Being Colonial: Colonial mentalities in Canadian Settler society and political theory

by

Adam Joseph Barker
B.A.Sc., McMaster University, 2003

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Indigenous Governance Program

Being Colonial: Colonial mentalities in Canadian Settler society and political theory

by

Adam Joseph Barker
B.A.Sc., McMaster University, 2003

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE

Dr. Taiaiake Alfred (Indigenous Governance Program)
Supervisor

Dr. Jeff Corntassel (Indigenous Governance Program)
Department Member

Dr. James Tully (Department of Political Science)
Outside Member

Dr. Arthur Kroker (Department of Political Science)
External Examiner

Supervisory Committee

Dr. Taiaiake Alfred
Supervisor

Dr. Jeff Corntassel
Department Member

Dr. James Tully
Outside Member

Dr. Arthur Kroker
External Examiner

ABSTRACT

Taking the stance that, in order to combat colonization at a fundamental level, it is necessary to understand the social and personal motivations behind colonial actions, this thesis is an explicit study of the hidden psycho-social workings of the colonial members of Settler Canada. This thesis, through an examination of literature critically engaged with historic and contemporary imperialism and colonialism, attempts to develop a description of the "colonial mentality" within the Settler society of contemporary Canada. Having developed this description, this thesis explores the existence of these colonial mentalities in the works of several prominent Canadian political theorists – Alan Cairns, Will Kymlicka, and Patrick Macklem – in order to demonstrate that these theories are motivated by and reinforce colonial and imperial thought. Finally, this thesis will synthesize the works of several radical Settler theorists, including Richard Day and Paulette Regan, in order to demonstrate that alternatives to the colonial project can and do exist for Settler peoples.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals helped with this project. I must first thank Taiaiake Alfred and Jeff Corntassel, who have been my most consistent and patient teachers, whether in the classroom or in the lacrosse box. I must also thank Jim Tully, who provided the inspiration for this by challenging me to re-examine my own place in my academic work. Also, thank you to Arthur Kroker for his insightful comments and encouragement.

Second, I owe thanks to everyone in the Indigenous Governance Program, and four people especially. To Chiinuuks Ogilvie, I have no words to describe how important you are to me; thank you for your strength and vision. To Paulette Regan, I am humbled and honoured to follow in your footsteps. Further, to Susanne Thiessen, whose singular efforts shaped the environment in which all of this happens, thank you. Finally, to Lisa Hallgreen, your support has been invaluable. Thank you so much.

To my students, as well as the staff and community members of the Saanich Adult Education Centre, and to the fine people of the WSANEC communities upon whose land I live and work, thank you for reminding me what I'm fighting for.

Finally, and most importantly, thank you to my family. To my father, Joseph, who taught me the importance of standing up for what is right; to my mother, Kathy, who taught me how to listen to my heart; to my brother, Christopher, who taught me to smile at adversity and fight like hell: thank you for everything. To my mother-in-law, Melanie, whose love of history keeps me thinking; to my brother-in-law James, who reminds me to have fun and follow my dreams: thank you so much. Most of all, to my wife and best friend, Emma, thank you for understanding all this better than I ever could, and for helping me become the man I am today. I love you now and always.

PREFACE

Each chapter in this thesis is opened with a quotation from a poem by Irving Layton. Layton, one of the most famous poets in Canadian history, was of Greek and Jewish heritage and was raised in Montreal. As a young man, he was an ardent socialist, and supporter of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and elsewhere. As he grew older and saw more of the world, he recanted this position, demonstrating a critical mind that defied dogma, a trait that would come to characterize him throughout his life. He also refused to accept that the popular opposite of communism – what we know today as liberal capitalist democracy – was any guarantor of freedom or equality, staking Layton firmly in the realm of the radical. His ceaseless, Socratic criticisms of the Western world, combined with an unapologetic passion for life, made him admired by some and despised by others. For my part, I have always found inspiration in the life and work of Irving Layton; very few people who go through the level of disquieting, at times painful, personal introspection and transformation that Layton did, leave such a moving literary record of it. In my mind, Irving Layton is to Settler Canadians what Malcom X is to the black community in America – a lightning rod for criticism who was never content being defined, refused to accept injustice, and had the courage to speak his mind. When Irving Layton passed away just as I was beginning this project, I took it to be a sign of the importance of explicitly including him in it. His words still resonate with me after his death, marking him as one of those which he called "pole-vaulters" – men and women whose courage caused them to transcend their time and place, and inspire those of us who follow after them.

DEDICATION

To Emma, my wife and fellow radical.

To the memory of everyone who fought so hard and gave so much that I might learn what it means to be human.

To my fellow Settlers, who may yet become more than they are.

CHAPTER ONE – INTRODUCTIONS TO IMPERIALISM, COLONIALISM, AND THE ONGOING 'SETTLER PROBLEM'

The sleepwalkers are advancing on Armageddon
where the lines form for the final conflict;
they all smile beautificially over
their shopping bags, their hands covered
by diamonds and fresh blood.
-from *Eternal Recurrence*, by Irving Layton

Despite an intellectual history largely concerned with social freedom and individual agency, it seems that the Settler societies – societies rooted in Western traditions and institutions and founded upon colonized territories – of Canada and the United States are only ever a short step from their brutal, colonial past. In the Cánadian context specifically, it often takes no more than a limited assertion of independence by Indigenous peoples to send Settler people scurrying to generate racist epithets and find ways to deny Indigenous peoples the same basic respect that was accorded to the first immigrants to Turtle Island (North America) by Indigenous societies. This was evident in the reaction of local residents to the blocking of the Mercier Bridge during the Oka standoff in 1990, and is evident again in the ongoing conflict that began in the spring of 2006 at Six Nations reserve between Haudenosaunee peoples and Canadian government forces, including paramilitary police. Despite these conflicts being based in complex political issues, the police have been all too eager to use firearms, tear gas and tasers, and the Settler residents of the neighbouring settlements of Montreal and Caledonia (respectively) held large rallies to urge the use of military force, often degenerating into calling the Haudenosaunee "dirty Indians" and similar inflammatory and racist epithets.

These events evidence problems directly tied to the existence and spread of hegemonic imperial power through colonial methods. This may be surprising to many

Canadians who often believe imperialism and colonialism to be anachronistic terms appropriate only to a by-gone era. However, an honest assessment of present global politics, state-corporate interactions, emerging social norms, and historical power imbalanced which carry into the present, must lead to the very different conclusion that Canada remains colonial in nature. This colonialism implicates both powerful elites and complicit 'average' Canadians, as it requires both to operate. Further, it is clear that the nature of Canada as a colony, a place of active expansion of imperial power, has remained nearly unchanged for centuries: the mentality of being a colonizer was present in Canadian and American society and culture at their inceptions, and in the imperialist European societies and cultures before that. As Albert Memmi notes in his analysis of colonialism in the African context, all of those who come to a colony in order to benefit from the spoils of colonialism are colonials, and this implies not just a geographical or political situation, but in fact, a particular set of ethics, motivations, fears, desires, and an overall colonial mentality. Memmi notes that, for the colonizer:

> It is impossible for him not to be aware of the constant illegitimacy of his status… A foreigner, having come to a land by the accidents of history, he has succeeded not merely in creating a place for himself but also in taking away that of the inhabitant, granting himself astounding privileges to the detriment of those rightfully entitled to them… He is a privileged being and an illegitimately privileged one; that is, a usurper. Furthermore, this is so, not only in the eyes of the colonized, but in his own as well.
>
> Memmi, 1965: 8-9

Frantz Fanon, too, made a study of the psychology of the colonizer, and how that psychology is replicated (Fanon, 1963), and while the work of Fanon and Memmi speaks specifically to the colonization of Africa, Canada as a colonial state can and should be examined through these same critical lenses. The effects of these colonial mentalities are easily observable in the Canadian past, but are also clearly demonstrated in the present

era, and though the expression of colonialism continues to change, the willingness of Settler people to participate in colonialism does not. The question, then, is what makes the Settler act in a colonial fashion? What are the specific parts of a colonial mentality that allow it to persist and thrive, even as the world around Settler people changes? Further, it is important to question the political consequences of colonial mentalities. If average Settlers continue to think and behave in a colonial fashion, then it stands to reason that academics and intellectuals who shape public policy, influence economic trends, and contribute to intellectual and cultural traditions will also think and behave in this way. This leads us to ask, are Canadian political theorists continuing to produce theories which are colonial in nature, and if so, what colonial qualities are demonstrated in these works? In earlier Canadian history, openly colonial governments concerned themselves with solving the 'Indian problem'. Perhaps what we face in the present is an ongoing 'Settler problem': Settler people who are so immersed in colonial psychology that their political structures make co-existence with Indigenous peoples impossible.

Through an analysis of studies of colonial structures, and the roles of individual Settlers in those structures, the purpose of this thesis is to develop a nuanced understanding of the motivations – overt and subtle, internalized or responses to external forces – behind the ongoing colonial actions of Settler peoples. This analysis will focus on drawing out those characteristics that inspire colonial action or prevent efforts at decolonization. The construction of this critique will rely primarily on analyses from Indigenous thinkers and writers engaged in resistance to colonization, from Fanon and Memmi writing in the context of colonized Africa, to Vine Deloria, Taiaiake Alfred and others writing in contemporary North America. The description of colonial mentalities

will also be based on commentaries from such anti-imperial Settler academics as Richard Day and Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, though always with a critical assessment of these works. Having analyzed these works to develop a synthesized description of the colonial mentality which inhabits Settler psychology, I will compare it to works by three prominent Canadian academics writing on Indigenous-Settler relations within the Canadian state: Alan Cairns, Will Kymlicka, and Patrick Macklem. My goal is to demonstrate that each of these Settler academics is operating within a colonial mentality, as represented in the analysis discussed above, which carries over into their work, making their theories de facto contributions to ongoing colonialism. In the final section of this paper, I will present several alternatives to these colonial projects; this is not intended to be an exhaustive survey of anti-colonial theory, but rather to demonstrate that alternatives to colonial theory do exist, and are in fact being developed by Settler people, contrary to the biggest argument against decolonization which is that there are no reasonable alternatives to current Settler society.

Before beginning this inquiry, it is important to define some major concepts in order to provide a boundary for what could otherwise be an impossibly expansive discussion. Foremost among these terms are empire / imperialism and colonization / colonialism. Imperialism, being the construction of an empire(s), has a long tradition in many societies, but in Western society in particular. Much of recorded Western history is that of empire building or contests between imperial powers. At one point or another, almost all of Europe was under the control of the Roman Empire, and later incarnations such as the Holy Roman Empire. Later, monarchical early states spread empires across the globe under the flags of Britain, France, Spain, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Sweden,

Russia, and others. After the end of the Second World War, the death of imperialism was loudly proclaimed; as many critical observers have since pointed out, however, that particular proclamation was extremely premature. The form of imperialism may have changed, but the reality of empires competing and cooperating in various empire building projects remains. In this context, Hardt and Negri's analysis of "Empire"[1] presents the most useful framework for analysis.

The Empire Model and Canada's Role in the New Imperialism

In their work, Hardt and Negri describe contemporary empire as the overlapping and interconnected spheres of influence around states, supranational organizations, and corporations, especially those corporations classified as "multi-national". The contemporary empire wields power beyond anything dreamed of by the Roman emperors of antiquity. Making the most of technological advances that, according to Jerry Mander have some applicability to the average person, but truly allow the disproportionate exploitation of resources (natural, artificial, and even human) (Mander, 1992: 2-4), these organizations are able to exert tremendous power over billions of human lives and make decisions which have very real and extreme impacts upon the natural environment on a global scale. It is important, though, to understand exactly how imperialism functions within this model, and also to engage in criticisms in order to provide the most appropriate framework for this analysis[2].

---

[1] Hardt and Negri differentiate between historical imperialism and contemporary "Empire" (capitalized). For the sake of accuracy and to avoid confusion, I use the terms "historical" and "contemporary" where applicable. Where neither of these terms appears, I am referencing a general concept that may be said to be applicable either across large spans of time, or completely irrespective of time. I will discuss the difference between Hardt & Negri's terminology and my own at the end of this section in greater detail.

[2] The following description of Hardt and Negri's model is taken entirely from *Empire*, pp. xi-41. Direct quotations are cited.

Hardt and Negri's model of empire represents a new form of sovereignty, above and beyond the powers invested in traditional sovereigns, and without many of the constraints upon classical sovereignty. Through a regulation of global exchanges between states, supranational structures, and transnational corporations, empire exerts governance over a new global order. While much has been made of the 'decline' in sovereign power of the state, which has long been perceived as the lone type of sovereign actor in global politics, that sovereign power has not dissipated but has rather crystallized and transcended reliance upon the territorial constraint and bureaucratic mechanisms of the state. As such, states, along with the previously mentioned supranational bodies and transnational corporations, are united under a single "logic of rule" (Hardt & Negri, 2001: xii), which is fundamentally different than classical imperialism which relied upon competing logic delineated by geographical boundaries, and where colonialism was essentially the extension of imperial power past those borders. This empire is decentred and deterritorializing. Wealth and power in this system increasingly flow from biopolitical production – the production of social life itself, as imperial powers order societies in such a way as to continually maximize their control and access to resources. Because of the lack of meaningful borders, this imperial rule essentially has no limits.

Just as this empire exists without borders, it also exists without historical context; it "suspends history" (ibid: xiv), portraying itself as the natural order, equally applicable anywhere on the globe, and harkening back to a Marxian "end of history" wherein a natural order overcomes chaotic difference and is established for eternity. As a consequence, because the imperial order does not rely on history to provide legitimacy or context, it is free to engage in endeavours to literally create new social realities as it goes

along. There are some constants in the new imperial order, most obviously that the expansion of imperialism has progressed more or less in step with the expansion of global capitalism. More importantly, though, is a constant of intent – the imperial world order consistently works to establish a global juridical formation. Part of this is accomplished through supranational organizations such as the United Nations, which act as sites of normative production and as such play a role as the source of the new sovereign authority mentioned previously. This sovereignty, unlike older versions of sovereignty, has the ability to act, react, and adapt very quickly and with an extreme amount of violence – both physical and otherwise – demanding a different analysis and a different form of engagement from those wishing to oppose it. Hardt and Negri describe the effect of this sovereignty as "a new notion of right, a new inscription of authority, and a new design of the production of norms and legal instruments of coercion that guarantee contracts and resolve conflicts" (ibid: 9). In essence, we are witnessing a transition from international law to the creation of a new, international constitution.

The publicly stated goal of Empire is the creation of perpetual peace, which both acts as evidence of the imperial order as being natural, and also justifies the use of force to create and defend this peace. The "Empire presents its order as permanent, eternal, and necessary" (ibid: 11), and has thus revived the concept of the "just war" as a means of ensuring that permanence. "Just war" is both legitimated and reconstructed as a necessary requirement for the creation of perpetual peace. The result of all of this is a hybrid system that sees the centralized creation of norms given wide audience through a far-reaching production of legitimacy. It has been called "governance without governments" (ibid: 14), and betrays a structural logic that is not always perceptible but

is increasingly effective in shaping society. Under this structural logic, peace, equilibrium, and the cessation of conflict, are the values towards which all efforts are directed; of course, because these things are impossible to create in permanence, there is a constant call for more and more authority to ensure peace. The result is "a machine that creates a continuous call for authority" (ibid: 14), with the effect of creating a more and more rigid system of acceptable activity, and even acceptable thought. As Hardt and Negri outline, "Every movement is fixed and can seek its own designated place only within the system itself, in the hierarchical relationship accorded to it" (ibid: 14). And while this sort of rigid system involves the use of force to ensure that everything is in its right place, Empire is not so much formed on the basis of force, but rather on the ability to present force as being in the interests of right and peace – force is only useful in so far as it can be presented positively and accepted by society. This has resulted in the creation of a "right of the police", or the right to intervene in the social life of imperial citizens under the guise of protecting them. Further, due to the relocation of sovereignty in the supranational order, supranational 'law' – which is to say arbitrary supranational imperial norms – overpower domestic law, and thus the right of police is extended across traditional borders, and states lose the ability to go against the current in terms of the larger political picture[3].

Insidiously, those people who are most powerless within the new imperial order – the individual who exists outside of the halls of power, including the marginalized and oppressed – are made to feel responsible for the development of this imperial order. Through legalist ties to states, individual ties to economic interests, and various other

[3] Hardt and Negri repeatedly warn against becoming nostalgic for the previous epochs of imperialism, including those which saw the supremacy of the state and the tyrannical results of this system, a sentiment which I fully endorse.

relationships to imperial structures, the imperial order assumes participation and thus legitimacy from all sectors of society:

> We are forced increasingly to feel that we are participants in the development [of global imperial order], and we are called upon to be responsible for what it becomes in this framework.
>
> ibid: 19

When we consider the increasingly rigid and ordered global system, alongside the demand for participation in this system, and the recourse to "just war" (on both literal and figurative levels) against those who refuse to participate or conform, it is easy to follow Hardt and Negri's analysis that, globally, societies are progressing from a "disciplinary society" (as outlined by Foucault) to a "society of control". This society of control ultimately rests upon the premise that nothing is exempt from imperial dictates – society and culture, media, travel, and even thought are policed and controlled in order to defend the "perpetual peace and order" of the empire. Of course, imperial power can only achieve this level of dominance over a population if and when it becomes integral to life; imperial power must either be consented to, or be so necessary to the maintenance of what people perceive as reality that it cannot be denied. While many individuals do consent to imperial control, the true goal of biopower, the power that shapes society itself, is to build a society absolutely dependent upon that imperial power. In essence, imperial power functions in society to its own ends: the goal of imperial power is the creation of a society hopelessly dependent upon that same imperial power – without room for alternatives.

With this in mind, it is important to re-examine the meaning of the supranational structures that already exist and function in the world. Regardless of the original intent of an organization such as the United Nations, supranational structures are now given

meaning only as part of the dynamic of biopolitical world order – their former / original / intended functions no longer make sense in the changed global order, and so they are co-opted to the uses of empire. Transnational corporations are especially effective and useful in this regard, acting as the connective tissue of global empire, regulating the flow of people, money, resources and, in effect, energy around the globe. Beyond simply engaging in exploitational capital ventures, they now "directly structure and articulate territories and people" (ibid: 31). Meanwhile, states – territorially confined and thus less useful in terms of wielding global power – become instruments to record the flow of various types of energy, assuming the role of global bureaucrats instead of active political entities. Further, these transnational corporations participate directly in the biopower creation of society itself by making commerce a core tenet of social reality. As everything becomes connected to money – given a price, quantified and valued, marketed and sold – the economic system develops the ability to artificially and arbitrarily produce "agentic subjectives" (ibid: 32), which is to say that money is used to define and redefine needs, social relations, and so on. The end result is the production of producers: supranational structures using money as leverage convince members of society to adopt certain perspectives on social reality, and these individuals then spread this view under their own power, the view gaining in size and strength as more individuals come on board until society is totally reshaped.

Of course, commerce is just one example of this redefinition of society. In a larger sense, the new imperial order "is a subject that produces its own image of authority. This is a form of legitimation that rests on nothing outside itself and is reproposed ceaselessly by developing its own languages of control" (ibid: 33). In other

words, the empire creates the language that reflects the reality it wishes to create, and then uses its power and authority to continually reassert itself, simply declaring a new norm and forcing others to follow along or be left behind. Hardt and Negri refer to this as "the informational colonization of being" (ibid: 34). As Hardt and Negri defined colonization earlier as the extension of imperial power beyond imperial borders, this can thought of as the extension of imperial power into the conceptual spaces of individual thought, choice and free will, the logical extension of efforts to colonize and control the entire physical realm. With this goal – and clearly demonstrated ability – to colonize individuals, we must re-examine traditional conceptions of imperial intervention, which revolved around the monopolization of the use of force by state authorities. Rather, "Empire's powers of intervention might be best understood as beginning not directly with its weapons of lethal force, but rather with its moral instruments" (ibid: 35). Rather than 'going in guns blazing', the territory that the new imperial order wishes to conquer is largely conceptual so, using the previously mentioned methods of coercion, empire now intervenes in the lives of individuals and in society by simply defining the undesirable as morally 'bad', and the desirable as morally 'good'. A primary means of accomplishing this is through NGOs, particularly rights-based organizations. These organizations (as an example, Hardt and Negri specifically cite the United Nations) are established with the goal of identifying and assuring "universal" rights and needs, which plays right into the hands of imperialism in terms of creating a narrow range of possible expressions of society. Ultimately, empire aims to – and is potentially able to – control every level of human life and organization. In short:

> The imperial order is formed not only on the basis of its powers of accumulation and global extension but also on the basis of its capacity to develop itself more deeply to be reborn, and to extend itself throughout the biopolitical lattice work of world society.
>
> ibid: 41

While Hardt & Negri's model of Empire is useful, it cannot be allowed to stand without criticism. In discussing specifically the Canadian context of empire – which by necessity must focus on the historical relationship between both foreign and domestic imperial powers and the Indigenous targets of overt colonization – there are several alterations that must be made to this model in order for it to be suitable as a framework for an analysis of the colonial intentions of contemporary Canadian society and intellectualism. First and foremost, we must clarify the relationship between the new imperial order of *Empire*, and previous imperial regimes such as those which contributed to the founding of the Canadian state. Hardt and Negri are insistent that the new imperial order is something completely different from previous formations of imperialism, and should not be regarded as simply a "perfecting" or extension of classical imperialism (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 9). I would argue that Hardt & Negri are simultaneously correct and incorrect in this assumption, and that it is a matter of perspective that is truly in question here. While Hardt and Negri's empire does appear to have broken from the "conflict or competition among several imperialist powers" to be replaced by "the idea of a single power that overdetermines them all, structures them in a unitary way, and treats them under one common notion of right that is decidedly postcolonial and postimperialist" (ibid: 9), I would argue that this shift in structure most largely affects those who are members of a society or group that previously acted in colonial fashion, and alters the landscape of privilege for those in the mid-levels of imperial hierarchy. As

an example, and one that I will return to, consider Taiaiake Alfred's interrogation of Settler peoples who formerly held high levels of privilege but have experienced a drop in economic advantage in conjunction with the shift to contemporary imperialism: fisherman, factory labourers, and others who are "nothing but staunch defenders of the first wave of globalization against the second wave" (Alfred, 2005: 235). For Indigenous peoples living in occupied spaces such as the Canadian state, foreign empires colonizing Indigenous lives and territories remain foreign empires. That there is one large unified empire now makes little difference to Indigenous peoples in terms of the practical effect of imperialism. Colonialism remains the extension of imperial power beyond the borders of the empire; if those borders have now become partially conceptual instead of largely or exclusively physical, it is simply an attempt to colonize a different part of Indigenous reality. Imperialism has indeed changed radically, and I would argue this is partially due to the inability of classical imperialism to completely subdue or control Indigenous populations globally, producing what Alfred and Jeff Corntassel refer to as "shapeshifting colonialism" (Alfred & Corntassel, 2005: 601): imperial powers change their forms, experiment with different expressions, conglomerate or divide, and continually probe Indigenous resistance for signs of weakness that can be exploited (Tully, 2000: 40). Empires are forged and controlled by elites, and made possible by the conscious cooperation of society at large; they are driven by will and intellect, and it is perfectly reasonable to say that part of the reason for the transition from classical imperialism to contemporary imperialism can be found in a calculated, reasoned response to counter-imperial resistance. As such, in the Canadian context, I do not make either the linguistic

or the conceptual distinction that Hardt and Negri employ in their work. For Indigenous peoples in Canada, imperial domination is imperial domination.

Second, there are often attempts made to draw a separation between physical and economic imperialism; for the purposes of this inquiry, I reject that particular distinction. Hardt and Negri also reject this distinction to a point, as demonstrated earlier in their paralleling of capitalist economic coercion and linguistic social coercion. It has been noted by many critics, over the span of decades (Fanon, Memmi, Alfred, Richard Day), that the act and intent of physical imperialism is inseparable from its economic motivations and benefits. In this context, economics are nothing more than a key to a different form of power. Within the framework described by Hardt and Negri, the contemporary empire is now almost everywhere (or has the ability to reach well outside of its usual physical sphere of influence), and as such the economic imperialism that was once notable for following periods of physical imperial expansion is now normalized and viewed as standard economic practice by the mainstream West and other global players in the imperial game. Consider the work of the World Bank, which draws vulnerable states into the imperial economic machines as resource providers and sources of cheap labour through the use of attractive loans predicated on stringent political structural requirements, and involving extremely punitive conditions should the unreasonable loan conditions not be met (Kingsnorth, 2003: 65-71). To be sure, the obvious physical imperialism that is evident in examples such as the American-led invasion of Iraq, or brutal Russian repression of dissidents in Chechnya, is highly visible, hotly debated, and widely condemned. What many commentators fail to realize is that these actions are not more widespread because in many areas this phase of imperial expansion is already

complete or has reached a stage in the complex dynamic of colonization and resistance where the violence of imperial expansion happens 'off stage'. This is the situation in Canada, where repeated violence by police, CSIS, and even the military against Indigenous peoples, goes largely unnoticed, domestically and internationally – it remains true that "white society, through the agencies of the state, will use violence in the attempt to suppress any serious threat to the colonial order" (Alfred, 2005: 53). However, one area where Hardt and Negri's theory is not particularly well-tailored to the Canadian context is in the discussion of land and territory. In their theory, the empire is completely deterritorialized, which is to say it exists everywhere, simultaneously, and with equal power (or has the ability to shift and apply power equally in many different arenas). However, this does a great discredit to Indigenous peoples who have long been and are currently engaged in conflicts centered around specific territories. Considering that Indigenous societies are culturally, spiritually, and historically tied to land in general as well as to specific important sites (Deloria, 1994: 66-67), if Indigenous peoples are to engage in resistance against the homogenizing moral colonization of empire, they must inherently defend their differential relationships to the land. Conflicts over land in the Canadian context are both extensive and still very much in question, and sites of Indigenous land resistance also mark places where imperial power is far from absolute: holes in the imperial sphere, both physical (distinct borders can be found in the lines of resistance between Indigenous protesters, warriors, and allies, and the Canadian military and paramilitary), and conceptual (as demonstrated by the many individuals possessed of a sufficiently non-imperial mentality to resist the imperial society of control). Conversely, the Canadian economic system remains greatly reliant upon the land and

resources which rightly belong to Indigenous peoples; Canada has not transitioned fully into the "postcolonial" economic system cited in *Empire*, based on communications, service, and other economics which assist the creation of biopower and agentic subjectives. In a sense, Canada remains a hybrid – a cross between old imperial conquest of land and resources, and new imperial conquest of social reality. James Tully differentiates between the "internal colonialism"[4] that is expressed in the Canadian or American context, wherein colonization occurs within the boundaries claimed by a state, and "external colonization", the more familiar extension of classical imperial power beyond imperial borders. He notes:

> The essence of internal colonization… is not the appropriation of labour (as in slavery), for this has been peripheral, of depopulation (genocide), for indigenous populations have increased threefold in this century, or even the appropriation of self-government (usurpation), for at different times indigenous peoples have been permitted to govern themselves within the colonial systems (as in the early treaty system and perhaps again today). Rather the ground of the relation is the appropriation of the land, resources and jurisdiction of the indigenous peoples, not only for the sake of resettlement and exploitation (which is also true in external colonisation), but for the territorial foundation of the dominant society itself.
>
> Tully, 2000: 39

The implication of this statement for this inquiry is quite clear. First, Hardt and Negri's assertion that locally-based resistance to imperialism is a fatally flawed technique (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 44-46), may or may not be true depending upon the particular conflict. For some Indigenous communities, especially those that remain largely isolated and retain access to many traditional resources (methods of food production, access to traditional medicine, etc.), local resistance to imperialism is not only viable, but in fact

[4] This should not be confused with "internalized colonialism", a term that is used later in this paper. Tully is referring to a political internal/external division. Internalized colonialism is in reference to the personal acceptance of colonization as a good or normal way of being, and can affect anyone, regardless of whether they are Settler or Indigenous.

far more practical than attempting to network with distant and inaccessible groups. An example of this is the Grassy Narrows conflict, wherein the Anishnabe people of Grassy Narrows have used the internet to educate and communicate, but remain committed to a blockade in their local territory as the primary form of resistance. This blockade has proven to be surprisingly effective and long-lived, having endured since 2002, and the relationship of the people involved in the conflict to the specific site of resistance is probably a major component in this[5]. Though Hardt and Negri are likely correct that a solely local approach cannot hope to defeat contemporary imperialism, in the Canadian context local or place-based resistance should not be entirely abandoned as a strategy, nor should the importance of land to imperial interests be ignored in an investigation into the motivations of colonial actors within Settler society. Second, because of the hybrid nature of the Canadian state, existing somewhere between classical imperialism and Hardt and Negri's ideal of empire, critiques of classical colonialism are likely to be applicable to the Canadian context in many cases. Finally, there is an even greater need to study and engage with imperialism in Canada, both because observing the dynamic of imperialism and colonialism in transition promises to be very valuable and educational, and because as the Canadian state is clearly a site of imperial weakness (or at least non-uniformity), this context can potentially be exploited by anti-imperial resistance. Again citing Tully's work, colonization in the Canadian context, "is seen by both sides as a temporary means to an end. It is the irresolution, so to speak, of the relation: a matrix of power put in place and continuously provoked by and adjusted in response to the acts of resistance of indigenous peoples" (Tully, 2000: 40). While Hardt and Negri's conception

[5] For more information, the two main internet contact points with the groups involved in the Grassy Narrows struggle are Friends of Grassy Narrows (www.friendsofgrassynarrows.com) and Free Grassy Narrows (www.freegrassy.org).

of empire is already deterritorialized and engaging in the juridical homogenization of society, the Canadian situation is less certain: so long as Indigenous lands remain contested, the work of creating an ideologically homogenized empire is hindered by the ties that bind peoples from different societies and cultures to lands and histories that defy imperial redefinition.

Finally, it is simply disingenuous to claim that imperialism is only now attempting to unite different people under a common moral code in order to exact further control. As ethnohistorian James Axtell writes, early Settlers were often defeated in their colonial desires by their inability to "predict" the behaviour of Indigenous peoples, and needed to find a way to "neutralize" them in order to engage in further imperial expansion (Axtell, 1981: 41). This was a primary function of missionaries – the attempt to link Indigenous peoples under a common morality. Christianity served, in that time period, a similar role to moral or ethical codes and standards in the contemporary period, in that they created a conduit for imperial control of Indigenous societies at the most basic levels of social consciousness. Axtell notes:

> As if heaven-sent, a small but determined cadre of invaders offered the ultimate answer to the settlers' prayers. Christian missionaries, who had come to America in the earliest phases of invasion, espoused a set of spiritual goals which colored but ultimately lent themselves to the more material ends of their countrymen. From the birth of European interest in the New World, religious men had ensured that the public goals of exploration and colonization included a prominent place for the conversion of the natives to Christianity. But the Christianity envisioned was not a disembodied spiritual construct but a distinct cultural product of Western Europe. Conversion was tantamount to complete transformation of cultural identity.
>
> Axtell, 1981: 42

Further, this practice was not restricted solely to missionaries; political agents also understood the importance of attempting to incorporate Indigenous peoples into a

common moral framework. For example, Champlain demanded that the Hurons convert to Christianity if they wished to continue trading with the French (Weyler, 1992: 259), a move that ultimately contributed significantly to the near-destruction of the Huron confederacy. Hardt and Negri are correct to note that the juridical formation of contemporary imperialism is different from that of classical imperialism, in that it now seeks to include all religions or spiritual codes within its scope, and relies upon such institutions as the United Nations to create overriding international laws instead of relying upon scripture. But this is simply a widening of the net; cooptation into internationalism in the present, is an updated form of conversion to Christianity. As such, just as traditional Indigenous spiritualities stood in opposition to Christian homogenization, so do traditional Indigenous ways of being and knowing stand in opposition to contemporary homogenization, which is necessary to understand the definitions of 'Indigenous' and 'Settler' people which follow.

Indigenous, Settler and Colonial – Further Definitions

Collectively, the efforts to expand imperialism will be summed up in this inquiry under the banner of colonialism. Far different from – yet still closely related to – common conceptions of colonization, contemporary colonialism does not necessarily involve the establishment of physical colonies, forced military suppression of peoples, slave labour, and other classic characteristics of colonialism (though these elements still persist in different forms), as noted previously. Rather, in the present, the efforts of colonialism are usually directed at winning over the hearts and minds of colonized peoples who have previously been enveloped by imperial forces. As Tully has made

clear, colonialism changes in response to the resistance of Indigenous peoples; as Indigenous peoples have proven resistant to being physically or legislatively extinguished, in order to secure the territory of Canada for further imperial imposition, Indigenous peoples are now assaulted on subtle social, cultural, and intellectual levels. In the Canadian case, Indigenous peoples have already experienced the direct physical aspects of colonization, even if only in the theoretical sense that they have been forced into subservience to a state, which relies upon the monopolization of territory and force for legitimacy. They have also experienced the early stages of mental and emotional colonization in residential schools, government programs such as enfranchisement, and the falsely constructed images delivered by the educational system, mass media, and embedded in racist attitudes of Settler peoples. As has been pointed out by Alfred, among others, the current regime of Canada is engaged in continued colonization of Indigenous peoples through the creation and promotion of the "aboriginal", a cooperative comprador class, which neatly circumvents the dichotomy pointed out by both Memmi and Fanon – the colonial needs the "native" in order to remain privileged (Memmi, 1965: 62; Fanon cited in Coulthard, 2006: 9). As Alfred points out:

> Aboriginalism, with its roots in this dichotomizing essentialism, plays the perfect foil to the Euroamerican mentality. Settlers can remain who and what they are, and injustice can be reconciled by the mere allowance of the Other to become one of Us. What higher reward or better future is there than to be finally recognized as achieving the status of a European?
>
> Alfred, 2005: 135

By not attempting the physical or political extermination of Indigenous peoples, but rather subverting them into the role of the "aboriginal", colonization achieves the end goal of establishing a stable social order based on a stratification analogous to that presented in Orson Wells' *Animal Farm*: all are equal, but some are more equal than

others. This ensures that the elites will always have someone to exploit to increase their own power, and that the structures of contemporary empire continue to function in their intended manner as they are filled by people who know their 'station'. Memmi refers to this as the "pyramid of petty tyrants" – oppressed people will allow themselves to be oppressed and even cooperate with their oppressors if only they are allowed to oppress others and thus create some level of privilege for themselves (Memmi, 1965: 17); this will remain an important concept throughout the analysis of the nuances of colonial mentalities. The alternative Indigenous identity to that of the aboriginal requires a commitment to engage in a conflict with colonialism, and exchange limited privileges within the colonial system for the hope of true freedom without it. If being Indigenous is not the existence of the "aboriginal", though, it requires its own definition. For the purposes of this discussion, the definition provided by Alfred and Corntassel, in *Being Indigenous*, is sufficiently clear and well-developed:

> Indigenousness is an identity constructed, shaped and lived in the politicized context of contemporary colonialism. The communities, clans, nations and tribes we call Indigenous peoples are just that: Indigenous to the lands they inhabit, in contrast to and in contention with the colonial societies and states that have spread out from Europe and other centres of empire. It is this oppositional, place-based existence, along with the consciousness of being in struggle against the dispossessing and demeaning facts of colonization by foreign peoples, that fundamentally distinguishes Indigenous peoples from other peoples of the world.
>
> Alfred & Corntassel, 2005: 597

Of course, as Indigenousness is defined here as being partly the product of active contention, the specific meaning itself must also be in contention. Alfred and Corntassel do an excellent job of arguing for a particular type of meaning in the rest of the article, but it is not appropriate, either in the scope of this inquiry or as Settler person, to enter into this debate. What is important is to understand that Indigenous peoples in the

context of Turtle Island (North America) are those peoples whose societies predated colonization, are tied to the land itself, and who have been and continue to be the targets of active colonialism.

This brings about the last term that requires definition: Settler. It is not enough to simply state that Settler people are "non-Indigenous", as is often done; this ignores the complexity of Settler society and culture itself, preventing much useful analysis, as well as ignoring the many people in contemporary imperial society whose identities are hybrid, or otherwise differently related to imperial society. Settler people in this context include most peoples who occupy lands previously stolen or in the process of being stolen from their Indigenous inhabitants, or who are otherwise members of the 'Settler society' founded on co-opted lands and resources. While this definition is far from comprehensive, it should suffice to draw a distinction between Indigenous inhabitants of the general continental area (a Blackfoot in Haida territory is still considered 'Indigenous' for the purposes of this inquiry), and those whose heritage originates elsewhere (often people of European descent, but in the contemporary sense, 'Settler' increasingly includes peoples from around the globe who willingly and intentionally come to live in occupied Indigenous territories to seek a betterment of life)[6]. Like Memmi, I do not distinguish between Settlers born in Settler states and immigrants who intentionally come to occupy Indigenous territory (Memmi, 1965: 7). In both scenarios,

[6] As noted, this definition is not comprehensive; it does not attempt to describe anything about Indigenous peoples, nor does it address complicated hybrid identities that exist in most Settler states. This is partly intentional – as a Settler academic concerned with the complexities of Settler participation in colonial systems, it is not appropriate to attempt my own definition of Indigenous identities. Only Indigenous peoples can or should speak to conceptions of Indigenous identity; for Settlers to attempt this is yet another colonial imposition. With regard to hybrid identities – such as the oppressed members of the black community, descended from slaves brought to the Americas against their will – attempts to integrate discussions of these hybrid identities with Settler and Indigenous identities are very complicated and beyond the scope of this particular inquiry.

an individual is benefiting from imperial oppression of the original inhabitants of a territory, "colonizers, forced to exploit in order to enjoy the fruits of colonialism" (Memmi, 1965: 157); it is this situation of privilege that defines the Settler. As such, applying the label of Settler does not imply a moral or ethical judgment; rather it is a descriptive term that attempts to recognize the historical and contemporary realities of imperialism that very clearly separates the lives of Indigenous peoples from the lives of later-comers. This is especially important to consider in response to Settler peoples who come from families with long-standing relationships with specific lands, who tend to problematize the idea of a 'later-comer'. In the documentary, *In The Light of Reverence* (McLeod, 2001), interviews with American ranchers whose lands overlap sacred lands of the Lakota people, put forth this opinion. The claim is that their families have been living on these same lands for so long – centuries – that they should be considered "native". However, following the logic used in the earlier definition of Settler, it can be reiterated that this very history, cited so defensively by some Settlers, is only possible because it is built upon theft, oppression, and an imbalance of power. In the case of the Lakota, the Fort Laramie Treaty of 1868, was supposed to define the Lakota and the United States of America as separate nations, and guarantee a vast territory as exclusively Lakota jurisdiction. Yet in 1873, "the U.S. government committed its first sanctioned violation of the 1868 treaty with the Lakota Nation by stationing federal army troops inside Lakota treaty lands" (Weyler, 1992: 62). Thus, even these ranchers ultimately live on land unjustly 'appropriated', regardless of their particular family histories with the land; they cannot truly call themselves 'native' if the original inhabitants only lost control of those lands through treachery, and especially if the original inhabitants continue to fight to

regain control of their lands. This has created for Settler people on a societal level, what Anthony Hall refers to as a "crisis of legitimacy" (Hall, 2003: 8). Further, it is important to recognize that land taken unjustly does not always involve a military conflict. Especially in the Canadian context, legislation or economic monopolies were the preferred mode of bringing large tracts of land under imperial 'ownership'. In fact, the vast majority of the Canadian north-west came under British control through the royal presumption of Charles II, who simply deeded the entire area to his cousin, Rupert, in the late 1600s. Rupert was given, "at the stroke of Charles' quill, sole possession of a land mass larger than all of Europe" (Weyler, 1992: 262). This method of land appropriation, which would be repeated years later during Canadian confederation, and is most obvious in the British Columbia interior which became part of Canada through no known legal mechanism, is no less colonial than the American violation of the Fort Laramie treaty. As such, Canadian Settler people have no special claim on moral or ethical superiority with regard to the land upon which they live.

Colonial and Non-colonial Settlers

It should also be noted how the 'Settler' identity relates to some of the other terms used in this inquiry. A Settler person is not necessarily a colonial – as stated, the term Settler is a statement of situation, whereas a colonial is one who actively participates with empire and spreads the imperial sphere of influence. Settlers can and do act in non-colonial ways; as an example, consider the historical relationship between British Settlers and Haudenosaunee peoples at Johnson Hall, which Anthony Hall refers to as "one of the main shrines of both the Covenant Chain [symbolizing the alliance between British and

Haudenosaunee peoples] and British North America before the American revolt against British authority" (Hall, 2003: 9). Hall further demonstrates that this relationship was not accidental, but was actually the conscious marriage of British political ambition and Haudenosaunee political will and cultural practice, mediated by a man who was willing to be creative and flexible. Hall states:

> In my estimation, the lord of Johnson Hall personified many of the attributes that enabled the British Empire to expand so widely, often through flexible and ingenious adaptations to pluralistic cultures of the many Indigenous peoples. The diplomatic institution of the Covenant Chain, a complex of elaborate treaty protocols that connected the Six Nations Iroquois with the governors of New York colony, is a perfect-example of the kind of transcultural invention through which the British Empire extended its web of influence around the planet.
>
> Ibid: 9

Hall's analysis demonstrates that, historically, it has been possible for Settlers and Indigenous peoples to engage in relationships that meet the needs of both parties. However, it is the premise of this inquiry that the vast majority of Settlers are also colonial in their actions, which is what makes examples like those discussed by Hall so important – they are rare glimpses at what could be[7]. It is through the actions of individual, non-colonial Settlers, though, that 'what could be' becomes reality. Consider that Hall attributes a critical importance the relationship between Lord Johnson and the Haudenosaunee that was developed prior to the founding of the Covenant Chain agreement. He notes that Johnson had a "reputation for dealing fairly", ordered his militia to assist the Confederacy in conflicts, and showed great respect for the women of

[7] I do not intend to ignore the fact that Lord Johnson was clearly an imperial agent and loyal subject of the British crown who helped to spread imperialism. However, what is clear is that he broke with the colonial practices of many of his contemporaries and attempted to forge a different relationship with the Confederacy, the short-term result of which is very important to note. The long-term result will forever remain speculative, as the American Revolution cut short an early experiment in alternative Indigenous-Settler relationships.

Haudenosaunee society (ibid: 10). These respectful relationships, which require the willingness of Settler people to relent in their hegemonic desire for Western norms, are very rare and clearly have not often preceded treaties or other political agreements between Settlers and Indigenous peoples; while Settlers are not predestined to be colonial in their actions, with rare exceptions like Johnson, they usually are. Additionally, the terms "Western" or "Western society" are often employed in discussions of Settler peoples. I often trace aspects of imperialism to Western tradition; this should not be misconstrued to assume that imperialism is a solely Western pursuit[8] or that all Western culture is concerned with imperialism. Rather, it is in recognition of the incredible amount of influence that Western imperialism has had on contemporary global realities, and the obvious connections between political imperialism and other aspects of Western society (Christian and other religious influences, the intellectual tradition of the Enlightenment, and others).

Considering the indictment of Western society and traditions that comes along with an attempt to identify and study Settler peoples and society, it is fair (and common) to ask what the locus of Settler colonialism is. Are Settler people bound to colonial behaviours by cultural imperatives? I would argue that this is a simplistic and ultimately unworkable suggestion. Western culture – in the broadest sense – has seen many empires rise and fall over the course of the several millennia in which it can be said to have existed. However, during that same time period, there have also been many philosophies and movements of liberation and freedom which have had various levels of impact and

[8] In point of fact, many imperial traditions in Western society were borrowed from early Persian imperialism, and later Arab, Chinese, Japanese, and even southern African empires have all contributed to Western theory and practice of imperialism. I would assert that the one uniquely Western aspect of imperialism is the ability to constantly learn from internal and external imperial successes and failures and improve the imperial mechanism, almost without limit.

success. The true question is why do Settler people choose interpretations of philosophy that repeatedly justify oppression, and visions of society founded upon that the results of oppression? There remains in Western culture a choice between imperialism and emancipation, and that means that imperialism and colonialism are social states, not cultural tenets or imperatives. As Alfred puts it:

> As a clash of "cultures," "civilizations," etc., this problem could be discussed in more objective theoretical terms to avoid the discomfort of personal responsibility, but in reality, the injustices we live with are a matter of choices and behaviours committed within a worldview defined by a mental framework of Euroamerican arrogance and self-justifying political ideologies set in opposition to Onkwehonwe peoples and our worldviews. The basic substance of the problem of colonialism is the belief in the superiority and universality of Euroamerican culture....
>
> Alfred, 2005: 109

Thus it should be kept firmly in mind that, as I develop an analytical description of colonial mentalities – the "mental framework of Euroamerican arrogance" – I am not attempting to assert that there is an inflexible core of Western or Settler culture which cannot be challenged, but rather I am attempting to create a deep description of the specific set of internalized thoughts and biases and external pressures that result from contemporary Settler social reality. Further, being "colonial" or "decolonized" is also an over-simplified dichotomy. As there is always choice involved, no Settler is ever completely colonial as that would imply a loss of agency or will. Similarly, there is never likely to be a state of total decolonization which, once achieved, can be taken for granted. It is far more accurate to suggest that Settler people all exist somewhere on a broad continuum of participation with imperial power; the goal of decolonization, then, is to constantly seek to move further and further away from imperial power, knowing full well that it is impossible to ever truly escape it. This is reflective as well of the changing

nature of the Settler identity itself. Certainly the definition of 'Settler' which has been developed for this inquiry was not always applicable, nor will it always remain accurate. These general dichotomies – colonial and decolonized, Indigenous and Settler – are necessary because the discussion of 'who we are' from within Settler society, focused on our particular power and privilege as colonial entities, is only now emerging. It is my hope that, as this discussion progresses, these concepts can take on much greater nuance as Settler people realize that they can reject their participation with imperialism and build alternatives within Settler societies. As such, it is my view that Settler people may be colonial at present, but they can – and do – choose to be otherwise.

With these definitions established, the true nature and complexity of the question I pose in this paper is apparent. By agreeing in large part with the analysis of Hardt and Negri regarding the existence of a new global empire, with the minor alterations to their model based on the distinct Canadian context, and by arguing that the majority of the Canadian Settler population is colonial in nature, I am effectively arguing that Settler people are working every day to expand an empire rooted in oppression, destruction and the funnelling of power into the hands of the imperial elites. I argue that this happens despite the philosophies and cultural myths of Western (and by extension, Settler) societies standing for freedom and justice.

Indigenous Words as the Settler's Mirror: A note on methodology

Methodologically, there are many very significant reasons to utilize primarily the writings of Indigenous peoples as the foundation of a description of colonial mentality among Settler peoples. Alfred states that, "European [and by extension, Settler]

philosophies have always been much less concerned about the search for truth than with providing intellectual covers for the exercise of brute power by white rulers" (Alfred, 2005: 102). Tully, a Settler political theorist himself, notes that, "With a few notable exceptions, western political theory has played the role of legitimation [of colonial policy and practice] in the past and continues to do so today" (Tully, 2000: 43). Historically, one need look no further than the work of John Locke, who despite his strongly held and widely-broadcast philosophies concerned with freedom of the individual and rights of the citizen, went to great lengths to explain why it was perfectly just to usurp Indigenous lands and resources (Tully, 1995: 72-79). This is not to say that all philosophical works produced by Settlers are insidiously attempting to support colonization; neither is it a suggestion that the sum total of Western philosophy is imperialist in nature. Rather, it is to say that most academic works do not honestly attempt to break free of the paradigms that bind Western thought; they lack self-criticism. Deloria identifies the serious problems this tendency generates with regard to anthropological study, debates about the nature of science, and even discussions on the origins of life. Deloria has demonstrated repeatedly that flawed theory which provides the backbone of Western civilization – and more to the point, justifies the colonial actions which create disproportionate benefits and high standards of living for Settler peoples by usurping resources from Indigenous and other oppressed peoples – is rarely questioned. As he notes in *Evolution, Creationism, and Other Modern Myths*:

> [I]t is apparent that science has replaced religion as the authoritative source of our knowledge regarding the world. We even derive emotional comfort from science by accepting, without criticism, whatever is given to us in the name of science.... The conflict [between science and religion] might be better described as a struggle between the fanatics on both sides.
>
> Deloria, 2002: 23-24

Further, many of the social philosophies which are taken for granted as the basic building blocks of contemporary Western society have roots in regressive, closed-minded and even frightening paradigms. Adam Smith's capitalist, free-market theories, along with many other theories generated during the Scottish Enlightenment, are rooted in a brutal, individualistic, Presbyterian philosophy that found expression in the decision to allow thousands of poor to starve to death, because to feed them would decrease their chances of reaching Heaven (Bigelow, 2005: 36). As Gordon Bigelow notes, early capitalist and free trade advocates "sought, in their study of political economy, not just an explanation of rapid change but a moral justification for their own wealth and for the outlandish sufferings endured by the new industrial poor" (Bigelow, 2005: 35). They found this moral justification in the evangelical Protestant ethic sweeping Europe at the time, and the suffering that resulted in Scotland and Ireland then was only a precursor of what was to come globally in the next century. While few in contemporary Canada or America would subscribe to such a philosophical paradigm, the systems which this paradigm spawned remain largely unchanged; as such it should not be a surprise that millions starve to death as capitalism is spread around the globe. In fact, the 'moral' justifications for the early free market are particularly bizarre considering present moral and economic realities, which should cause most Settler people to engage in serious moral and ethical reflection:

> The wages of sin are often, and notoriously, a private jet and a wicked stock-option package. The wages of hard moral choice are often $5.15 an hour. Free markets don't promote public virtue; they promote private interest. In this way they are neither "free" (that is, independent of human influence) nor uniformly helpful in promoting freedom.
>
> Bigelow, 2005: 38

Of course, were these serious moral and ethical questions being asked, Settler people likely would not be able to maintain the level of colonial thought which is evident in Settler societies, pushing imperialism ever onward despite the mind-boggling paradoxes at the core of colonial mentalities.

In another common situation, academics and thinkers, having written their theories, are often at risk of having those theories take on a life of their own. One example is that of noted physicist Stephen Hawking, who helped to develop the "Big Bang" theory. Hawking later rejected that theory as too simplistic, but it has remained not just publicly popular, but also the site of major scientific inquiry, a situation in no way hindered by the Vatican endorsement of the Theory. This theory, as Deloria describes, now forms the background of closed-minded theories about the nature of human existence, despite major flaws in the theory and, consequently, all theories built upon it (Deloria, 2002: 62). This is not a problem exclusive to one theory; rather it is symptomatic of the widespread problem of Western theories, scientific or otherwise which are supposedly neutral in their development, being subtly influenced or overtly co-opted by pre-existing social and cultural bias. Richard Dawkins, the popular and controversial British scientist and atheist crusader, articulated in his book *The God Delusion*, his assertion that religion is an unfounded, inherently evil thing while science is pure reason and must be the 'salvation' of humankind. Recently, Pulitzer Prize winning author Marilynne Robinson critiqued his book, and pointed out how tilted this thinking is. She states:

> There is a pervasive exclusion of historical memory in Dawkins's view of science… Dawkins deals with all this [use of science in persecuting Jews during the 20th century] in one sentence. Hitler did his evil 'in the name of… an insane and unscientific eugenics theory.' But eugenics is science

> is science as surely as totemism is religion. That either is in error is beside the point… That both of them can do damage on a huge scale is clear. The prestige of both is a great part of the problem, and in the modern period the credibility of anything called science is enormous. As the history of eugenics proves, *science at the highest levels is no reliable corrective to the influence of cultural prejudice but is in fact profoundly vulnerable to it.*
>
> Robinson, 2006: 84; emphasis added

Dawkins' theories, which pin almost every single problem throughout human history on the 'insane' belief in a 'higher power', and uncritically accept popular scientific theories, serve to deflect criticism away from serious human political and social actions and choices, by turning spirituality into a bogeyman to be demolished in straw-man attacks. This does a disservice both the scientific theories upon which his arguments rest, and the serious thought and effort that grounds many spiritual precepts. Further, the speed with which a particular philosophy can be twisted to serve imperial ends is truly astonishing. Deloria also describes the manner in which Nazi thinkers and propagandists seized on the works of Fredric Nietzsche, perverting his calls for humans to overcome social ills by becoming better, or "supermen", into a statement that the German people literally were better, "vesting them with an extraordinarily destructive idea of racial superiority" (Deloria, 1999: 283). This simple act, performed by people in a position of imperial power, was quickly believed (and accepted) by many people throughout the imperial hierarchy, and to this day Nietzsche's original theories are often poorly understood, with the Nazi interpretation far more commonly known[9].

It should be noted that there are some Settler academics within Western institutions who actively fight to maintain an ethical mentality and engage in critical, self-

[9] This is especially unfortunate considering that Nietzsche's theories can also be interpreted as liberatory, and are cited by anarchists of various types, notably in the recent book *I Am Not Man, I Am Dynamite* (Moore, 2006).

reflective inquiry that does not accept the core of Western imperialism as untouchable despite pressures from the academy to conform. However, academics who make these choices often pay a high price for their integrity. Difficult fights for tenure, limited publication opportunities, and widespread shunning – if not outright suppression – of their works is all too common. Though these works do exist, they are unfortunately few and far between. In the course of this inquiry, I do rely upon the works of Richard Day (anarchist theorist), Paulette Regan (radical historian and "insurgent educator"), Tony Hall (historian concerned with critiques of colonialism), James Tully (political theorist concerned with Indigenous freedom), and other Settler writers who attempt to honestly engage with their own colonial histories. It is simply unfortunate – as well as both frustrating and telling – that there are so few Settler peoples willing to do this.

Under these circumstances, even though many Settler thinkers are well-meaning, it is difficult (and foolish) to take the 'benevolent' intentions of Settler philosophers at face value. Thankfully, with Indigenous scholars and writers fully engaged with the struggle against colonialism, several insightful works that point out the shortcomings of Settler society have been produced from outside of Settler society itself. In reflecting on their own long and contentious history with imperialism, Indigenous thinkers have acted as the Settler's mirror, showing the reality of how Settler society appears to those it affects, rather than the idealized version of Settler "myths" that those inside Settler society cling to. Alfred, Coulthard, Corntassel, and others, are continuing a tradition that began with Frantz Fanon and Albert Memmi speaking out against French colonialism in Africa, and Vine Deloria engaging with colonization in the American context. Further, as can be seen in the thoughtful critiques already presented, and as will be seen in the many

more that follow, these Indigenous scholars are not simply demanding recognition or inclusion into Settler society; rather, they juxtapose the words and actions of colonial Settler society with those of principled Indigenous societies to achieve a clarity of critique often lacking within the philosophies of Settler peoples. Even as non-Indigenous peoples – some Settlers, others not – begin to take a part in this engagement, it is clear that the emerging criticisms of Settler states, colonial mentalities, and global imperialism, are only possible because the colonized have the courage to speak out and articulate the serious ethical lack in Settler mentalities, which Settlers themselves are often incapable – or unwilling – to perceive.

CHAPTER TWO – AN INVESTIGATION INTO COLONIAL MENTALITIES

But sometimes I turn my eyeballs around
to see my skull's interior, become
a mad neurologist and probe with poised lens
the mechanism of brainfold and nerve
that ticks towards the bright disaster
-from *Anarch,* by Irving Layton

Colonial mentalities are complicated; Fanon, a trained psychiatrist, devoted his entire life to attempting to understand the complex interplay between colonizer and colonized, as did his contemporary, Memmi. As the world has become more complex in the intervening decades as a result of globalization, fantastical leaps in technology, and the transition from traditional to contemporary imperialism and the corresponding shapeshifting forms of colonialism, colonial mentalities have persisted precisely because they are multi-layered, complicated, and mutable. Colonial mentalities are the result of internalized colonialism (meaning internalized and normalized within individual worldviews), as well as external colonial pressures from established imperial systems. As both external and internal in origin, and varied from individual to individual, colonial mentalities have proven incredibly enduring.

The Effects of the Society of Control

With a grasp of the location of the critique of Settler mentalities – commentary from the Indigenous "periphery" on the Settler "centre" – it is important to understand the historical context and contemporary reality of colonialism and the role of the Setter as a colonial agent. Drawing on the work of Hardt and Negri, developed in *Empire*, I contend that Western history is a history largely predicated upon the existence and expansion of hegemonic power. If power is the end to which many historical and contemporary social

constructs are dedicated – from monarchies, to churches; from states to corporations – then these structures seek to achieve power through the creation and spread of overlapping systems of control. Imperialism and empire are, by their nature, the loci of great amounts of power, and imperial elites seek to gain more power. This is not to judge the reasons why power is sought – security, greed, megalomania, popular demand, and even duty all factor into the decisions of imperial elites – but rather to note that the acquisition of power, as a broad catch-all term for the acquisition of physical resources, wealth, military strength, geographic security, political influence, control of vital information, and other material and immaterial "resources", is a literal requirement of the structures of contemporary empire. Further, it bears restating that contemporary empire in the words of Hardt and Negri:

> …establishes no territorial center of power and does not rely on fixed boundaries or barriers. It is a *decentered* and *deterritorializing* apparatus of rule that progressively incorporates the entire global realm within its open, expanding frontiers. Empire manages hybrid identities, flexible hierarchies, and plural exchanges through modulating networks of command.
>
> Hardt & Negri, 2000: *xii*; emphasis in original

Colonialism, then, is the method by which imperial influence is spread and more power ultimately acquired by imperial elites. The major methodology of colonialism is one of increasing control, through the establishment of control-based systems (for example, the monopolization of violence by the state) and the ever-increasing control of the lives of peoples within those systems. In fact, as Hardt and Negri further describe, imperialism is actually predicated upon claiming the ability to establish a permanent order and peace, and it is this claim that actually inspires the will to authority (and authoritarianism). In essence, those who seek to establish an empire portray themselves as the bringers of

peace and order for all times, encouraging large numbers of people to empower them to this end, thus creating empire (Hardt & Negri, 2000: 14-16). The two key components in this analysis are, first, the foundations of imperialism rooted in a prescribed order, and second, the consent of society at large which calls the empire into existence. The combination creates a widespread methodology of control in which both imperial elites and colonial individuals are complicit, one through the intent of creating an overarching order, and the other through the consent that allows it to happen. On a societal level, Hardt and Negri refer to this as the "society of control", the more powerful and pervasive heir to Foucault's "disciplinary society".

There are many obvious examples of this dynamic creation of control in action. Throughout history, and very prominently at present, we can see efforts being made to control the activities and movements of people, the moral definitions of right and wrong[10], and even how and what people can think and feel. This is an interpretation of the society of control as an over-riding methodology, wherein every challenge is met with increasing levels of control, to the point that control becomes pre-emptive; even concepts such as 'decentralization' only involve shifting systems of control and responsibility to the power sphere of other imperial elites. Consider that at Lubicon Lake in 1988, Oka in 1990, Ipperwash in 1991, Caledonia in the spring of 2006, and many other instances where Indigenous peoples have resorted to 'inconveniencing' mainstream Canada in an attempt to protect land and life, instead of dealing with the problems politically, which might involve having to share power with Indigenous peoples, the reaction from Canada – both the authorities (legislative and judicial) and the Canadian people – has been to

[10] Nietzsche was one of the first Western thinkers to recognize this tendency within Western society, asserting that "right" and "wrong" had much less to do with universal moral standards than with competing definitions from elites ("princes" and "priests") striving for power over people (Nietzsche, 1956: 158-188).

treat the situation as a 'law and order' problem, resulting in arrests and state-sanctioned violence. The only way in which most Settler people can conceive of resolving the problem is through increased levels of control that protect, and even expand, current power bases. To do otherwise would fly in the face of the basic imperial premise of perpetual peace and order.

In light of the global imperial systems exposed by Hardt and Negri, among others, who can deny that contemporary imperialism seeks to control literally everything? From patenting the genetics of life, to enforcing state sovereignty over land, to the use of propaganda and mass media to shape thought, imperialism seeks control in the way that the Roman Empire constantly sought to expand its geographic boarders, regardless of whether those outside the empire truly posed a threat to Rome or not. Leroy Little Bear contrasts the Indigenous and Settler worldviews by noting that Indigenous peoples view the world as one of constant flux, comprised of energy waves (Little Bear, 2000). He notes that Indigenous cultures centre around rituals of renewal in order to ensure that the vast patterns of the world continue to emerge. In this way Indigenous peoples actually submit themselves to the overarching condition of the universe and play a role in it without directing it. Indigenous philosophies are constructed from personal experience of the universe, and some things are simply considered unknowable. This is clearly anathema to Western philosophy in general, which seems to start with the acceptance that humans have a priori dominion over the Earth and that the natural world is something to be tamed and controlled, lest the wild things destroy 'civilization'; in essence, the spreading of control is both a right and a duty, and the creation of empires the highest

function of human existence. Day illuminates this difference with the dichotomy of controlled civilization versus the "war machine":

> The war machine is that which is exterior to the state apparatus, that which has not been captured and resists capture. Here the metaphor of roving bands or packs is deployed, reminding us of the way in which the nomad appears in an archetypical nightmare of European civilization – galloping in off the steppes, sweeping away everything that matters: houses, walls, fields, institutions, lives.
>
> Day, 2005: 139

This need for control in order to reinforce imperial power bases is so pervasive that Day has labelled it "the hegemony of hegemony"; he demonstrates that within the last two centuries both established orders and challenges to these established orders (democratic capitalism on one hand, and various forms of socialism on the other) have relied upon competing forms of hegemonic control, usually embodied in the form of the state, but increasingly embodied in global conceptions of economics and corporate "rights" that allow for the exercise of control over states that may choose to go "rogue" (to steal a phrase from contemporary American political rhetoric) and defy the wishes of the highest levels of the imperial order. Even with the best of intentions, the creation and reinforcement of control ultimately takes precedence over all other concerns. To quote Day further:

> 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.
>
> Day, 2005: 80; emphasis added

The question of what society would look like should hegemonic control be relinquished is rarely, if ever, engaged with in mainstream Settler discourses; the assumption is simply that without control and enforced order, society simply cannot exist[11]. It would seem clear that this demonstrates that the Settler mentality cannot conceive of 'giving' power away, which is to say, relying on less control rather than more in order to achieve often-stated desires of freedom or justice.

One reason why so many individuals may be so willing to accept overarching imperial control in exchange for "peace and order", and thus how this attitude becomes concentrated in the colonial mentality is a particular cultural phenomena: a rigid, religiously-based code of conduct that serves as a core component of imperial dogma. Deloria cites the Nuremberg Trials following World War II as "the moment of history in which Western Christianity achieved its greatest influence"[12] (Deloria, 1994: 49). As Deloria describes, the Allied nations – forming the core of the new imperial and colonial elites – "presumed to speak for all of civilization and judged the Nazi leaders not as losers but as those who had violated the basic tenets of civilized and religious existence". Of course, this act relied on a falsehood – "that they themselves stood sinless before all and before history and were fit to judge" (Deloria, 1994: 49-50). Deloria makes the point that it is this attitude of superiority which allows those within the imperial structure to act as self-crowned arbiters of morality – often deciding that what benefits themselves the

[11] I expand upon Day's conception of "the hegemony of hegemony" Chapter Four.

[12] Many people reject the idea that Christianity, or any religious code, holds significant sway over contemporary Western society outside of religious fundamentalists. However, as Deloria reminds us, "As Christianity gained political control over the lives of Western peoples, the Western theories of human personality began to develop. While Christianity has recently declined in its importance in the West, *many of its original premises continue to exert influence over the way people think of themselves*" (Deloria, 1994: 188; emphasis added). Of course, as noted previously, Christianity has often also been tailored to fit the needs of Western imperialism; the reality is likely that imperial society and Christian dogma have been mutually reinforcing and have influenced each other greatly.

most is 'good' – and that this attitude is as deeply rooted and as violently acted out as any unquestioning, fundamentalist, dogmatic position. Thus those within the imperial order contribute to colonialism by acting as judges and enforcing the decisions of 'civilization' as a whole; this helps to explain why Settler peoples tend to react so strongly and with such violent repression to challenges from Indigenous peoples. Alternatively, consider heads of powerful corporations who judge the conditions in which workers are forced to exist not in terms of what the workers desire, but rather what is most profitable to the company. In both types of colonial act – either the direct and often racist actions of anti-Indigenous Settler protests, or callous corporate decision making – the power and privilege of being a citizen of empire grants a right to judge others based solely on the colonizer's own perspective, without considering others; the only difference is that of degree, which is to say the relative importance of the colonizer with the imperial order. Challenges to these perspectives are neither welcome nor tolerated. These challenges are not simply challenges to the imperial order itself, but to the very core of 'civilization', which as Day has pointed out, is the only thing, in the mind of the Settler, standing between themselves and destruction. Just as this perception of superiority is based in part on monotheistic religious dogma, the social reflection of this is that of a world where power is concentrated in elites, with evangelical colonizers spreading the "good word", by force if necessary (Deloria, 1994). What Settler people fail to realize is that this sort of control through judgment and repression tends not to achieve safety for colonizers and others within the imperial order; it is this repression which, just as it fuelled violence in Algeria and Viet Nam, now fuels suicide bombing in the Middle East, acts of terror in Chechnya, and other violent 'lashing out' around the globe[13]. Colonial mentalities seem

[13] For a good analysis of how increasing levels of control actually create insecurity, see Noam Chomsky's

incapable of grasping that, like sand, the more tightly these securities are gripped, the faster they tend to disappear; in the end, the increasing levels of control rarely if ever result in greater freedoms, but serve rather to funnel power into imperial elites in a more efficient manner.

More so than for other members of imperial orders[14], for Settler peoples the psychology that results in control as an unquestioned, overarching methodology, is reinforced in several ways, beyond being held as a dogmatic precept. First, Settlers live very close to Indigenous peoples and on Indigenous lands. This has the effect of constantly reminding them of the existence and threat of 'disorder', meaning an existence outside of carefully controlled imperial power structures – this is part of the maintenance of Canada as a location of hybrid imperialism, as noted earlier. Consider Fanon's description of French settlers in Algeria, holed up inside their walled cities. "The colonial world", Fanon reveals, "is a world divided into compartments… The Settler' town is a strongly built town, all made of stone and steel… The settlers' town is a town of white people, of foreigners" (Fanon, 1963: 37-39). The fear that the Indigenous inhabitants inspired in the Settlers was not even dependent on their actions; the simple existence of the "Other" was enough to remind the Settlers that chaos lurked wherever the colonizer had not established absolute control[15]. Similarly, even when Canadian Settlers and Indigenous peoples have engaged in peaceful contact – trade agreements, peaceful co-existence treaties, and military alliances all spring to mind – the Indigenous

---

Hegemony or Survival (2003). His arguments are extremely convincing, and dovetail well with Hardt and Negri's framework of "empire".

[14] It is important to remember that not all imperialists are Settlers – Settlers are specifically those people who live upon occupied Indigenous territory, while imperialists exist around the world, both in colonizing countries, and as co-opted individuals in colonized areas.

[15] I further expand upon the concept of Settler fear of Indigenous peoples later in this section.

peoples remained a threat in the Settler mentality, which helps to explain why treaties have historically been broken as fast as possible. Treaties as a limited form of control were useful, but Settlers quickly traded them for more pervasive forms of control – such as military dominance, and later economic coercion – as soon as these options became available. The example of the Lakota and the breaking of the Fort Laramie treaty described earlier is pertinent here. The Fort Laramie treaty was useful in buying time after the Lakota had fought the U.S. military to a stand-still, but when "rumours of gold in the Black Hills had lured a swarm of miners and prospectors into Lakota country", and American military strength had recovered sufficiently to overcome fear of defeat, peace was no longer desirable (Weyler, 1992: 62).

In addition to the proximity of Settler peoples to the "war machine", the colonial mentality of control for Settler people is further reinforced by the myths which they have created for themselves about their societies. For example, Paulette Regan describes the "peacemaker" myth of Canadian society; this myth is extremely powerful in that it justifies Canadians taking control of Indigenous peoples' lives. Regan notes:

> [Most] 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.
>
> Regan, 2006: 11

After all, if Canadians are peacemakers, benevolent and noble, they clearly have the best interests of Indigenous peoples at heart and a wealth of experience in "assisting" others. This myth reinforces ignorance and excuses Settler participation in the creation of the

society of control, since the benefit is the establishment of 'peace and order'; all of their actions are recast in the light of the mythic peacemaker. Joseph Campbell states that it is myths which inform a society's ethos, and that much of the reason that imperial societies must rely upon law and other forms of control stems from the fact that contemporary American societies have ignored or denuded mythologies to the point that they now have no ethos (Campbell, 1991: 10). Perhaps the truth is not that Canadian society, in its imperial nature, has no myths or ethos, but rather that the constructed myths of Settler society – such as the 'peacemaker myth' – are designed specifically to create an ethos that glorifies or requires control, and therefore glorifies or requires being colonial as an agent of spreading imperial control.

Contributing to this, Memmi notes that the act of being controlled leads Settlers – and those whom they colonize – to seek the control of others, pointing out that "Such is the history of the pyramid of petty tyrants: each one, being socially oppressed by one more powerful than he, always finds a less powerful one on whom to lean, and becomes a tyrant in his turn" (Memmi, 1965: 17). Many writers, including Day and Alfred, have noted that the state itself is neither ethically nor culturally neutral; it is a hierarchical (pyramid-shaped) mechanism of control expressive of the aspects of Western society that have been historically and continue to be concerned with power above all else, and serves to encourage further oppression. The myth-building that Settler societies engage in is also indicative of this society, and every generation that passes reinforces old myths and facilitates in the construction of new myths. In essence, because Settler people exist within imperial systems designed to colonize and control, they themselves are repeatedly re-colonized and re-ordered to contribute to the empire. The same controls that

imperialism impresses upon Indigenous colonized people – the use of police force to enforce arbitrary legislation, cultural myth-making and history writing, and economic coercion – are also applied to the colonist. The sole difference is that the Settler receives a much greater degree of reward and privilege for participating in the system of power and control[16]; this is why assimilation of Indigenous peoples, even as an end goal, will never be full assimilation – the colonized must fill a lower slot in the pyramid than the colonizer. A society based upon power and control implies a society of imperialism and colonialism, and the myths that justify such a society should not be taken lightly.

To review, Western society and culture – in the most general sense – contains many elements which encourage a need for power, and thus many individuals choose to engage in expansive creation of systems of control, encouraged by the efforts of imperial elites who grant privileges in exchange for assistance; Settlers feel this need particularly strongly because of their proximity to Indigenous peoples who, in their eyes, represent chaos and because of the growing, complicated myths of Settler benevolence that act as a both a cover and a motivator for their actions of control. As noted, imperialism itself exerts pressure to ensure that Settlers continue to fill their colonial role. Once this process is established, though, we must ask the question of why Settlers continue to submit to a society predicated upon power and control that is so diametrically opposed to the principles that most Settlers claim so strongly to espouse, and which results ultimately in their own control implying that Settlers are not only not free, but participate in their own bondage. Essentially, why do Settlers, from philosophers to average citizens of Canada or America, continue to promote ideals of freedom and yet engage in acts of

[16] A discussion of Settler privilege, and the greed for it that motivates ongoing colonization, appears in the next section.

colonialism? The answer to this is found in internalized barriers to decolonized thought that Settlers display. These barriers, unlike the broad systems of control resulting from the drive for control, are individualized; in essence, on some level, every Settler person builds the walls that both protect imperialism from external decolonizing influences, and also imprison Settler peoples inside the empire.

Why the Settler Still Thinks "Colonial": Internalized barriers to decolonization

It is difficult to understand how a society that, from readings of Western philosophy, is apparently committed to freedom, justice, and other principles of 'liberty' can continue to be so blatantly colonial in both intent and practice. First it is necessary to reiterate a point that Alfred asserts in *Wasase*, which is that Settler philosophy has never been concerned as much with principles of freedom and justice as it is with justifying the actions of Settler colonists and elites (intentionally or unintentionally – either blatantly or through the cooptation of philosophies to the imperial cause) (Alfred, 2005: 102). This is not a new phenomenon, but rather is evident throughout colonial history. As an early example, in the 1500s, when the Catholic church was still the locus of most Western philosophy and learning, "Pope Paul III declared that natives in the Americas had the right to their land and freedom, but he was forced to reverse himself within a year by King Charles V of Spain who granted to Spanish soldiers the right to own land and enslave Indians" (Weyler, 1992: 258), demonstrating that colonial ambition controlled Western philosophy, rather than the other way around. Into the present, many Western – and specifically, Settler – intellectuals, despite the political writings to the contrary of Indigenous thinkers such as Alfred, or the writings of Marcos on behalf of the Zapatistas,

despite explanations of Indigenous cultural philosophy from Deloria, Little Bear, and others that clearly demonstrate the inappropriate structure of their theories, and despite the theories of Settler academics such as Day, simply assert that there are no other options. Of course, as Tully points out in *The Struggles of Indigenous Peoples for and of Freedom*, the great lie is that there is "no viable alternative" (Tully, 2000: 51). The other options are endless, and yet on a philosophical level, imperialist philosophies are continually pushed, and usually under the obfuscation of Indigenous 'benefit'.

Of course, this is both a symptom of and a contributing factor to the problem of continued colonial thought in the Settler population. The Western academic tradition prides itself on accumulated knowledge – that is, building knowledge on top of previous knowledge – so sharp deviations from the academic tradition are discouraged. Further, as Deloria has repeatedly pointed out, certain dogmatic views within the Western academic and philosophical tradition which support imperialism and colonialism, are taken as untouchable[17]. When we acknowledge that Settler academics are not objective, a common myth, we are faced with the distinct possibility that Settler academics are largely colonized in their thought. I would suggest that this is reflective of a similar phenomenon in wider Settler society. Further, I would suggest that most Settler people have internalized psychological barriers to decolonized thought; these barriers are greed, fear, and ignorance[18]. These internal barriers can be conceived of as psychological

[17] Deloria most frequently cites the Bering Strait theory, noting that "this migration from Siberia is regarded as doctrine, but basically it is a fictional doctrine that places American Indians outside the realm of planetary human experiences" (Deloria, 1999: 76).

[18] This is, of course, an oversimplification. The Settler mentality is very complex. However, I believe that these three barriers to decolonization of Settler people are extremely powerful, and correspondingly appear often in analyses of colonialism. As such, they comprise a useful description of Settler inhibitions to decolonization.

constructions which, while powerful and difficult to engage with, are not absolute. Alfred makes the following statement on the present state of colonial psychology:

> Memmi, who was so powerful in his exposure of colonial mentalities at play during the Algerian resistance against French colonialism, spoke of the fundamental need to cure white people, through revolution, of the disease of the European they have collectively inherited from their colonial fore-fathers. I believe his prescription of spiritual transformation channelled into a political action and social movement is the right medicine.
>
> Following an awakening among the people and cultural redefinition, after social agitation, after engaging in a politics of contention, after creative confrontation, we will be free to determine our own existences.
>
> Alfred, 2005: 28

In the second section of this statement, Alfred is clearly referring to his hope for the cure to internalized colonialism among Indigenous peoples. However, if we consider the colonial mentalities among Settler peoples as the psychological fountainhead of that internalized colonialism, the same prescription holds true. Thus it is fair to say that Settler people by and large, in addition to being externally controlled, possess a largely unconfronted psychological condition which, when addressed, requires a complete rethinking of Settler society and culture, but also holds the potential for true freedom on both an individual and societal level. For the purpose of this thesis, it is my contention that many academics, like most Settler people, are under the influence of some combination of these three psychological barriers, inhibiting decolonized thought; once this analysis of these barriers is fully developed, it should be readily apparent in the works of many Settler academics, including Alan Cairns, Will Kymlicka, and Patrick Macklem, who due to their prominence and explicit writing on Indigenous issues, will comprise a useful test group. The implication, then, is that if these colonial mentalities are demonstrable in the works of these individuals, they themselves are colonial Settlers,

and their suggestions for the future of Indigenous-Settler relations can never lead to true freedom, only to further colonization.

The First Internalized Barrier: Greed

The first of these three barriers, greed, is the most easily targeted. Anti-globalization movements around the world tend to focus on various types of greed (unfortunately, without often enough making the connection between types of greed and larger colonial endeavours): corporate greed, first-world greed, consumer culture greed, the greed of the military-industrial complex within specific states, and the greed of class progression (lower or middle classes trying to raise themselves up in the class structure through accumulation of wealth and status objects). Greed is a serious inhibitor to decolonized thought because, in simple terms, Settler peoples benefit greatly from colonialism (at least in the immediate, visceral sense). Colonialism is, in classical terms, the mechanism of spreading empire; for geographically based empires, this requires the physical capture of land. However, as global realities have changed, colonialism has also changed (or perhaps, been intentionally altered) to ensure that the imperial order is spread into new, unoccupied territories using new, difficult-to-defeat techniques. As Deloria notes:

> Deprived of their traditional source of wealth from the undeveloped and former colonial nations, [imperial people and elites] now have little choice but to seek ways of rechanneling their present wealth through the various forms of social organization already present domestically. A certain inertia has been achieved, perhaps unwittingly, that means a major shift in political thinking among Western peoples.... As undeveloped nations, such as those in Africa or the Middle East, continue their own growth, severe modifications of exploitation must occur, and more sophisticated forms of colonialism, such as sanctions and embargoes, must be created if Western countries are not to suffer economic collapse.

> It is doubtful that many Americans understand the meaning of this shift from the colonialist attitude. At best it means the humanization of peoples who for centuries were considered merely producers of raw materials and consumers of those products they were required to purchase. At worst, the end of one form of colonialism means the beginning of a movement to feudalize political systems around the globe so as to stabilize the economic conditions of the more affluent nations.
>
> Deloria, 1994: 64

Of course, global events point almost entirely to Deloria's worst-case scenario becoming the norm. As Alfred and Corntassel more recently point out, colonialism has developed into many "shape-shifting forms", and as economic realities have changed from the time of classical colonialism, so has the effect of colonialism (Alfred and Corntassel, 2005: 601). Under present economic realities, one facet of colonialism is concerned with ensuring the wealth of all kinds flows into the hands of imperial elites[19], and in the only working example of economic 'trickle down', those who assist imperial elites will benefit in turn. This has become a major aspect of colonialism, overtaking previous efforts to annihilate, convert or 'civilize' Indigenous peoples; as Memmi notes, "Today the economic motives of colonial undertakings are revealed by every historian of colonialism. The cultural and moral mission of a colonizer, even in the beginning, is no longer tenable" (Memmi, 1965: 1).

As an example of how any segment of Settler society can be swayed by greed, Subcommandante Marcos, in his recent missive titled *An Other Theory*, speaks of intellectuals – being those "who say what is science and what is not, what is serious and

[19] Considering that wealth, in reality, is simply a way of representing relative levels of power through the acquisition of resources, this should be no surprise at all. As Deloria notes in an analysis of Smith's early capitalist theories, "Adam Smith's individualist theories… saw national wealth in terms of the sum of affluent individuals who composed the policy-making portion of the nation" (Deloria, 1999: 211). Therefore, those with wealth also have the power to make decisions, tying wealth inherently to the ability to wield power in the Western system.

what is not… what is intelligent and what is not" (Marcos, 2006) – and asserts that many of them are quite flexible in their allegiances based on greed. Marcos states that greedy intellectuals look after "good behavior in intellectual thought and theoretical analysis", and that "Capitalism doesn't just recruit its intellectuals in the academy and in the culture, it also 'manufactures' their sounding boxes and assigns them their territories" (Marcos, 2006). Marcos makes no distinction between those intellectuals who are clearly the tools of corporate and government greed (working as consultants and advisors), and those who merely pursue funding and secure position within academic institutions by accepting what amounts to bribes to conduct specific research. He states that "what they have in common is their foundation: feigning humanism where there is only thirst for profits" (Marcos, 2006). This sort of 'intellectual colonialism' is made possible both by the vast wealth that imperial institutions and elites can offer Settler intellectuals, and because of the greed that motivates individual academics to 'sell out'. The resulting work of these intellectuals embodies and furthers colonialism and also helps to normalize greed in Settler society.

If the object of colonialism is to funnel wealth and power (be it land, resources, or human energy and effort) into the hands of the elite, it is easy to understand why those who have the most to lose would not participate in efforts to end colonialism. Sidney Tarrow, in *Power in Movement*, notes that people tend to respond more to opportunities to challenge oppression rather than to years of actual oppression (Tarrow, 1998); considering this analysis, the wealthy (and keeping in mind that even the lower-middle class of Euro-American society is fabulously wealthy compared to most people living in colonized areas of Africa, South America, south-east Asia and other places) have few

"opportunities" to act against colonialism, at least not without destroying their own way of life. Perhaps the most powerful example of this is embodied in the formation of the United States itself. As Deloria points out in calling the American Revolution "the most radical experiment in the history of human existence" (Deloria, 1999: 207), America may never have "worked", except that there was always more land to take providing endless economic opportunities for Settler people. As Deloria states it:

> The American Revolution can be understood... as transferring an abstract set of propositions [regarding individualism and capitalism] to a physical setting in which there were no real boundaries within which the contract could function. American social and political order has been able to work- primarily because it always had a greater economic opportunity for the mass of people than it allowed expression of political rights or participation. That is to say, during the two centuries of American political existence, there have been few real opportunities to test the validity of political ideas because the relative freedom of economic opportunity has provided an escape valve for discontent.
>
> Ibid: 217

No wonder, then, that America is engaging in blatant overseas imperialism, and what appears to be internal cannibalism (in the widening of the gap between rich and poor, and the abandonment of inner city populations) now that the continental United States no longer provides as many options for that release of pressure. Further, in instances where Settler people begin to see that their greed is unsustainable or find their positions of privilege made redundant in the expanding imperial order – for example, auto workers suffering from massive job losses or fishermen whose livelihoods have been destroyed along with their over-fished stocks, as previously identified by Alfred – their resistance to colonialism and imperialism does not consist of decolonized thought and action, but of a desire to "turn back time" to a previous era of colonialism, when they benefited more greatly or directly from colonialism. Alfred responds to these people with a figurative

shrug and the observation, "Looks like we're all Indians now, heh?" (Alfred, 2006: 235). Unfortunately, the message seems lost on most Settlers. These Settlers are not so much attempting to fight colonialism, but rather are fighting to maintain their own privileged position in the larger imperial order – a tendency that Memmi noted in sympathetic, leftist Settlers in Africa five decades ago (Memmi, 1965: 19-44). This explains why Settler people are slow to respond – if they respond at all – to the obvious environmental side-effects of an imperial lifestyle that actually detriments their own standard of living. As Deloria notes, continuing colonialism has dire environmental consequences that affect everyone:

> It is extremely disturbing to see so many Americans wanting to clear cut the ancient forests, overgraze the remaining grasslands, and use the precious water of the continents for frivolous consumptive purposes. How many shopping malls and parking lots do we really need? In the United States we stand but a few dry years from ecological disasters that we cannot begin to fathom. Yet we see our government busy authorizing the destruction of the remaining wetlands on the continent so that a few developers can squeeze yet a few more dollars from a complacent public.
>
> Deloria, 1994: 3

The key phrase is "complacent public": the average Settler person ignores these issues because, ultimately, acting in an imperial fashion makes their lives more immediately comfortable – not necessarily better or of a higher quality, but comfortable.

The Second Internalized Barrier: Fear

This leads in to the next psychological barrier to decolonized thought: fear. Many Settler people are subject to intimidation and threat by colonial states should they attempt to look past their self-interest and work towards more fundamental decolonized goals of freedom and justice; as noted, imperial structures constantly exert pressure to keep people

in place and enforce the ideological status quo. This fear functions on many levels. The first, closely related to greed, is the fear of losing privilege. As with the Settlers that Alfred and Memmi refer to, many Settler people have a great fear of losing their privileged position, including wealth, relative freedom of movement, cultural dominance, and power over others. Even many Settlers who are not motivated out of greed for an *increasing* accumulation of power, privilege, and wealth can be subdued by the threat of a *decrease* in these things. Alfred, in referencing Indigenous movements in Canada compared to the Zapatista movement in Chiapas, notes that the "Mayans who make up the Zapatista army are incredibly poor in material terms and live surrounded by Settlers who are themselves only marginally wealthier. The Zapatistas are willing to live that way and capable of doing it. Our people are not. This is a reality" (Alfred, 2006: 211). If Indigenous peoples in Canada have become accustomed to the "Canadian" lifestyle and by and large are not willing to subsist at the level of Zapatistas in order to further their own causes, it stands to reason that Settler people would be subject to the same sort of motivation, and to an even greater degree due to their accordingly increased privilege as compared to Indigenous peoples in the Canadian state. If truly confronting colonialism meant an end to colonial privilege, it is easy to understand why a Settler person, even one who is aware of the problems of colonialism cannot fully commit to the fight:

> Finally he 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 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
>
> Memmi, 1965: 40-41

Indeed, as Memmi points out, the colonial both hates and needs the native because, while the ongoing-oppression of the native wounds the Settlers conscience, without the native the colonial holds no privileged position, and the Settler cannot conceive of life without this privilege (Memmi, 1965: 66-67). It should be noted, though, that the Settler does not need Indigenous peoples to exist in their original forms, adhering to traditional principles; colonized, obedient, oppressed, and powerless Indigenous peoples with anachronistic trappings of a 'lost past' suit the needs of the colonial society just fine. As such, the resistance of Indigenous peoples to colonial change, and resurgences of Indigenous culture through conscious adaptation, are an incredible threat to Settler privilege. Thus, the Settler will always remain afraid of Indigenous peoples because, as the source of all colonial privilege, Indigenous peoples have – no matter how obscured – an incredible ability to completely destroy imperial comfort and privilege for Settler people.

However, there are other fears at work in the Settler consciousness. For one, Settler people have a long-standing – and one can only assume that it is deeply culturally rooted – fear of the 'Other'. Recall the earlier observations regarding "safe" walled colonial cities as described by Fanon, who among many others, notes that Settlers often react with great fear to Indigenous peoples whose lifestyles, philosophies, cultures and societies are far removed from the Euro-American ideal. Fanon notes two separate aspects of the Indigenous 'Other' that inspire fear in the Settler. First, knowing that colonialism has allowed Settlers to set themselves up in a highly privileged position compared to colonized peoples, the Settler fears that the Indigenous peoples wish to take their place, showing a fear of being oppressed in the same way that they oppress others (Fanon, 1963: 39). In another vein, Settlers fear the deep levels of Indigenous systems of

belief that tie Indigenous peoples to their principles, their lands, and each other so strongly that centuries of colonialism has yet to succeed in severing the bond. Fanon, speaking as an Indigenous man, notes that, "By entangling myself in this inextricable network where actions are repeated with crystalline inevitability, I find the everlasting world which belongs to me, and the perenniality which is thereby affirmed of the world belonging to us" (ibid: 56). In the face of this vastly broader (and often more powerful and empowering) worldview, "the settler's powers are infinitely shrunken"; or to quote Fanon's metaphor, "the zombies are more terrifying than the settlers" (ibid: 56). The Settler's fear in this case is two-fold: the fear of being defeated by an incomprehensible and alien "superstition"[20], and the fear of the Indigenous worldview itself, which to Settler sensibilities seems wild and intimidating – a spiritual embodiment of the "war machine" (if only in the perception of the colonial Settler). Fanon further discusses how Indigenous religious and cultural beliefs can – and do – translate into the motivations to attack and destroy colonialism and imperialism. It makes sense, then, to believe that Settler people do not simply fear Indigenous culture for its 'strangeness', but for the power it represents, which is a power that imperialism has been attempting to colonize for centuries with only limited success. This fear is built into Settler culture at its very core, and perhaps the best analysis of this can be found in the words of Chief Luther Standing Bear (quoted by Vine Deloria):

> The white man does not understand America. He is too far removed from its formative processes. The roots of the tree of his life have not yet grasped the rock and soil. The white man is still troubled by primitive fears; he still has in his consciousness the perils of this frontier continent, some of its fastnesses not yet having yielded to his questioning footsteps

[20] For a historical example of this, witness the effectiveness with which the Haitians (mixed African and Carib descent) wielded Vodun/voodoo, a complex spiritual worldview and corresponding lifestyle, to terrorize French colonial oppressors and to motivate their own resistance movements.

> and inquiring eyes. He shudders still with the memory of the loss of his forefathers upon its scorching deserts and forbidding mountaintops. The man from Europe is still a foreigner and an alien. And he still hates the man who questioned his oath across the continent.
>
> Deloria, 1994: 60

This reveals another dimension of the fear that inhabits Settler colonial psychology: the connections between Indigenous peoples and the land itself, a source of incredible power socially and culturally, as well as incredible responsibility which contradicts the short-sighted and environmentally abusive lifestyle of Settler peoples in the West. Mander notes that "If you have ever spent time with American Indians, you have noticed that their resistance to resource development is expressed as an effort to protect 'Mother Earth'" (Mander, 1991: 212), and that the idea of a living planet – rather than a mechanistic planet, existing only to be controlled and used – is deeply ingrained in Indigenous cultural viewpoints. He posits that Settler people react fearfully to this notion:

> [W]hite folks have a hart time accepting this is logical, since the concept is as alien as the people who speak of it. And yet it behoves us to at least entertain the possibility that the idea of a living planet, a concept that has endured for millennia, just might be true…
>
> Many authors, notably Carl Jung and Aldous Huxley, have stated that Western societies fear, hate, destroy, and also revere Indians, precisely because they express the parts of our personal and cultural psyches that we must suppress in order to function in the world as we do. How could present-day America possibly exist if great numbers of people believed that the minerals in the ground, the trees and the rocks, and the earth itself were all alive?
>
> Ibid: 213-214

This powerful, culturally-based philosophy terrifies Settler people because the implication – that their entire lifestyle and society must be rethought, and their comforts derived from environmental destruction willingly foregone – would essentially spell the

end of the Western world in its present form. Thus colonialism remains an attractive option: it is comfortable, free of threat, and reinforces the superiority of humans over the Earth.

It is no surprise then that Settler conceptions of justice revolve around restoring comfort to Settler peoples – reducing fear – rather than actively engaging with Indigenous peoples on their own terms; as Memmi points out, without dismantling the colonial system, even the "benevolent colonizer can never attain the good, for his only choice is not between good and evil, but between evil and uneasiness" (Memmi, 1965: 43). One example of this is the apologies issued by various colonial state governments, including Canada, ostensibly to Indigenous peoples who have been wronged; as Corntassel notes, these apologies are more about alleviating Settler guilt than about actual admissions of wrong-doing or any type of restitution[21]. It is not hard to surmise that, in addition to a fear of loss of privilege through restitution, the apologies ring so hollow (and it should be noted, are carefully crafted to avoid any actual admissions of guilt) because there is an underlying fear of Indigenous peoples in the Settler consciousness. Otherwise, Jane Stewart's infamous 'apology' would have included an apology for the intent of the residential schools (assimilation and destruction of Indigenous culture and society), instead of only regret that the schools involved sexual and physical abuse, starvation and forced labour.

The third level of fear that inhibits a Settler from actively decolonizing involves the last resort of the state: violence. Settler people who rise up against the established order are just as susceptible to violent repression as Indigenous peoples who resist

[21] Here I make a reference to Corntassel's presentation to the American Indian Studies section of the Western Social Sciences Association annual conference, held in Phoenix, Arizona, on April 20, 2006. His presentation, *Who's Sorry Now: Apologies and Truth Commissions*, forms the basis of a forthcoming paper.

colonization, and this fear of their own constructs is a major barrier to decolonization. This is part of the reason why even many well-intentioned Settlers who wish to aid the cause of Indigenous peoples, and who recognize the oppression that Settler society focuses on Indigenous peoples, often direct their efforts into ineffective social organizing that has already been rendered impotent by imperial authorities. As Sydney Tarrow explains:

> [T]here are compensations for groups that choose the institutional path. Ordinary people are more likely to participate in forms of collective action that they know about than risk the uncertainty and potential violence of direct action. Police are less likely to charge an unarmed demonstration than one made up of people carrying clubs and brandishing chains. Once a movement's chosen form of action crystallizes into convention, it becomes a known and expected part of the repertoire [of social organization]. As Kafka wrote in one of his most prescient fables: 'Leopards break into the temple and drink to the dregs what is in the sacrificial pitchers; this is repeated over and over again; finally it can be calculated in advance, and it becomes a part of the ceremony…'"
>
> Tarrow, 1998: 101

In essence, Settler people often recognize the oppression of Indigenous peoples, but do not recognize their own oppression – they do not understand that the fear of reprisal from imperial authorities is part of the construct that keeps them thinking and acting as colonizers. A fact that applies equally to Indigenous and Settler people who seek to make fundamental, decolonized changes in the state is this:

> If contention is necessary to make change, if contention leads necessarily to confrontation, and if confrontation has an inherent element of potential or real violence, as the experiences in Oka and Gustafsen Lake demonstrate, then we must be prepared to accept violence and deal with it.
>
> Alfred, 2005: 47

However, most people fear violence, one of the trump cards of the state which monopolizes 'legitimate' use of force. This use of force under contemporary imperialism, goes well beyond traditional conceptions of direct, violent police or military

repression. As Hardt and Negri point out, when entire systems of political, economic and bureaucratic power are directed towards homogenizing and controlling peoples, the entire system becomes "the police", and as such, force in various forms can be applied almost anywhere, at anytime, using a variety of techniques all of which are sanctioned by the state and the imperial order (Hardt & Negri, 2000: 22-23). This fear of force, of course, applies equally to Indigenous peoples, but there are two caveats that must be noted here. First, Indigenous peoples in the contemporary sense have a choice between physically violent confrontations with colonialism, or culturally genocidal but physically-less-violent non-confrontation. This is why Alfred states that Indigenous peoples must organize and engage "the tactics of militant non-violence and anti-institutional strategies" (Alfred, 2005: 56); the fear of violent repression for Indigenous peoples should be no greater than the fear of passive extinction as, in effect, they have comparatively little to lose. The second caveat is that the threat of violence is often far more exaggerated (at least in the Canadian and American context) than the actual potential of violence. As many commentators have pointed out, the presence of the media at Wounded Knee in the 1970s, and Oka in 1990, prevented the use of truly overwhelming force (consider that either site of resistance could have been simply bombed out of existence). This is doubly so for Settler peoples, who due to their privileges (including but not limited to skin colour, recognizable social practices and language, and economic advantage), are spared most of the worst types of violence more often than not. In the end, the fear of state violence and imperial force is a Settler boogey-man: it may be real, but it is likely far less frightening than the fearful construct in the Settler's mind.

The Third Internalized Barrier: Ignorance

The third barrier to decolonized thought by Settler peoples is ignorance, and it often overlaps extensively with the other two barriers. Again returning to the walled, controlled cities of French colonists in Algeria, as described by Fanon, filled with European structures, peoples, and objects, we see a demonstration that in the Settler's colonial mentality there is a willingness to remain comfortably insulated within the limited scope of colonial knowledge, culture and experience. In addition to this willingness to accept the limited colonial reality, Settler people are themselves subject to the same sorts of propaganda, disinformation, and reality and identity construction that Indigenous peoples face. Marcos writes a great deal about this propaganda, most recently declaring that intellectuals help to construct pacifying theories which, "While the Other says 'wake up', those intellectuals say, beseech, beg, implore: 'Stay asleep'" (Marcos, 2006). Alfred also comments on this in his discussion of the creation of the "aboriginal" identity, "comprador politicians operating within colonial systems" (Alfred, 2005: 62), some of whom are truly fooled by massive propaganda regarding the "proper way" to be an Indigenous person (embodied in such events as the Aboriginal Achievement Awards). Again, it stands to reason that if Indigenous peoples are subject to this propaganda, and there are visible results to demonstrate the effectiveness of it, then Settler people are exposed to the same sorts of propaganda designed to encourage them to fill useful roles in imperial orders. Memmi, in discussing the disproportionate privileges of Settler peoples as compared to the colonized, notes:

> While [the colonizer] cannot help discover this [inordinate amount of privilege], there is no danger that official speeches might change his mind, for those speeches are drafted by him or his cousin or his friend.... If he preferred to be blind and deaf to the operation of the whole machinery, it

> would suffice for him to reap the benefits; he is then the beneficiary of the entire enterprise.
>
> Memmi, 1965: 8

The pervasive "peacemaker myth", noted by Regan earlier, is just one type of propaganda that Settler people are exposed to, accept, and in turn bring forth to others. While the process of media manipulation of everyone, from Settler to Indigenous peoples, is a well documented phenomenon, and while there is some awareness of this tactic both among Indigenous writers (Alfred and Corntassel, among others) and Settlers (Naomi Klein's *No Code*, and the documentary film *The Corporation*, both deal with this), it remains incredibly effective. There is a connection to be made here back to the first psychological barrier of greed: much of the media manipulation and the intentional isolation of Settler peoples is driven and directed by imperial elites, motivated by greed for wealth, power and control, and Settler people accept it on some level because of their own greed for imperial scraps.

With that in mind, it remains important to point out that often the ignorance of the Settler population is intentional and self-inflicted. Deloria, in writing on the nature of history for Westerners, notes that Settler people "review the movement of their ancestors across the continent as a steady progression of basically good events and experiences" (Deloria, 1994: 62), making history an inevitable progress from some sort of barbaric primitivism towards enlightened cultural and social perfection (embodied in Western, imperial societies, of course). To support this view of history, Settler people need Indigenous populations to both remain unchanged (at least in appearance) and to disappear from the modern world. Deloria notes this particular bias in the literature on Indigenous peoples:

> For generations it has been traditional that all historical literature on Indians be a recital of tribal histories from the pre-Discovery culture through the first encounter with the whites to about the year 1890. At that point the tribe seems to fade gently into history, with its famous war chief riding down the canyon into the sunset. Individuals appear within this history only to the extent that they appear to personalize the fortunes of the tribe. A mythical Hiawatha, a saddened Chief Joseph, a scowling Sitting Bull, a sullen Geronimo; all symbolize not living people but the historic fate of a nation overwhelmed by the inevitability of history.
>
> Deloria, 1994: 27

Of course, Settler people must make this choice to stay ignorant of the reality of Indigenous existence in order to support their own version of reality. However, as Regan notes, with the overwhelming evidence of both the existence of and the damage caused by colonialism, it is "virtually impossible for us not to *know*. What we choose to deny is our complicity in perpetuating a colonial system that is rooted in violence and social injustice" (Regan, 2006: 22; emphasis in original).

Of course, imperialism is no more healthy in the long run for the majority of Settler people than it is for Indigenous peoples, encouraging over-consumption, reliance upon chemicals and synthetics, causing depression and mental and emotional illness from poor social connections, polluting living environments, and so on. In a recent interview, the radical psychologist, Terry Kupers, suggests that many things considered illnesses in present Settler society, such as depression, are actually a result of an extremely unhealthy, oppressive lifestyle, and the question is one of what we pathologize (Soong, 2006). Kupers suggests that rather than treating depression, we should be treating consumerism, individualism, and the other rampant, dehumanizing and unhealthy practiced philosophies that make up western society, but that we choose to ignore the severe consequences of these social practices. Mander corroborates this view in his

critique of contemporary Western society which has become dependent on technological advancement to solve problems:

> People who celebrate technology say it has brought us an improved standard of living, which means greater speed (people can travel faster and obtain more objects and information sooner), greater choice (often equated with freedom of choice, which usually refers to the ability to choose among jobs and commodities), greater leisure (because technology has supposedly eased the burden and time involved in work), and greater luxury (more commodities and increased material comfort). None of these benefits informs us about human satisfaction, happiness, security, or the ability sustain life on Earth. Perhaps getting places more quickly makes some people more contented or fulfilled, but I'm not so sure. Nor am I convinced that greater choice of commodities in the marketplace qualifies as satisfying compared with, say, love and friendship and meaningful work.
>
> Mander, 1991: 26

Mander goes on to note that, despite the supposedly improved condition of contemporary Settler societies, criminal activity has increased dramatically since WWII, the prison population in the United States passed one million people in 1990, and that suicide and drug use are at "epidemic levels and growing", while suicide became "the third leading cause of death among young people" (ibid: 27-28). Further criticisms of contemporary society from Mander regarding homelessness, poverty, the massive accumulation of wealth and power in a tiny portion of the population, educational inequality, and other problems echo the criticisms that, while not new, are voiced only by those Settlers who have pierced the veil of intentional ignorance regarding the quality of life in imperial society. As has been noted, many commentators are beginning to observe that Settlers are themselves continuously being re-colonized to ensure their conformity to emerging forms of empire, an endeavour that Settler people usually submit to on some level. Here again the overlap between ignorance and the barriers of greed and fear is apparent. Settler people clearly have found the motivation required in order to deny very obvious

facts about their own behaviour and the nature of Settler societies, and like addicts, Settlers remain ignorant of the decline of their constructed reality in a desperate quest for ever more power, and living in desperate fear of losing this power. Some have suggested that Settler guilt is also a motivator for denying (at least consciously) the existence and prevalence of colonialism; however, it seems that guilt would require Settlers admitting that colonialism is actually wrong in the present. Settlers, however, seem to revel in apologizing about past wrongs – the very obvious atrocities of the past – as a method of denying the continuation of colonialism in the present. In this way, guilt, when expressed, can actually reinforce ignorance of further colonialism by creating a sense of accomplishment among Settlers, while simultaneously denying Indigenous peoples true emancipation. As Coulthard explains, "Without conflict and struggle the terms of recognition remain 'the property' of those in power to bestow on their 'inferiors' in ways that they deem appropriate" (Coulthard, 2006: 17). Settler guilt is far more about the colonizer than the colonized, serving to allow Settlers to avoid hard realities by wallowing in emotional rhetoric, which is what should be expected from a people so consumed with the establishment of control, personal acquisition of power and the fear of the power of others.

Summary of the Description of Colonial Mentalities

Ultimately, any Settler possessed of a colonial mentality likely will demonstrate a combination of these three internalized traits in differing degrees. The methodology of control that permeates the state construct, corporate economics, and international treaty making simply complicates these issues – a person who challenges their own internal

barriers to decolonized thought is likely to run up against systems of control designed to reinforce imperial power and direct them straight back into the fold, as well as their own personal reliance upon and support for those systems of control. Since Settler people, themselves colonized, are taught to respect and participate in these systems of control, and in fact have trouble conceiving of alternatives to the obvious problems posed by colonialism that do not rely on further imposition of controls, even those well-meaning Settler people who move past the influences of greed, fear and ignorance, often cannot clear the final hurdle of relying upon governments and courts to simply 'be better'. Considering the track record of governments and courts in fighting imperialism – or even the nature of these structures as part of a state, which seeks to homogenize and exert ultimate authority over the citizens of the state – pursuing freedom and justice through these colonial structures is a hopeless endeavour. It might even be appropriate to say that justice can only be expected from these institutions when the colonial mentalities of the Settler people who comprise the Settler states of Canada and America are purged.

I do recognize that there is not and has never been a society completely free of prejudiced individuals. No collective, nation, or state has ever been homogenously comprised of unselfish individuals, completely devoid of greed, fear, or ignorance, and certainly every society and culture has stories about those who seek ever-greater levels of power through whatever means necessary, manipulating, oppressing and exploiting along the way. What makes the situation in Canada so worthy of attention is two-fold. First, the characteristics of colonial mentalities that are revealed through the writings of Indigenous authors such as Deloria, Alfred, Fanon and Memmi, have persisted largely unchanged in the five decades since they began writing, and show striking similarities

across continents. These mentalities are clearly widespread in the Settler population, and are pervasive enough that they are evident in government policy and action, and large scale social mobilization, which means that they directly impact upon 'the colonized' – Indigenous peoples especially, but also all other oppressed groups which colonialism attempts to force into the lower levels of the imperial pyramid. The second reason for paying attention to these mentalities is that they are simply so completely and utterly opposed to the principles espoused by Settler society. The philosophies of the Western world at least since the Enlightenment, with few exceptions, have been philosophies of freedom and liberation, protected rights and equality. This sort of hypocrisy goes mostly unnoticed by the Settler people themselves, and thus it is important to make the effort to recognize colonial mentalities expressed by the Settler population, and confront them. When these mentalities are expressed by individuals who wield power and influence, this task is all the more important. So with this description of colonial mentality in place – external control and internal greed, fear and ignorance – I will now turn to an examination of the works of three prominent Settler political theorists: Alan Cairns, Will Kymlicka, and Patrick Macklem.

CHAPTER THREE – COLONIAL MENTALITIES IN MAINSTREAM THEORY

Alas, only Orwell still speaks from the grave

There's no imperial voice to scare away the bedbugs
no sudden torchlight to make them scurry from panic

Intellectuals always have had a ripe talent
for servitude, an exquisite taste for it
-from *Bedbugs*, by Irving Layton

In terms of a purely structural analysis of the proposals of Alan Cairns, Will Kymlicka, and Patrick Macklem, they appear to occupy very different places in the political mosaic. Other than their prominence among the intellectual and political elite in Canada, few would associate the works of these three academics with each other. However, utilizing the descriptive analysis of colonial mentalities developed in the previous chapter, it is apparent that all three academics demonstrate colonial mentalities as fundamental underpinnings of their work.

Analysis of Alan Cairns: White Paper Liberalism Redux

Alan Cairns' work is described by Dale Turner[22] as representative of the same intellectual tradition that produced the Canadian federal government 1969 White Paper (Turner, 2006: 37) – assimilation through political minimization of the difference between Indigenous and Settler peoples, with Settler society and culture taken as the

[22] I recognize that Turner is also a proponent of an altered yet still fundamentally liberal viewpoint. His contention that Indigenous "word warriors" carry the responsibility to "explain" Indigenous points of view and societal desires is founded in the contention that colonial action is the result of a lack of knowledge that generates biases and discrimination against Indigenous cultures and causes. Turner continues to contend that the basic state system of Canada – with some alteration – can accommodate Indigenous cultural, social and political aspirations, despite the evidence to the contrary (including the analysis of the society of control, and the internalized colonial mentalities which I have already described). What Turner advocates in *This Is Not a Peace Pipe* (2006) is an alteration of the proposals of Will Kymlicka, which are outlined in the next section. Having recognized this, though, some of Turner's structural critiques of Cairns and Kymlicka remain relevant, even if his conclusions are problematic.

norm. Cairns does not go so far as to propose immediate dissolution of all recognition of difference between Indigenous and Settler Canadians, but he is a strong advocate of a very limited politically recognized difference. Cairns' proposals are fully developed in his most well known work, *Citizens Plus* (2000), which is actually a rewriting of the Hawthorne Report of 1966 which Cairns helped to develop prior to the White Paper, and the theory behind his proposal is mildly fleshed out further in his recent work, *First Nations and the Canadian State* (2005). Cairns generalizes prior and current proposals for Settler-Indigenous relations as falling into two distinct categories. On one hand is the assimilationist perspective, whereby Indigenous peoples would be recognized as Canadian citizens – nothing more and nothing less – with no government discrimination or benefit. This type of proposal is rooted in basic liberal philosophy originating in the European Enlightenment whereby equality is achieved through identical individual treatment by the state. On the other, according to Cairns, is Indigenous nationalism which advocates the break-up of the Canadian state and redistribution of state-based sovereignty to Indigenous nations (Cairns, 2005: 5-6). Cairns portrays his proposals as a middle road between these two options. He advocates the dissolution of Constitutional recognition for Indigenous peoples that would imply autonomy, and the removal of any privileges based on group affiliation (membership in an Indigenous nation or treaty group, for example). Cairns believes that limited benefits should be legislatively granted to Indigenous peoples on an individual basis, accorded by Indian status, for the purpose of equalizing the economic, social and political imbalances that exist between Indigenous and Settler peoples as a result of historical colonialism. Quoting the Hawthorne Report, which he helped create and which forms the basis of his proposals, Cairns notes that

"Indians… should be regarded as 'Citizens Plus.' In addition to the normal rights and duties of citizenship, Indians possess certain additional rights as charter members of the Canadian community" (Cairns, 2000: 161-162). However, Cairns' proposals are rooted in several significant misconstructions of past and present realities, and an over-reactive defensiveness regarding the future of the Canadian state, all of which clearly demonstrate his personal colonial psychology.

One of the most obvious facets of Cairns' colonial mentality is ignorance. Beyond simply misconstruing historical 'facts', Cairns actively engages in disinformation by replacing those facts with a more palatable – but incorrect – assertions. As an example of this in action, Turner in his critique of Cairns' theories notes Cairns' fundamental misreading of the two-row wampum treaty, a prime example of untruths supporting continued ignorance. According to Turner, Cairns "caricatures Iroquoian political thinking, which in turn affects the way we ought to understand his Citizens Plus view" (Turner, 2006: 45). Cairns suggests that the Guswentha (two-row treaty) implies a completely disjointed relationship between the participants in the two-row treaty, a situation that "does not address the reality of our interdependence, and of our intermingling" (Cairns quoted in Turner, 2006: 45). As Turner points out:

> …Cairns fails to mention that there are three beads, representing peace, respect, and friendship, that bridge the two parallel rows. This is a serious oversight because understanding the meaning and significance of these three beads helps explain what the Iroquois meant by a just political relationship.
>
> Turner, 2006: 48

Further, as has been demonstrated previously in the analysis of Hall, the principles of peace, respect, and friendship, when taken seriously as personal ethics, led to the creation of the Covenant Chain, a successful political alliance between Britain and the

Haudenosaunee (Hall, 2003: 9-10). A thorough historical investigation into not just the full meaning of the Guswentha, but also the later agreements that were forged on the basis of its characteristics, demonstrates a much more nuanced – and practical – political reality which has and can result from a two-row style arrangement. As it is not possible to simply deny the two-row treaty as a viable and powerful diplomatic arrangement, Cairns engages in disinformation by presenting the two-row treaty in a fundamentally untrue manner. It cannot be stated enough that simple ignorance due to a lack of information or resources is not the source of Cairns' misconstruction; the act is intentional, whether consciously or unconsciously. The ability to portray the Guswentha – and by extension any type of two-row agreement – in this manner could be negated by an immersion in a more honest history (such as that written by Anthony Hall) or in actual experience with Indigenous communities, where the relationships developed on principles of respect and trust could tell a different story. Cairns' ignorance stems from his remote position, theorizing within the confines of the accepted Canadian political paradigm. Regan notes:

> Canadian anthropologist Julie Cruikshank reminds us that "what too often are missing from scholarly studies, are interruption and risk... unless we put ourselves in interactive situations where we are exposed and vulnerable, where... norms are interrupted and challenged, we can never recognize the limitations of our own description." In assessing the quality of our research, Strega urges researchers to reflect on "our own complicity in systems of domination and subordination."
>
> Regan, 2006: 67

Cairns, obviously, does not place himself into these positions. His theories are ignorant not because Cairns does not have access to information, but because they spring from an unchallenged, un-self-critical place.

Perhaps more revealing than Cairns' ignorant misconstruction of the Guswentha is his motivation for engaging in discussions of Indigenous-Settler relations. Cairns says all the right things in terms of his analysis of historical injustices perpetrated against Indigenous peoples by colonial powers, but he comes up short in his analysis of present conflicts. Cairns does not recognize that current relationships between Canada and Indigenous peoples remain colonial; rather he appears to credit current conditions affecting Indigenous communities to a lag in social and economic development due to historical imperialism with no recognition of continuing colonial actions, suggestive of outdated theories of inevitable Indigenous extinction, and believes that Indigenous aspirations are "for a North American standard of living" which can only be achieved by "inevitable" urbanization (Cairns, 2000: 162). In fact, Cairns dismisses Indigenous nationalism - regardless of the form it might take - outright (as demonstrated by his criticism of the Guswentha and the nation-to-nation relationship prescribed by the RCAP and many others) as incapable of solving the problems affecting Indigenous communities (Cairns, 2005: 8-10). Cairns cites the small population size of Indigenous reserve communities, the urbanization of Indigenous populations, intermarriage, and cases of "successful assimilation" as reasons for denying Indigenous aspirations towards nationhood (ibid: 11-15). However, his real motivations are quite clearly less noble than his historical analysis would lead one to believe, and less concerned with creating a just relationship than with preserving Settler privilege. Throughout Cairns' analyses and proposals, he constantly references the imperative that the Canadian state not be broken up and the need for Indigenous peoples to accept the fact that they are subsumed within

the state, that they are citizens, and Indigenous political aspirations are completely subservient to Canadian political stability (Cairns, 2000: 159; 2005: 57).

Consider first Cairns' assertion that all Indigenous peoples are Canadian citizens, with both the privileges and duties implied by citizenship. As Turner notes, many Indigenous peoples became citizens of the state under dubious circumstances, and have legitimate reason to claim that they are not citizens; to claim otherwise is to remain completely ignorant of history. However, as with Cairns' misrepresentation of the Guswentha, it is too simplistic to assign this stance to simple ignorance. It is more important to ask the question, who benefits from enforcing Canadian citizenship upon Indigenous peoples in Canada? The answer can only be that imperial elites do, and the Settler society to a lesser extent as a result of their participation in the imperial system. As Hardt and Negri point out, one of the key goals of imperialism is the creation of order and "peace" (meaning a lack of disruption to social mechanisms) (Hardt & Negri 2001: 14); as well, Memmi notes that the goal of colonization has long been to incorporate Indigenous peoples into the economic systems of the state for the economic benefit of imperial elites (Memmi, 1965: 1). Alfred's concept of the aboriginal, the co-opted Indigenous elite who cooperates with imperial and colonial aspirations, is predicated upon the aboriginal integrating to some extent with state and corporate interests (Alfred, 2005: 30-31). Considering that the state, contrary to claims of both Cairns and Kymlicka, is primarily controlled by the Canadian nation – and thus, the largely colonial Settler population – and broader imperial interests beyond that, unquestioned citizenship in the state represents for Indigenous peoples submission to a high level of imperial control. "Citizens plus" style benefits, such as continued tax exemption, represent little more than

a co-opting bribe. To this end, citizenship has long been a tool of the state, utilized to assist in absorbing "Others" – Indigenous and non-Indigenous – into the functioning apparatus of Canadian society. This has lead Day, in *Multiculturalism and History of Canadian Diversity*, to refer to Canada post-WWII as developing a "citizenship machine" to assist the state in the "attempt [at] increasing everyday microcontrol of the lives of both canonical Selves and problematic Others" (Day, 2000: 165). This also corresponds to the deeper implication of citizenship as developed by Hardt and Negri. As noted earlier, in *Empire*, they identify the post-WWII era and specifically the founding of the United Nations as the beginning of the homogenization of concepts of "right" and "justice", essentially creating arbitrary boundaries of accepted behaviour that ultimately feed back into the interests of imperialism. In their words:

> [T]he new juridical apparatus is presented to us in its most immediate figure: a global order, a justice, and a right that are still virtual but nonetheless apply actually to us. We are forced increasingly to feel that we are participants in this development, and we are called upon to be responsible for what it becomes in this framework. *Our citizenship, just like our ethical responsibility, is situated within these new dimensions – our power and our impotence are measured here.* We could say… that our internal moral disposition, when it is confronted with and tested in the social order, tends to be determined by the ethical political, and juridical categories of Empire.
>
> Hardt & Negri, 2000: 19; emphasis added

In effect, by insisting upon the imposition of undifferentiated citizenship on Indigenous peoples, Cairns is also insisting that Indigenous peoples participate in and tacitly accept and support the imperial moral, economic and political order. Considering that the imperial order is designed largely to benefit Settler people, who remain higher on the pyramid of petty tyrants thus gaining greater privilege and comfort, and that the imperial order remains predicated on what Hardt and Negri refer to as a "juridical apparatus"

which is often in conflict with Indigenous cultural and social traditions, this is especially perverse. It is also very revealing; Cairns' assertion that Indigenous peoples are Canadian citizens is not only ignorant of historical fact, but also serves to reinforce Settler privilege by slowly drawing Indigenous peoples into the imperial machine, encouraging participation in state systems and wider imperial economic systems. In this way, Cairns demonstrates that he is highly motivated by a mentality of greed for Settler privilege within the imperial order.

Throughout his works, Cairns constantly demonstrates misconstruction of Indigenous political aspirations and social realities in order to justify denial of any sort of recognition of inherent Indigenous right, or even Indigenous difference. As demonstrated in the imperial contextualization of Cairns' insistence upon common Canadian citizenship, at least some part of this rests in the mentality of greed for imperial scraps for Settler people and an intentional ignorance that justifies this under the guise of practical concern for Indigenous and Settler people alike. However, a great deal of Cairns' writing also appears defensive in nature, although following the familiar pattern of misconstruction rooted in ignorance. A prime example is Cairns' insistence upon rooting Indigenous nationhood in band council-centered reserve communities, and further insistence that the end result of Indigenous nationalism is state-based separatism (Cairns, 2005: 16-17). Both of these contentions are clearly fallacious. First, Indigenous conceptions of nationhood have little to do with Euro-American conceptions of nationalism which are rooted in Enlightenment traditions. Indigenous peoples, recognized even by the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples as comprising nations prior to contact, are rooted in complex and dynamic Indigenous philosophies that are very

different from those of the European Enlightenment. Alfred notes that "contemporary Native nationalism seeks to replace the dividing, alienating, and exploitive notions, based on fear, that drive politics" with notions of power "gained through balancing the diverse aspects of our being, harmonization with the natural forces that exist outside us, respect for the integrity of others and the divers forms of power, and knowledge of ritual" (Alfred, 1999: 52-52). Deloria, among others, has pointed out that Indigenous identity – including national identity – is rooted in specific places, and a cultural and spiritual connection to those places (Deloria, 1994: 66-67); simply because colonialism has relocated and fractured Indigenous peoples does not severe those connections. Consider that contemporary Indigenous thinkers, including Vine Deloria and Taiaiake Alfred, have identified renewal of connections with the land as key to Indigenous cultural resurgence, and it is clear that Cairns is operating from a position of ignorance regarding Indigenous nationalism, either intentionally or out of a lack of serious consideration. Further, as Alfred clearly outlines in *Peace, Power, Righteousness*, sovereignty, "an exclusionary concept rooted in an adversarial and coercive Western notion of power" (Alfred, 1999: 59), which implies state-based separatism, is simply not appropriate for Indigenous peoples, and while some Indigenous peoples have expressed this type of attitude in the past[23], in the present it seems far more common to find Indigenous peoples arguing for some manner of autonomous relationship within the context of the state[24]. This all begs

[23] As an example, while George Manuel helped found the National Indian Brotherhood, which later became the Assembly of First Nations, he also caused a great amount of Settler angst when he expressed admiration for African-style state independence (McFarlane, 1993: 162). This seems to be the example that Cairns is almost obsessed with, as he constantly references the African situation, stating that it is regrettable that the same option is not possible in Canada (Cairns, 2005: 9). Considering the very dubious results of African "decolonization", Cairns may be the only one who finds that regrettable.

[24] See Alfred (1999 and 2005), and Coulthard's discussion of anarcho-indigenism (2000).

the question as to what is motivating Cairns' constant repetition of these ignorant perspectives.

It would seem that Cairns is demonstrating a very clear case of Settler fear of Indigenous peoples, especially in larger numbers. Consider the following statement as typical of Cairns' fearful, reactionary theory:

> ...nation-to-nation as the lens for viewing Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal relations inevitably conjures up images of a mini-international system and weakens the idea of a common citizenship. Academic and political support for a transformed federalism in which Aboriginal nations within Canada are defined by treaties – "treaty federalism" – drives us towards a view of Canada as a multinational polity in which we relate to each other through the separate nations we belong to – a lens that can only reduce our feelings of responsibility for each other and our willingness to share. Both treaty federalism and nation-to-nation are proud, dignifying, and status-raising rubrics for Aboriginal peoples, but this benefit comes at a price. They distance Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal peoples from each other. They also imply that our relations are community relations, not those of shared citizenship.
>
> Cairns, 2000: 7

Cairns somehow construes Indigenous peoples, in control of their traditional lands and their futures as a threat to Settler peoples because they will, in his estimation, refuse to "share", despite the historical reality wherein Indigenous peoples have always shared with Settler people who adhered to the principles of trust, respect, and honesty embodied in the Guswentha. As Cairns has already shown that he does not understand these principles, this possibility must terrify him. The other possible interpretation of his statement is that the only thing that inspires Canadians to "share" their (stolen) resources with Indigenous peoples is the common bond of "Canadian" citizenship. In that case, Cairns is ignoring that the inverse of his own statement: common citizenship may reduce the "distance" between Indigenous and Settler peoples, but they also reduce the "difference" – Indigenous land and resources are shared with Settlers forcibly, while

citizenship provides the means by which Indigenous peoples are pulled into the imperial moral and cultural framework.

Cairns falsely attributes sovereigntist aspirations to Indigenous peoples because he cannot conceive of the demise of the Canadian state, as revealed by his insistence that the Canadian state remains paramount despite the obvious subversion of all state forms (not just the Canadian state) into the global imperial order, and then works to undermine those false aspirations by applying a second falsehood – rooting Indigenous nationalism in reserve-based political units. In addition to his Settler greed in hoping to draw Indigenous peoples deeper into the imperial machine through imposition of citizenship, Cairns is also attempting to head-off the deepest fear of any Settler: the resurgence of legitimate claims to independence that undermine the validity of the state that directly provides Settler privilege.

Analysis of Will Kymlicka: A Colonial Wolf in Settler Sheep Clothing

Will Kymlicka is potentially the most dangerously colonial of the three academics considered in this critique. To begin with, Kymlicka tends to allow for a much greater range of powers and rights for Indigenous peoples in the Canadian context than does Alan Cairns. Kymlicka uses the language of nationalism, and advocates the preservation of a separate societal culture for Indigenous peoples within the Canadian state. Self-government and constitutionally protected special status are both key pillars of Kymlicka's arguments, neither of which can be found in any of Carins' writings, and he goes so far as to propose that "The question is not, 'have national minorities given us a compelling reason to abandon the norm of ethnocultural neutrality?' but, rather, 'why

should national minorities not have the same powers of nation-building as the majority?'" (Kymlicka, 2001: 29). Ultimately, however, Kymlicka is just as committed to the goal of submerging the Indigenous population within the Canadian state, and to ensuring the primacy of the state in all things. In this way, Kymlicka demonstrates openly colonial attitudes that betray the imperialist tendencies of his work.

To begin, Kymlicka firmly entrenches himself in a position of familiar colonial control by granting himself the ability to decide what is and is not a core aspect of Indigenous being. On one level, Kymlicka severely limits the potential scope of Indigenous aspirations by drawing a firm line that 'cultural continuation and only cultural continuation is the essential element of Indigenous survival within Canada. As Glen Coulthard points out, many Indigenous peoples "seek a considerable level of political freedom and economic autonomy from the institutional structure of the surrounding state… Kymlicka's limited conceptualization of Aboriginal rights as 'cultural' rights is unable to accommodate for this degree of freedom" (Coulthard, 2000: 68-69). It is not enough to say that someone should be happy in an oppressive situation, unable to achieve security over land, unable to fully express and fulfill cultural and spiritual obligations to relationships with the land and rituals of renewal, unable to engage in any economic system except that prescribed by the state, and should be grateful for the 'assistance' in having their culture perpetuated. Easing up one aspect of control – colonial prohibition of cultural practices[25] such as sun dances, pot latches, and even traditional languages –

[25] It is questionable whether or not 'culture' even could perpetuate under Kymlicka's proposed scenario, as many cultural expressions would remain verboten, both implicitly and explicitly. Implicitly, an Indigenous nation closely tied to a particular place might see it as their duty to defend or otherwise interact with that place; however, if that place is considered private property, the cultural precept becomes incommensurate with the Canadian legal system, regardless of additional cultural rights. As the oft-posed Settler question goes, "What do you do with the Indians who have a land claim on the city of Vancouver?" That land claim

does not negate the extreme levels of control applied by the state in all other areas of existence. In this way, Kymlicka acts in a protectionist manner towards Canadian privilege, betraying a mentality based in colonial greed.

It is important to understand that Kymlicka's theories, like those of Alan Cairns[26], are based in a fairly traditional conception of liberalism, with a few modifications. Liberalism in a general sense has not been a friend to Indigenous peoples because, among other reasons, it is rooted in some of the same theories of control that Kymlicka so clearly demonstrates. As Turner notes, liberalism is rooted in the concept of a "blank slate"; individuals are the fundamental unit of society, all individuals are considered to be completely equal and should be treated as such by the state, and culture is near irrelevant (consisting of "customs, cuisine, and crafts") (Turner, 2006: 13). Liberalism as a theory assumes that all that matters is the 'common humanity' of individuals. The implication of this is that culture and history are both considered irrelevant. Any culture should be practicable within any liberal system, and history does not matter so long as individuals are treated in an equal (meaning identical) fashion by the sanctioned authorities. This has the obvious effect of perpetuating colonialism and encouraging colonial mentalities because it encourages ignorance by glossing over difference, privileging Western culture and as such privileging Settler individuals who are members of that culture, and drawing harsh, fear-inspiring distinctions between those who accept liberalism and those who do not (the mysterious and terrifying Other). Operating in the same liberal framework as

---

is both political and cultural. As noted, Kymlicka rejects additional political considerations for Indigenous peoples, and his conception of culture holds no answers to the conundrum.

[26] Though Kymlicka and Cairns disagree with each other on details, they still clearly inhabit similar positions in the wider political spectrum. While Kymlicka insists that he is promoting "liberal culturalism" rather than traditional "liberal nationalism" (Kymlicka, 2001: 39-42), Turner notes that Kymlicka's conceptions of liberal culturalism still fall back on the "rights of individuals" (Turner, 2006: 61), and the state as "*the* ultimate legitimate expression of political sovereignty" (ibid: 63; emphasis in original).

Cairns, Kymlicka insists upon a common citizenship between Indigenous and Settler peoples in the Canadian state, and as such, many of the same criticisms apply. As Turner notes, liberal philosophical approaches to Indigenous-Settler relationships – in Canada, Turner's critiques specifically cover the 1969 White Paper, Alan Cairns' "Citizens Plus" model, and Will Kymlicka's minority rights theory – are flawed from the start because they refuse to recognize and deal with past injustices[27] (Turner, 2006: 37). Staying with the critique of Kymlicka, Turner notes that Kymlicka's theories only pay lip service to the historical injustices of colonialism, refusing to truly engage with the implication that Canada remains a colonial state. Turner denies that the liberal appeal to equality can address the needs of Indigenous peoples:

> If we invoke the equality argument without looking at history, we gloss over the fact that Aboriginal peoples became citizens in many different ways, most of them unjust. More importantly, Aboriginal peoples in some communities simply are not citizens of the Canadian state. Canadian political leaders, policy makers, and especially judges have unilaterally assumed that for better or worse, Canada's Aboriginal peoples have become citizens of Canada in the fullest sense. Essentially, this is how Kymlicka uses the term incorporation....
>
> Turner, 2006: 68

Turner is not the first or only writer to note that liberal theory tends not to produce liberation but rather to shift the locus of oppression. Subcommandante Marcos, speaking at the behest of the Zapatistas, often notes that liberalism is part of the oppressive mechanism of Mexico, and as has already been articulated, Richard Day counts current state-based liberalism as part of the ongoing "hegemony of hegemony" which is highly oppressive (Marcos, 2002; Day, 2005). In reference to the problems resulting from multiculturalism and multicultural policy, a distinctly liberal theory, Stanley Fish

[27] Turner fails to make the point that they also refuse to acknowledge many present injustices, but this is also a pressing and important point to make. It is not enough to conceive of injustice as simply 'in the past'.

developed his critique of "boutique multiculturalism", which states that state-based liberalism cannot seriously hope to be honestly inclusive of cultural difference and still allow a state (or, in fact, contemporary Western society) to function in any recognizable way (Fish, 1997). While Kymlicka proposes to be searching for fairness, due to his entrenchment in comfortable liberal theory, in reality he is searching for a proposal to make continued control of Indigenous peoples by the Canadian state – and thus the wider imperial system and the implicit "society of control" – more palatable; Kymlicka effectively justifies the 'brute force' of Canadian society by ignoring the use of physical force in the past, and justifying the use of bureaucratic force in the present. In fact, the unjust nature of the Canadian state and Settler society in general seems to be the one taboo subject in Kymlicka's academic investigation. Kymlicka has put a new spin on classical liberalism by conceding that some differential treatment for individuals of differing cultures is required, as culture is considered a fundamental good – a stance that Kymlicka promotes under the label of "liberal culturalism" – but that culture is still not treated seriously and in fact takes a back seat to the necessity of social control, evidenced by the continuing demand for the supposedly-neutral arbitration of the Constitution and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In effect Kymlicka repeatedly attempts to make liberalism 'work', an act that resembles nothing so much as putting an elephant into a suitcase – that is to say, it's equal parts slight-of-hand and blunt force[28]. Kymlicka, completely ignorant of the writings and philosophies of the Indigenous peoples whom he is writing about (rather than for) simply asserts that there are no other options. Thus he

[28] Kymlicka's absolute insistence upon the broad framework of the status quo can be considered "blunt force" in the philosophical sense. His recognition of and simultaneous lack of consideration for the historical injustices associated with Indigenous "incorporation" into Canada and the implications of this for sovereignty (Turner, 2006: 68), is subtle, academic sight-of-hand.

shows himself as being complete immersed in and supportive of the society of control, and the wider imperial project.

Explicitly, Kymlicka states that any Indigenous rights, be they group rights or individual rights, can never trump the remainder of the Constitution of Canada, including the Charter of Rights and Freedoms (Kymlicka, 2001: 81), or more insidiously, that individual "tribal constitutions" must be acceptable from "a human rights point of view" (ibid: 86, in footnote), meaning that separate constitutions for Indigenous communities would be functionally undifferentiated from current constitutions. There is no acknowledgement that imposing the Charter on Indigenous peoples (who, as fully functioning nations at the time of contact, possessed and continue to maintain complex systems of socially and culturally acceptable behaviour akin to rights, and systems to resolve disputes that parallel the intended function of a judiciary) is a completely arbitrary act. This arbitrary act becomes the ultimate guideline for when culture becomes 'too much' culture, and as such, Indigenous peoples are only free in this system in the sense that they are free to act in a way that does not challenge, offend or otherwise inconvenience Settler people. This is greatly akin to the concept of "boutique multiculturalism" proposed by Stanley Fish (Fish, 1997), who notes that a boutique multiculturalist permits only those surface cultural practices that are inoffensive to the "mainstream". It might be tempting to label Kymlicka a "deep multiculturalist", as he appears to be far more open and accepting of Indigenous culture, but in reality, his proposed barriers of control are not so different from those proposed by Cairns; he simply disguises them better, and this is an important analytical point to make. Kymlicka uses the rhetoric of fairness and equality quite well, and his attention to the importance of

culture, and recognition of cultural difference in the broad sense, seduce many people into believing that Kymlicka is something that he is not, namely a radical reformer who believes that the demands of Indigenous peoples can only be met by massive changes in the political system of Settler Canada. However, as should now be clear from this analysis of his work, Kymlicka's primary concern is the appearance of change to placate Indigenous political demands, not the actual meeting of or engagement with those demands. Kymlicka, by constantly relying on the primacy of the state and the need to regulate and control Indigenous expressions, and by granting himself and other Settler elites the ultimate power to determine what is and is not cultural as well as determining that culture is the only issue of concern to Indigenous peoples, shows the same heavy-handed reliance upon control that characterized the days of Duncan Campbell Scott, though his methods are more palatable to a contemporary Settler society that no longer accepts the sort of outright racism espoused by Scott. Kymlicka, in contributing this proposal for the future of Settler-Indigenous relations, is not simply passively contributing to colonialism by his inaction, but is fully reinforcing the powerful colonial structure, and shows himself to be an ardent imperialist in that he encourages the wilful ignorance of the colonial Settler population, helps to perpetuate it, and seeks to maintain the comfortable position of greedy Settler privilege.

Though Kymlicka's reliance upon and support of the society of control is the most obviously colonial aspect of Kymlicka's theories, throughout his works Kymlicka inherently demonstrates that he is also motivated by the internal colonial mentalities displayed by many Settlers. Most prominently, Kymlicka displays a (potentially intentional) ignorance of the fundamentals of Indigenous philosophy and culture. By

treating Indigenous cultures as a simple variation on Western conceptions of culture, Kymlicka ignores, among other things, the cultural precepts that call for many Indigenous peoples to interact with land, water, and animals as equals (Mander, 1991: 212-214). He ignores the powerful tie to place that is a central element of Indigenous culture, as previously noted, an element that cannot be fully expressed so long as political questions about access to land (including specific sacred sites) remain unresolved and unaddressed. Kymlicka also ignores that all cultures adapt and change over time – something that for Indigenous peoples, based in a philosophy of flux as stated by Little Bear (Little Bear, 2000), is not just a passive historical reality, but a conscious, active reality for individuals and groups. Kymlicka's concept of "cultural continuation" does not take into account that Indigenous cultures have always incorporated new elements, both from other Indigenous cultures and from foreigners such as Europeans, and that this does not in any way contradict or devalue traditional culture[29]. Though his proposals may seem perfectly acceptable in that they work well within contemporary Canadian legal and political structures, Kymlicka's proposals hold Indigenous peoples to a very unfair standard of 'culture'.

There are also several revealing passages in Kymlicka's work that demonstrate his unflinching commitment to the status quo of 'greedy' imperial privilege. First is Kymlicka's insistence that he will not in any way consider a system that is different from that of the contemporary state-based system. Kymlicka even agrees that the state-based

[29] For example, Indigenous peoples' adoption of rifles changed nothing about cultural principles regarding hunting or warfare; neither does Indigenous adoption of a writing system and alphabet invalidate traditional oral histories. Many Indigenous communities have been very successful in choosing to incorporate elements of technology and culture into their social and cultural realities as compliments, rather than absolute alternatives. As Alfred states, "Survival is bending and swaying but not breaking, adapting and accommodating without compromising what is core to one's being" (Alfred, 2005: 29).

system can be criticized as oppressive, but he simply refuses to deal with anything else as being unrealistic (Kymlicka, 2001: 75, in footnote). Kymlicka calls this 'dealing with reality'; it seems rather a poor excuse to perpetuate Settler privilege, especially considering his otherwise positive attitude towards fanciful theorizing. Kymlicka also notes in his discussion of additional rights for Indigenous peoples that, should they ever achieve a higher level of relative power within the Canadian state, those rights would be removed and similar rights granted to Settler people in order to create a balance. It is not logically consistent for Kymlicka to refuse to deal with "the unrealistic" on one hand, and to specifically address an almost unfathomable situation, until one realizes that in dealing with both scenarios, Kymlicka is defending the status quo of Settler superiority enforced by a colonial state structure.

Ultimately, Kymlicka's theory is flawed and his motivations suspect. He demonstrates repeatedly his inability to solve the problem of Settler colonialism through any other means but resorting to tighter controls – identity definition, codified systems of rights – on the Indigenous victims of colonial oppression. He further picks and chooses which issues to address and which to leave, apparently based on which angle will provide greater surety for Settler privilege, a sure sign of greed for imperial privilege. Combined with a fundamental ignorance regarding the core of Indigenous philosophies, and an overriding reliance upon control, Kymlicka has created a fine-sounding theory with great appeal to centrists and liberals in the mainstream political spectrum, founded on the same deceit and half-truths that have been used to excuse colonialism for decades. No amount of high-minded phraseology can cloak Kymlicka's harmful colonial mentality.

Analysis of Patrick Macklem: Benevolent Intentions, Colonial Actions

Patrick Macklem is certainly well-intentioned; if nothing else, his work is proof that one need not be intentionally or explicitly colonial in order to assist in the colonial project and expansion of imperial power. Rather, Macklem is very concerned with freedom, equality, and justice. However, he is unwilling to engage in the sort of self-critical analysis that leads to the understanding that the heart of colonialism rests not just in institutions which are predicated on power imbalances which work against Indigenous peoples, but in the widespread and deeply rooted colonial motivations of both average and elite Settler peoples. This failure to engage deeply with the roots of colonialism ends up leaving Macklem mired in the paradoxes of contemporary imperial existence. One of the major problems within Macklem's work is that he struggles to reconcile the 'relativist versus universality' argument of cultural morals and ethics. Macklem describes the problems that stem from this dichotomy as lending themselves to oppression on one hand, through the enforcement of arbitrary social and cultural norms, and the tolerance of oppression on the other, by allowing cultural imperatives as an excuse for oppression. This is a fundamental reason for Macklem's desire to utilize the Canadian constitution as a flexible and inclusive document – Macklem sees an open interpretation of the constitution as being able to provide cultural recognition and sensitivity while also providing basic human rights enforcement on the other. Despite Macklem's best efforts to contort the Constitution, though, he still ends up promoting colonialism, largely by ignoring realities of constitutional statehood, and by participating in Tully's "great lie" – that there is no other way.

First, as Tully points out in *Strange Multiplicity*, constitutions exist for the purpose of homogenizing a society and thus crafting a (singular) national identity, as well as providing a basis for state control, including state-sanctioned violence (Tully, 1995: 206-207), and as such, contemporary constitutionalism is inherently imperial (ibid: 96). Even Cairns recognizes that the Canadian Constitution was intended as a nation building instrument of the Anglo majority and a bulwark against Quebecois separatism (Cairns, 2000: 156), and it fulfills a similar role with regard to Indigenous peoples. Macklem's advocacy for a flexible Constitution that promotes and nurtures difference is seriously problematic, especially since he does not advocate writing a new Constitution, but rather simply reading flexibility into the present Canadian Constitution. Like Kymlicka, Macklem believes that a state can, if it so chooses, engage in a nation building process for multiple nations (Macklem, 2001: 111), and in a theoretical sense, this may be true. However, considering the construction of the current Constitution, which allows for all sorts of infringements on Indigenous nation building such as arbitrary government identification and labelling of 'Indians' under the Indian Act, it is difficult to imagine a scenario where the Canadian state would (even if it theoretically could) read the constitution in such a manner that Indigenous difference was seen as an obvious component of the constitution and that state-assisted nation building considered a primary public good. Constitutions are, as Tully states, yokes about the necks of Indigenous peoples, as "It is taken for granted that the unity of constitutional association consists in a centralized and uniform system of legal and political authority, or clear subordination of authorities" (Tully, 1995: 83), not just because they are rigid and inflexible – which is often the case – but also because they provide an excuse for state elites to act in colonial

fashion and yet justify their actions under the law. As has been pointed out in discussions of Cairns and Kymlicka, liberalism has never been a friend of Indigenous peoples, and the Canadian constitution, like many state constitutions, is heavily influenced by liberal Enlightenment thought; more so in Canada than many other places, as the creation of the Canadian Constitution was the direct result of the efforts of the Trudeau administration – hardcore adherents to liberal thought. Of course, it is important to remember that the term "liberal" in reference the Constitution and the Charter have nothing to do with the internal politics of Canada; as Alfred notes "the liberal, conservative, and racist reaction across the political spectrum are the same and distinguish themselves from each other only in their varying intensities and styles" (Alfred, 2005: 109). Thus, it is difficult to imagine who in government Macklem believes would be willing to engage in a massive reinterpretation of the Charter to avoid these problems. His intentional ignorance about the scope and function of the Canadian political system are apparent in the complete unfeasibility of his proposals.

The question then becomes, why does Macklem rely so heavily on appeals to Constitutional authority, or more simply, why does Macklem believe the Constitution is a required mediator of a fair relationship with Indigenous peoples? If Constitutions in general, and the Canadian Constitution specifically, have historically been problematic for Indigenous peoples, why try to pound a square peg into a round hole? The answer to this question may lie in Macklem's preoccupation with a peaceful relationship between Settler and Indigenous peoples, devoid of conflict. Macklem appears to desire most of all a peaceful, orderly relationship between Indigenous nations and the Canadian nation, bounded by the state – consider that his conception of treaty rights is predicated on

"successful negotiations with the Crown" (Macklem, 2001: 6), implying that the state and Indigenous nations can achieve finality in their relationships. As an example of this finality, Macklem raises the spectre of the Nisga'a Final Agreement (ibid, 281-285)[30]. Here Macklem shows his imperial colours vividly. As Hardt and Negri point out, one of the seductive appeals of imperialism is the promise of peace and order (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 10-11), which ultimately necessitates imperial power and control. In Roman times, this meant the construction of roads and protection from threats through the presence of the Legions. In Marxist-based Soviet regimes, this meant orderly production and state prevention of any bourgeois exploitation of the proletariat. In Canada, it means painless economic development, and no "Okas". This appeal to peace and order is actually used to inspire the call for greater authority, essentially willing the empire into being, and Macklem falls right into this trap. Either motivated by internal greed and fear or intentionally playing upon the greed and fear of other Settlers[31], Macklem's proposal would not only read Indigenous difference into the constitution, but would also de facto instil the ability to define what exactly constitutes Indigenous difference into the hands of the Supreme Court or state sanctioned arbiters (inline with Hardt and Negri's assertion that contemporary imperialism is based on an expanding juridical order). This, though, is the same judiciary that has failed Indigenous peoples time and time again.

---

[30] Many writers have commented on the deeply flawed nature of the Nisga'a Final Agreement. While I agree with many of these assessments, the quality of the Agreement is not the important factor here, but rather its finality, implying a forever static, unchanging entrenchment of the Nisga'a nation in the Canadian state.

[31] Macklem's very technical but earnest style of conveying his thoughts does not betray motivations of fear and greed as clearly as the styles of either Kymlicka or Cairns. This does not mean these aspects of colonial mentality are absent from his work – their existence is betrayed by his overarching imperialism and appeals to authority – but rather, the roles that they play in his work are obscured.

As an example, the *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia*[32] decision of 1997 is particularly enlightening. In attempting to reconcile Indigenous land claims and claims to the validity of oral history with Canadian property law and legal tradition, the Canadian judicial system engaged in a bizarre slight-of-hand with the *Delgamuukw* decision. What is commonly known about *Delgamuukw* is that the decision recognizes many aspects of what Macklem refers to as "Indigenous difference" as having a standing in Canadian law. For example, oral histories as legitimate evidence and a broad and fair interpretation of treaties, are both part of the Indigenous difference that Macklem believes can and should be read into the Constitution. However, the decision also holds that the Canadian state retains the ability to completely renege on any agreement with Indigenous peoples and infringe upon their rights whenever it so desires so long as it is in the best interests of the state. Consider the following lists of conditions which may qualify such an act as being in the best interests of the state:

> Per Lamer C.J. and Cory, McLachlin and Major JJ.: *Constitutionally recognized aboriginal rights are not absolute* and may be infringed by the federal and provincial governments if the infringement (1) furthers a compelling and substantial legislative objective and (2) is consistent with the special fiduciary relationship between the Crown and the aboriginal peoples. *The development of agriculture, forestry, mining and hydroelectric power, the general economic development of the interior of British Columbia, protection of the environment or endangered species, and the building of infrastructure and the settlement of foreign populations to support those aims, are objectives consistent with this purpose.* Three aspects of aboriginal title are relevant to the second part of the test. First, the right to exclusive use and occupation of land is relevant to the degree of scrutiny of the infringing measure or action. Second, the right to choose to what uses land can be put, subject to the ultimate limit that those uses cannot destroy the ability of the land to sustain future generations of aboriginal peoples, suggests that the fiduciary relationship between the Crown and aboriginal peoples may be satisfied by the involvement of aboriginal peoples in decisions taken with respect to their lands....

[32] Commonly referred to as *Delgamuukw*.

> Per La Forest and L'Heureux-Dubé JJ.: *Rights that are recognized and affirmed are not absolute.* Government regulation can therefore infringe upon aboriginal rights if it meets the test of justification under s. 35(1). The approach is highly contextual.
>
> *The general economic development of the interior of British Columbia, through agriculture, mining, forestry and hydroelectric power, as well as the related building of infrastructure and settlement of foreign populations, are valid legislative objectives that, in principle, satisfy the first part of the justification analysis.*
>
> *Delgamuukw v. British Columbia*, 1997 (emphasis added)

The list is lengthy and broad, meaning that Canada must respect these aspects of Indigenous difference only so long as it is convenient. It should be noted that Macklem sees this aspect of the decision as problematic; however, for his part, the depth of his ignorance is revealed in that he is not so concerned with the colonial nature of the decision, but rather that the "duty to consult" that is further mentioned in *Delgamuukw* is not carried through to the logical conclusion: "co-management agreements" (Macklem, 2001: 281)[33]. In Macklem's conception, co-management agreements with regard to resource extraction – regardless of the internal division in Indigenous communities and the prominence of 'aboriginals' at negotiating tables – seem to be the highest form of autonomy that Indigenous peoples can hope to achieve, even if they are deeply protected by the constitution. Further, considering that *Delgamuukw* is seen as an extreme in terms of what constitutes "aboriginal interest" and that anything further would invite "anarchy" by such prominent (and racist) political commentators as Mel Smith (Smith, 1995: 256-257), it is hard to picture a scenario where the Supreme Court ever actually embraces Macklem's conception of Indigenous difference to the fullest and commits Canada as a nation and a state to the protection of Indigenous difference at the cost of the privilege

[33] It is no coincidence that this desired conclusion protects Canadian economic development, as would be expected from a colonial mentality.

and comfort of the Settler majority. The Supreme Court, as a pillar of the state, remains an intensely political body; its mandate is to protect and enforce the constitution, and thus the 'peace and order' of the state. While the Supreme Court could conceivably abandon its current mandate in the pursuit of high-minded principles, that scenario is very far fetched. Even Macklem, while offering an open (comparatively) interpretation of Aboriginal and treaty rights, warns against too much protection of Indigenous society which "risks the constitutional recognition of all aspects of Aboriginal social existence" (Macklem, 2001: 170), without actually explaining why this would be a problem; it is simply assumed that the greater the degree of Indigenous difference that is protected, the worse off the Canadian state is, betraying the fear inherent in a colonial mentality. Further, if the Supreme Court did alter its mandate as suggested, there remain countless ways in which the remainder of the imperial sphere of power – the legislature, corporations, and the supranational bodies in which Canada holds membership – could avoid being bound by such a counter-imperial decision. The "not withstanding" clause of the constitution is an obvious method that could be pursued by the legislature, as are various reinterpretations of the "duty to consult" mentioned previous. More directly, as happened in the United States when the United States Supreme Court ruled as part of the Marshall trilogy of decisions that Cherokee removal was unconstitutional, imperial power could simply ignore the ruling, which President Jackson did, publicly stating, "[Supreme Court Justice] Marshall has rendered his decision, now let him enforce it" (Weyler, 1992: 100); the Supreme Court has authority only so long as the empire invests legitimacy in it.

Macklem attempts to close this loop-hole by advocating that not all conflicts between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian state be resolved through the court system.

Macklem, proposes the creation of "neutral" arbitration bodies to oversee the negotiation and maintenance of treaties[34], effectively creating yet another authority and body of control within the state apparatus, specifically designed to wield influence over the lives and affairs of Indigenous peoples (Macklem, 2001: 272-273). Macklem is, in essence, articulating an artificial need for peace and order that does not exist in order to will authority into existence and expand imperial influence on the lives of Indigenous peoples. Further, since Settler people, themselves colonized, are taught to respect and participate in these systems of control, and in fact have trouble conceiving of alternatives to the obvious problems posed by colonialism that do not rely on further imposition of controls, even those well-meaning Settler people who move past the influences of greed, fear and ignorance, often cannot clear the final hurdle of relying upon governments and courts to simply 'be better'. This is a major flaw in the work of Patrick Macklem, a well-intentioned constitutional legal scholar in Canada, who has written extensively on how the Constitution could be interpreted to be fair to Indigenous peoples. While Macklem's heart may be in the right place, his reliance upon the courts to simply wake up and 'fix' things is ignorant of the role that courts and state constitutions play in ongoing imperialism. Macklem demonstrates over and over his willingness to participate with the imperial "society of control" that has done so much harm to Indigenous peoples, and it seems his ignorance is what repeatedly leads him to this stance.

Further, he also betrays a significant problem rooted in further ignorance in his understanding of the source of the threats posed to Indigenous peoples. In his conclusion, Macklem states:

---

[34] This mirrors the proposal of Will Kymlicka to have international courts watch over the decisions of Indigenous governments (Kymlicka, 2001: 86).

> Indigenous difference corresponds to Aboriginal interests associated with culture, territory, sovereignty, and the treaty process. Each merits constitutional protection for relatively distinct reasons. Aboriginal cultural interests warrant constitutional protection because Aboriginal cultural practices provide a shared intelligibility to Aboriginal existence and shape the formation of individual and collective identities, and because Aboriginal people face steep challenges in their efforts to maintain and reproduce their cultures. Aboriginal territorial interests warrant constitutional protection because Aboriginal people have unique spiritual relationship with their ancestral lands and lived on and occupied their lands before the establishment of the Canadian state. Interests associated with Aboriginal sovereignty merit constitutional protection because a just distribution of sovereignty requires both constitutionally recognizing the fact that Aboriginal peoples were sovereign prior to European contact and vesting greater law-making authority in Aboriginal communities. And Aboriginal interests associated with the treaty process warrant constitutional protection because treaties distribute constitutional authority by establishing basic terms and conditions of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal co-existence.
>
> Macklem, 2001: 287

Nowhere in this paragraph, nor anywhere else in Macklem's text, is there an analysis of *why* Indigenous peoples, societies and cultures remain under threat, why they "face steep challenges", or why the "basic terms and conditions of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal co-existence" remain undefined after five hundred years of contact. There is a serious logical gap between the reasons that Macklem has given for why Indigenous difference requires protection and his conclusion that this protection must (or even can) come from the Canadian constitution. That gap is the lack of recognition that it is Canadian Settler peoples, operating within a colonial mentality, participating with imperial elites in a society of control, which continually threatens Indigenous interests and existence. This logical gap implies that Indigenous peoples and Settler peoples simply cannot live together without Indigenous peoples being constantly menaced by Settler culture, society, and political decisions. In essence, the most important site of agency in the ongoing conflict between Indigenous and Settler societies in Canada is ignored: the agency of the

average Settler person, who remains happily complicit with colonial systems designed to destroy Indigenous peoples. Founded in ignorance, if not outright arrogance, Macklem's entire proposition hinges on the need for an overriding control to police the relationship between Indigenous and Settler, while letting the Settler people themselves off the hook[35]. This is reflective of the larger imperial project which uses 'moral grounds' to justify homogenizing intervention and institute greater control. The Supreme Court of Canada, under Macklem's proposal, would become akin to the many NGOs which seek to spread a particular conception of 'right' around the globe; in Hardt and Negri's terms, "Empire's powers of intervention might be best understood as beginning not directly with its weapons of lethal force but rather with its moral instruments" (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 35); and it is not difficult to conceive of a situation under Macklem's proposals where, in protecting "Indigenous difference", Indigenous communities are divided and conquered and Indigenous political will which is contrary to imperial interests is blunted. In this way, Macklem demonstrates further colonial thinking in his pursuit of a solution that will allow colonization to continue apace, protecting Settler greed for colonial privilege and insulating Settlers from the fear – or 'unsettling' – which accompanies real change. This is similar to the situation already underway due to international involvement in Indigenous issues, with the supranational bodies of the United Nations generating "blunting" and "channeling" effects which serve to protect imperial interests from Indigenous threat. Corntassel describes these effects in *Towards a New Partnership?*:

[35] The use of the term 'police' here is intentional; it has long been illegal to commit murder, and yet the Saskatchewan-based police forces – supposedly the enforcers of the law – in recent years have faced multiple incidents of police officers committing murder by forcibly taking Indigenous peoples into remote areas during winter nights and leaving them to freeze to death (Barnsley, 2001). No amount of constitutional alteration can touch the core of racist, morally and ethically bankrupt belief that allows for police officers to think it is somehow acceptable to murder Indigenous peoples.

> Blunting simply means that an indigenous political agenda is shifted and altered to fit the dominant norms of institutional structures. For example, downgrading an Indigenous right of self-determination to a claim to internal territorial autonomy in order to gain wider support from state actors would be one obvious form of *blunting*....
>
> Channeling effects occur when members of indigenous groups, having accepted representation via global forums, cease forms of resistance through other means and confine their activities within these official structures. For instance, rather than pursuing grassroots mobilization to stop encroachment onto Indigenous homelands stemming from a development project, an Indigenous community might *channel* most of their political efforts into publicizing human rights abuses within a global forum....
>
> Corntassel, 2006: 3; emphasis in original

It is easy to see the same situation being replicated within the Canadian state, and Macklem's proposals feed directly into this with the various representatives of the constitution taking on the role of global forums, and the constitution itself acting as a mirror for the seemingly inclusive but actually aggressively colonial philosophies of supranational bodies representing imperial interests.

As a colonial, Macklem ignores the true source of contemporary conflicts – ongoing colonial will – and instead focuses on the effect – loss of Indigenous autonomy – and proposes to solve the problem by increasing the power and authority of the very organizations that have spent centuries participating in creating the present situation. Macklem's suggestion that the state further empower the Canadian constitution, and by extension the judiciary and legislature of the state, to make decisions that would "protect" Indigenous interests is as ignorantly colonial as they come, both in that it ignores the situation of Canada in the burgeoning global empire, and ignores the colonial history and nature of the Canadian state itself. The alternative, though, seems frightening to most Settlers. If there is not going to be perpetual peace between Indigenous and Settler

people – ensured by a powerful, watchful judiciary and government that 'knows best' – does this mean a future of war and chaos? Of course, this is a false dichotomy: implicit in the discussion from Hardt and Negri regarding the call to perpetual peace (Hardt & Negri, 2001: 14) is the concept that perpetual peace is impossible; rather, periodic conflict is not only desirable but required in order to continuously allow room for societies and cultures to change and adapt over time. Perpetual peace and order would attempt to freeze social and cultural norms in time, something that is clearly impossible – the long sought after, but never achieved "end of history". The motivation of "perpetual peace and order" is a false hope that plays to the greed and fears of imperial subjects; it simply cannot exist. Settler people understand on some level that, as beneficiaries of the imperial machine, their privilege is tied to the smooth operation of that machine. The greed for continued or increased privilege, and the intense fear of the "war machine" (representing disorder and a loss of privilege), are both played upon in order to justify further imperial control. However, alternatives to this colonial expansion under the banner of peace and order do exist, as will be demonstrated by the works of Day, Regan, and others.

CHAPTER FOUR – A REBELLION OF THE TRUTH FROM WITHIN

Friends, my delight,
my sole excuse for being
was to catch life
in its tempestuous flight
-from *Friends, My Delight*, by Irving Layton

From the analysis of Cairns, Kymlicka, and Macklem, it is clear that these academics are not creating decolonized theories, as their works lack two key qualities. First, in order to work towards decolonizing the thought of Settler people, individual Settlers must confront, or be confronted with, their own barriers of greed, fear, and ignorance, and the consequences of these barriers (colonialism in all of its varied forms). Second, in order to create space – physical and intellectual – for substantive change, the colonial society of control must be fractured. These two requirements are very closely related, though the approaches taken to achieve each must by necessity differ. Paulette Regan, in her PhD dissertation *Unsettling the Settler Within* (2006), engages with the need for, and strategies of, engaging directly with Settler peoples, with the goal of "shaking up" Settler awareness of their own colonial actions and thoughts. Regan sees the need for direct, personal challenges to Settler people, a tactic that has the effect of confronting those personal barriers to decolonized thought of guilt, fear, and ignorance. Richard Day, conversely, is largely concerned with understanding and assaulting the large systems of control – the state, corporate dominance, and individual elites – which act to colonize and re-colonize Indigenous "objects", in addition to the Settler population living under imperial control, and this is the focus of his most recent work, *Gramsci Is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements* (2005).

Unsettling: Individual, Transformative Change

Examining the individual level of resistance to decolonization first, Regan's work may be considered by some to be a historical endeavour, a call to re-write Settler history to more accurately 'include' or 'recognize' Indigenous history and factual reality. However, I believe that this sells the work far short of both its fundamental goal and its potential to create real change. Regan does call for historical revisioning, but not simply to get to the 'facts'. Rather, her work is very consciously directed at attacking the underpinnings of Settler colonialism, specifically Settler myths. Regan links myth-making to ongoing colonial practice, in that Settler myths – specifically to Regan's work, the myth of the "benevolent peacemaker" – cast Settler actions as positive, caring, and mutually beneficial, when in reality, "the subtlety of the peacemaker myth is far more insidious and potentially just as lethal as the physical violence that has been perpetrated against Indigenous peoples" (Regan, 2006: 142). Clearly, Regan is concerned with history, but history as it informs Settler culture; in effect, Regan is dealing with the way that Settler people colonize themselves, attempting to explode the myths that allow Settlers to serve their role in imperial orders and preserve their personal space in the hierarchy of the pyramid of petty tyrants, contrary to stated principles of freedom, fairness, and justice, without dealing with their personal ethical and moral paradoxes. These myths have become part of the Settler cultural landscape, and "are deeply ingrained in the national identities of the United States and Canada. Thus the 'demystification' of Settler history… is an essential component of truth-telling and decolonization" (Regan, 2006: 140). Further, Regan manages to transcend the "politics of recognition", found in both the works of Kymlicka and Macklem, which have an

insidiously damaging effect on Indigenous peoples and cultures (Coulthard, 2006: 3). Because Regan accepts that the Settler, both as an individual and as a society, must change in order for the oppression of Indigenous peoples to end, she does not propose to "recognize" the distinctiveness of the Indigenous person within the society that remains colonial, but rather to recognize the colonial mentality within the Settler and confront it.

Regan presents her approach as an alternative to many contemporary, mainstream approaches which attempt to tackle the problems within Indigenous-Settler relations; she specifically cites the problems with the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process, currently pushed by most established government programs and Canadian professionals. Regan notes that ADR relies upon the abstraction of self on behalf of moderators and many other participants in the process, but also that this goal of neutrality is ultimately unachievable. Regan states:

> It is this disembodied Settler stance, with its denial of Indigenous history and presence that reinforces unequal power relations and prevents us from engaging our moral imagination in ways that are deeply transformative. This bifurcation of consciousness encourages us to "manage" processes, invoking our "superior rationality" and the legal-utilitarian concerns of Settler governments in the face of Indigenous stories of injustice, loss and pain. As we saw earlier, this Western cultural tendency to separate rational thought from our emotional, somatic and spiritual responses further manifests itself in requiring oppressed peoples to "leave their pain at the door" when engaging in dialogue or negotiation processes.
>
> Regan, 2006: 191-192

In effect, Regan is noting that neutrality itself is impossible, and that the pretence of neutrality is in effect a retreat into colonial thought, privileged to over-ride all other thought. Similarly, Fish, in his article *Boutique Multiculturalism* (1997), notes that contemporary multicultural discourses are inherently disempowering for non-Westerners (regardless of whether they are Indigenous peoples struggling with Settler colonialism,

immigrants and refugees newly arrived to Settler states, or peoples in other parts of the world facing the "neo-liberalization" of their own societies), because the core values of Western society and culture are defended by Enlightenment-inspired rationalist thought, and that this thought is not culturally neutral (Fish, 1997: 389-391). Engaging in this sort of discourse actively marginalizes those who express differing cultural values and worldviews because those who do not speak the language of Enlightenment rationalism are, by definition, irrational, and "only crazy people will listen to crazy talk" (Fish, 1997: 390). Of course, in the ADR process and elsewhere, there is a long and growing history of Indigenous peoples being not just marginalized but actually colonized as well by this sort of "boutique aboriginalism"[36]. As Regan demonstrates, the problem is not the "inability" of committed Indigenous peoples to engage in rational discourse; rather the problem is that Settlers retreat into "neutrality" in order to preserve colonial mentalities which might otherwise be shaken by the contact with Indigenous peoples and their differing cultures and worldviews.

As an alternative to Settler strategies that protect Settler consciousness from the "schizophrenic" disconnect between Settler peoples' stated principles (freedom and justice) and the reality of Settler intent and action (colonization and control), Regan employs "a pedagogical strategy for unsettling the Settler within which privileges not neutrality but engagement" (Regan, 2006: 199). Regan's focus is upon truth-telling, apologies, and restitution, three concepts that can force Settler people to break through intentional and comfortably insulated existences to confront actual ignorance, fear and

[36] The term "boutique aboriginalism" is an amalgam of Fish's "boutique multiculturalism" and Taiaiake Alfred's "aboriginal" identity (Indigenous peoples co-opted by Settler states). I have developed this concept fully in a previous paper; please see *Boutique Aboriginalism: Assimilation Made Comfortable*, prepared for the Western Social Sciences Conference, American Indian Studies Section, 2006. However, it is sufficient to understand the two concepts as described previously in this paper.

greed, which hold Settler people back from decolonizing. The hope is that when Settler people are forced into an uncomfortable personal place, when the undeniable truth of colonialism is placed directly before them, a formative moment is created wherein Settler people can choose to accept the truth and choose to begin the process of decolonizing their own thoughts and feelings. In a theoretical sense, this is similar to the situation that Joseph Campbell describes that helps to create "visionaries" and "leaders": their "dreams" (broadly taken to mean their internal understanding of the world which "come up from the psyche") for some reason no longer match up with their public "myths". As a result, a moment of possible "heroic" change is created:

> They've moved out of the society that would have protected them, and into the dark forest, into the world of fire, of original experience. Original experience has not been interpreted for you, and so you've got to work out your life for yourself. Either you can take it or you can't. You don't have to go far off the interpreted path to find yourself in very difficult situations. The courage to face the trials and to bring a whole new body of possibilities into the field of interpreted experience for other people to experience – that is the hero's deed.
>
> Campbell, 1991: 49

For Regan, her personal unsettling came as part of the attempt by the Canadian federal government to begin addressing the legacy of residential schools among the Indigenous communities of British Columbia. Regan, as a government representative, heard the personal experiences of many residential school survivors, including an elder who spoke on the first day of Regan's involvement. In reflecting on her experiences, she writes:

> For almost three years, I listened to the stories of residential school survivors in both private and public settings… I am just beginning to understand the richness of the gift I was given by the elder on that first day and by all the other survivors afterwards. Sometimes we are offered a gift that we do not want to accept. Perhaps we do not recognize the gift because it feels like a burden, like a heavy responsibility that we don't quite know how to carry. And we are afraid that we will do so poorly. I

> now see that part of the struggle of this writing is to make sense of my own unsettling in a way that honours the gift.
>
> Regan, 2006: 222; personal reflection

It is no surprise, then, that Regan concentrates on the direct, transformative power of truth telling, and this is consistent with what Alfred, in *Wasase*, calls for from an Indigenous perspective: a "rebellion of the truth" (Alfred, 2005: 282)[37]. From differing perspectives, Regan and Alfred both promote the incredible power of the truth in the face of lies and ignorance.

Consider the great number of "untruths" that exist in the colonial mentality. Of the three barriers to the decolonization of individual Settler colonial mentalities, only the most blatant greed functions free of untruths. Most levels of individual greed are based on colonial untruths regarding social conditions for other peoples, the nature of wealth and poverty, and the opportunities that are available for the average person to rise above poverty, as well as assumptions. Settlers benefit from believing colonial untruths that say that anyone can achieve "equal dignity"[38] by sheer effort within the imperial system. Fear, as noted by Alfred and many others, is often based upon the illusion of state power. The Oka standoff, as previously noted, demonstrated that states such as Canada are actually very reluctant to unleash their full military might against dissidents, especially those who are not themselves a direct military threat (regardless of their potential for social and cultural change). In a more extreme example, even when a nation such as

---

[37] I do not believe that either Alfred or Regan use the term "truth" in an essentialist fashion; rather their goals both seem to be to attack blatant and intentional lies and misinformation, commonly used to maintain control in imperial contexts. Both recognize that there are many "truths" in the world, and rather than promoting any one over all others, Alfred demands the space for Indigenous truths to be respected and Regan proposes that Settler should consider other truths at least on par with their own in order to critically examine their colonial assumptions

[38] This is a reference to the "politics of equal dignity", as outlined by Stephen Rockefeller – theorizing from an entrenched liberal framework that all humans share common human dignity, and as such should be treated the same regardless of culture – and criticized quite thoroughly by many including Stanley Fish. Please see: Fish (1997).

Mexico does unleash significant military might, resistance is still possible; the lack of Mexican success in stymieing the EZLN (the Zapatista Army of Liberation) during the initial military conflicts of the Zapatista rebellion is well noted, but the relative low numbers of casualties in open conflict is often obscured as is the fact that the EZLN has actually increased in strength and global relevance since the initial uprising. Consider that of the three thousand EZLN members engaged in the initial armed uprising and the thousands of Indigenous peoples supporting them from behind the scenes, government retaliation claimed only one hundred and forty lives[39], and that Zapatista actions in Mexico continue to gain the direct, participatory support of tens and hundreds of thousands of people (Hansen, 2002: 11). Finally, ignorance, both self-inflicted and imposed, is usually based not simply on a denial of truth, but also on replacing the truth with a more palatable untruth, as was demonstrated in the previous analysis of the work of Alan Cairns.

Regan's hope in exposing Settlers to previously unknown (or ignored) truths is that the experience will force Settlers to reconsider their colonial mentalities. She states:

> For Settlers, Indigenous peoples' stories are deeply *unsettling*. They are filled with experiences that upset our cultural identity as a nation of peacemakers. They are stories of violence and dispossession that we do not want to hear because they shake us to the core, causing us to question our national myth and the history of Canada that we thought we knew. Now we are unsure.
>
> Regan, 2006: 224; emphasis in original

Regan's goal in proposing truth-telling as a means of decolonizing Settler mentalities is to attack the Settler myths, including the peacemaker myth, which justify greed, fear, and

[39] Obviously this is still a terrible number of lives lost, and does not include the number of people unofficially 'disappeared' as part of the conflict. However, it cannot be considered to be greatly disproportionate to the number of lives lost to starvation and other poverty-related causes, or through the actions of paramilitary groups organized against the Mayans, both before and after the direct conflict between the EZLN and the Mexican armed forces.

ignorance. Her hope is that by exploding these myths, Settlers can see their unsupported biases as the flimsy untruths of colonialism at odds with their own perceptions of the principles of Settler society. She also notes that before this can happen, a fundamental change is required in the way in which Settler people listen. Regan notes the need for "deep listening", requiring a silence that is "intellectual, somatic and spiritual" (Regan, 2006: 225-226). This is a putting away of preconceptions and a rejection of excuses; essentially, Settlers must be prepared to be completely open to Indigenous truths in order to be impacted by them. This can be seen as a contemporary adaptation or updating of Fanon's insistence that Indigenous peoples must fight and struggle for liberation if it is to mean anything beyond another "grant" from colonial rulers (Fanon, 1963: 94). As Coulthard notes, the politics of recognition fail specifically because they are in no way predicated upon the transformation of the Settler person or society; Fanon saw this transformation as only achievable through revolution, and explicitly violent revolution (Coulthard, 2006: 16). In Regan's proposal, perhaps owing to the differences between contemporary Canadian and historical Algerian colonialism, this transformation can be achieved, and an Indigenous victory fought for and won, through honest and powerful dialogue that challenges, deconstructs and reconstructs Settler conceptions of self.

However, Regan's theories do not encompass the totality of the colonial psychology[40]; only those specifically internal barriers are accounted for, and the effects of the society of control, the active 'touch' of empire upon the Settler person, remains. The empire, in the Hardt and Negri concept, does not allow for the creation of silence or

[40] To be fair, this is intentional. Regan quite rightly notes that every Canadian must figure out for themselves what it will mean - in a practical sense - to decolonize. Regan proposes that "the work of decolonization cannot rest on the backs of Indigenous peoples alone... Canadians have a different, yet critical role to play on this front - one that we must figure out for ourselves" (Regan, 2006: 30).

the following dialogue. Any gap created in imperial control is quickly filled in with a different form of control that maintains the same function of protecting and promoting imperialism. This is the shapeshifting form of colonialism at its most insidious; even well-intentioned efforts towards decolonization are often stymied by adaptable, flexible colonial power. It is easy for well-intentioned efforts to tell truths to go awry, as Settler people attempting to decolonize their thought while still under colonial control are often lead astray, trading one set of colonial lies for another. It should be noted that Alan Cairns, Will Kymlicka, and Patrick Macklem, in crafting colonial philosophies, spend a significant amount of time engaged in "truths" about the Indigenous experience with colonialism; however, it is not enough to acknowledge the past existence of colonialism if that truth is not coupled with the truth of *present* colonialism. For most Settlers, faced with the choice of accepting the uncomfortable implications of Indigenous truths, or the comfortable lies of different colonial orders, the choice is obvious. We must reiterate and recognize that even Settler people are colonized and controlled. Further, as the immediate aims of imperialism shift (for example, shifting from acquiring and controlling territory to acquiring and controlling obedience of peoples in specific territories), colonialism – as the method of spreading empire – shifts and consequently all peoples, including those already playing a role in imperialism, must be recolonized. As such, Settler peoples who are already colonial in nature are subject to constant recolonization. Consider Alfred's analysis of the liberal democratic state:

> …in which the primary relationship is among rights-bearing citizens, and the core function of government is to integrate pre-existing social and political diversities into the singularity of a state, *assimilating all cultures into a single patriotic identity*, and in which political freedom is mediated by distant, supposedly representative structures in an inaccessible system

> of public accountability that has long been corrupted by the influence of corporations.
>
> Alfred, 2005: 155, emphasis added

This assimilation process applies equally to external challenges from Indigenous peoples, and to internal challenges from free-thinking Settler peoples. This presents a serious challenge for any effort to assist (or force) Settler peoples in decolonizing their mentality. The structures of imperialism are focused on creating and continuing large, dynamic systems of control, and since decolonizing inherently involves becoming free of imperial control, individuals attempting to decolonize put themselves in direct confrontation with a powerful opponent.

Overcoming Hegemony

One of the links between the work of Alfred and Regan's proposal is that their works are targeted specifically at those people who already have 'a foot in the door' of decolonization. Alfred, for his part, directs his work specifically towards Indigenous peoples, who have prior historic, geographic, and social isolation, economic marginalization, and all manner of violence perpetrated against them as a reminder of the colonial agenda and a motivator to continue efforts of resistance. Regan, conversely, recognizes that not all Settler people are equal participants in imperialism, nor do they all benefit equally from imperial action (Regan, 2006: 59), and as such targets her work towards those "Settlers who would be Indigenous allies [and who] choose pathways of transformation that teach us how to shift from being perpetrators to authentic peacemakers, accepting that we will struggle, be discomforted and unsettled" (ibid: 266). In other words, Regan's subjects are those people who already have some awareness of

continuing colonialism and reject it, even if they do not know enough about their own colonization to decolonize themselves. She mentions "decolonizing Canada", but in her proposals she is targeting the much-more achievable goal of reaching individuals who have already begun questioning the validity of present modes of colonial thought, those who (like herself) chance to interact with Indigenous peoples over long periods of time on Indigenous rather than state terms, or those who are not completely fooled by Canadian culture myths (a relative few people, since as Regan points out, "not knowing" is almost impossible in the present context; wilful ignorance remains the norm). However, as Alex Khasnabish reminds us, in reviewing Alfred's work:

> In recent years, many excellent "histories from below" have been produced that focus on the stories of struggle and the desire for liberation on the part of a diversity of people against elite-driven projects of colonialism, imperialism, and capitalism… These works all point to the profoundly violent nature of these exploitative and dehumanizing projects as well as to the fact that this violence was not merely directed outward toward other peoples and places but inward toward rebellious and undesirable subjects within these centres of power as well. Imperialism, colonialism, and capitalism and the associated constructs of "progress", individualism, patriarchy, racism, and heterosexism (to name only a few) did not crystallize themselves out of thin air, nor did they emerge unproblematically out of a logical and linear historical trajectory. Rather, these projects and constructs have been built out of a protracted, bloody, terror-filled, elite-driven campaign for power and domination.
>
> Khasnabish, 2006

Khasnabish effectively identifies one of the major problems in any project to directly reach individual Settler peoples with the goal of furthering decolonization: elites concerned with power and domination will certainly object, and many people throughout the hierarchy of imperialism will fight to preserve even a meagre position in the pyramid of petty tyrants. Thus it is clear that in order to maximize the effectiveness of projects

that attempt to "unsettle" Settler peoples, the influence of imperial elites must be simultaneously attacked and their influence blunted.

One of many possible angles on this problem is articulated by Richard Day, working from the position of a radical anarchist (that is, radical even among anarchists). To begin with, Day breaks with much traditional anti-imperial thought by noting that the two "polar opposites" of the 20th century – capitalist democracy and post-Marxist socialism – are equally controlling. As noted earlier, Day demonstrates that, in attempting to escape the dominance of hegemony, revolutionary thinkers have overshot their mark and landed squarely in another form of hegemony. Day notes it is not simply the repressive acts of Soviet communists and the terror of Stalinism that fall under this hegemonic ideal, but rather the entire revolutionary movement that seeks not to defeat hegemony, but rather to replace those in control of the state hegemonic form, including all manners of liberalism, post-Marxism (Day, 2005: 80), and even the construction of the homogenous "masses" in the work of Hardt and Negri (Day, 2005: 155). For Indigenous peoples, this has never resulted in freedom – consider the state of African nations which relied upon Soviet aid to break free of European colonialism. Even Fanon's Algeria did not fare well, despite his insistence upon revolution as a method of decolonization. Day's theory is that using hegemonic structures and ideals to confront the oppression that results from a different set of hegemonic structures and ideas cannot lead to freedom, only to hegemony; in any case, some group or people must be exploited to maintain the new order. This argument appears circular, and yet it has been the basis of many social and political challenges throughout Western history. For example, the Protestant reformation confronted the hegemony of the Catholic church, but within a short span of

time, had degenerated into arguments between Protestant sects as to whose version of the Christian faith was 'the truth'. Further, in England, Protestants went from being oppressed under the Catholic regime, to lynching Catholics under the Protestant queen, Elizabeth I. Any social order which depends upon rigid control, proscriptions of absolute right and wrong, and classical conceptions of sovereignty including a monopolization of violence, will ultimately end up oppressing those who disagree. Considering that the Settler population of many colonial states – including Canada and America – comprise an overwhelmingly large portion of the population, that Settler philosophies have dominated most discourses in these states, and that any Settler state would continue to rely upon stolen land in order to provide resources from food to timber to oil, it seems clear that any type of hegemonic revolutionary force cannot accurately address the injustices perpetrated against Indigenous peoples. In fact, they can only continue to recreate colonialism. This is the same proposition forwarded by Alfred when he warns of the need for means-ends consistency (Alfred, 2005: 51). Just as violent revolution creates a society of violence, a revolution rooted in hegemony can only lead to a society of control. Thus, there is no hope for Indigenous or Settler peoples in hegemonic revolution, or in appealing to present state hegemony for protection. There is only another of the shape-shifting forms of colonialism.

Day proposes alternatives to hegemonic revolution that take into account what Khasnabish notes: that many different peoples have been exploited and oppressed in many different ways by many seemingly different systems of control. In effect, Day ties the liberation of Indigenous peoples to the liberation of other peoples around the globe: exploited "illegal" immigrants in the United States, child sex workers in Thailand,

farmers in South America displaced by the "war on drugs", traditional farmers in India, and many others. Central to his proposals in the development of "affinities" – recognition and action based on commonly shared goals of very different identities. Day suggests the need for "groundless solidarity and infinite responsibility"; essentially an agreement that the one common bond between disparate groups – their oppression by imperial hegemony, and their respect for each other's need for places to fully practice and express their particularities – is enough common ground to join together in common cause, and to fight not *for* any one structure of society, but rather against *one* structure of society. Day notes that the model for this kind of solidarity work can be traced to Indigenous groups, including "the Zapatistas, who have been extremely effective in building worldwide support for their struggles" (Day, 2005: 190). Day also cites the Haudenosaunee, and the principles embodied in the two-row treaty (properly conceived of, rather than the bastardized portrayal in Cairns' work) which "guides the political life of some of the most radical and self-reliant indigenous communities in North America" (Day, 2005: 193). Further, this model provides the basis for just relationships between Indigenous and Settler people, as there is distinction between the two allowing for autonomy, but the dichotomy is not absolute, allowing for a fluid relationship that can draw closer when common interest allows (Day, 2005: 194). This sort of fluidity of relationship between two different groups of peoples can go a long way to fracturing the rigid, oppositional systems of imperial control, and the "Othering" inherent to colonial practices.

To this end, Day brings together many different proposals for creating spaces where affinities can be made. It goes without saying that these affinities are contrary to

the interests of imperial authorities, because the goal of these affinities is to generate independence through cooperation and mutual support, breaking up hegemonic control. In order to allow the development of affinities without state interference, Day devotes a great deal of thought to the development and maintenance of "autonomous zones", places (physical or conceptual) that are free from state interference. Unlike many previous anarchist theories, the ideas forwarded by Day do not seek a complete overthrow of the state, but rather the creation of an autonomous space within the shell of the state. The development of autonomous zones is the first step towards this goal. Day differentiates between temporary (TAZ) and permanent (PAZ) autonomous zones. The temporary autonomous zone, says Day, is the easiest to create but the hardest to utilize creatively, "reliant upon what seems to be an ethos of fleeting, individualist encounters" (Day, 2005: 164). Day notes that these zones tend to attract only the most hardcore anarchists and revolutionaries, those without family connections and those with a great deal of privilege which allows high mobility, as they are the only ones who know of the creation of the zones and have the ability access them. This leaves little opportunity for transformative change, but does provide for meeting places to exchange ideas and provide limited mutual support. The permanent autonomous zone is extremely rare, says Day, noting that they become resource intensive to maintain, and tend to be targeted for disruption or co-optation by authorities (Day, 2005: 163-164). The ideal, the autonomous zones of the Zapatistas in Chiapas, are incredibly hard to replicate without a rare combination of circumstances. Nevertheless, small-scale autonomous zones, like bookstores or collective gardens, can still be very useful provided they do not attempt to overreach their capabilities. Day notes that there is a potential to break out of the temporary/permanent

dichotomy: the SPAZ, or "Semi-Permanent Autonomous Zone; a form that allows the construction of non-hegemonic alternatives to the neoliberal order here and now, with an eye to surviving the dangers of capture, exploitation and division" (Day, 2005: 164). And while the Zapatista example cannot be completely replicated, it "is not entirely incommunicable – certain elements of the struggle can be creatively appropriated elsewhere" (Day, 2005: 206). However, the SPAZ seems to be a concept still in its developmental stages, and while there is hope for it as a means of creating spaces of lessened colonial control, the final result is yet to be seen.

As much as Day breaks with traditional revolutionary thought, he also breaks with traditional anarchist thought in that he believes that, in any social situation, some type of order arises and that even between two people there are often power relationships at play which people can willingly consent to without personal detriment. Ultimately, Day seeks a flexible freedom from state control; rather than rejecting all systems of power outright, Day advocates a project of assessing every power arrangement as it appears or presents itself to determine its validity. Quoting Foucault, Day shows that is possible to go beyond traditional anarchist theory in this respect:

> I am not saying that all forms of power are unacceptable but that no power is necessarily acceptable or unacceptable. This is anarchism. But since anarchism is not acceptable these days, I will call it anarcheology, the method that takes no power as necessarily acceptable.
>
> Foucault quoted in Day, 2005: 137

This concept clearly carries over into one of Day's central concepts: the identity ideal of the smith. Unlike the problematic dichotomy of the citizen/nomad (the root of the "civilization/war machine" dichotomy earlier used to illustrate Settler fears of chaos), the

smith relies on neither a rigid construction of society nor a wild, lack of all power relationships in order to function. Quoting Deleuze and Guattari, Day explains:

> 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

The smith, then, embodies innovation, self-sufficiency, and practicality. The smith is non-dominating, which implies that the smith is willing and able to cooperate with others when it is appropriate and possible to do so; this is analogous again to the two-row treaty, where the autonomous, separate rows of the two peoples are linked by peace, respect, and friendship which will, on occasion, require contact and cooperation between the otherwise autonomous peoples. Should the individuals who generate the many challenges to imperialism think and behave as smiths, they can engage in effective "affinities" with each other, increasing their mutual strength without imposing their personal beliefs upon each other; essentially, situational coherence without broad hegemony. One practical example of this is found in anarcho-indigenist challenges to imperialism. Inspired by the two-row treaty as a model, creatively engaging with the state, and drawing on both Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples for support, "anarcho-indigenist strategy seeks to end colonial state-sanctioned violence, exploitation and domination, *not* by demanding more protection and rights within the institutional and discursive structure of the colonial-capitalist state, but by *creating* new relationships that simply refuse to involve the state" (Coulthard, 2000: 93-94; emphasis in original). Unlike the citizen, appealing to the state for change, or the nomad, desperate to wipe out

the state as an end unto itself, anarcho-indigenism relies upon the conception that the state is just one of many methods of implementing colonialism on behalf of empire, and calls on individuals and communities to defy imperialism in its own backyard through creativity, cooperation and solidarity.

The short-term goal for Day is the creation of many affinities within protected "shells" of power, within which groups can work for change, contact each other, and share resources. The long term goal is, rather than the overthrow or destruction of the state, the hollowing out of the state, turning it into one giant shell that exists only to protect autonomous activity within it. This is very similar to the "umbrella" concept forwarded by Vandana Shiva in India as part of her work with traditional farmers who find themselves in contention with massive, multinational corporations and foreign governments seeking trade opportunities which are damaging to the farmers' traditional way of life. The intent is to have a "state" that can act as a contact to the outside world – especially other states, or corporate-type interests seeking to gain footholds in autonomous ('unconquered') territory – but which has no authority or ability to influence the people under the umbrella. Shiva posits that "Living democracy basically works like a tree: It grows from the roots upwards, from the people and their organizing capacity" (Juhasz & Shiva, 2005). Ultimately, Day prizes a technique similar in many ways to both Shiva's and Alfred's in confronting imperialism: maintain formlessness, attain self-sufficiency, build alliances, and do not get caught up with a campaign against an abstract

ideology (attacking all power relations everywhere), or a campaign that will lead you to become what you fight against (political revolution)[41].

The obvious shortcoming of Day's proposal is that it only makes space available to those already decolonizing and aware of the threat of colonialism – those who seek to act as smiths must first understand the concepts of the citizen, the nomad, and smith. Affinities between resistance groups create opportunities for those involved in movements to build their strengths from within and perhaps drive further wedges into imperial hegemony, but there is no inherent decolonization engagement, either for those involved or, more importantly, for the masses of people who are not already involved in an "affinity" movement. There is an assumption that those who are able to engage in this approach are already decolonized to the extent that they can understand the form and goal of the endeavour, but decolonization is complicated and for most people, Settler and Indigenous alike, it is a lifetime endeavour. We have already seen the many layers which Settler people maintain in their individual colonized consciousness; simply attacking imperial hegemony without dealing with the colonialism that remains in the mind of Settler peoples will ultimately fail, as Settler peoples recreate imperialism in order to serve their colonial mentalities and the society of control. Essentially, colonialism abhors a vacuum of control. Just as Day's smith finds the holes in hegemony and fills them with affinities, colonialism will attempt to close holes opened by smiths, filling them with control. This underscores the need for a symbiotic relationship between Regan's unsettling truth-telling approach, and Day's fracturing of hegemonic control. Alone, neither can reach its fullest potential; Regan's approach is stymied by the ongoing

[41] It may be significant to note that these values for the formation of affinity movements are all values found in the strategic writings of Sun Tzu; there is potential to re-read Sun Tzu in this way, as Alfred (2005) does to a limited extent.

colonial process that seeks to suppress dissent, and Day's runs the risk of either becoming incestuous (the same people and groups involved in the same small-scale discussions, safely ignored by the imperial processes) or degenerating into revolutionary violence, attacking hegemony only to replace it with another hegemony to address the masses of still-colonized people who disagree with the revolution – Day notes that this is the danger of the war machine: "if it does not succeed in warding off the development of a state form, it must pass into the service of the state or destroy *itself*" (Day, 2005: 172; emphasis in original). However, if the fracturing of colonial control is used to create a space to engage in truth-telling and unsettling, both within the groups who would otherwise be seeking such spaces and serving as a safe space to draw in others from mainstream Settler society, there is a potential to create real, transformative change at a cultural level.

Summary of Decolonized Theory: The Colonial Matrix and the Harsh Realities

If the suggestions yielded by a synthesis of Regan and Day's work seem insubstantial, it is because they refuse to do what so many others have done and suggest a 'one size fits all' solution. There is a fundamental understanding evidenced in their work that no one analysis, no one solution, and no one social organization will ever be appropriate or permanent. In *Peace, Power, Righteousness*, Alfred warns us to "beware the magic" (Alfred, 1999); if it seems too good to be true, it probably is. Day and Regan surely understand that their own approaches are only part of the discussion, and that the problems associated with these approaches are many (though not insurmountable). First, the greater a threat to the imperial order a particular approach poses, the more the

colonial power of imperialism will focus upon it; it is impossible to say exactly how imperialist forces would seek to recolonize any efforts of this sort, but in the past the response has been swift and often brutal. Since this type of effort would necessitate a very long struggle, maintaining resources, momentum, and vision over the long term would be very difficult. Alfred addresses the issue of burnout in his strategic discussion, noting that "fractured and unhealthy social environments" as well as personal distraction by material concerns must be overcome in order to fight effectively (Alfred, 2005: 86); the same concerns would apply equally to any movements to decolonize among Settler society. However, these are structural concerns that plague any movement that challenges colonialism and imperialism in any form. Of real concern is the fact that some people, when unsettled, even in the absence of imperial control, are so deeply colonized or so heavily in favour of the imperial order, that when push comes to shove, they either simply refuse to believe the truths they are exposed to, or they come down firmly on the side of open imperialism (becoming true "colonials" in the sense of the word used by Memmi). A pop-culture reference is actually very useful here: the analogy of "the Matrix".

In the movie, *The Matrix*, all humans exist in a sort of suspended animation, where reality is created for them by a vast computer program – "the Matrix" which lends its name to the movie – and humans are used as living fuel for incredibly powerful machines which control 'reality' for most humans. Some humans make the conscious decision to reject the false reality around them, and they have the capacity to escape the Matrix. However, that is not the situation for the majority of humans, as the monologue by Morpheus, a freed human, directed towards the newly-freed Neo, reveals:

> The Matrix is a system, Neo. That system is our enemy. But when you're inside and you look around, what do you see? Businessmen, teachers, lawyers, carpenters - the very minds of the people we are trying to save, but until we do, these people are still a part of that system and that makes them our enemy. You must understand, most of these people are not ready to be unplugged. And many of them are so inured, so hopelessly dependent on the system that they will fight to protect it.
>
> *The Matrix* (1999)

This same situation exists in contemporary Settler societies; Settler people often choose the certainty of a controlled existence to the uncertainty of a free existence. Regan and Day, like Alfred, stress the need to experiment with social organization, accepting that not everything that is tried will work, and nothing will be appropriate for everyone. This sort of uncertainty is terrifying to Settler peoples who have lived their entire lives not only as subjects of an imperial order, but as colonial agents whose purpose is to spread that order. Canada, as such, cannot be completely and homogenously decolonized – there are simply a large number of people, some of whom speak with very 'progressive' language and consider themselves liberated in the way that Cairns, Kymlicka and Macklem surely do, who will refuse to participate in decolonization and will, instead, fight to defend imperialism; there are also surely a large number of people who simply do not mind being controlled, especially those near the top of the pyramid of petty tyrants, as their reward is substantial. However, just as Regan and Day avoid specific prescriptions for how to conduct a decolonization 'revolution', or what Canada should look like afterwards, perhaps all that can be done is engage, experiment, and reach those who will listen. As Coulthard reminds us, "effective social transformation can and will only occur if one makes it happen" (Coulthard, 2000: 93), and the transformation of Settler society in a decolonized society is certainly worth fighting for.

CONCLUSION – COLONIAL CHOICES

Faith or ideals lacking
how will they resist
another tyrant or dictator?

Luckily
no one has the will or energy
to enslave them either:
they also are lacking

Only boredom
will ever conquer them again,
the futility
they find each night in their own
mirrors

Out of their effluvium
and collective nothingness
is built
the final Leviathan

-from *Leviathan*, by Irving Layton

To many Canadians, the suggestion that Canada remains a colonial state, focused on internal colonization for the purpose of securing once and for all the territorial and resource base of Canada, as has been asserted by Tully and others, and fully participating in global imperial systems as has been suggested by Hardt and Negri, is unthinkable. While Regan (2006), Alfred (2005), and Day (2000) all emphatically refute the Settler "myths" of the nature of the Canadian nation and state, these myths die hard. The concepts of benevolent administration, peaceful coexistence, and fair treaty making have all been shown to be completely false; yet they endure in the Canadian Settler consciousness as powerful sources of national identity and pride. These same concepts provide the foundation of continued governmental policy. Simultaneously, academics and thinkers such as Cairns, Kymlicka, Macklem, and their many contemporaries, perpetuate intellectual dishonesty and fraud by selling academic snake oil to Canadian

politicians and bureaucrats and the broader Canadian public. This snake oil is the tonic of liberalism, mixed with the politics of recognition, and fortified with the juridical apparatus of contemporary global empire that is marketed as a cure-all for what ails Indigenous peoples. In reality, it acts as a vector for the continued spread of colonialism. However, as damaging as these theories are, they are not actually leading the way in the continuation of colonialism in the Canadian context. That distinction falls to the general Canadian populace.

One of the heavy implications of the analysis of the colonial mentality developed from the observations of Indigenous writers and allied Settler thinkers committed to confronting imperialism is that Settler people by-and-large want to remain colonial. The Canadian public will is largely directed to maintaining privilege within the pyramid of petty tyrants, fearful reactionary responses to terrifying Indigenous "Others" and the inherent threat of imperial discipline for anyone who strays too far from the party line. This has the effect of propping up an insulated and limited understanding of Indigenous-Settler history and relationships, and cooperation with the burgeoning "society of control" that is both tacit acceptance of being controlled and active participation in controlling others. That the works of the three colonial Settler academics analysed in this thesis so clearly accords to this particular description of colonial mentalities suggests that these thinkers are engaged in the age-old practice of many Western intellectuals, as identified previously by Alfred: the justification of further violent appropriation of Indigenous lands and lives through intellectual acrobatics. These theories are not new or innovative; rather they are re-articulations of traditional imperial and colonial thought altered and updated in response to ceaseless Indigenous resistance to colonialism and

resurgence of Indigenous ways of being. Cairns, Kymlicka, and Macklem are all participants in the colonial project, whether actively or passively, because they refuse to fundamentally challenge it. This is also true of every Settler Canadian whose livelihood and mode of existence is dependent upon historical and contemporary oppression of Indigenous peoples, even if they personally are not on the frontlines of colonial expansion. If neo-colonialism is active in the realm of intellectual and moral cooptation, then intellectuals become foot-soldiers in the expansion of imperial power; if contemporary empire is decentred and deterritorialized, the true generals are the masses of the public that accepts and encourages colonialism, along with the established imperial elites who encourage patterns of behaviour which most benefit themselves. In this context, academics such as Cairns, Kymlicka and Macklem should not be granted excessive prominence in the fight against imperial domination – the momentum of colonization in the contemporary setting comes from the continued, wide-spread demand for it, and as such will only end with the ending of colonial mentalities among the massive Settler populace.

The natural question to ask from this analysis is what will alternatives to the Canadian aspect of imperial society look like? There is no singular answer. If the broad overview of the works of Regan, Day, Tully, Hardt and Negri, and other intellectuals concerned with creating a decolonized Settler society are any indication, all that can be said for certain is that uncertainty, radical experimentation, the role of the "smith", groundless affinity, and the dynamism of philosophies such as anarcho-indigenism, are the recourse for those seeking another way. Abandoning Settler greed and privilege means accepting a philosophy of taking no more than you need and giving back what is

not yours, and the consequent acceptance of a vastly reordered economic and political reality for Settler societies. Abandoning Settler fear entails accepting that there are no permanent solutions, that eternal peace and order is impossible, and that conflict is not something to be feared but embraced and learned from as an opportunity for growth and change. Abandoning Settler ignorance requires taking on the responsibility to educate oneself about the other peoples, societies, and cultures with which Settlers must inevitably ally and share land, which also requires the acceptance of multiple truths and a radical re-reading of Western philosophical traditions and ways of knowing. Perhaps most importantly, abandoning the society of control means accepting a different set of premises for social organization in general; the Canadian creed of "peace, order, and good government" will have to pass away in favour of the far less explicit – but much more empowering – creed of "freedom and justice". Is any of this possible?

Social organization of this kind is possible and, in fact, is reliant upon Indigenous freedom alongside the Canadian social construct. Indigenous societies – without becoming too general or idealistic – have achieved these lofty goals in many places and times, and this is something both to learn from and to be inspired by. Utilizing complex social and political organization, many Indigenous societies achieved levels of egalitarianism undreamed of by Europeans at the time of contact, and unachieved by either the "post-colonial" nations or the post-war European states who made freedom and equality their fundamental rallying cries[42]. And as Indigenous peoples have been generous with their resources and teachings, perhaps Settler people can once again beg

[42] Generally, the work of Bruce E. Johansen gives an excellent overview of the incredible influence that Indigenous political organization – specifically the model of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy – had upon Western thought. See *Forgotten Founders* (Johansen, 1982), as well as The American Indian in the Past (Lyons, 1992) for details.

for the help of Indigenous societies in the attempt to become true allies and decolonized societies. Paulette Regan demonstrated the power of unsettling contact with Indigenous peoples, but it is perhaps Paul Kingsnorth who most accurately reflects the potential for transformative individual change, especially that which occurs in the absence of hegemonic and homogenizing imperial power. Kingsnorth, an Englishman, is welcomed into a celebration of resisters and radicals from around the world at a global activist conference, which inspires him to write the following:

> …I look around me and I realize something. It's when everyone is up and moving, ripping and running around in mad circles to the Che Guevara song, under a waving, multicoloured, chequered flag; the symbol of the *campesino* farmers of Latin America. I'm being swung from South African to Colombian to ecologist to anarchist, from Brazilian to Bangladeshi, from *cocalero* to tribesman, all of them grinning madly, most of them dancing badly, and me worst of all.
>
> It's when I look around and see that everyone who surrounds me – all colours, from all corners, all together even as they are so far apart – all of them, all of these people, are determined and somehow together. I realize that they have between them something too powerful to wash away. You'd have to kill all these people, and the hundreds and thousands more they represent, to stop this movement. And as the pipes and drums roll on and the circle turns faster, throwing people half off their feet, I can't see anything that will shut them up, shut them down, make them go home quietly and stop causing so much trouble. Apart from winning.
>
> Kingsnorth, 2003, 84-85

Is Kingsnorth's vision overly-romantic? Likely it is, especially in the Canadian context wherein struggles for freedom continue to have problems getting off the ground, in no small part because of the comparatively high level of comfort accorded to colonial actors. Nonetheless, he raises a valid point: the struggles in the Canadian context are not disconnected from the multitude of struggles that have been and continue to be fought in many different societies, among many different contexts and this diversity is an advantage. One thing that is certain in the midst of the fog of conflict between the

imperial forces on one hand, and the multiplicity of resistance movements on the other, is that in the Canadian context the futures of Indigenous and Settler societies are inextricably linked. Kingsnorth dancing with this diverse group is a useful metaphor: we ultimately share a space – be it geographical, or conceptual – and we are all dancing together, whether we like it or not, and this unavoidable diversity is ultimately to our benefit. As Marilynne Robinson states in closing her critique of Richard Dawkins' hegemonic praise of science, "It is diversity that makes any natural system robust, and diversity that stabilizes culture against the eccentricity and arrogance that have so often called themselves reason and science" (Robinson, 2006: 88). Settler peoples, as always, have a choice to make. Either we can continue to attempt to control and dominate, ultimately engaging in a project to "kill all these people" (either physically or conceptually), embracing our colonialism and abandoning the high-minded ideals of freedom and equality espoused by Canadian society, and attempt to create a hegemonic, homogenous society, or we can accept the multiple histories and identities, changing realities, and temporary social forms necessitated by a pluralist existence. In the words of Alfred:

> The time has come to recognize our mutual dependency; to realize that indigenous and non-indigenous communities are permanent features of our political and social landscape; to embrace the notion of respectful cooperation on equal terms; and to apply the peace-making principles on which were based both the many great pre-contact North American confederacies and the later alliances that allowed European societies to establish themselves and flourish on this continent.
>
> Alfred, 1999: 53

The choice between being a colonizer and being a Settler ally, between contemporary empire and radical social reorganization, is simultaneously in the hands of each individual Canadian and in the hands of society as a whole, and as new forms of

Indigenous resurgence push and challenge Settler colonialism to greater degrees than ever, these choices will be critical to the future of both Indigenous and Settler peoples, so that at the end of the day, it will not be the intellectuals who decide what future Canadian society looks like. It will be the dynamic results of the mass choices of Settler and Indigenous individuals and societies; together we will choose whether to ally together, or fight to an uncertain end. However, before that choice can even be made, Settler colonizers must understand – and perhaps be made to understand – the complexities of their own colonial mentalities, and the realities of their social choices. It is impossible to expect that Settlers can overcome a problem which most are not aware exists. It is only through critical self-reflection of the type evidenced in the works of Regan, Day, Hall, Tully, and other Settlers willing to question their own position and privilege with the existing social order, that Settlers can understand what it means to be colonial, and more importantly, how to be something else entirely.

WORKS CITED

Alfred, Taiaiake (2005). *Wasase: Indigenous Pathways to Action and Freedom*. Broadview Press.

Alfred, Taiaiake (1999). *Peace, Power, Righteousness*. Oxford University Press.

Alfred, Taiaiake & Corntassel, Jeff (2005). Being Indigenous, from *Government and Opposition*, (pp. 597-614) 40:4.

Barnsley, Paul (2001). *"Starlight tour" brings officers' conviction*. Windspeaker Archives. Found online at: http://www.ammsa.com/windspeaker/topnews-Oct-2001.html#anchor463124. Last accessed Nov. 17, 2006.

Bigelow, Gordon (2005). Let There Be Markets: The evangelical roots of economics, in *Harper's Magazine* (pp.33-40), vol. 310, no. 1860, May 2005. Harpers Magazine Foundation, NY.

Cairns, Alan (2005). *First Nations and the Canadian State*. Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queens University: Kingston, ON.

Cairns, Alan (2000). *Citizens Plus*. UBC Press: Vancouver.

Campbell, Joseph (1991). *The Power of Myth*. Bill Moyers (contributor) & Betty Sue Flowers (ed.). Anchor Books.

Chomsky, Noam (2003). *Hegemony or Survival*. Owl Publishing.

Corntassel, Jeff (2006). *Towards a New Partnership? Indigenous Political Mobilization and Co-optation During the First UN Indigenous Decade (1995-2004)*. Forthcoming in Human Rights Quarterly.

Coulthard, Glen (2006). *Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the Politics of Recognition in Colonial Contexts*. Forthcoming. Full Draft: May, 2006.

Coulthard, Glen (2000). *Facing the Challenge of Freedom: Dene Nationalism and the Politics of Cultural Recognition*. Thesis completed in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of MA in Indigenous Governance, University of Victoria.

Day, Richard (2005). *Gramsci is Dead: Anarchist Currents in the Newest Social Movements*. Between the Lines: Toronto.

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

Delgamuukw v. British Columbia (1997). Judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, File No. 23799. Found online at: http://scc.lexum.umontreal.ca/en/1997/1997rcs3-1010/1997rcs3-1010.html. Last accessed: Sept. 12, 2006.

Deloria, Vine (2002). *Evolution, Creationism, and Other Modern Myths*. Fulcrum Press.

Deloria, Vine (1999). *Spirit and Reason*. Fulcrum Press.

Deloria, Vine (1994). *God Is Red*. Fulcrum Press.

Fanon, Frantz (1963). *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press.

Fish, Stanley (1997). Boutique Multiculturalism, or Why Liberals are Incapable of Thinking About Hate Speech, from *Critical Inquiry*, Vol. 23, Winter 1997. University of Chicago Press.

Hansen, Tom (2002). Zapatistas: A Brief Historical Timeline, in Hayden, Tom (ed.) *The Zapatista Reader* (pp. 8-16). Thunder's Mouth Books: New York.

Hardt, Michael & Negri, Antonio (2001). *Empire*. Harvard University Press.

Johansen, Bruce E. (1982). *Forgotten Founders*. Harvard Common Press: Boston.

Juhasz, Antonia & Shiva, Vandana (2005). River vs. Water Inc. in *LiP Magazine*. Found online at: http://www.lipmagazine.org/articles/featshiva_water.htm. Last accessed: April 28, 2006.

Kasnabish, Alex (2006). Review of Wasase, in *Politics and Culture*. Found online at: http://aspen.conncoll.edu/politicsandculture/printer_page.cfm?key=519. Last accessed: April 28, 2006.

Kymlicka, Will (2001). *Politics in the Vernacular*. Oxford University Press.

Little Bear, Leroy (2000). Jagged World Views Colliding, in Battiste, Marie (ed.) *Reclaiming Indigenous Voice and Vision* (pp. 77-85). UBC Press: Vancouver.

Lyons, Oren (1992). The American Indian in the Past, from *Exiled in the Land of the Free*. Clearlight Press.

Macklem, Patrick (2001). *Indigenous Difference and the Constitution of Canada*. University of Toronto Press: Toronto.

Mander, Jerry (1992). *In the Absence of the Sacred*. Sierra Club Books: San Fancisco.

Marcos, Subcommandante (2002). *Our Word Is Our Weapon*, Juana Ponce de Leon (ed.). Seven Stories Press.

Marcos, Subcommandante (2006). *An Other Theory*. Released March 29, 2006. Found online at: http://www.zmag.org/content/showarticle.cfm?ItemID=10012. Last accessed: April 28, 2006.

McFarlane, Peter (1993). *Brotherhood to Nationhood*. Between the Lines: Toronto.

Memmi, Albert (1965). *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Beacon Press.

Moore, John (ed.) (2006). *I Am Not Man, I Am Dynamite*. Autonomedia.

Nietzsche, F. (1956). *The Birth of Tragedy and the Geneaology of Morals*, translated by Golfing, F. Anchor Books.

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

Robinson, Marilynne (2006). Hysterical Scientism, from *Harper's Magazine* (pp.83-88), vol. 313, no. 1878, Nov. 2006. Harpers Magazine Foundation, NY.

Smith, Mel (1993). *Our Home Or Native Land?* Stoddart Publishing: Toronto.

Soong, C.S. (host) (2006). *Activism and Mental Health*. Aired Feb. 16, 2006; KPFA Pacifica Radio.

Tarrow, Sidney (1998). *Power in Movement*. Cambridge University Press.

The Matrix (1999). Film written and directed by Andy and Larry Wachowski.

Tully, James (2000). The Struggles of Indigenous Peoples for and of Freedom, from Ivison, Patton & Sanders (eds.), *Political Theory and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* (pp. 36-59). Cambridge University Press.

Tully, James (1995). *Strange Multiplicity*. Oxford University Press.

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

Weyler, Rex (1992). *Blood of the Land*. New Society Publishers: Philadelphia, PA.