism, most of whom are Indigenous themselves – Véronique Hébert, Gord Hill, Freda Huson, J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, Clifton Ariwakehte Nicholasee – see Francis Dupuis-Déri and Benjamin Pillet, Eds. 2019. *L'anarcho-indigénisme*, Montreal: Lux Canada.

[48] Adam J. Barker and Jenny Pickerill. 2012. "Radicalizing Relationships To and Through Shared Geographies: Why Anarchists Need to Understand Indigenous Connections to Land and Place," *Antipode* Vol 44(5): 1705–1725.

[49] Ibid.

[50] David Graeber. 2011. "Occupy Wall Street's Anarchist Roots," *Al Jazeera*, November 30, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/11/201111287283590 4508.html.

[51] http://occupywallst.org/about/

[52] National Museum of the American Indian. 2011. "America's first urban myth?" *NMAI blog*, April 3, https://blog.nmai.si.edu/main/2011/08/americas-first-urban-myth.html. Accessed January 3, 2020.

[53] Joanne Barker. 2018. "Social text: Territory as Analytic: The Dispossession of Lenapehoking and the Subprime Crisis," *Social Text* Vol. 36 (2): 27-28.

[54] Joanne Barker, Tequila Sovereign, "Manna-hata" http://tequilasovereign.blogspot.com/2011/10/manna-hata.html; " Because Not All 99%-ers Are Created Equal," http://tequilasovereign.blogspot.com/2011/10/because-not-all-99-ers-are-created.html; "The Difference that History Makes in the OWS Movements" http://tequilasovereign.blogspot.com/2011/10/difference-that-history-makes-in-ows.html
"Memorandum of Solidarity with Indigenous Peoples," http://tequilasovereign.blogspot.com/2011/10/proposal-to-occupy-oakland-memorandum.html; "What Does 'Decolonize Oakland' Mean? What Can 'Decolonize Oakland' Mean?," http://tequilasovereign.blogspot.com/2011/10/what-does-decolonize-oakland-mean-what.html. All accessed December 2, 2011.

[55] Barker 2018.

[56] David Graeber. 2013. *The Democracy Project: a History, a Crisis, a Movement*, 20-21, New York: Random House.

[57] Adam J. Barker. 2012. "Already Occupied: Indigenous peoples, settler colonialism, and the Occupy movements in North America." *Social Movement Studies*, 11(3-4): 327-334.

[58] Ibid.

[59] Sandy Grande. 2013. "Accumulation of the primitive: the limits of liberalism and the politics of occupy Wall Street," *Settler Colonial Studies*, 3(3-4): 369-380.

[60] Adam Gary Lewis. 2015. "Anti-State Resistance on Stolen Land: Settler Colonialism, Settler Identity and the Imperative of Decolonization," 145-186. *New Developments in Anarchist Studies*, P.J. Lilley and Jeff Santz, Eds. Brooklyn: Thought

Crimes. See also: Adam Gary Lewis. 2017. "Imagining autonomy on stolen land: settler colonialism, anarchism and the possibilities of decolonization?," *Settler Colonial Studies,* 7(4): 474-495.

[61] Craig Fortier. 2017. *Unsettling the Commons: Social Movements Against, Within, and Beyond Settler Colonialism*, Oakland and Edinburgh: AK Press.

[62] Black Orchid Collective, "The Radicalization of Decolonize/Occupy Seattle," *Insurgent Notes: Journal of Communist Theory and Practice,* January 12, 2012, http://insurgentnotes.com/2012/01/guest-article-the-radicalization-of-decolonizeoccupy-seattle/

[63] Allan Antliff, personal communication via email, January 25, 2021. See also "Occupy Victoria – People's Assembly," Dean Kaylan, December 17, 2011, https://deankalyan.com/occupy-victoria-peoples-assembly-of-victoria/. Accessed January 25, 2021.

[64] Ibid.

[65] See Harsha Walia, "Letter to the Occupy Together Movement," *Critical Legal Thinking*, October 19, 2011, https://criticallegalthinking.com/2011/10/19/letter-to-occupy-together-movement/. Accessed January 25, 2021.

These examples of non-Indigenous North American anarchists in general being indifferent or even hostile toward Indigenous sovereignty and, by extension, failing to address decolonialization as the central issue in North America, may look different in some Canadian contexts. For example, Allan Antliff's interview with Gord Hill (included here) suggests that "in Canada there is a history of critical consciousness regarding indigeneity, sovereignty, and decolonization -- and activism related to it -- that goes back at least to the 1970s." In other words, the movement there is perhaps more historically developed on these issues than the movement in the United States.

[66] Carrie Mott. 2016. "The Activist Polis: Topologies of Conflict in Indigenous," *Antipode* Vol. 48(1):193–211.

[67] Adam Gary Lewis. 2017. "From Standing Rock to Resistance in Context: Towards Anarchism against Settler Colonialism" E-International Relations, February 1, https://www.e-ir.info/2017/02/01/from-standing-rock-to-resistance-in-context-towards-anarchism-against-settler-colonialism/. Accessed January 3, 2020.

[68] Ibid.

[69] Alfred, Ibid. Lewis has further theorized the concept: "I conceptualize anarcha-Indigenism first as a 'third space', following post-colonial theorists, and extend this concept towards an 'n-dimensional' space of meeting, where theoretical perspectives can come to engage with one another. This space consists of points of contact and resonance chiefly between Indigenist, anarchist and feminist theory and practice, but also extends to any perspective that might meet the core commitments of anarcha-Indigenism, namely resistance to all forms of oppression and domination." See Adam Gary Lewis. 2012. "Decolonizing Anarchism: Expanding Anarcha-Indigenism in Theory and Practice," A thesis submitted to the Graduate Program in Cultural Studies in conformity with the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts Queen's University Kingston, Ontario, Canada.

[70] This piece (originally published in *Green Anarchy*) was reprinted by the Indige-

nous Anarchist Federation, https://iaf-fai.org/2020/04/13/locating-an-indigenous-anarchism/. Accessed October 20, 2020. Aragorn! self-identified as an Indigenous individual but neglected to note his background in terms of the substance of that claim, with no mention of any specific tribal affiliation.

[71] Ibid.

[72] Ibid.

[73] Ibid. He further offers another explanation for why Native people may lack interest in anarchism: that anarchist milieus "tend to have a distinct language, cadence, and set of priorities" that may help in cohering different anarchist factions (on the one hand), but alienate people who may find "the arrogance of the educated along with the worst of radical politics' excesses."

[74] Andrew Robinson and Simon Tormey. 2012. "Beyond the state: Anthropology and 'actually-existing anarchism,'" *Critique of Anthropology*, 32(2): 143-157. See p145.

[75] Ibid.

[76] Ferguson and Johnson, 697.

[77] Ibid, 698.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Ibid, 699.

[80] Kevin Bruyneel. 2007. *The Third Space of Sovereignty*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; Jean M. O'Brien. 2010. *Firsting and Lasting*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; Mark Rifkin. 2017. *Beyond Settler Time*, Durham: Duke University Press; Joseph Weiss. 2018. *Shaping the Future on Haida Gwaii*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[81] Roy Krøvel. 2010. "Anarchism, The Zapatistas and The Global Solidarity Movement," *Global Discourse*, 1(2): 20-40; 10; "What every anarchist should know about the Zapatista's [sic] and Chiapas," The Struggle Archive, http://www.struggle.ws/mexico/anarchist.html. Accessed January 2, 2020.

[82] These distinct communities are linked in a federation with other communities, which constitute autonomous municipalities that comprise a Caracol, which are connected to create a region. Pablo González Casanova. 2005. "The Zapatista 'caracoles': Networks of resistance and autonomy," *Socialism and Democracy*, 19(3):79-92; Ross, John. 2005. "Celebrating the Caracoles: Step by Step, the Zapatistas Advance on the Horizon," *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, 29(1): 39-46; Pablo Gonz. 2011. "The Zapatista Caracoles: Networks of Resistance and Autonomy," *Socialism and Democracy Online*, March 5, http://sdonline.org/39/volume-19-no-3/the-zapatista-caracoles-networks-of-resistance-and-autonomy/. Accessed January 3, 2020.

[83] n.a. 2019. "Zapatistas to extend their control with 11 more autonomous zones in Chiapas President López Obrador welcomed the announcement, saying it would benefit the people," *Mexican Daily News*, August 20. https://mexiconewsdaily.com/news/zapatistas-to-extend-their-control/. Accessed January 3, 2020.

[84] Staughton Lynd and Andrej Grubačić. 2008. *Wobblies and Zapatistas: Conversations on Anarchism, Marxism and Radical History*, Oakland and Edinburgh: PM Press; Andrej Grubačić and Denis O'Hearn. 2016. *Living at the Edges of Capital-*

ism: Adventures in Exile and Mutual Aid, Berkeley: University of California Press; and Shannon Speed. 2006. *Rights in Rebellion: Indigenous Struggle and Human Rights in Chiapas*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

[85] Andrew Flood. 1999. "The Zapatistas, anarchism and 'Direct democracy'," *Anarcho-Syndicalist Review* 27, Winter, reprinted September 23, 2008, https://anarchism.pageabode.com/andrewnflood/zapatistas-anarchism-direct-democracy. Accessed January 3, 2020.

[86] Idle No More, "An Indigenous-Led Social Movement," https://idlenomore.ca/about-the-movement/. Accessed January 3, 2020.

[87] For a rich overview of the movement, readers can listen to my interview with activist-scholar Niigaanwewidam James Sinclair (St. Peter's/Little Peguis Indian Settlement in Manitoba). J. Kēhaulani Kauanui. 2013. "Episode 52: Idle No More," *Horizonal Power Hour,* January 8, https://horizontalpowerhour.wordpress.com/2013/01/21/243/. Accessed January 3, 2020.

[88] Ibid.

[89] Adam J. Barker. 2015. "'A Direct Act of Resurgence, a Direct Act of Sovereignty': Reflections on Idle No More, Indigenous Activism, and Canadian Settler Colonialism," *Globalizations*, 12(1): 43-65.

[90] Zig Zag, "Indian Act Chiefs and Idle No More: Snakes in the Grassroots?" (2012), https://warriorpublications.wordpress.com/2012/12/14/indian-act-chiefs-and-idle-no-more-snakes-in-the-grassroots/. Accessed January 25, 2021.

[91] Indigenous Anarchist Federation, What We Are About," https://iaf-fai.org/about/. Accessed October 20, 2020.

[92] Ibid.

[93] Here 'rez' is a vernacular way to refer to an Indian 'reservation' or 'reserve.' In the U.S. context, an Indian 'reservation' is an area of land that has been reserved for an Indian tribe, band, village, or nation. The federal government holds legal title to the reserved territory, whereas the tribe holds beneficial title to the land (that affords them the exclusive right of occupancy). See David E. Wilkins and Heidi Kiiwetinepinesiik Stark, *American Indian Politics and the American Political System*, 4th Edition, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2018. In Canada, First Nations have Indian 'reserves,' which are lands claimed by the Crown and set aside through the Indian Act "for the use and benefit" of the respective bands (a body of Indians) for which they were set apart under treaties or other agreements." Indian Act (R.S.C., 1985, c. I-5), https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/I-5/page-1.html?txthl=tract+lands+land#s-2. Accessed December 10, 2020.

[94] Ibid.

[95] Three of this issue's articles were first presented as conference papers at a one-day event I organized at Wesleyan University, "Pedagogies of Anarchist Praxis," April 12, 2019.

[96] Warburton, this volume, p 44.

[97] Ibid. p 45.

[98] Ibid. p 48.

[99] Corntassel, this volume, p 72.

[100] Ibid. p 73.

[101] Gómez-Barris, this volume, p 119.
[102] Ibid. p 119.
[103] Ibid. p 121.
[104] Baker, this volume, p 113.