

Land and Liberty: Settler Acknowledgement in Anarchist Pedagogies of Place

Theresa Warburton*+

Introduction

In the summer of 2012, much of the activism in Western New York State (WNY) was rooted in the practices and language that had emerged from Occupy Wall Street about a year earlier. As in many other cities across the country, the Occupy movement had a significant impact on activist communities in Buffalo and Rochester, where the local encampments and related organizing bodies grew quickly, bringing anarchist principles and practices more into a mainstream public than they had been since the 1999 protests against the World Trade Organization (WTO) in Seattle.

As the harsh winter conditions for which WNY is known for gave way to warmer weather, the store of energies collected during those months continued. One particularly well-attended and well-covered event was the Rochester Anti-Capitalist March, held in July of 2012. With reports of between 75 and 150 participants, the march became a ‘hot-button’ item of the summer in the region after Rochester

*Theresa Warburton is an Associate Professor in the Department of English at Western Washington University, where she is also affiliated faculty in Canadian-American and Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies. Her book, *Other Worlds Here: Honoring Native Women's Writing in Contemporary Anarchist Movements*, is forthcoming from Northwestern University Press in April 2021. Along with Cowlitz writer Elissa Washuta, she is also the co-editor of *Shapes of Native Nonfiction: Collected Essays by Contemporary Writers*, which was a finalist for the Washington State Book Award. Her work has appeared in *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, *Cultural Studies/Critical Methodologies*, *Upping the Anti*, and *Perspectives on Anarchist Theory*, where she is also a member of the editorial collective. +Portions of this article appear in Chapter 1 of *Other Worlds Here: Honoring Native Women's Writing in Contemporary Anarchist Movements*, part of the Critical Insurgencies Series from Northwestern University Press edited by Jodi Byrd and Michelle Wright. Copyright © 2021 by Northwestern University Press. Published 2021. All rights reserved.

police pepper-sprayed and arrested 18 peaceful protesters during the event. As local anarchist organizer Shane Burley, who later authored *Fascism Today: What It Is and How to End It*, observed “Rochester Police Department today attacked a stream of peaceful protestors with chemical weapons without provocation, arresting 18 people. Many of these people were attacked, thrown on the ground, pepper sprayed when in handcuffs, and done so without being asked to comply with any requests.”¹

The incident in Rochester ignited a regional debate about the militarization of police and their confrontational relationship with ever-growing groups of activists affiliated with both specific Occupy encampments and a national movement centered on anti-capitalism. But this narrative does little to reflect some of the challenges of organizing in that expressly anarchist space, especially in pushing organizers to consider what it means to do anti-capitalist work on occupied territory—in this case, that of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Confederacy. And though this does not show up in coverage about the abusive treatment of protestors, there was at least one relatively contentious discussion about this topic that has remained in my mind as a small, rough grain wearing away at something more significant lurking beneath. In it, I started to see not only the structure of settlement being expressed in distinctly anarchist terms but also the way that this structure was being willfully obscured not through a *denial* of it but through its *acknowledgement*.

About a week before the march itself, organizers communicated across the region using a Facebook event page. In one post, an organizer suggested an aesthetic choice for marchers: “Just a thought, anyone not covering their face can put on war paint.”² The ensuing conversation, though perhaps marginal and inconsequential now to many of those involved then, profoundly shaped my engagement with anarchism because of how perfectly it captured the enduring issue of how settlement as an ongoing process of colonialism becomes normalized and re-made within anarchist spaces. In what followed, I began to identify a form of engagement that I later came to understand as “settler anarchism,” or a form of anarchist praxis that re-makes the structure of settlement using anarchist logics.

I am not particularly surprised or concerned by the initial use of the term ‘war paint’ in an anarchist space. After all, these spaces exist within rather than outside of the structures of settlement through which the United States is constituted. To assume that anarchists, simply by virtue of being anarchists, manage to avoid any socialization into racialized, gendered, and settler structures would move us away from the more difficult conversations necessary to address how such structures of violence and dispossession persist in spaces expressly committed to eradicating them. In this way, the use of the term itself is less my concern since its invocation is a relatively ubiquitous one that is part of American discourse.

As I sit writing this, the celebration parade for the Kansas City Chiefs’ victory in Super Bowl LIV is underway, complete with an appearance from the team’s horse, “Warpaint.”³ And around the time that this conversation concerning the Rochester Anti-Capitalist March was happening, the American indie-rock band “Warpaint” was enjoying worldwide success, projecting an aura that matched the implications of their name, which founding member Emily Kokal described this way: “It just feels intense...we wanted the band to have a provocative kind of name...the idea of putting on war paint to prepare for battle...it’s very seductive.”⁴ In each case, the use of the term signals an invocation of broader tropes about Indigenous peoples that have constructed them as hypersexualized and war-like in an effort to justify violent repression through both implicit and explicit claims to the moral superiority and civility of white settlers.⁵

It is no surprise that various anarchists working in the U.S. 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. Thus, it is not my goal here to simply point out that some anarchists in Western New York got into a fight on the Internet about the use of this pejorative term almost a decade ago and that it is this utterance that provides cut-and-dry evidence about the persistence of settlement in anarchist spaces. In fact, this would only provide evidence of the persistence of settlement in the American cultural discourse and anarchists’ interpellation into that discourse. Not so insightful. Instead, what this conversation

shows us is that the structure of settlement is maintained in anarchist spaces through what happens after we recognize this interpellation. That is, it is not the utterance itself that shows us something important: it is the subsequent acknowledgement that there is a lack of active engagement with and responsibility to Native nations coupled with a failure to engage that lack through the praxis being evidenced in the conversation itself.

After the initial post, the first comment was made by a local white anarchist man pushing against the suggestion and its framing: “it would be really sad and fucked up were there to be white people wearing ‘war paint’ at this march that they are having on Haudenosaunee land.” Other white anarchist men quickly jumped into the fray and escalated the conversation. The person who had initially pointed to the pejorative connotations of the term ‘war paint’ responded to the claim that “war paint does have a historical presence in plenty of parts of Europe” with a clear citation of the term’s roots in 19th century American discourse about Native peoples. He noted that although “plenty of people have painted their bodies throughout time for all sorts of reasons, the term ‘war paint’ is a relatively recent term invented by white settlers to project warlike characteristics onto the Indigenous people who they were trying to exterminate.” Even further, he suggested that this conversation lent insight into the lack of Native participation in anarchist movements in the region and more broadly. Multiple white anarchist men, including one very prominent one who would later be outed as a serial sexual harasser, took particular issue with this final point.

He noted “this is literally the first time I’ve heard the term used in anti-capitalist circles...I’d imagine that the low participation of Indigenous people in this sort of event runs a good deal deeper than the use or defense of the term. To claim otherwise seems like a real simplification of a much more substantive problem of connection and depth.” And, in a return of the aggressive-internet-anarchist-activist participation in the conversation, another local white anarchist man (likely unknowingly) offered a fairly succinct summary of the host of problems with anarchist approaches to settlement framed by this conversation:

“If you’re wondering why the Indigenous [sic] are not flocking to ‘our’ movement it’s definitely not because people decided to use let alone say ‘war paint’. That’s oversimplification and white liberal guilt bullshit that’s been slammed down our throats trying to make me guilty for something my ancestor did. Fuck. That. Shit. Why don’t you tell my mixed partner to go back to Europe right? Or maybe Africa? Or how about she tells you to fuck off because she’s also a tiny bit native [sic].”

What has always been the most compelling part of this conversation to me has been this turn — the move from a defense of this kind of pejorative term to a deflection of responsibility for the persistence of settler structures within anarchist movements, *even as such a problem is admitted with ease*. What is more, both the defense and the deflection are meted out through heteronormative logics, evidenced in the invocation of the commenter’s ‘mixed partner’ who is ‘a tiny bit native’ but who never comments or speaks for herself. We aren’t even certain whether she exists. It is the structure of this engagement, and the form of political analysis that it gives us, that interests me most. I see it replicated often, across time and place. Because of this, it seems worthwhile to attempt to unpack it here.

In what follows, I am interested in exploring how this interaction is not unique but, rather, symptomatic of broader engagements with the question of settlement in contemporary anarchist spaces. Rather than focus on providing an expositional archive of moments like this, where it becomes abundantly clear that most anarchists have not adequately dealt with the question of settlement within (or without) our movements despite the continued participation of Indigenous peoples in them as well as in radical social movements more broadly, I aim instead to use this moment as a way to sketch out an anarchist *form of engagement* that ends up informing our praxis across a range of issues.

In short, this conversation provides an opportunity to better attend to these issues of anarchist praxis and how they limit our ability to adequately recognize, account for, and address the persistence of

settler structures in anarchist politics. I use the term ‘praxis’ here because, as I mentioned above, this is an issue of how we choose to live the politics we espouse, rather than simply a theoretical rumination on why the structure of settlement persists in anarchist spaces.

In what follows, I unpack the particular issue of land acknowledgements as a pedagogical praxis in order to guide us into a broader conversation about how most anarchists in the U.S. have failed to reckon with the question of doing anarchist work in a settler colonial context leading up and into the 21st century. I end with a brief reflection on how anarchists might draw on the work of Native storytellers, activists, and intellectuals to reorient our understanding of the relationships between place and politics in ways that enable us to better confront the structures of power we seek to destroy.

Pedagogy, Praxis, and Land

In order to bring out the contours of this conversation, I begin here by bringing two things together: pedagogies of anarchist praxis and the practice of land acknowledgements. I take the first term from a symposium organized by Kanaka Maoli scholar and activist J. Kēhaulani Kauanui at Wesleyan University in Spring 2019, where a version of this paper was first presented. For me, this term emphasizes a focus on the methods we use to learn and engage anarchist praxis, rather than focusing only on the contours of the practices themselves.

I take up the second term because I see land acknowledgements, as well, as a pedagogy of practice. What is more, I believe that current prominent debates about formal land acknowledgements within Native and Indigenous Studies as they become a more ubiquitous practice across the U.S. and Canada provide a useful epistemic method through which to engage the broader questions with which this piece is concerned. In these debates, which I outline more in-depth below, I locate some of the same core questions that emerge from the conversation above: how do we use acknowledgements (whether of history, of harm, of presence, of absence, of persistence, of responsibility, or of culpability) to shape what comes after? That is,

how do they structure our pedagogies of praxis once they have been recognized? What are the current limitations of these practices and how might we reimagine them to align our methods with our desires for the worlds we make together?

In the first case, I want to turn especially to the term “pedagogy,” which I view as central to anarchism. For me, the emphasis on pedagogy has been one of the things that elevates anarchism as not only a viable political but ethical practice. As David Graeber has observed, this is one of the qualities that makes anarchism a more fertile method of political organizing than other radical strands because of its grounding in particular practices instead of particular luminaries. He argues that:

one need only to compare the historical schools of Marxism and anarchism...to see we are dealing with fundamentally different things. Marxist schools have founders. Just as Marxism sprang from the mind of Marx, so we have Leninists, Maoists, Trotskyites, Gramscians, Althusserians...Schools of anarchism, in contrast, emerge from some kind of organizational principle or form of practice: Anarcho-Syndicalists and Anarcho-Communists, Insurrectionists and Platformists, Cooperativists, Individualists, and so on.⁶

It follows from Graeber that this nomenclature signals a distinctive quality of anarchist politics, namely its ability to grow and adapt through practice rather than its adherence to a strict ideological foundation. I agree with him that this is one of the things that makes anarchism a particularly salient form of political and social organizing in an era of neoliberalism, since it is able to better account for diffuse, dynamic structures of power and capital.

What I want to emphasize here is how intimately this promise of adaptability is tied to pedagogy, both functionally and formally. To understand foundational anarchist practices like prefigurative politics, consensus-based decision-making, and direct democracy simply as examples of practices that are in-line with anarchist theory, is to

ignore the pedagogical role that such practices have. That is, these are not merely exercises we learn and then execute as a way of making anarchist worlds—they are practices we exercise in order to learn *how* to make those worlds and to care for them as we do. As famed scholar of pedagogy Paulo Freire reminds us, “the more radical the person is, the more fully they enter into reality so that, knowing it better, they can better transform it. They are not afraid to confront, to listen, to see the world unveiled.”⁷ The term ‘pedagogies of anarchist praxis’ then, helps us to identify both the practical and didactic qualities of our interactions with each other and with the multiple worlds in which we live. What is more, it can help us reframe contention away from a focus on how to convince one another that we are right and, instead, to focus on the question: how and what are we learning to be through this? This is what I hope for anarchism, in its most realized pedagogical praxis.

Now, let us put a pin in that and pivot for a moment to another practice connected to pedagogy, that of land acknowledgements. This practice of recognizing the traditional territories of local Indigenous communities has become more popular in the U.S., following its institutionalization in other settler colonial contexts like Canada and Australia. Its purpose is ostensibly making us aware of Indigenous presence, to acknowledge that the work we do has a material foundation in the land and its people. Following Lila Asher, Joe Curow, and Amil Davis, I also see this praxis as a form of pedagogy or a teaching method that, aspirationally at least, aims to anchor our work in not only the ideological but also the material realities of doing this work on occupied land.⁸ Such land acknowledgements are acts of protocol or procedures that establish the contours of our forms of relation with the land and its people in a dynamic way. That is, these acknowledgements are not a static naming of a given place but, rather, a commitment to respecting the protocols of relation that live with the land and its people. They are not a quick resolution of settlement in a given space, uttered at the beginning of any event so that we may move on to what was important to begin with.

Except, of course, when they are. And often, they are.

Many universities, including my current institution, have established formal land acknowledgements that are meant to be printed and read aloud at campus events; people have started putting traditional territories in their email signatures, along with their pronouns, titles, and office phone numbers. In Canada, land acknowledgements are popular before hockey games or at meetings of Parliament. And, more and more, radical groups are opening meetings and events with some form of land or territorial acknowledgement.⁹ As numerous scholars and activists have pointed out, this proliferation of land acknowledgements across the U.S. and Canada has not necessarily transformed the ways of relating manifested through and in the service of settlement. In fact, for many, it has further entrenched the structure of settlement through what Eve Tuck (Unangax) and K. Wayne Yang have termed “settler moves to innocence.”¹⁰ As Asher, Curow, and Davis note “by taking what has been, in some nations, a diplomatic protocol, gutting it of its ontological and relational context, and repurposing it to legitimate settlers’ continued presence on stolen land,” land acknowledgements act as a reinscription of settler control over Native land rather than a pedagogical practice that foments the return of Native land to Native people and an adherence to local protocols and relations.¹¹

This is precisely the kind of discomfort that Anishinaabe scholar Hayden King noted when he spoke recently on his regret at having participated in writing a formal land acknowledgement for Ryerson University. In an interview with Cree writer and poet Rosanna Deerchild for *Unreserved*, a CBC radio show focused on stories and music from across Indigenous Canada,¹² King discussed how the life that the acknowledgement took on after he helped to pen it helped him to “see how the territorial acknowledgement could become very superficial and also how it sort of fetishizes these actual tangible treaties. They’re not metaphors—they’re real institutions, and for us to write and recite a territorial acknowledgement that sort of obscures that fact, I think we do a disservice to that treaty and to those nations.”¹³ What King highlights here is a question of pedagogy. That is, his worry is not that acknowledging the territory and its people is an inherently alienating practice but that the way it is being done is not accomplishing the task for which it has ostensibly been adopted. This

is precisely what Cree and Métis writer Chelsea Vowel has pointed to in her argument that territorial acknowledgements must be “sites of disruption” and that, to do this, perhaps we must move “beyond territorial acknowledgements to ask the hard questions about what needs to be done once we’re ‘aware of Indigenous presence.’”¹⁴

So now, unpinning this question of pedagogies of anarchist praxis, I am interested in how anarchist pedagogies, or methods of sharing knowledge and skills, have been limited by the things to which the scholars I mentioned above have pointed to in their discussions of land acknowledgements. Additionally, I am interested in how we might move beyond that limit to create the sites of disruption of which Vowel speaks. In the example I provided at the beginning of this article, those anarchists pushing back against the critique of the use of the term ‘war paint’ never underwrote their resistance through a claim that relations between local Native communities and local non-Native anarchists were strong. Rather, they acknowledged that a problem existed, and it was this acknowledgement that they used to eschew responsibility for it. Put another way, they used their acknowledgement of the poor relationship between anarchism and Native peoples as a way to mark their defense of both the term and practice of donning ‘war paint’ in their anti-capitalist march on Haudenosaunee land.

It is this tendency that I see replicated on a larger scale, so large that it has become a definitive characteristic of a particular kind of anarchism that emerged in the U.S. and Canada in the 21st century. What is more, I see this as a failure to acknowledge the pedagogical imperative of praxis. Pedagogy, as Freire notes, is inherently dynamic — it transforms what comes after the moment of learning so that learning becomes an unending continuum rather than a static location. In the case of land acknowledgements, a pedagogical approach requires the same: that we acknowledge and engage the land and its people in a set of on-going relationships rather than as static surfaces upon which we act. In what follows, I turn to a more extensive analysis of the development of this particular anarchist tendency, which I refer to as “settler anarchism,” in order to explore how this, as a *form of engagement*, limits the ability of anarchists to reckon with the persis-

tence of structures of violence within our own communities.

‘Settler Anarchism’ in Seattle

What I aim to bring out through the comparison of pedagogies of anarchist praxis and land acknowledgements in both the discussion above and the example with which I began this article is a centering of the question of how anarchists respond to the material, political, and cultural realities in which we practice. Or, more pertinently, how we don’t. In this case, I want to focus on what Graeber and Andrej Grubačić have dubbed the ‘New Anarchism’ or the particular strain of anarchism that emerged in the late 20th and early 21st centuries in North America, usually associated with the type of mass protests epitomized by those against the WTO in Seattle in 1999.¹⁵ As scholars like Graeber, Grubačić, Barbara Epstein, Richard Day, and Todd May argue, this particular form of anarchism is usually understood as arising alongside the shift towards a neoliberal global political and economic order in the late 20th century and the crisis of communism as a radical political alternative following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.¹⁶

This genealogy of ‘New Anarchism’ is largely fomented around a series of large-scale protests throughout the 1990s and 2000s aimed at the World Bank (WB), WTO, and International Monetary Fund (IMF), including the interruption of the 50th celebration of the IMF and the WB in Madrid in 1994; the “Carnival Against Capital” coinciding with the meeting of the G8 (Group of 8 Industrialized Countries) and the third ministerial conference of the WTO in 1999; protests against the meetings of the WB and IMF in Washington DC in 2000; protests against the “Summit of the Americas” in Québec City and the meeting of the G8 in Genoa in 2001; and protests against the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) negotiations in Miami in 2003. The proliferation of anti-capitalist organizing committed to horizontalism signaled the arrival of a new era of global resistance to neoliberalism that has been referred to by numerous names including ‘anti-globalization,’ ‘alter-globalization,’ and ‘global justice.’¹⁷

This resurgence of anarchism as a primary mode of social movement was particularly influential in North America. Fresh from the back-

lash in the 1980s against the advances of the radical struggles of the 1960s and 1970s, the resurgence of radical social movements in the 1990s evidenced a renewed tradition of leftist uprising. Due in part to the success of large-scale protests, this era of social movements became defined both by anarchist commitments to anti-statism and anti-capitalism and to anarchist tactics of direct action and affinity-based organizing. In this sense, resurgence marked the emergence of a new form of anarchism in North America. In terming the myriad participants in these events ‘New Anarchists,’ Graeber sought to emphasize an emphatic commitment to anti-state and anti-capitalist politics in tune with, earlier generations of North American anarchists. However, ‘New Anarchists’ had moved away from the foundations of syndicalism and transatlantic immigration upon which many mid-nineteenth and early twentieth-century anarchist movements had been built. Incorporating the legacies of radical social movements in North America, ‘New Anarchism’ was defined instead by its inherently globalized character, epitomized by the oft-used tag-line “as global as capital.”

Here, I am interested in ‘New Anarchism’ in particular because it helps us to point to a form of anarchism that developed in response to a *particular* historical moment within the context of a particular place. Of course, contemporary anarchism does not belong to anarchists in the U.S., but ‘New Anarchism’ is a useful term for asking the questions: what is particular about this form of emergent anarchism, especially in the U.S., during this period? And how is it related to the material conditions in which it rose? Much of the talk about the rise of ‘New Anarchism’ has centered on questions of neoliberalism, globalization, and imperialism. One of the ways that scholars and activists have sought to answer these questions has been to emphasize the central role that the U.S. has played in establishing a global neoliberal order. Scholars like Naomi Klein, Edward S. Herman, Noam Chomsky, and Joseph Stiglitz have documented the central role that the U.S. played in the development of this global order while anti-war and anti-militarism activists mobilized around the deep connections between American corporatism and imperial war, especially in Iraq and Afghanistan.¹⁸

In these cases, radical U.S. scholars and activists took seriously the responsibility they had to critique their own government's interventions in the global world. In doing so, they also sought to make horizontal connections with other activists and organizers around the world that subverted hierarchical models for engagement across the Global North and Global South mirroring the supra-national organizations on which the proliferation of global neoliberalism depended. As a young person coming to political consciousness during this time, these connections had a profound influence on my own political growth and understanding of the global world. However, I have begun to worry about the how the continued suturing together of the stories of 'New Anarchism' and neoliberal globalization actually serves to obscure, rather than illuminate, the question of how anarchism in the U.S. is related to the material conditions in which it rises. Namely, I think the urgency of needing to place 'New Anarchism' within this narrative of global justice, and to insist on its participation in a transnational movement, has meant ignoring the necessary questions of place that come with doing work in a settler colonial context.

As a result, I fear that many U.S. based anarchists have not only ignored the question of how settlement affects our work, but have come to depend so heavily on the assumption that anarchism is inherently in conflict with settlement that we have ended up remaking settlement paradigms within anarchist spaces using anarchist logics. That is, what I see is that the commitment to taking up the responsibility of U.S. activists to engage critically with the state that acts globally in their name has meant consistently locating the exaction of U.S. empire out there without recognizing the structure of settlement *in here*. In doing so, we have reinscribed an ordering of space, time, and nation that does the work of the U.S. settler state in anarchist terms, using the critique of U.S. imperialism to create distinct ideas of what count as a 'domestic' or 'foreign' space which, as Amy Kaplan has pointed out, has been essential to the maintenance of the particular brand of exceptionalism that denies the existence of U.S. empire.¹⁹ In the case of 'New Anarchism', this has meant a critical insistence on confronting the central role that the U.S. has played in the proliferation of global neoliberalism without sufficient concomi-

tant recognition of how settlement provided the literal foundation for the resources, both material and ideological, that the U.S. has used to mobilized this power since its founding.

As shorthand, I have come to refer to this as ‘settler anarchism’ or a version of anarchism in the U.S. that not only replicates but has remade dominant narratives and structures of settlement within our own politics. This is not about a politics of purity — I agree with Alexis Shotwell that to commit to such a politics is to base our attempts at ethical life on the assumption of a pure past to which we can return. Of course, there is no ‘there’ there. As she argues, “all there is, while things perpetually fall apart, is the possibility of acting from where we are... There is not a pre-racial state we could access, erasing histories of slavery, forced labor on railroads, colonialism, genocide, and their concomitant responsibilities and requirements.”²⁰ My use of the term ‘settler anarchism’ is a way of pointing out that anarchists in the U.S. too rarely ask the question of ‘where we are’ and that this, in turn, has limited our ability to frame both our theoretical and practical engagements in transformative ways. To build on the example I gave at the beginning, let me turn to an instance of this form of engagement in a more substantive place: in the very origin story of ‘New Anarchism’ itself.

The 1999 protest against the WTO in Seattle looms large in the story of ‘New Anarchism’, where it is ubiquitously invoked as a type of origin story. If you are reading a text about contemporary anarchism, check the index—I bet Seattle is there. And this makes sense—it is a great story. It’s a triumphant story, one that highlights the possibilities of coalitions, of solidarity, of creativity, of radical affinity, and of direct action. It’s something to hold onto. But rarely in this constant retelling of the protests is ‘Seattle as such’ anything more than a backdrop. It becomes the setting, the material upon which the action happens rather than a place with a history, people, and set of relations that belong to it. Besides a few comments that suggest the success of the protests owed something to the labor and radical environmentalist history of the region, very few reflections on the protests and their organization consider the role that the place and its life played in the events of those five days.

For instance, why was *Seattle* chosen as the meeting place for the WTO in the first place? Why were local lawmakers and politicians so compelled to host this global meeting? What role did Seattle play in the development of a global neoliberalism? How was this connected to local political, economic, and social issues? What were the hot-button issues in Washington State at the time and how might that have affected the organizing strategies and outcomes of the protests? The specter of settlement unwrites each of these questions since, as Tlingit writer Ernestine Hayes has pointed out, “place is not the stage upon which events occur but is rather an active participant in those events.”²¹ That is, Seattle doesn’t just *happen* to be the place that either the WTO meeting or these protests occurred. And, without an engagement with these questions, we limit our understanding of the role that the city and the region have played in both the structures the protests were meant to confront and the ones that we still haven’t be able to address.

In the 1990s Seattle was undergoing yet another arc of redevelopment in the cycle of boom and bust that had characterized the city’s identity since settlement began in the 19th century. When Seattle beat out 40 other cities to host the 3rd ministerial meeting of the WTO, this was part of a broader arc of redevelopment in which multiple visions of what Seattle could be were coming into conflict as the city emerged from the Boeing Bust of the 1970s and 1980s into the twenty-first century. As Sam Howe Verhovek noted in an article covering the announcement of Seattle as the host city, “local leaders were exultant. Here in what is often called the most trade-dependent region of the nation, they said the meeting would be a chance to show off Seattle as a world-class center of high-tech innovation and a friend to global trade.”²²

In fact, establishing Seattle as an important terminal in global trade networks was essential to the process of settlement in both the region and the city itself. Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, the development of Seattle depended on this sense of it as a global city, from the arrival of the transcontinental railroad in the 1880s, to the successful fight to become the southern site of the path north during the Klondike Gold Rush in the 1890s, to the hosting of the

Alaska Yukon Pacific Exposition in 1909, to the region's central role in U.S. military intervention during both World Wars. Claiming Native space and resources was always in the service of this globalized vision of the city.²³

This is the history upon which politicians and businessmen drew when they lobbied so hard to attract the WTO meeting to the region. However, organizers tapped into a 'narrative of place' as well, keen to show-off the globally-minded nature of the city's progressive heart. As anti-WTO organizer Michael Dolan put it in 1999, "I was thrilled when Seattle was selected... It's almost like they're giving us home-field advantage. There are great labor unions here, great labor energy, all these environmentalists."²⁴ This sense of Seattle as a progressive, environmentalist city whose disposition linked into broader global sentiments was an essential one that the 1999 protests tapped into. However, it was also rooted in associations of the region with a Western frontier consolidated through settlement, with both coming together in what famed author Tom Robbins' has termed a "frontier metropolis."²⁵ Robbins' term captures the perception of Seattle as a simultaneously 'wild' and 'urban' space on the edge of the world that those inviting the WTO and opposing the WTO tapped into.

In this sense, 'settler anarchism' in the region persists through a failure to consistently identify the connection between manifest destiny and environmental conservation in the establishment of the economic, political, and cultural 'norms' of the region. What is more, this structure is constantly re-inculcated on a broader scale when the specificity of Seattle is unfailingly removed from the retelling of the story of the 1999 protests across anarchist spaces as an origin story of 'New Anarchism'.

Let me offer a specific example here to illustrate this point about how a lack of attention to place has enabled the structure of settlement to flourish in 'New Anarchism'. During the same year as protests against the WTO in Seattle, Washington State was embroiled in the controversy over Makah whaling. This controversy had reignited tensions over treaty rights that had characterized many Native and non-Native relationships in Washington since the Fish Wars of the 1960s

and 1970s.²⁶ After the grey whale was removed from the endangered species list in 1994, the Makah made an appeal to the International Whaling Commission (IWC) for the right to resume their traditional whale hunt as secured in the 1855 Treaty of Neah Bay. As the Makah moved to hunt a gray whale in the spring of 1999, the backlash against their renewed hunting practices saw willful collusion between right-wing politicians, radical environmentalists, and animal rights organizations. As scholars Zoltán Grossman and Joshua L. Reid (Snohomish) have documented, this resistance was characterized by a distinctly anti-Native sentiment at worst and an ignorance regarding sovereignty, indigeneity, treaty rights, and the law at best.²⁷

This is the context in which planning for the 1999 ‘Battle in Seattle’ was occurring. This was a heated issue in Washington State, bringing to the fore debates about tribal sovereignty, indigeneity, and environmental conservation not only in both state and federal contexts, but also on the international stage. It was closely covered by national news media (including articles by the same *New York Times* journalist who covered the protests) and was watched across Indian Country since the outcome promised to set precedent for other challenges to the limitation of Native treaty rights not only on national, but supra-national stages. Despite both the intensity and prevalence of the Makah whaling controversy in Washington State in 1999, it rarely comes up in any of the materials reflecting on the emergence, effects, or legacy of the 1999 ‘Battle in Seattle’. This is notable largely because it was connected to the region in many ways, including an overlapping of participants.

For instance, late environmentalist and animal rights activist Ben White was intimately involved both in the WTO protests and activism against the renewal of the Makah whale hunt. White “lived inside WTO week in Seattle for at least ten months before it happened” and the images of White’s sea turtle brigade, with protestors decked out in cardboard sea turtle armor, are some of the most lasting from the protests.²⁸ During this time, he was also working with the Makah to try to prevent them from resuming the whale hunt, issuing advertisements in local newspapers from the organization “People for the Makahs and Whales” that offered money to stop the whale hunt

as well as organizing presentations to the Makah Whaling Commission to provide “historical background” related to protests against the Makah that took place after the whaling permit was granted.²⁹ He appears often in interviews about the controversy, speaking as a “longtime environmental activist” who believed that the Makah had not “considered the worldwide social and political consequences of their actions.”³⁰ And though White’s understanding of the topic isn’t representative of the feelings of the diverse array of participants at the 1999 protests, his ardent participation in both the planning of the mass protests and resistance to the revitalization of the Makah whale hunt demonstrates that these issues were overlapping.

The legacies of this local Indigenous context are lost in the collective recollection of the protests in ‘New Anarchist’ texts, especially those dealing with the Battle in Seattle such as Eddie Yuen, George Kat-siaficas, and Daniel Burton Rose’s collection *The Battle in Seattle: The New Challenge to Capitalist Globalization* or Janet Thomas’ *The Battle in Seattle: The Story Behind and Beyond the WTO Demonstrations*. In fact, I looked in every text about anarchism in North America in the 21st century that I could find and while the majority of them had reference to (and often started with) the story of the 1999 Battle in Seattle, none had a concerted attempt to reckon with the contemporaneous history of the Makah Whaling Controversy—few even mentioned it.³¹

The fact that this is absent is not only a problem of omission but one that demonstrates a lack of serious consideration of a core question: What was happening in Seattle and in Washington State during the lead up to the protests? How did this impact the structure and legacies of the events that followed? Neglecting this question in the fifteen or so years of commemoration has meant an extended disavowal of the important connections between trade, settlement, and neoliberalism at the turn of the 21st century. The fact that the Makah whaling controversy and the meeting of WTO in Seattle were happening simultaneously is no coincidence. Rather, they rose together as part of the attempt to advance the long-lasting desire to secure for Seattle a position as a central locus of trade in the global world.

Global trade was an important dimension of the public discussions surrounding the renewal of the Makah whale hunt. Both animal rights activist Paul Watson and White routinely focused their resistance to Makah whaling on their perception that the Makah would attempt to sell whale meat to Japan — a charge that the Makah Whaling Commission consistently rejected. Citing this as a matter of international trade law, environmentalists like Watson invoked the sovereignty of the U.S. settler state to intervene in the trade activities of Native nations. In this way, anti-whaling activists drew on long histories of using settler governance to restructure international trade in ways that benefitted the newly emerging U.S. state. As Reid points out, attempts to prevent tribes from developing or maintaining independent trade relationships with other nations was an essential part of the treaty process during the late nineteenth century in what was then Washington Territory. Reid reminds us that after the territorial governor Isaac Stevens was unable to muster strong military power through territorial militias, he “turned to the treaties to encode some method of control,” which included preventing tribes such as the Makah from trading with long-standing trade partners and kin relations.³² In this sense, transnational trade issues were of great concern to agents like Stevens in the mid-nineteenth century as the U.S. was trying to establish itself as a global economic power; just as they were for politicians, businessmen, and protestors alike at the turn of the twenty-first century.

What would it mean to integrate this story into the story of the Seattle protests? Why isn't it deemed important, and what is at stake? My sense is that part of the answer to this question is that the Makah whaling issue belies what many assume is an easy parallel between anarchism and Native sovereignty movements. However, this assumption is relatively easily to do away with if one looks to the plethora of work in anarchist studies more generally and realizes how little, until recently, it dealt substantially with questions of settlement in North America, particularly the United States.

Indeed, activists and scholars like Adam Gary Lewis, Adam Barker, Craig Fortier, Nick Montgomery, and carla bergman, have offered other critical approaches to these questions by exploring how non-

Native activists might work to build more accountable and sustainable relationships with Native nations, there is little work that considers what it means to do anarchist work in a settler colonial context.³³ And the special issue of *Affinities: A Journal of Radical Theory, Culture, Action* titled “Working Across Difference for Post-Imperial Futures: Intersections Between Anarchism, Indigenism, and Feminism” edited by Glen Sean Coulthard (Yellowknives Dene), Jacqueline Lasky, Adam Lewis, and Vanessa Watts (Mohawk and Anishnaabe) brings together articles that explore the connections between anarchism, feminism, and indigenism; Indigenous feminism and the nation-state; anarch@-Zapatismo; urban indigeneity and international relationships; and Hawaiian nationhood within activist spaces.³⁴

In each of these cases, however, the focus is often on the intersection between anarchism and *indigeneity* rather than anarchism and *settlement*. So, then we need to get into the more complicated answer to my question: that though there are important intersections between anarchism and indigeneity, there might also be a relationship between anarchism and settlement as well. And, if we acknowledge this is an uneasy relationship, then we need to ask more difficult questions, such as how anarchists have at times slipped into upholding the structure of settlement in the effort to advance anarchist politics.

This seems to me exactly the kind of concern that people like King and Vowel describe when they talk about land acknowledgements becoming superficial or fetishized. That is, their vision for land acknowledgement as a place-based pedagogy is one that draws on the multiple stories that live with a place. They implore us, as settlers, to center our relationship to that place, its people, and the promises that have been made on our behalf. The criticism is how acknowledgements can be ‘managed’ in order to create a narrative that either eludes the question of how to live up to the responsibilities of being in relation to the land and its people or assumes that the answer is a foregone ‘already taken care of’ conclusion. This is precisely what happens when we de-link the story of the 1999 protests in Seattle from any examination of the place itself, including complicated histories of activism and settlement in the region, and allow the story

of ‘Seattle’ to become a broader stand-in for the story of ‘New Anarchism’. The relationship between the place and the movement that emerged from a complicated set of long-standing relationships is no longer part of the story. What is more, pedagogically, this perspective doesn’t ask the necessary questions that can teach us to reckon with the structure of settlement and what it means to do anarchist work on Native land.

So, in my example, the story of the 1999 protests in Seattle does not really become about Seattle at all, but rather about ‘New Anarchism’ itself. This has implications beyond how we narrate the rise of ‘New Anarchism’. What I’m interested in is how this example evidences issues with how we structure the very questions we ask, how these questions work pedagogically as a model for engagement, especially when we think about the relationship between anarchism and other movements or bodies of thought. In this example, an assumption that anarchism and Native sovereignty are inherently aligned against the state in Seattle-related literature has resulted in the replication of the structure of settlement within anarchism itself, not because it has made them one and the same but because it has prevented anarchists from critically evaluating our movements as part of structures of settlement. Recall the vignette with which I began this article: this method of engagement has prevented us from being vigilant about how we remake society even when we acknowledge structures of settlement are an issue.

As in the rote repetition of a land acknowledgement, lack of critical engagement leaves intact the foundation of ‘settlement’ in all our ethical commitments. The pedagogical form that emerges, one of simultaneously acknowledging settlement without allowing such an acknowledgement to lead us to a place-based method that transforms our politics, prematurely settles transformative conversations. Again, this is not an issue of purity but one of pedagogy. What happens when we don’t center a place-based pedagogy in our approach to anarchism? What happens when we don’t reckon with the material reality of the U.S. as a settler colonial project in our praxis? What happens when we use this pedagogical imperative only as a form of acknowledgement instead of as a way of restructuring our relations?

Conclusion

The day before giving an earlier version of this paper at the *Pedagogies of Anarchist Praxis* conference, I had the honor of chairing a panel of Native students, staff, faculty, and community members on Narragansett and Wampanoag territory at Brown University. During this panel, Lorén Spears (Narragansett/Niantic), Nitana Hicks Greendeer (Mashpee Wampanoag), Niyo Moraza-Keeswood (Diné and Chichimeca), Ruth Miller (Dena'ina Athabaskan), and Raelee Fourkiller (Cherokee) all spoke about how to center land and its people beyond the process of rote acknowledgement. What struck me most during this conversation was the specificity with which each person spoke to their relationship to place; to particular shorelines and horizons; to particular plants and their tastes and smells.

As I drove down to Mattabesett (Middletown) in Wangunk territory the next day to give my own talk about pedagogy and land acknowledgement, I thought about how the people on the panel, who came from a variety of tribal and national locations but were drawn together by the fact that we all had some relationship to the institution at which the event was held, emphasized the persistence of their forms of acknowledgement. From describing joy at finding wild onions on campus to talking about recognizing the contours of the land during a daily commute, all methods of acknowledgement were rooted in a relationship to place that had to be developed through consistent, concerted engagement.

This is what I understand Simpson to mean when she talks about “land as pedagogy.” It works against the type of acknowledgement and subsequent disinvestment from responsibility that characterized the discussion about ‘war paint’ with which I began this piece. I want us, as anarchists, to be able to develop a pedagogy that not only acknowledges the history of settlement, but also foregrounds our continued responsibilities to the land and its people—not just because there were promises made on behalf of many of us by settler institutions that we are obliged to uphold, but because this is the literal foundation of the work that we do.

Each place where I have resided and learned, I've sought an example of pedagogy that lives with the people of that place as a way to orient me to my responsibilities. For example, while living on Narragansett and Wampanoag territory, I considered Narragansett elder Dawn Dove's essay, "In Order to Understand Thanksgiving, One Must Understand the Sacredness of the Gift." Rather than reject the narrative of Thanksgiving itself, a story whose repetition remains a central myth whereby the U.S. justifies its claims over Native territory, she reminds us that Thanksgiving is an Indigenous ceremony that signals relationship to the land. In the narrative of giving that characterizes Wampanoag and settler exchange during the First Thanksgiving, Dove locates the promise and responsibility of reciprocity — a promise and responsibility that settlers have consistently betrayed. As she notes, the Wampanoag men whose interaction with the Pilgrims has become the basis for the story of the First Thanksgiving, were "offering [a] sacred gift...the gift of Friendship, Respect, Equality, and Justice, the gift that would have made this country truly a land in which there was freedom and justice for all. Unfortunately, the gift was refused because of greed and racism."³⁵ What Dove describes is a pedagogy, a method of engagement, a way of relating that emanates from the land and lives with its people. As anarchists doing work on land that is claimed by the U.S. settler state, we must not only recognize that these pedagogies exist but allow them to transform the work we do. In this way, we need to be attentive to the specificity of the place where we do our work since, by virtue of our presence, we are imbricated in these relations.

As anarchists, we must recognize that any to attempt to confront the U.S. state without addressing settlement is not to confront the U.S. state at all. In fact, neglect to do so reinforces some of the very foundational claims to sovereignty upon which the U.S. state depends. But what if, as anarchists, we adopted a pedagogy that recognized, as Dove puts it, the sacredness of the gift? How might our movements be transformed if we took seriously a method of engagement that centered place? One that recognized that not only are other worlds possible, but that there are other worlds here — other worlds that live with the land and for which we already have models for relation, if only we would honor them.

Notes

¹ “Police Snatch and Arrest 18 at Anti-Capitalist March,” *Rochester Indymedia*, 21 July 2012, <http://rochester.indymedia.org/node/53497>

² These quotes are taken from personal screenshots of the conversation.

³ “Warpaint Rides in Chiefs’ Superbowl Victory Celebration” (video), *KMBC Kansas City*, February 5, 2020: <https://www.msn.com/en-us/weather/video/warpaint-rides-in-chiefs-super-bowl-victory-celebration/vp-BBZGCyF>

⁴ Nino Munoz, “Warpaint” in *The Last Magazine*, January 21, 2014, <https://thelast-magazine.com/warpaint/>

⁵ For more on the gendered dimensions of these tropes, see Rayna Green’s “The Pocahontas Perplex: The Image of Indian Women in American Culture,” *The Massachusetts Review* 16:4 (1975): 698-714 and Scott Morgensen’s “Cutting to the Roots of Colonial Masculinity” in *Indigenous Men and Masculinities: Legacies, Identity, Regeneration*, ed. Robert Alexander Innes and Kim Anderson (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2015).

⁶ David Graeber, *Possibilities: Essays on Hierarchy, Rebellion, and Desire* (Oakland: AK Press, 2007): 304.

⁷ Paolo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2000).

⁸ See Lila Asher, Joe Curnow, and Amil Davis, “The limits of settlers’ territorial acknowledgements” in *Curriculum Inquiry*, 48:3 (2018): 315-334.

⁹ For mainstream examples, see Amanda Coletta, “Canada pays tribute to Indigenous people before hockey games, school days. Some complain it rings hollow,” *The Washington Post*, July 17, 2019 https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/the_americas/canadas-land-acknowledgments-draw-criticism--from-the-Indigenous-peoples-theyre-supposed-to-honor/2019/07/25/8479ab14-accd-11e9-9411-a608f9d0c2d3_story.html; for an example in the anarchist context, see the announcement for the 2018 Seattle Anarchist Book Fair, which reads: “The tenth annual book fair held on occupied Duwamish land will be a two-day thrill ride on Saturday and Sunday, November 17th and 18th, from 10 AM - 5 PM at the Vera Project.” Anonymous Contributor, “Announcing the Seattle Anarchist Bookfair 2018,” *It’s Going Down*, September 11, 2018, <https://itsgoingdown.org/announcing-the-seattle-anarchist-bookfair-2018/>

¹⁰ Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, “Decolonization is Not a Metaphor” in *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, and Society* 1:1 (2012): 1-40.

¹¹ This echoes the arguments that Athabaskan scholar Dian Million has made regarding reconciliation and that Yellowknives Dene scholar Glen Coulthard has made about recognition, both in the Canadian context. See Dian Million, *Therapeutic Nations: Healing in an Age of Indigenous Human Rights* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2013) and Glen Sean Coulthard, *Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).

¹² See “About” on CBC’s *Unreserved* website: <https://www.cbc.ca/radio/unreserved/about-unreserved-1.4349977>

¹³ CBC Radio, “I regret it; Hayden King on writing Ryerson’s territorial acknowledgement,” *Unreserved*, January 18, 2020: <https://www.cbc.ca/radio/unreserved/>

redrawing-the-lines-1.4973363/i-regret-it-hayden-king-on-writing-ryerson-university-s-territorial-acknowledgement-1.4973371

¹⁴ Chelsea Vowel, "Beyond territorial acknowledgements," *âpihtawikosisân*, September 23, 2016: <https://apihtawikosisan.com/2016/09/beyond-territorial-acknowledgments/>

¹⁵ David Graeber, "The New Anarchists," *The New Left Review* 13 (Jan-Feb 2002): 61-73; Staughton Lynd and Andrej Grubačić *Wobblies and Zapatistas: Conversations on Anarchism, Marxism, and Radical History* (Oakland, PM Press: 2008); Andrej Grubačić and David Graeber, "Anarchism, or the Revolutionary Movement of the Twenty-First Century," *Z-Net*, January 6th 2004, <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/andrej-grubacic-david-graeber-anarchism-or-the-revolutionary-movement-of-the-twenty-first-century>;

¹⁶ As May has argued, "The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union has reshaped the terrain so that the foundation of existence upon which was built much of the vision of what could be has also collapsed. This is the meaning of the slogan that Marxism is dead." See also Richard Day's *Gramsci is Dead*; Barbara Epstein, "Anarchism and the Anti-Globalization Movement," *The Monthly Review*, (September 1, 2001): <https://monthlyreview.org/2001/09/01/anarchism-and-the-anti-globalization-movement/>

¹⁷ For a more comprehensive discussion of this history, see David Graeber, *Direct Action: An Ethnography* (Oakland: AK Press, 2009).

¹⁸ See Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (New York: Picador, 2008); Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media* (New York: Pantheon, 2002); and Joseph Stiglitz, *Globalization and its Discontents* (New York: W.W. & Norton, 1994).

¹⁹ Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005).

²⁰ Alexis Shotwell, *Against Purity: Living Ethically in Compromised Times* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016): 4.

²¹ Ernestine Hayes, "Contemporary Creative Writing and Ancient Oral Tradition" in *Shapes of Native Nonfiction: Collected Essays by Contemporary Writers* ed. Elissa Washuta and Theresa Warburton (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2019): 27.

²² Sam Howe Verhovek, "For Seattle, Triumph and Protest," *New York Times*, October 13 1999: <https://www.nytimes.com/1999/10/13/us/for-seattle-triumph-and-protest.html>

²³ For more on Seattle's history, see Coll Thrush's *Native Seattle: Histories from the Crossing-Over Place* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008); for more on the construction of the transcontinental railroad, see Manu Karuka, *Empire's Tracks: Indigenous Nations, Chinese Workers, and the Transcontinental Railroad* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2019); for more on the Alaska Yukon Pacific Expedition, see Shari M. Huhndorf, *Mapping the Americas: The Transnational Politics of Contemporary Native Culture* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009).

²⁴ Verhovek, "For Seattle."

²⁵ Robbins' acceptance speech was reproduced in print for the first time in 2006.

Tom Robbins, "Here in Geoduck Junction," *Seattle Weekly*, October 9, 2006: <http://archive.seattleweekly.com/2000-05-03/news/here-in-geoduck-junction/>

²⁶ I am thankful to Zoltán Grossman for challenging me to think through this interplay between the Battle in Seattle and the Makah whaling controversy, which is informed by his work on Native and non-Native alliances during the Fish Wars in both Washington and Wisconsin. See Zoltán Grossman, *Unlikely Alliances: Native Nations and White Communities Join to Defend Rural Lands* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2017).

²⁷ Zoltán Grossman, *Unlikely Alliances*; Joshua L. Reid, *The Sea is My Country: The Maritime World of the Makahs* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015). Opponents like House of Representatives Republican Jack Metcalf (Washington State, Second District) and Sea Shepard's Paul Watson were joined by journalists like Richard Blow (writing for *Mother Jones*) in demonstrating an extreme lack of knowledge not only about the issue at hand, but about the history of treaties in Washington in general. Metcalf repeatedly depended on claims that the right to whale is a 'special right' granted to the Makah by the United States government, rather than a right secured and reserved by the Makah during the signing of the treaty. Joining Metcalf's project of preventing Makah peoples from exercising their treaty rights, Watson consistently decried the hunts by positioning himself as the arbiter of traditionalism, pointing over and over to Makah whalers' use of contemporary tools as evidence that the whale hunt had no relationship to maintaining traditional cultural practices. And in his article "The Great American Whale Hunt," Blow describes the broader political issues at hand: "Challenging the whaling moratorium, and the [National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration] would ignite international fury, not to mention the wrath of domestic environmental groups. But contest the Makah's treaty, and it would risk a political firestorm from all American Indians, all of whom live under similar treaties with the federal government." Of course, not all Native peoples in the U.S. live under treaties with the federal government. But what is more, Blow (much like Metcalf) misunderstands the fundamental character of treaties themselves. Because the U.S. government signed the treaty with the Makah that reserved their rights to traditional whaling practices and grounds in 1855, it had no authority to give away those rights when it participated in either the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling (ICRW) in 1946 or agreed to the moratorium on whaling through the IWC in 1982. As a sovereign nation, the Makah petitioned the IWC themselves, willfully participating in an international conversation that demonstrated their ongoing commitment to a balance between conservation and traditional whaling practices — something central to Makah whaling practices since time immemorial.

²⁸ Janet Thomas, *The Battle in Seattle: The Story Behind the WTO Demonstrations* (New York: Fulcrum Publishing, 2000): 20. Graeber has mentioned White's turtles as a notable example of the use of puppetry in mass protests. Graeber, *Direct Action: An Ethnography* (Oakland: AK Press, 2009): 491; Marc Cooper of the *Los Angeles Times* noted White's turtles as a definitive image of the protests as well. Marc Cooper, "Teamsters and Turtles: They're Together at Last," *Los Angeles Times*,

December 2nd 1999: <http://articles.latimes.com/1999/dec/02/local/me-39707>

²⁹ Associated Press, "Protestors leave, but what hunt is still planned: Makah tribes is considering alternatives," *Deseret News*, December 1st 1998: <https://www.deseretnews.com/article/666150/Protesters-leave-but-whale-hunt-is-still-planned.html>; Jim Nollman, "Whaling Report to the Makah Tribal Council," *Interspecies Newsletter*, 1999, <https://www.whaleweb.org/intersp/pages/makah.html>

³⁰ Christopher Dunagan, "Hunters become the hunted," *Kitsap Sun*, October 5, 1998: http://web.kitsapsun.com/archive/1998/10-05/0056_hunters_become_the_hunted.html

³¹ For instance, see David Graeber's *Direct Action: An Ethnography* (Oakland: AK Press, 2009), Richard J.F. Day's *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements* (New York: Pluto Press, 2005), and Staughton Lynd and Andrej Grubačić's *Wobblies and Zapatistas: Conversations on Anarchism, Marxism, and Radical History* (Oakland: PM Press, 2008), all of which are invaluable texts in the study of the rise of New Anarchism. Each focuses, in some part, not only on the protests in Seattle, but on questions of Indigenous uprising more generally. However, none consider the local Indigenous context of what happened in Seattle as part of the narrative of those protests and their importance to the rise of New Anarchism in the United States at the turn of the 21st century.

³² Both the Treaty of Neah Bay, signed with Makahs, and the Treaty of Point Elliott, signed by representatives from across the Native nations of the Salish Sea region, including Duwamish leader Chief Seattle, contained articles that explicitly prevented tribes from trading "at Vancouver's Island or elsewhere out of the dominions of the United States." According to Reid, this was Steven's attempt to "control Indian trade, redirecting it to benefit the U.S. rather than British interests," and to dislocate important kinship connections between Native nations newly divided by the 49th parallel (Reid, 133).

³³ Adam J. Barker, "Already Occupied: Indigenous peoples, settler colonialism, and the Occupy movements in North America," *Social Movement Studies* 11, no. 3-4 (August 9th 2012): 327-334; Adam J. Barker, "The Contemporary Reality of Canadian Imperialism: Settler Colonialism and the Hybrid Colonial State," *American Indian Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (Summer 2009): 325-351; Adam J. Barker, "From Adversaries to Allies: Forging respectful alliances between Indigenous and Settler Peoples" in *Alliances: Re/Envisioning Indigenous non-Indigenous Relationships*, ed. Lynne Davis (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010): 316-333. See also Adam J. Barker and Jenny Pickerill, "Radicalizing Relationships To and Through Shared Geographies: Why Anarchists Need to Understand Indigenous Connections to Land, Sea, and Place," *Antipode* 44, no. 5 (August 17th 2012): 1705-1275 and Adam J. Barker and Emma Battell Lowman, *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada* (Halifax: Fernwood Press, 2015). Craig Fortier, *Unsettling the Commons: Social Movements Within, Against, and Beyond Settler Colonialism* (Winnipeg: Arbiter Ring Publishing, 2017); Nick Montgomery and carla bergman, *Joyful Militancy: Building Thriving Resistance in Toxic Times* (Oakland: AK Press, 2017): 73.

³⁴ *Affinities: Theory, Culture, Action*, August 31st 2011,

<https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/affinities/issue/view/572>

³⁵ Dawn Dove, "In Order to Understand Thanksgiving, One Must Understand the Sacredness of the Gift," *Dawnland Voices: An Anthology of Indigenous Writing from New England*, ed. Siobhan Senior (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014): 484.