19 From Adversaries to Allies: Forging Respectful Alliances between Indigenous and Settler Peoples

ADAM BARKER

Copyright 2010. University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division.
All rights reserved. May not be reproduced in any form without permission from the publisher, except fair uses permitted under U.S. or applicable copyright law.

Introduction: The Problem of Hegemonic Alliances

To be an ally first requires recognition of the need for action in a real and present struggle: in this case, the struggle of Indigenous survival and resurgence against colonial and neo-colonial power, within Canada and globally. But after this recognition, it is no easy thing to be a Settler[1] person committed to acting as an Indigenous ally; combinations of active social and cultural pressures, passive understandings of 'normal,' and internal psychological and emotional barriers often create paralysis for Settlers attempting to act in de/anti-colonial ways. As a Settler who has been attempting to act as an ally for years, with varying degrees of success, I know these complexities all too well. It is a long way, physically and conceptually, from my origins in a white, middle-class suburb of Hamilton, Ontario, to focusing my life, academic and personal, on participating in social and political activism alongside Indigenous peoples and communities.

This is my attempt to put to theory my own experiences, successes, and failures in working towards acting as an ally to Indigenous struggles in Canada and beyond. I do not claim to have the answer to the question of how Settlers can move from Adversary to Ally in the struggles taking place in colonized areas, but I hope to be able to articulate my answers as part of a dialogue among Settlers as we collectively try to figure out our roles and protocols, strengths and weaknesses, and relationships among ourselves and with Indigenous peoples and communities. The framework in which I hope to situate this dialogue is twofold: first, I am inspired by Prudhonian federalism,[2] with an emphasis on personal responsibility and the prevention of domination;

EBSCO Publishing : eBook Collection (EBSCOhost) - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
AN: 682639 ; Davis, Lynne.; Alliances : Re/Envisioning Indigenous-non-Indigenous Relationships
Account: s5672194.main.ehost

and second, by an understanding of the Haudenosaunee Guswentha (Two Row) agreement, which calls for non-interference, but also relationship-building and dynamic alliance between Indigenous and Settler societies.[3] This exploration is predicated on several key points: first, that individual Settlers have the power to choose and change their level of colonial involvement (though the process is difficult and by no means free of opposition); second, that for a Settler to choose a decolonizing path requires unlearning much of what is taken for granted in contemporary Canadian society; and third, that what it means to be a decolonized Settler and act as a true ally remains an open and dynamic concept, which is not 'settled' now, and hopefully will never become 'settled.'

In *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*, Mohawk scholar Taiaiake Alfred (2005) comments on the phenomenon of Settler people seeking guidance from Indigenous peoples. His response is that it is the responsibility of Settler people to figure out for themselves what their course of action should be (235), reflective of a similar sentiment expressed in 1972 by Shuswap chief and founder of the National Indian Brotherhood, George Manuel (see Regan, 2006: 30). Alfred and Manuel, then, lay the primary responsibility for the 'how' of Settler involvement in Indigenous struggles at the feet of Settler people, both individually and collectively. Personal responsibility is a concept that I both agree with, and, from a historical perspective, find extremely problematic; Settler people, and Western society in general, have managed to 'solve' problems of oppression and tyranny in the past by developing newly oppressive, hierarchical structures. The Settlers who had utilized language of anti-oppression quickly became dictatorial when Indigenous action and intent did not meet up with unrecognized colonial ideals. This is ultimately a flaw in Western methods of political engagement – as Richard Day (2005: 80), an anarchist academic and activist, points out in his discussion of 'the hegemony of hegemony':

> Both liberalism and postmarxism, then, share a reliance upon a politics of demand, a politics oriented to improving existing institutions and everyday experiences by *appealing to the benevolence of hegemonic forces and/or by altering the relations between these forces*. But, as recent history has shown, these alterations never quite produce the kinds of 'emancipation effects' their proponents expect. The gains that are made (for some) only appear as such within the logic of the existing order, and often come at a high cost for others. (emphasis added)

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

So it stands: some Settlers attempting to act in alliance with Indigenous peoples have missed the contradiction between their goals and their actions, ultimately replicating the effects of colonization.

In order to generate long-term alliances, Settler people must work to understand why many attempted solutions to social problems caused by Settler political structures, social norms, and chosen lifestyles continue to fail, replicating hegemonic colonial harm. This approach inevitably points to continued colonial involvement among past and present Settler peoples and societies, and thus to decolonization as a response to colonialism. There is much discussion in the literature about the need for Indigenous peoples to 'decolonize,'[4] but there has traditionally been little recognition that Settler people can, and perhaps must, decolonize as well. Just as Indigenous peoples must defeat the legacy of prior colonization and the realities of current neocolonialism in order to achieve freedom, Settler people must do the same for themselves.[5]

The Colonist Who Refuses

A barrier to Settler involvement with Indigenous causes is detailed in Albert Memmi's (1965) identity construct of 'the colonist who refuses.' In *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, Memmi draws a distinction between colonials who actively, openly, and unashamedly engage in colonization, and those who refuse to participate (at least actively). His distinction is one based on intent, not on effect. The true colonial is the person who actively engages in colonial pursuits, inherently seeing hegemonic power and a homogenous society as important goals to pursue.[6] In the contemporary liberal state of Canada, this type of colonial is rare. Yet, colonialism is not over; Taiaiake Alfred and Cherokee scholar Jeff Corntassel (2005) identify with great clarity sites of ongoing colonialism, in Canada and elsewhere, including, 'a legal, political, and cultural discourse designed to serve an agenda of silent surrender to an inherently unjust relation at the roof of the colonial state' (598). The difference is that in the present context, the individual colonizer takes on a much more obfuscating attitude, presenting themselves as a 'friend,' an 'ally,' a 'concerned citizen' – they know that there is 'something' wrong – and it is these individuals that pose a subtle, shifting danger in their support of colonial regimes. In Memmi's words: 'Finally [the colonizer who refuses] realizes that everything may change. He invokes the end of colonization, but refuses to conceive that this revolution can result in the overthrow of his situation and himself. For it is too much to ask

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

one's imagination to visualize one's own end, even if it be in order to be reborn another; especially if, like the colonizer, one can hardly evaluate such a rebirth' (40–1).

I suggest that the first step in becoming a decolonizing Settler is contesting against this colonial ignorance that allows Settlers to maintain thinly veiled power and privilege. As the Settler historian Paulette Regan (2006) notes, it is 'virtually impossible for us not to *know* [about the oppression of Indigenous peoples]. What we choose to deny is our complicity in perpetuating a colonial system that is rooted in violence and social injustice' (22; original emphasis). Indigenous peoples in Canada suffer from overwhelming levels of disease, starvation, alcoholism, and any other indicator that can track poverty, as well as racist treatment from individuals, courts, governments, and corporate interests. These issues are widely written about, and reported on, in scholarly circles as well as in popular media. However, colonial Settlers do not recognize or acknowledge their own roles in colonial practices that not only continue into the present, but pervade our own lives. I am often reminded of the words of Albert Speer (1970),[7] who declares that, 'had I only wanted to, I could have found out ... [B]eing in a position to know and nevertheless shunning knowledge creates direct responsibility for the consequences – from the very beginning' (19). To be in a position of privilege and power and not to question the source of that power and privilege indicates a deliberate choice of colonial action and intent. This, I assert, is one of the defining characteristics of a *colonial* Settler: the ability to access such knowledge, but the refusal to do so.

Memmi's (1965: 17) concept of the 'pyramid of petty tyrants' is a useful way of understanding why non-elites participate in imperialism and oppression. He notes how a member of colonial society is content to be oppressed as long as there is someone else upon whom they can exert power. For colonial Settlers behaving in this insidiously colonial manner, silently oppressing others through a refusal to question the systems and institutions which provide us with massive benefits, is considered simply normal. Alfred (2005: 109) notes that much of what is taken for granted in contemporary North American life is part of the larger colonial project:

> The basic substance of the problem of colonialism is the belief in the superiority and universality of Euroamerican culture, especially the concepts of individual rights as the highest expression of human freedom, representative democracy as being the best guarantor of peace and order,

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

> and capitalism as the only means to achieve the satisfaction of human material needs.
> It is this 'liberal dogma' that is the clearest and most present manifestation of Euroamerican arrogance, and it displays itself across the political spectrum and colonial class structure as racism, conservatism, and liberalism.

This normalization of colonialism for Settler people – even those who 'refuse' on the surface – both requires and relies upon the creation of colonial Settler 'myths' about our own history. Foundational to colonial Canadian Settler identity is the 'peacemaker myth.' Regan (2006: 11) notes:

> Canadians associate violence only with physical confrontation such as that which occurred during the Oka, Gustafsen Lake, Ipperwash Park and Burnt Church crises. We are disturbed by these violent conflicts because they call into question a core belief and tenet of the peacemaker myth: that our relationship with First Nations is built on non-violence. We congratulate ourselves on the fact that armed confrontation is still the exception in Canada, seeing this somehow as proof of the moral and cultural superiority we have demonstrated by willingly negotiating with Indigenous peoples over time.

Colonial Settlers become so entrenched in the 'idea' of themselves as benevolent peacemakers, that the terrible social conditions that affect Indigenous communities across Canada are honestly surprising and confusing; they cannot follow the logic to see that their own actions – for example, promoting resource extraction on Indigenous lands – leads to brutal consequences for Indigenous peoples. The embedded myths of colonial Settler society intentionally obscure the relationship between colonization and the person of the colonizer.

If Settler peoples are serious about becoming allies to Indigenous peoples, and serious about helping to solve the problems that Indigenous communities face in the present, they must first accept that these problems have definitive causes: as cliché as it sounds, there are no accidents. Further, we as Settler people are not immune to these problems, though our privilege tends to insulate us from the brunt of the effect of colonial action. For example, economic oppression which is a result of contemporary economic imperialism does disproportionately affect Indigenous peoples; however, Settler people who have come to occupy a lower stratus of the 'pyramid of petty tyrants' (which is to say have lower levels of imperial privilege) have begun to feel these effects. As

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

imperial forces gain a more certain control of land, which political theorist James Tully (2000: 39) identifies as a main goal of colonization, new global imperialism begins to prioritize a different basis of power – a power base that rests on communications, technology, and the subtle manipulation of 'right' and 'wrong' to generate a decentred and deterritorialized imperial construct.[8] In this neo-imperialism, formerly essential colonizers, such as primary food producers like fishers, factory labourers, or those in the automotive industry, are no longer deemed essential, and so their privilege erodes.

From this it becomes clear that globalization, social oppression, and racism are connected to the wider imperial project. Rather than being based in separate, rigid, ideological, cultural, or economic concepts, these uses and abuses of power all serve the same overarching system(s). This awareness must be internalized by Settler peoples, or we can never hope to truly confront colonialism because we will always confront it with one hand while supporting it with the other. There can be no 'sacred cows' in Western society; rather, we must question literally everything we do, all of the assumptions which underpin our personal lives and larger societies, and the myths which inform our very identities. We must be prepared to face the fact that our comfortable lives, our 'privileges,' exist because we are useful to imperialism, and that being an ally and confronting imperialism requires us to risk our comforts and to confront the entire imperial system.

'What Should We Do?' – An Honest Question?

This brings us back to the question of what we Settlers should do if we wish to truly become allies. Asked frequently, and in many different settings, it is important to understand that, as an honest, engaged question, there is nothing wrong with it. However, if the question is a dishonest one, then it only serves to perpetuate all the negative aspects of colonial Settler society. Too often, this question is motivated by feelings of guilt or shame, generated when Settler people encounter the undeniable consequences of their lifestyles in the oppression of Indigenous peoples.[9] This indicates a concern for the problems evident in Settler society as a whole, but often a lack of willingness to sacrifice personally in order to solve the problems that have been presented. Here, the more direct question is actually, 'How do I restore comfort to myself?'

Two responses to this question are typical: the first is the empty apologizing in which Settler governments especially seem to revel. Witness the

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

1998 'apology' by then-minister of Indian Affairs Jane Stewart for residential schools abuses which only addressed overt sexual and physical abuse that occurred in the institutions.[10] At the time, and for several years following, there was no apology whatsoever for the fact that the schools were designed to carry out cultural genocide, had staggering mortality rates, or that the families of residential school survivors are still experiencing the generational effects of the abuses and the genocidal conditions found in the schools. The 'apology' was clearly not designed to deal with the effects of the schools, or to move towards real acknowledgement and restitution, but rather to deal with the obvious and undeniable parts of the residential school legacy that make Settler society feel guilty: extreme sexual and physical abuse of children. Further, these gestures of 'apology' are rarely combined with any kind of meaningful action on the part of the government to redress the serious wrongs they finally, and in such a limited way, choose to acknowledge.

The second response is what Corntassel (2006: 36) has called the 'Free Tibet syndrome.' In this instance, colonial Settlers engage with injustices, but only with those clearly perpetrated somewhere else, by someone else. This allows the release of pent-up guilt over opulent and privileged lifestyles through the contribution to 'some good end,' without actual personal sacrifice or discomfort. Further, involvement in such causes is often token – small donations, a bumper-sticker, standing at a rally outside of an embassy or legislative building, when convenient.[11] It is as if the pain that results from colonialism is commodified; the pain that results from being colonized and the pain that results from realizing that one is a colonizer are supposed to disappear because of donations that may or may not ever actually affect anyone's life. Meanwhile, practical actions that could be taken in the immediate social and political context of the colonial Settler's own life and location are ignored.

In order to ask the question honestly, Settler people must come to understand that colonization is motivated by an implicit individualism, functionally similar to selfishness: colonial Settler actions, even when not intended as such, can appear as greed for power and privilege, insulation from conflict or fear, and the freedom to completely ignore problematic 'others' as well as the effects of individual actions.[12] Decolonization, on any scale, cannot be motivated by an effort to maintain as much comfort or privilege as possible; given the nature of hierarchical oppression, confronting oppression requires that some individuals within the hierarchy will have to make significant sacrifices. Alfred (2005) highlights the need for means-ends consistency in Indigenous peoples' struggles for free-

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

dom: a violent revolution will lead to a violent society, an economic development solution to a competitive, capitalist society, and so on (52). For Settler peoples, a personal revolution based in self-preservation above all else will result in a selfish life. To ensure that this does not happen, Settler people who hope to become effective allies must move past the desire to re-establish comfort and ask the question, 'What do we do?' from a profoundly uncomfortable place. This place of profound discomfort, generated by an honest inquiry into the causes and effects of colonialism, and our individual responsibility for colonization, is what Regan (2006) has referred to as 'unsettling the Settler within.'

The fundamental premise of Regan's approach is that we as Settlers must learn to accept that being unsettled is not something to be avoided, but rather to be embraced and explored. We become unsettled when we are confronted with the inconsistencies of colonial logic, and the paradoxes of colonial ideals. As such, unsettling moments provide for Settler people a signpost that they are bumping up against one of the weak points of imperial existence: the internal inconsistencies that only continue to function because we overlook and tacitly accept them. An unsettled Settler person is in effect breaking free of what Regan identifies as the 'myths' of Settler existence; myths about freedom of choice and the individual, economic opportunity, democratic government, and the 'right' of Canada and America to exist (among others) are all part of the long roster of myths that Settlers must confront.

Of course, being unsettled does not necessarily mean that a Settler will (or must, or even should) begin a journey towards decolonization. However, free of the insulating effects of constructs which allow and encourage ignorance,[13] a Settler person makes a critical choice: to be openly colonial, or to reject colonialism and attempt to find a different way.[14] Some individuals will choose a colonial path, making the conscious decision to embrace domination, social stratification, and the pursuit and accumulation of power. This is not surprising, nor should these individuals be judged on moral grounds by those who pursue a decolonized path. What is truly at issue here is whether or not the colonial Settler is aware of their colonialism; if so, the decision must be respected, even as the results of it are actively fought on a social level.

The Settler who chooses a decolonizing existence must adjust to new and challenging realities. First, and most importantly, there must be an understanding that Settler people, including those who reject colonial society and culture, may continue to benefit from that society and culture on many levels. There must further be an understanding that, in

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

order to restore a measure of balance to the inevitable power relationships and imbalances in society, Settler people must be willing to take the power that has been granted to them by virtue of their 'membership' in Settler society and put it at the disposal of those whose power has been violently co-opted or stolen. Richard Day (2005) cites the need for those working towards social change to engage in 'groundless solidarity and infinite responsibility,' working with other individuals and groups who share the same goal of confronting and defeating control, domination, and oppression (186–97). For the Settler person, this means working with the Indigenous peoples upon whose land and from whose resources Settler society has been built, and also requires that Settler people give up the often-seen need or desire for 'control' of groups or actions involved in confronting imperialism. This is the meaning of the term 'groundless': Settler people must be willing to assist Indigenous peoples, groups, and nations in the pursuit of their goals, regardless of whether or not these goals fit a Settler individual's pre-existing idea of what form the struggle should take.[15]

Radical Experimentation

What must settlers do in order to decolonize? What should be sacrificed? How are lifestyles changed appropriately? These are the questions that arise from an honest engagement with internalized, personal Settler colonialism. Even when the influences of colonial and imperial power are stripped away, there is no clear single alternative to contemporary Western society or to the dominant interpretation of a colonial world view which informs societal norms. For each individual, whole arrays of previously invalidated ways of knowing and being in the world become available. However, for the Settler person bounded by the goal of being an ally, concern for an ally and respect for the autonomy of that ally (core principles of both Prudhonian federalism and the Guswentha Two Row treaty) are principles too essential to alliance building to be ignored, and therefore give Settler people a place to start. However, just as Indigenous peoples come from diverse histories and cultures and face diverse contemporary challenges with many different desired outcomes, Settler people must not fall into the trap of attempting to distil one single world view, ethic, philosophy, policy, or plan of action.

Alfred quotes biblical scholar Donald Akenson in pointing out that 'There is no such thing as a nice monotheism ... the god of any other

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

people is *traif* (non-kosher)' (Akenson, cited in Alfred, 2005: 108; original emphasis); any absolute truth incorporates an element of domination over those who disagree with that truth. In a general sense, as Hardt and Negri (2001) point out, contemporary Empire engages in juridical construction, which is to say the large-scale defining of right and wrong, moral and immoral, in order to engage in the bio-production of power which is used to 'directly structure and articulate territories and people' (31). While Hardt and Negri identify this as a problem specifically associated with oppressive power, Day (2005) demonstrates that the generation of 'absolutes' is also a phenomenon that has been internalized by many radical challenges to oppressive power, resulting in what Day calls the 'hegemony of hegemony' (80). Because oppression is now seen as being exercised not only through direct coercive tactics, but also through culture, socialization, economic pressure, and so on, confronting oppression can be characterized by Antonio Gramsci's concept of 'counter-hegemony.' Gramsci believed that 'a social group ... strives to 'dominate antagonistic groups, which it tends to "liquidate," or to subjugate perhaps even by armed force,' at the same time as it attempts to '"lead" kindred and allied groups' (Day, 2005: 7).

In Western societies, the historical result has been the adoption of the tactics of the oppressive establishment by rebels and radical groups. Power obtained by a particular group – for example, the Bolshevik revolutionaries in Russia – is used hegemonically to promote its own ends and to quash dissent; the result is, at best, infighting among radical groups who share otherwise-common complaints, and, at worst, the replacement of one type of oppression with another.[16] When Settler people choose to engage with their own colonial legacy, or with the neo-colonial nature of contemporary Settler societies, we must be careful to avoid developing a hegemonic counter to these forces. If our intent is to end colonial oppression, then we must always keep in mind that there must be a multitude of responses to oppression. These responses will differ depending on culture, personal experience, and goals, but also will differ over time and place, and in both proactive and reactive interaction with 'shapeshifting' colonial power (Alfred and Corntassel, 2005: 601). A tactic or response that works in the present may be useless tomorrow; as such, the principles not the tactic or perspective must remain central to the effort. It is my contention that Settlers must engage in radical experimentation, with a dual, self-reflective, and groundless affinity focus (Day, 2005).

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

Radical experimentation is the willingness to examine current colonial problems in both a broad and personal context, and to identify problems based on the exercise of imperial domination. Rather than simply 'reforming,' or using opportunities presented within the present system, radical experimentation directs us to seek out avenues of resistance, and to assert new, non-imperial forms that are not currently in practice and that may never have been tried before. The experimental nature of this endeavour is in the intent: every attempt at something new must be undertaken self-consciously and free from ego, so that if the attempt fails – which is a distinct possibility – the failure can be a source of learning for future experiments, increasing the possibility of success. Keeping in mind the concept of an 'experiment' is also crucial to prevent attempted solutions from taking on a life of their own and becoming 'institutionalized' in the Western sense, in the way the protests against state governments have now become expected and controllable. The goal is to prevent any particular tactic from becoming more important than the principles behind it, and thus becoming a site of weakness for imperial response that can bring a great deal of power to bear on techniques, groups, or formations that refuse to shift locale, whether conceptual or physical. This experiment must be conducted both internally and externally. Internally, Settlers must constantly confront the colonial legacy within their own psyches, and be aware that the decolonization process is never 'complete.' We are all subject to recolonization if we let our guard down, and we should never be so arrogant as to assume that we have become somehow 'pure,' and transcended colonialism.

As Settlers attempt to decolonize, there is likely to be a shift or transmutation of values and principles. Sometimes this will involve the wholesale abandonment of some principles; at other times principles may broadly change meaning. The external component of radical experimentation stems from seeking out and building alliances based on these new understandings of principles, rather than simply strategic commonality or shared interests. This is consistent with the construct of the 'smith': 'Where the practice of the citizen is oriented to "staying on the road," as it were, and that of the nomad to destroying all roads, the smith is guided by an alchemical, metallurgical will to the "involuntary invention"… of new strategies and tactics. Rather than attempting to dominate by imposing all-encompassing norms, the smith seeks to innovate by tracking and exploiting opportunities in and around structures' (Day, 2005: 174).

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

The smith works with available materials and seeks constant improvement of both the community and the smithy in which they work. When circumstances dictate that a particular tool is no longer useful or needed, it is no longer produced, though the knowledge of the production remains. When a smith is no longer needed in a community, they move on to a community that has need, maintaining contact with previous home communities in case of future need. The concept of the smith is not a strategy for action, but rather a useful identity and set of principles. For a Settler, the life of a smith is flexible without being completely dislocated, and the smith produces work based on personally and communally perceived need rather than on orders received from 'above.' In short, the smith discards nothing except the assumption that anything is permanent, and humbly seeks to do the best they possibly can as circumstances shift; the smith gives of their own self, serving the requests of the people.

Conclusion – No Concrete Alternatives? No Models?

One of the frustrating implications of the decolonizing, unsettling, and, ultimately, respectful approach to becoming a Settler ally, which has been outlined here, is that there is no 'plan,' no universally applicable model, no clear set of friends and enemies. There is only a set of principles, and the individual commitment to follow those principles. This is largely alien to many of us raised in Settler society, exposed to the complications and controls of colonial power. However, it is necessary in order to escape the failures of past efforts to end the oppression of Indigenous peoples and transform Settler society. The vast majority of concrete alternatives that have been or are currently proposed rely upon those in power to 'fix' oppression. This is problematic because the conflicts that arise between Indigenous and Settler peoples are the result of the thoughts and attitudes within each and every person, within society collectively, and within aspects of Western culture that inform both individuals and society. This is to say that the problems currently faced by Indigenous peoples do not emanate simply from laws, structures of government, modes of economics, or philosophical views of relationships between humans and the rest of the earth, but from within us. Settler people accept and generate all of these systems and philosophies, and, as such, tacitly accept, support, and carry out colonization of Indigenous peoples primarily, but also of each other, and of every new generation of Settlers. No government or court can legislate how

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

we think and feel; as such, relying upon these institutions to solve these problems abdicates responsibility for our individual and collective actions, and pours even the most well-intentioned energy into a bottomless pit. Even the most optimistic assessments of contemporary Western social institutions miss the crucial point: we are responsible for ourselves. The state, corporate power, and all other aspects of complex contemporary imperialism may influence Settler people, but Settlers are not destined to be colonial; at some level, conscious or unconscious, it is a choice.

Tully (1995) points out that, 'the unity of constitutional association consists in a centralized and uniform system of legal and political authority, or clear subordination of authorities' (83). This hierarchy demands unequal distribution of power in government, which is then reflected in all aspects of society – someone must govern, and someone must be governed. Individuals likewise participate in these systems in order to partake of the lower-level benefits available to collaborators – this is the contemporary 'pyramid of petty tyrants.' The lesson is clear: the power to change a society must be generated by the society itself; if it is imposed, it will be oppressive. And, if societal change is to be pursued seriously, the change must be fundamental. Rather than attempting to build new checks and balances, new government departments and economic development schemes, Settlers must start asking basic questions: who are we, what do we want our society to look like, and how do we wish to relate to the Indigenous peoples whose lands we live upon? In this scenario, an ally must accept that all potential solutions to the problems generated by imposed colonialism must be based in a clear and engaged understanding of principles – primarily, respect. Turner (2006: 49) provides an excellent definition of respect from the Haudenosaunee perspective that may inspire Settlers further. He notes:

> [I]n a political context, respecting another person's intrinsic value means that you recognize that they have the right to speak their mind and to choose for themselves how to act in the world. It follows that in principle, one cannot tell another what to do or how to behave … But respect functioned in a communal context; that is, individual respect was reciprocated. This form of reciprocity is what gave rise to freedom of speech and freedom of religion ... The freedom of speech gave everyone the right to speak his or her mind, but it was embedded in the context that everyone else possessed the same right.

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

How this understanding of respect can be manifested in reality is hard to say, as it possibly calls into question fundamental legal and political principles of contemporary states, and definitely requires a paradigm shift in popular (colonial) understandings of individual rights, social responsibility, and basic conceptions of Indigenous 'integration' into Canada or America. In order to understand what needs to be done, decolonizing Settler people must first achieve an understanding of the meaning of respect, both in Western traditions and Indigenous traditions, and then experiment with manifestations of respect in relationships.

In the course of such efforts, some relationships will not turn out as expected or intended, and some plans may have to be scrapped and new ones undertaken. This must not be viewed as a reason to stop trying. So long as respect is the driving principle, mistakes are a source of useful information. There is no true failure when attempts to build a different world do not reach the lofty goals of those who plan them; there is only true failure if pursuit of those plans entails the abandonment of respect, or reliance upon control and domination, or an attempt to build harmful absolutes. Ultimately, to do nothing is itself failure; to risk oneself and become unsettled is a success in and of itself. There is no one way to be an ally, just as there is no one way to be colonial. There is not one single struggle against imperialism, and so there is no one single solution to these struggles. No one solution, that is, except to try.

NOTES

This chapter originally grew out of the presentation of an excerpt of my MA thesis at the Building Alliances Conference held at Trent University in November 2006. An earlier version was presented at the annual conference of the Western Social Sciences Association in April 2007. I would like to sincerely thank the participants in both conferences for their feedback. I would especially like to thank Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel for their generous editing assistance, and Emma Battell Lowman for her support and guidance throughout.

1 The term 'Settler' refers, in general, to any non-Indigenous individual who is living on Indigenous lands and participating in contemporary Euro-American society. It is a term that attempts to break free of totalizing racial or ethnic signifiers such as 'white' or 'European,' while still recognizing the influence of race and heritage in identity construction and social privilege.

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

It is also designed to recognize that it is possible to be a Settler *without inherently being colonial in ideology and action*, as will be demonstrated in this chapter. I make no distinction between Settlers whose families arrived as colonists centuries ago, or immigrants to contemporary Settler states, such as Canada. I do exclude various groups from this definition; for example, some North Americans of African descent whose existence upon Indigenous lands and exposure to Settler society is itself predicated on imperialism and colonial actions. For a more complete discussion of the nature of the Settler identity, please see *Being Colonial* (Barker, 2006).

2 It is very difficult to define exactly what Prudhonian federalism 'looks like,' as it is necessarily context-specific and place-based. However, it is important to note that Prudhon (2005: 74) conceived of a 'federal system ... contrary of hierarchy or administration and governmental centralization which characterizes, to an equal extent, democratic empires, constitutional monarchies, and unitary republics.'

3 Dale Turner (2006: 48) makes an important point in noting that, in addition to the well-known 'parallel rows' of the Guswentha, which signify a parallel partnership between allies, it is also 'crucial to point out ... that there are three beads, representing peace, respect, and friendship, that bridge the two parallel rows.' As such, my theoretical framing is based on a concept of autonomy, but also of interconnectedness.

4 Please see Alfred (2005), and Linda Smith's (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies* for two good examples among many.

5 As a grammatical note, I attempt to refer to Settlers in this chapter in a generalized or gender-neutral sense. I do not employ 'him/her' universally, as I reject this sort of strict dichotomy of sex or gender. More often, I use the pronouns 'they' or 'their' to represent individual Settlers; this is an intentional violation of grammatical rules in response to the lack of an appropriate neutral pronoun.

6 The basis of this homogenous society – nationalism, evangelical religious precepts, racial or ethnic 'purity,' or even strict political ideological demands (i.e., an insistence upon liberal capitalist democratic statehood) – is not important. The overall drive for homogenization that results is the key.

7 Albert Speer was a powerful member of the Nazi party in Germany during the Second World War, serving as the Minister for Armaments. He later repented his actions, pleaded guilty in Nuremburg, and served 20 years in Spandau Prison without attempts to appeal. His later memoirs are critical of imperialism in general, as well as his own actions and those of the Third Reich.

8 The nature of this 'decentered' and 'deterritorializing' imperialism is in dispute. While Hardt and Negri (2001: 35) rightly point out that imperial power

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

now seeks not just to control territory but to define the nature of society, Day (2005: 6) argues that this project does still have specific centres of power – state governments, international trade bodies, and capitalist elites – that can be identified and engaged with as 'struggles occur in an increasingly common context.' In some cases, such as that of Canada, where territory itself is still in question, the effect is one of generating a hybrid colonialism that simultaneously seeks to secure territory for the Canadian state, while constantly redefining reality for Canadian citizens, emphasizing colonial Settler 'myths' in order to maximize cooperation. This concept of hybrid colonialism is developed further in *Being Colonial* (Barker, 2006: 14–18).

9 At the National University of Ireland's Fifth Conference on Colonialism (Settler Colonialism), Haunani-Kay Trask (University of Hawai'i) asserted that there is a high level of this phenomenon in Hawai'i, a statement supported by Settler academics Eiko Kosasa (Leeward Community College) and Candace Fujikane (University of Hawai'i). From a panel presentation, 'Settler Colonialism in Hawai'i,' 27 June 2007, at the National University of Ireland, Galway.

10 The 'apology' has never actually been referred to officially as an apology, but rather as a 'statement of reconciliation' made as part of the *Gathering Strength* action plan that was announced on 7 January 1998, in direct response to the findings of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples. Please see *Gathering Strength* (1998) for the full text of the statement.

11 This is not to denigrate the efforts of Settler and other peoples who perceive and address connections between distant and local oppression, or the field of internationalism generally, which has long been a locus of Indigenous struggles. It is a comment, rather, on commodified activism.

12 I fully examine the existence of and rationale behind these colonial barriers to Settler decolonization in *Being Colonial* (Barker, 2006).

13 The complex, subtle, and overlapping systems and constructs which discourage critical inquiry are too numerous to fully describe here. However, as an example, Blackfoot philosopher Leroy Little Bear describes how Western focuses on individualism have generated a society of 'specialists': keepers of arcane knowledge in one narrow field, and disinterested in (or discouraged from seeking out) knowledge in other fields or commenting on matters not explicitly tied to their speciality. Please see Little Bear (2000: 75–85) for further investigation of this.

14 This is, of course, an oversimplification; the choice to be colonial or not is in no way dichotomous. There are many variations on and much 'grey area' in the general philosophy of decolonization. Personal experience,

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

spiritual and religious affiliations, family circumstances, and/or ethnic, gender, sexual, and class conditions can and do generate many different possibilities and problems. Further, we have no ability to predict the ways in which some 'established' institutions may be subverted, or the ways in which some methods of radical resistance and resurgence may themselves be co-opted. As such, it is impossible to comment on the full range of potential experience; however, this generalization is useful as an introduction to the possible range of decisions.

15 This has been a serious issue throughout the history of interactions between Indigenous groups and elements of Settler 'counterculture.' For example, the communist and post-Marxist socialist movements in the 1960s and 1970s attempted to draw direct parallels between their own ideology and Indigenous struggles for freedom, but remained unwilling to question their own ideologies even when they proved harmful to Indigenous interests.

16 While the founding of the Soviet Union is an obvious example of this, one could also look to the example of the American attempts to 'liberate' South American states through the use of the School of the Americas over the course of the twentieth century.

REFERENCES

Alfred, Taiaiake. 2005. *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Alfred, Taiaiake, and Corntassel, Jeff. 2005. 'Being Indigenous.' *Government and Opposition*, 40 (4): 597–614.

Barker, Adam. 2006. 'Being Colonial: Colonial Mentalities in Canadian Settler Society and Political Theory.' Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, Indigenous Governance Program, University of Victoria, BC.

Campbell, Joseph. 1991. *The Power of Myth*. With Bill Moyers. Ed. Betty Sue Flowers. New York: Anchor Books.

Corntassel, Jeff. 2006. 'To Be Ungovernable.' *New Socialist*, 58 (September-October): 35–7.

Day, Richard. 2000. *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

– (2005). *Gramsci Is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*. Toronto: Between the Lines.

Deloria, Vine. 1994. *God Is Red*. Golden, CO: Fulcrum Press.

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use

Fields, Barbara J. 1990. 'Slavery, Race, and Ideology in the United States of America.' *New Left Review*, 181: 96–188.

Gathering Strength: Canada's Aboriginal Action Plan. (1997). Published under the authority of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Indian and Northern Affairs Canada. Last accessed 11 April 2006 from http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/gs/chg_e.html#reconciliation.

Hardt, Michael, and Negri, Antonio. 2001. *Empire*. Boston: Harvard University Press.

Hochschild, Adam. 1999. *King Leopold's Ghost*. New York: Mariner Books.

Little Bear, Leroy. 2000. 'Jagged World Views Colliding.' *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision.* Ed. Marie Battiste. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Memmi, Albert. 1965. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. 1965. Boston: Beacon Press.

Pierce Erikson, Patricia. 1999. 'A-Whaling We Will Go: Encounters of Knowledge and Memory at the Makah Cultural and Research Centre.' *Cultural Anthropology,* 14, no. 4 (November): 556–83.

Prudhon, Pierre-Joseph. 2005. Excerpt from 'The Principle of Federation.' In *Anarchism – A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas. Volume One: From Anarchy to Anarchism (300CE to 1939)*, 72–4. Robert Graham. Ed. 1863. Reprint. Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Regan, Paulette. 2006. *Unsettling the Settler Within: Canada's Peacemaker Myth, Reconciliation, and Transformative Pathways to Decolonization.* Dissertation submitted in fulfilment of requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Indigenous Governance Program, University of Victoria, BC.

Smith, Linda. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies*. London: Zed Books.

Speer, Albert. 1970. *Inside the Third Reich: Memoirs by Albert Speer.* C. Winston. Trans. Toronto: Macmillan.

Tully, James. 1995. *Strange Multiplicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

– 2000.'The Struggles of Indigenous Peoples for and of Freedom.' In *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, 36–59. Duncan Ivison, Paul Patten, and Will Sanders. Eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, Dale. 2006. *This Is Not a Peace Pipe*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Willems-Braun, Bruce. 1997. 'Buried Epistemologies: The Politics of Nature in (Post) Colonial British Columbia.' *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 87, no. 1 (March): 3–31.

EBSCOhost - printed on 2/2/2020 6:28 PM via UNIV OF BRITISH COLUMBIA. All use subject to https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use