Chapter 6
Indigenous Peoples and Black People in Canada: Settlers or Allies?

Zainab Amadahy and Bonita Lawrence

6.1 Introduction

This chapter has been created as the starting point of what will hopefully become an ongoing dialogue, between Black peoples and Native people in Canada, about relationships to this land, as Indigenous peoples and those who have experienced diaspora and settlement here. Its purpose is to clarify what the bases of relationships entail, in the interests of a deeper solidarity. This is particularly important in view of the ongoing struggles relating to the presence of Black citizens within Indigenous nations that have developed in different Native communities in the United States, struggles which represent only one site in which Native–Black relations are taking place globally.[1] This chapter will, hopefully, offer some points of connection, and above all, be read with a good heart.

It is important, in focusing on this subject, to consider specificity of context – that Canadian policies toward Indigenous peoples and toward diasporic racialized communities have been distinct from those in the United States. At the same time, we are mindful that claims to Canadian specificity and difference from American contexts are primary ways in which Canadians deny the prevalence of anti-Black racism and the virulence of colonial relations toward Indigenous peoples in this country. However, the legacies of Indigenous genocide and slavery – how deeply both processes have shaped relations between Black people and Native people in the United States – have had a different shape in Canada, for a number of reasons. We therefore begin by clarifying certain Canadian contexts. Later in the chapter, however, we will also refer to how American discourses of both antiracism and Indigeneity have penetrated and influenced Black–Native relations north of the border.

In this chapter, we also wish to break through and deconstruct postures of innocence – the ways in which both Black and Indigenous people may insist that the primacy of their own suffering and powerlessness is so unique and all-encompassing that it erases even the possibility of their maintaining relationships of oppression relative to another group (Razack 2004, pp. 10, 14). It is particularly important to talk about postures of innocence when referencing Black–Native relations because

A. Kempf (ed.), *Breaching the Colonial Contract: Anti-Colonialism in the US and Canada*,
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

both Black and Indigenous peoples have experienced unique global levels of devastation as races. Genocide in the Americas[2] represents the largest holocaust that the world has ever known, which destroyed almost one quarter of the earth's population within 150 years (Todorov 1984, p. 133), and in the ensuring 400 years successfully changed the face of two entire continents; today's survivors have descended from the 2–5% of Indigenous peoples who survived (Churchill 1995, p. 41). Moreover, the gold and silver claimed during the initial sixteenth-century genocidal plunder provided Europe with the finance capital necessary to mount the expeditions to the Far East, and to build the ships that made global mercantilism possible, particularly the triangular trade of slaves and goods between Africa, the Americas, and England.[3] The Atlantic slave trade, meanwhile, was unique in its global scale; the manner in which it harnessed chattel slavery to industrial production, thereby bankrolling the industrial revolution; the global relations of imperialism it shaped; and the diasporic Black realities it created.

Perhaps most important, however, is the fact that these unique experiences *still* shape the lives of Native and Black peoples today in particular ways. Indigenous peoples are still being targeted for physical and cultural destruction and are widely assumed to have already "vanished". Erased from history as viable nations, their lands therefore continue to be seen as "there for the taking," either as ongoing sources of resource theft or as real estate for the world's wealthy migrants. In this context, Indigenous peoples globally are still relentlessly being pushed toward extinction, as peoples. Meanwhile, Black diasporic peoples today continue to be uniquely racialized by a discourse created through slavery, whereby everything from standards of beauty to notions of criminality hinge on degrees of phenotypic blackness. Furthermore, globally, the legacy of 5 centuries of slavery, and the rape of Africa that it enabled means that the Black-led nations of the world, while nominally recognized as nation-states, are still the poorest and most disenfranchised of nation-states.

Because of the specificity and intensity of historical and contemporary disempowerment that both Black and Indigenous peoples in the Americas have experienced, claims to innocence for both groups are particularly potent and can be (and in some cases are being) used to cancel out any form of criticism of one group's behaviour toward another group. In this chapter we wish to both acknowledge and avoid this posturing of innocence, by exploring the grounded realities that may help to clarify relations. As part of this process, it is important to consider what we mean in this context when we refer to "Indigenous" peoples and "settlers".

The claims of Indigenous peoples have been hotly contested globally, and perhaps this is reflected in the confusion of definitions that arises when the term "Indigenous peoples" is used. Because of this we have chosen the definition used by the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Peoples:

> Indigenous communities, peoples and nations are those which, having a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies that developed on their territories, consider themselves distinct from other sectors of societies now prevailing in those territories or parts of them. They form at present non-dominant sectors of society and are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic

> identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions, and legal systems. (Maaka and Fleras 2005, pp. 30–31)

While the term "Indigenous" has been contested and challenged, it is perhaps telling that there is little attention paid to the definition of a "settler." The term is intrinsically linked to the complex relations of the post-Columbian White colonialist project globally. As Linda Tuhiwai Smith clarifies, however, settlers are only one part of an intricate apparatus of colonial control that must be in place for settlers to be able to truly usurp the land:

> [A]fter figures such as Columbus and Cook had long departed, there came a vast array of military personnel, imperial administrators, priests, explorers, missionaries, colonial officials, artists, entrepreneurs and settlers, who cut a devastating swathe, and left a permanent wound on the societies and communities who occupied the land named and claimed under imperialism. (Smith 1999, p. 21)

From this perspective, for groups of peoples to be forcibly transplanted from their own lands and enslaved on other peoples' lands – as Africans were in the Americas – does not make the enslaved peoples true "settlers." Even in situations in Canada where Black people, after slavery, attempted settlement as free peoples, the process has been fraught with dispossession and denial of access to land. The reality then is that Black peoples have not been quintessential "settlers" in the White supremacist usage of the word; nevertheless, they have, as free people, been involved in some form of settlement process. What seems more important than the semantics about whether or not individuals should be called settlers is the question of the relationships that Black "settlers" have, by virtue of their marginality, with those whose lands have been taken, and what relationships they wish to develop, *at present*, with Indigenous peoples. In writing this chapter, we will look both at what relationships have been envisioned and what possibilities exist. We will begin, however, by starting with the specificities of our own locations.

6.2 Our Different Places in the Story…

6.2.1 Zainab's Location

I was born in New York City, to a White mother and a Black Indian father. Measuring Indigenous blood quantum on my father's side of the family has always been an inexact science. Measuring African blood quantum was never an issue since we have always grudgingly accepted the one-drop rule (one drop of African blood makes you Black/African-American) imposed by the US context in which we lived.

Suffice it to say that both my father's parents were mixed race with African, Indigenous, and European ancestry and it is unlikely that anyone from my great-grandparents downward knew the exact percentages of any of it. Being enslaved can do that to a family. My father's parents died when he was young so his paternal Cherokee grandmother raised him and his siblings in a small Black community

outside of Staunton, Virginia. She was over 100 years old when she passed on and I was 6 when I last saw her.

My great grandmother had been enslaved since birth alongside Blacks, Indians, and Black Indians on the Reynolds tobacco plantation and had experienced emancipation as a child. She was aware of her Cherokee heritage but not connected to any Indigenous community, as was the case with most of the Black Indians in Staunton – and there were many. She raised my dad as a Baptist, although various gems of what I now recognize as Indigenous wisdom permeated her parenting, whether from the African or Cherokee traditions, I couldn't say.

I, however, was raised in an urban environment at the height of both the Civil Rights and American Indian movements. I spent several summers at my great-grandmother's home outside of Staunton, not the most isolated location, but rural enough for a city girl to gain some land-based teachings.

While I was raised to be aware and proud of my Indigenous heritage, it was never presented to me as my primary cultural identity. My parents encouraged me to embrace my multiracial background; a task that would have left me friendless in a terribly segregated society then governed by Jim Crow laws and an official policy of genocide toward Indigenous peoples. Indeed, what I learned of Cherokee and Indigenous peoples generally came first in books – liberal and sympathetic yet written from a Eurocentric worldview.

In the meantime I lived an urban lifestyle in segregated Black or Hispanic neighborhoods of New York City and Philadelphia. Most Black and Hispanic people I knew acknowledged Indigenous heritage, but it never formed the core of their cultural identities, clearly a testament to the effectiveness of the genocide project perpetrated in the Americas. In fact, when I was growing up, identifying as "Black Indian" was often seen as an attempt to claim some sort of light-skinned privilege. With the Black Power movement at its height, I identified simply as Black in my high school years. Though when it came up I never denied Indigenous ancestry and felt pride in it. However, I was never presented with an opportunity to embrace the culture or connect with an Indigenous community or develop a relationship with the land.

Today I really wonder how Indigenous I can claim to be given that I am clanless, my Indigenous family history – African and Cherokee – has been lost in the colonization process and I do not have any familial relationship with the land. I have come to understand that this self-doubt is common to urban Indigenous people whether with White or African ancestry. It is a consequence of genocide.

Though raised in a Protestant tradition, my mother converted to send me to Catholic school because the academic standard was higher than in New York City's public schools. She also regarded Catholic schools as "safer," though I have never before or since experienced anti-Black racism as vicious as I did in the predominantly White Catholic school from students, teachers, and parents alike.

I was in the public system by the time I went into high school, being bussed from a Black community outside Philly in an effort to integrate into a formerly all-White suburban school. Let us just say it was another traumatizing yet character-building experience. It was in this phase of my life that I made a commitment to political activism, mostly to the civil rights/Black power movement.

These movements shaped my framework of analysis when it came to studying Indigenous history and culture in my later years. My familiarity with the American Indian Movement (AIM) was a long-distance one (fund-raising and information-sharing) and I cannot say that I thoroughly understood the fundamental struggle. Even if I did, I would have still been positioned as an outsider to it. I was generally supportive but in terms of concrete activism there was just nothing going on where I lived that provided me with the opportunity to become seriously involved in the parallel processes of decolonizing my worldview as I engaged in activism. In university I was politically active in solidarity work with Central American struggles (a manifestation of Indigenous resistance to the genocide there) and the South African antiapartheid movement.

In 1980s Toronto, I went through 6 years of university without encountering a single student who identified as Indigenous. Genocide will do that to a people. There were no Aboriginal campus groups and I tended to identify and hang out with other racialized students. It was in this context that I was introduced to marxism and developed an antiracist, feminist, class analysis. This academic, Eurocentric framework shaped my early understanding of Indigenous struggles. I came to work within "The Left," though I was never entirely comfortable with it, but lacking a connection to anyone or anything Indigenous, I was unable to develop an analysis of something that just didn't "feel" right.

It wasn't until my mid-thirties that I put concerted effort into absorbing oral histories, songs, and teachings of Elders. Thus, I was finally able to put a name to my political framework of analysis: "Indigenism." I have been active in Toronto's Aboriginal community ever since. Initially I was resistant to identifying as a "Cherokee," despite pressure from many of my friends and colleagues to do so. I compromised with the term "Black Cherokee," which most people accept, even though there is no common understanding of the term.

As an Indigenist activist I cofounded the Coalition in Support of Indigenous Sovereignty in 2003 and currently work with an Indigenous caucus. The Indigenous community in Toronto, as most urban Aboriginal communities, is comprised of alienated, traumatized, and disconnected mixed-race people from a variety of backgrounds and experiences, all of which have left them struggling to come to terms with their cultural identities. It is a community in which I fit quite nicely. The fact that I am not dark-skinned, as Black Indians go, probably helps me fit in even better, since I have heard from other mixed-race people that the more "Black" you look, the less acceptance you find.

Identifying as Black has been even more problematic, as most Black people who will talk to me about the topic don't see me as Black, in terms of my appearance, my mannerisms, or my politics. Certainly I am no longer connected to any "Black" community and my Indigenist worldview makes it difficult to work out of any other framework.

Today, though more experienced and, theoretically, wiser I struggle as much with identity issues, personal and political, as I did when I was 15. My Indigenous worldview makes it difficult for me to interact as an intimate in urban Black communities. My lack of connection to a landed Indigenous community makes it difficult

for me to find a complete sense of belonging in Indigenous circles. I constantly grapple with the implicit responsibilities of having Indigenous ancestry from both Turtle Island (North America) and Africa, as well as coming to an understanding of Indigenism through intellectual processes, oral teachings, and occasional ceremony rather than lived experience on the land.

In general, I see my journey as one of many Indigenous stories lived out in the context of colonialism and genocide. There are similar and not so similar stories out there but I see them all as parts of the Indigenous experience on Turtle Island. I share the concerns of many in Black, Indigenous, and Black Indian communities and am personally invested in seeing those communities come to terms with their own indigeneity as we struggle against colonialism, genocide, racism, and other aspects of globalization as it manifests in the twenty-first century. If there is one truth I have come to with age, it is that Indigenism has great potential to heal ourselves, our communities, and the land. It is for this reason that I decided to coauthor this chapter.

6.2.2 Bonita's Location

I come to this chapter from a history of "marginal Indianness." My ancestors on my mother's side were New Brunswick mixed-bloods, Mi'kmaq on one side, Acadian on the other. Our ancestry is unclear – while my grandmother appears to have connections to Lennox Island, she was born in the 1870s, shortly after the reserve was created, so it is unlikely she ever was a band member. By the time my grandmother was born, Mi'kmaq population collapse had reached the point where there were less than 1,500 left (out of a precontact population of 300,000), and a silence around Mi'kmaq identity, for those who were off reserve, became intense, particularly during my mother's generation so that most of her siblings – landless, brown-skinned, predominantly French-speaking, and silent about their identities – were scattered away from the Maritimes in search of work, mostly in the United States. The men worked in factories, the women were cleaning ladies; one uncle, hopelessly alcoholic, remained in New Brunswick and spent most of his adult life in prison. In the postwar proliferation of "new" identities, they mostly married immigrant "ethnic" Whites, so that among my generation, Indianness became a precarious identity. The older aunts and uncles still understood Mi'kmaq, but the younger siblings, like my mother, only occasionally heard Mi'kmaq and did not understand it; they spoke only French (and later, English). And all of them maintained a contradictory stance toward their own identities: too Native to be White, too White to be "really" Indian; if pressed they said they were Acadian.

When my mother married an Englishman and moved to Montreal, we entered into the fiction of being a British family, entailing a complete suppression of my mother's identity until I was 7, when the marriage ended. With my father gone, my mother experienced a defiant reclaiming of being dark-skinned; the darker we got in the sun each summer, the more pleased with us she was. Successive waves of

Indigenous militancy, in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s made my mother more open about her heritage and brought our nativeness closer to the surface. The reality, however, is that without Indian status, without our language, without connections to Mi'kmaq territory, and living in a society embroiled in a Quebec sovereignty movement which claimed my mother as "French" but further silenced her Indianness, there has been a significant confusion in my family about Native identity. When we were children, largely surrounded by Whites, we were considered "too dark"; with the advent of significant immigration of people of color, particularly as my family members relocated to Toronto, most of my siblings and nieces and nephews are now mostly considered far, far too White to be "real Indians." Nevertheless, the heritage of oppression that my family carried was replicated in my generation (and that of my nieces and nephews). I come to this chapter, therefore, with a strong awareness of the different levels of racialization and privilege that come from being intermarried with White rather than intermarried with Black, and yet with the knowledge that even with White intermarriage, violence is the legacy that Indigenous families seldom escape.

The struggles around Indigeneity that Native students encounter, and the colonialism they navigate, are also not dependent on the color of their skin. Being one of six Aboriginal students pursuing a doctoral degree at OISE in the late 1990s highlighted this reality. In a university with no Aboriginal professors, I was nevertheless part of a faculty that considered itself highly cutting-edged and equity-minded – where a number of faculty of color taught powerful courses on antiracism which, with a few exceptions, were silent about Indigenous presence, where we were taught postcolonial discourse which ignored ongoing colonization in the Americas, and where the devaluation of Indigenous knowledge was virtually complete. In doing my Ph.D., I was therefore required to assimilate several bodies of knowledge at the same time – not only the standard body of graduate-level sociological knowledge, and the "critical" postcolonial framework which critiqued this standard body of sociological knowledge – but a counter-discourse of resistance to BOTH the previous discourses, composed mostly of Mi'kmaq language classes and elders' critiques of what we were learning in school, supplemented by unpublished essays or occasional articles by Indigenous writers challenging postcoloniality and other antiracism discourses which excluded Indigeneity. The winter that welfare rates were cut by 20% meant that huge numbers of marginal Native people – including my Mi'kmaq language instructor – were forced out onto the street. The exclusion of Native realities and Indigenous epistemologies in postcolonial and antiracist theory was never so contradictory to me as it was that winter, on a daily basis walking by Indigenous bodies huddled on the pavement outside the university.

Several years later, the ongoing erasure of Indigenous presence, particularly within academic, postcolonial, and antiracism theory caused me to coauthor, with Enakshi Dua, the paper "Decolonizing Anti-Racism". In this paper, we asserted that Canadian antiracist theorists, by ignoring the Indigenous peoples whose land they were on, were furthering the colonial project that Canada continues to be engaged in. Dua, in particular, stated unequivocally that peoples of color in Canada should be considered "settlers" on Indigenous land.

In presentations of this paper, the most vociferous criticism has come – and continues to come – from Black people, who have challenged the use of "settler" when speaking of their relationship to Indigenous peoples in Canada, the United States, and the Caribbean. My purpose in undertaking this paper, therefore, is to explore in a deeper and more thoughtful manner the specific relations between Black and Aboriginal people, to more clearly articulate what constitutes a settler relationship, and to explore what might be needed to strengthen connections between Black and Indigenous communities. Having had the opportunity to teach courses which addressed both global and local colonialism has highlighted to me, above all, that there are strong interconnections between Black and Aboriginal peoples, globally and locally. This has led to my desire to work with Zainab Amadahy to address these issues.

6.3 Historical Context: Colonization and Settlement in Canada

In the United States, expressions of overt antipathy between Black and Native people are rare; the lines of tension are situated primarily within the context of their tribal interrelations and/or intermarriage – the existence of Black Indians and/or Black tribal citizens, frequently ignored by Black people, and fraught with tensions for Native people. Contemporary conflicts over the "Indianness" of Black tribal citizens in the United States came to a head in March 2007, when a minority[4] of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma successfully voted to expel their fellow Cherokee citizens of Black ancestry, historically known as "freedmen."[5] However, other, less well documented, conflicts have arisen in the other Indigenous nations whose lands were displaced by White slave owners and whose own ranks were therefore divided between slaveholders and those who rejected slavery – for example, the Choctaws (Collins 2006), the Creeks (Chang 2006; Saunt 2005), the Chickasaws (Krauthamer 2006), and the Seminoles (Micco 2006). Still other complexities are taking place within the nations of the eastern United States who, after being overwhelmed by settlers for centuries and intermarrying with both Black and White settlers, are struggling for federal recognition as tribes.[6] In all these cases, slavery, segregation, and the regulation of racial and tribal identities have overdetermined how Black Indians are seen, and have shaped the complex relations between Black Indians or freedmen tribal citizens, and non-Black tribal citizens. There are additional pressures among many Native peoples in the south, particularly those who are struggling for federal recognition as Indians, to be silent about the manner in which anti-Black racism may have entered their communities (Klopotek 2007). As Robert Keith Collins notes, however, one reason why this subject is capable of raising such controversy among Native people is that very little of the discourse about Black Indianness is actually grounded in the lived realities of Black–Native tribal members, including their knowledge of Indigenous languages, and other aspects of cultural knowledge

(2007). Black Indianness therefore can become a lightning rod highlighting Native Americans' most tremendous fear – of ceaseless cultural dilution by those who are perceived as "outsiders," until nativeness, after centuries of genocidal policies, ceases to exist altogether.

Having outlined some details of the complexities of Native–Black relations in the United States, we will now proceed to introduce some of the differences between Canadian and American policies toward Native and Black people, by way of introducing the Canadian contexts in which Native–Black relations take place. While slavery and regulation of Indigenous identity have proceeded in the Canadian context, it has, for the most part, taken different forms with different implications.

Historical policies toward Indigenous peoples in Canada have varied throughout the colonization process – from eighteenth-century policies of outright physical extermination on the east coast toward the Mi'kmaq, coupled with wartime allegiances and fur trade partnerships further west with the Iroquois Confederacy and the Three Fires Confederacy; to nineteenth-century treaty-making and ultimately subordination in central and western Canada with the Cree and Blackfoot peoples; to the "terra nullius" policies toward west coast Native peoples in the nineteenth and early twentieth century; to modern and ongoing resource rape and dispossession in the north, toward the Inuit. On the whole, though, control of most Indigenous communities has been maintained, since the 1870s, through a centralized body of legislation known as the Indian Act, which controls "Indian" identity and entitlement to land, as well as most other aspects of existence for those recognized "Indians" who come under its policies.

Differences between federal regulation of Indianness in Canada under the Indian Act, and the reliance on "blood quantum" in the United States, are on one level, minimal, and on another, profound. While both regimes have focused on drastically supplanting Indigenous ways of identifying relationships (and in the process minimizing numbers of registered "Indians" and maximizing land theft), the Indian Act has functioned less to quantify "degrees" of Indianness than to draw absolute divisions between status Indians and all other Native people.[7] Blood quantum measurement in the United States, however, has specifically mediated Indigenous identity as being solely about "blood," in potentially shaping who will be recognized as a tribal citizen and who will not, among Indian nations.

What is perhaps unique about colonization history in Canada, as compared to that of the United States, is the more overtly colonial framework that Britain was capable of exercising in its Canadian colony, which is highlighted by the formidable nature of the Indian Act as a weapon of legal oppression, which enabled the formal fragmenting of Indigenous nations into tiny "bands" with very few having over 1,000 members. Most bands in Canada only won a very limited degree of control over their membership in 1985, and continue to have governance powers that at best are equal to municipalities; meanwhile, land theft in Canada has been so extreme that all the lands reserved for Indians in Canada would fill less than half of the Navajo nation in Arizona (St. Germain 2002, p. xix). In such a context, the control that the larger federally recognized tribes in the United States can exercise over their-citizenship, whether Black or not, has not been possible for Canadian bands to exercise.

In 1969, in a document entitled "Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy, 1969" (popularly known as the White Paper), Canada attempted to formally divest itself of historic treaty obligations to Native peoples, while holding on to the land which is its basis of power, and privatizing the remaining reserves still left in Native hands. This formed the backdrop to a terrain of ensuing struggle, whereby the Indian Act has become the vehicle through which claims are made ON the state, and where those historically excluded from the Indian Act (and those who continue to be excluded through highly restrictive identity legislation) are divided from those with Indian status and are seen as not only as competitors for state funding but as those whose claims to Indigeneity are in some respects fraudulent. Indigenous identity, therefore, has become a major terrain of struggle for Native peoples, no less in Canada than in the United States. The extent to which this identity legislation becomes the crucial factor dividing Black Indians from other Native people, as it undoubtedly has in the United States, remains to be seen.

Under the Indian Act, the only people who can gain Indian status in Canada are those whose male ancestors were defined as Indians (the status of Indian women was considered to flow only from their fathers or husbands until 1951), and only those with Indian status have been entitled to live on reserve. If Indian status continues to be the final arbiter of who is "really" Indian, then historic off-reserve intermarriages between Black people and Mi'kmaq people in the Maritimes and Black people and Ojibway people in Ontario will never "count" as *real* Indians in Canada – at least not as far as status Indian communities are concerned; although the ongoing intermarriage between Black people and status Indians in communities all over Canada today means that at present, and in the future, their children, Black Indians, will have Indian status; their band membership will depend on their parent's membership and the policies of band membership on their reserve. Reserves may potentially have significant numbers of Black Indians in the future. For Black–Native intermarriage where the Native parent is non-status, however, being recognized as Black Indians will be considerably more precarious.

In comparing Black–Native relations in Canada with those in the United States, perhaps the biggest difference, however, is in immigration history. While both Native and Black slavery existed in Canada until the early nineteenth century, its limited economic value in a climate too cold for a large-scale plantation agricultural economy has meant that large numbers of enslaved Black people were not brought in to Canada, as with the United States. Indeed, settlement in Canada has, as in Australia, been overwhelmingly on a Whites-only basis. This was maintained through racist immigration policy and legally codified racial discrimination that was stringently maintained until after World War II. With changes to immigration policy at that point, urban centers in Canada have experienced profound demographic shifts, as immigration from the Caribbean, South Asia, East Asia, and Africa changed the face of some Canadian cities. Toronto, and to a lesser extent, Montreal and Vancouver, have become increasingly "brown" cities; however, they are surrounded by smaller communities across the country which are still overwhelmingly White.

In response to such profound urban demographic shifts, in 1971, the Canadian government enacted the policy of multiculturalism, which, in addition to other human rights legislation, affirmed individual racial equality and created space for limited cultural "difference" within the Canadian bicultural (French–English) framework. While debates on multiculturalism are considerable, multiculturalism as a policy can be considered to have had three primary effects. First of all, it has contained insurgent diasporic communities in subordinate positions to the two so-called founding races (British and French). Secondly it has enabled those diasporic communities to make limited claims on the state in the name of multiculturalism, for services and support, and often in the process, to engage in antiracist resistance. Finally, the multiculturalism policy profoundly strengthened Canada's attempts to divest itself of any formal recognition of Indigenous peoples, by creating a playing field where Aboriginal peoples could potentially be reduced to "just another cultural group" within a multicultural mosaic.[8]

There are a number of other by-products of these histories. A crucial one is that the presence of older communities of color – in particular, the communities of Black people who entered Canada between the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries, as well as west coast East Asian and South Asian communities dating back to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries – is constantly being erased from the Canadian body politic, by a multiculturalism policy that treats all racialized cultural communities as "new immigrants." Black Canadians in particular face a nation-state which has continuously excluded large-scale Black settlement, and which, despite the existence of centuries-old Black settlements, continues to construct a vision of Canadian nationhood where Black people are forever marginal newcomers, always external to the nation.[9]

What this means is that any acknowledgment of the presence of Black Indians in Canada has been sharply constrained, not only by the colonial control that Britain (and then Canada) has maintained over Indigenous communities, isolating them and subordinating each community, until 1951, under the coercive control of government "Indian Agents" and the Church, but by the profoundly "Whites only" nature of the rest of Canadian society. In such a repressive context, surrounded by hostile Whites, historic Black communities faced continuous pressures to "whiten themselves" culturally. Meanwhile, the intensity of control maintained over Indigenous communities prevented those Black people with Native heritage from turning to Native communities in any large-scale manner for support. The result has been a legacy of silence about Black Indianness in the Maritimes, a silence which has yet to be significantly broken. An even greater silence, about the very existence of Black Ojibways in central Ontario, has also been maintained. In each case, the only communities who have acknowledged the existence of Black Mi'kmaqs or Black Ojibways have been the surrounding Mi'kmaq and Ojibway communities.

Another by-product of this erasure of historic Black (as well as East Asian and South Asian) presence in the massive upsurge of postwar diasporic communities is that the newer and more numerous communities are defining the terms of struggle with the state; these communities, however, have little or no knowledge of the presence

of Indigenous peoples in Canada.[10] As a result, particularly in the larger Canadian cities, antiracism has been theorized and articulated solely in the context of diasporic communities, in the process absolutely eclipsing and erasing Aboriginal presence (Lawrence and Dua 2005). On those occasions when antiracist activists attempt to be inclusive of Indigenous contexts, they lack knowledge of the histories of Indigenous communities, their relationships to the land, the spiritual–political processes that maintain Indigenous communities today, and the value which Indigenous peoples place on relationships. It is in the hopes of addressing these absences that we introduce some aspects of these perspectives below.

6.4 Indigenous Ways of Maintaining Relatedness

In seeking to understand ways of working together, we can learn much from the oral histories and stories of Indigenous peoples concerning the framework in which relationships are understood. While the examples below are taken from Indigenous Turtle Island stories and teachings, the values inherent in them are common to all Indigenous cultures from around the globe. Probably the most fundamental principle of many Indigenous cultures is human interdependence with other life-forms in nonhierarchical ways. Creation Stories, for example, emphasize the interdependence of two-leggeds (human beings) with the plants, animals, sun, moon, and the land itself. In the *Rotinosoni* (Iroquois) Creation Story, Sky Woman and the land animals, sea creatures, and winged ones cooperated and had different roles in the formation of Turtle Island and in growing food that sustained the human lives that came afterward.

Indigenous worldviews give us other ways of looking at "cultural pluralism." To illustrate, consider this Cherokee teaching.

> Mother Earth and all her children teach us that diversity is necessary to our health and well-being. You do not see the trees insisting that they all bear the same fruit. You do not see the fish declaring war against those who do not swim. You do not see corn blocking the growth of squash and beans. What one plant puts into the soil, another takes. What one tree puts into the air another creature breathes. What one being leaves as waste another considers food. Even death and decay serve to nurture new life. Every one of Mother Earth's children co-operates so that the family survives.[11]

In *Rotinosoni* communities every gathering – ceremonial, social, or business – is opened with what is known as the Thanksgiving Address, a prayer expressing appreciation to all "living"[12] creatures (plants, animals, waters, stars, sun, moon, etc.) for their contribution to providing two-leggeds with food, clothing, shelter, medicine, and everything else that is required for healthy living.

In *Anishinabe* gatherings the term "All My Relations" is used to honor a concept of family that does not stop with living blood relatives but includes ancestors, the generations to come, and a whole host of "spirit beings" that inhabit another realm, all of whom play various essential roles not only in sustaining life on Mother Earth but in facilitating our spiritual development – collective and individual. It also

includes, in a nonhierarchical way, the animal and plant life that are a necessary part of Indigenous survival.

In this worldview, “extended family” takes on a whole new meaning. This concept of family challenges us to evolve beyond philosophies urging tolerance of “otherness” in the expectation that “diversity” or even equity can enrich us in either material or esoteric ways. Inherent in cultivating relationships with “others” we must understand our mutual interdependence, both in terms of our very survival as a species as well as our evolution as spiritual beings (and there is no endpoint to spiritual development).

In this framework, individuals do not and could not exist outside of community or the land. Our past, present, and future relationships define who we are and determine what roles we play as well as responsibilities we have to the community and to the land that sustains it. Likewise, who we are and what we do as individuals impacts that broad sense of community.

The notion that roles and responsibilities are assigned to all beings, genders, age groups, clans, nations, etc. is thematic in Indigenous histories, stories, and worldview. Inherent in this concept is that we need to understand, respect, and celebrate what everyone brings to the circle. Anyone who has ever worked in a team is challenged to respect the notion that individuals bring something unique to the group’s work. Likewise, communities, with our particular histories, cultures, and experiences have something to contribute to the human family: indeed to “all our relations.”

Consequently, leadership is just another role someone is expected to play in service to community. Leadership opportunities are understood less as privileges that come with perks than they are responsibilities to serve and remain accountable to a community and a set of values that the community aspires to.

As we develop an understanding of these concepts, it is important to realize that they reflect value systems or sets of ideals that have been profoundly damaged by colonialism. And yet, these fundamental values have survived in many contemporary Indigenous communities, and are the source of every successful defense of the land and the life-forms that rely on it. It is easy, from the outside, to romanticize and idealize Indigenous societies (past, present, and future); however, such romanticism prevents outsiders from seeing in real terms the actual strengths and values that contemporary Indigenous communities maintain today. Viewing the world through the lens of Indigenism highlights the fact that Native communities are still here, that they know the histories of their own traditional lands, and that these realities, despite their erasure from the mainstream, need to be taken into account by activists from other communities. More profoundly, it can offer a template to understand how deeper connections can be developed, across our differences, as Black and Indigenous peoples.

How we understand our relationships also shapes and is shaped by what academics write about these issues. It is theory and literature which “train” successive generations in how to think about certain issues, and for that reason, it is crucial to explore this aspect further, as well.

6.5 Another Way of Understanding the Story: The Theoretical Picture of Our Relations in Black Thought

6.5.1 Black Writing in Canada

> *Dry rivers in the valley*
> *The thirst at the banks of plenty*
> *The room at the streetcar shelter*
> *A bus stop bed…*
> *The last postcard you sent was kinda weird*
> *Poor people sleeping at the bus stop?*
> *Surely you don't have that there?*
> *Anyways, I'm dying to come to Canada*
> *I'm a pioneer.*
>
> (Lillian Allen 1989, "Unnatural Causes")

The above spoken-word poem, from the album *Conditions Critical*, by Jamaican–Canadian dub poet Lillian Allen, reflects the ambiguous position of Black people in Canada relative to Indigenous peoples, as portrayed in critical Black writing. In her poetry, Allen encompasses the realities of those who leave (or flee from) homes already devastated by colonialism globally, those who have bought in to the myth of Canada as an empty land where they can remake themselves and their lives, and the violence of racism that all Black migrants encounter at the point of arrival in Canada (whether in the eighteenth century or the twenty-first). For Allen, a politicized vision of Canada's anti-Black racism is highlighted by a gesture toward its colonial relationship to Indigenous peoples, as referenced by the satirical ending "I'm a pioneer."

And yet, this gesture – which a growing number of Black Canadian writers make toward the colonial nature of the Canadian state – is insufficient to address the ongoing erasure of Indigenous realities within critical Black writing. This erasure is neither deliberate nor accidental – it flows inevitably from a theoretical framework that separates racism from colonialism and genocide, and grants priority to racism. It is perhaps not surprising that this approach would dominate in Black Canadian writing; the reality of Black suffering in Canada is mediated through racism – whether it is through the structural realities of poverty, job discrimination, discrimination in housing and in education, or the lived daily realities of police violence and over-incarceration.

By comparison, when Aboriginal peoples, across Canada, address racism, it is in the context of colonialist genocide – the ceaseless targeting of Aboriginal people for destruction *as peoples* in a colonial order – whether through removing people from land and livelihood, or removing children through child welfare agencies (and formerly through residential schooling) – too often resulting in the relentless spirals of alcoholism, drug addiction, family violence, and sexual abuse that are devastating Aboriginal communities. In such a context, the pressures to relinquish culture, language, and identity as Indigenous nations are constant and overwhelm-

ing; and the price for those who cannot survive the losses are the highest rates of Indigenous incarceration and suicide in the world (Razack 2002, p. 122), accompanied by such a phenomenal rate of sexual violence against Indigenous women that it has brought international attention to this issue (Amnesty International 2004). Indeed, Andrea Smith, addressing both Canadian and American contexts, has highlighted the role that sexual violence plays in ongoing colonial control, noting that Native women AND Native youths are approximately 50% more likely to experience violent assault than any other racial group, including Black people, and that, unlike any other racialized group, Native women are assaulted more often by White men than by men of their own group: 60% of the perpetrators of sexual violence against Native women are White (Smith 2005, p. 28).

Indeed, when epidemics of diabetes and fetal alcohol syndrome, poor housing, and unsafe drinking water are taken into account, it is very clear that Indigenous communities, in Canada and globally, form the "Fourth World" as described by the late Rodney Bobiwash (2001, p. 12):

> The Fourth World is … the world of Indigenous people – the original peoples of the Americas and across the globe who have been marginalized on their own lands, excluded from civil society, denied economic opportunity, and stigmatized by the Myth of Conquest and The Doctrine of Discovery – who have fallen off of even the lowest rungs of the false ladder of economic determinism – called progress.

Particularly now, under globalization, the very survival of Indigenous peoples throughout the world is threatened.

In Africa, Indigenous peoples face land appropriation, resource theft, and policies of genocide, often organized by Black African elites, in partnership with colonial or imperial powers, who have internalized colonial values. But whether we are talking about contemporary migration from Africa itself, or the ongoing diaspora of peoples of African descent created by slavery, the reality is that African peoples living in the Americas are living on the lands of other Indigenous peoples. And for all peoples forced to live on other peoples' lands, a crucial question becomes what relationships they will establish with the Indigenous peoples of that land whose survival is so under siege. Ultimately, to fail to negotiate a mutually supportive relationship is to risk truly becoming "settlers," complicit in the extermination of those whose lands they occupy.

What renders the situation more complex, of course, is that peoples of African descent in the Americas are primarily those who are survivors of the holocaust and cultural genocide that is slavery; others are survivors of direct colonial occupation or genocide in Africa. Most peoples of African descent in Canada, whether recently arrived or "old stock" from the seventeenth century, are therefore in a profoundly contradictory relationship to Indigenous peoples here. As racialized people, inevitably positioned as outsiders to the Canadian nation, and survivors of one or another form of genocide, they have much in common with Indigenous peoples. Perhaps this is the reason that most Black Canadian writers routinely make gestures toward Indigenous presence. And yet their very marginality within Canada generally also forces them, contradictorily, to make settler claims as part of challenging Canada's racism.

Rinaldo Walcott, for example, in his work frequently references Indigenous genocide and a subordinated First Nations presence, positioning Black people implicitly as allies to Indigenous peoples. And yet, contradictorily, he also advocates that the eighteenth-century loyalist land grants offered to Black Loyalists, but subsequently denied, should be honoured (1997, p. 36). In so doing, he is erasing not only the reality of the eighteenth-century genocide of Mi'kmaq people[13] that accompanied the loyalist presence in Nova Scotia, but the fact the Mi'kmaq people today have never formally ceded their land to any settlers. In such a context, to urge the "honoring" of Africadian land rights means demanding the right to retroactively participate with Whites in an ongoing illegal land grab. Another contradiction within Walcott's writing, which appears common in most critical Black Canadian writing is the ongoing erasure of Black Mi'kmaq people, by referencing all Maritimers of African descent simply as "Black." He thus deepens an already profound silence about Black Native identity which few Black Native people in Canada have broken, to date.

Indeed, Walcott's work highlights a fundamental contradiction within most critical Black Canadian writing, particularly Black history: even as the writing attempts to reference Canada's subordination of Indigenous peoples, it normalizes relations of colonialism. Joseph Mensah (2002), for example, in *Black Canadians*, restricts his coverage of the presence of eighteenth-century Indigenous people to the fact that the family of Joseph Brant, as acculturated elite Mohawks, historically owned slaves. In this treatment, the eighteenth-century presence of White AND Black people on Indigenous lands is normalized, as if colonial domination and the claiming of Indigenous lands for settlement are inevitable and beyond question. Such treatment is not only inaccurate, given that in the eighteenth century, the European presence in North America was still being consolidated. It also invites the posturing of Black innocence as settlers: if colonization is inevitable and beyond question, the presence of Black settlers on Indigenous lands can be normalized; they are, in fact, not colonizers, but victims, of slave-owning Native people such as Joseph Brant.

If we do not normalize colonization, it becomes clear that Black struggles for freedom have required (and continue to require) ongoing colonization of Indigenous land. While the Underground Railroad frequently ran through the cross-border reserves of Indigenous peoples, it brought Black peoples to Canada to claim land that was newly taken from Indigenous peoples. And yet it is clear that, because of slavery, in this context there was little choice. Moreover, Black settlers, unlike White settlers, were generally forced to proceed without the support of established colonization programs.

We can see these contradictions in the writings of Daniel Hill about Blacks in early Canada. By leaving out the presence of Indigenous peoples, Hill positions Black settlers simply as noble in their fortitude in clearing the land, not as those who are displacing Indigenous peoples in the process. However, his work also demonstrates that while Blacks in Ontario attempted to claim land as Whites did, they were not included in settler programs but were forced to forage out on the land on their own, often clearing bush recently claimed from Indians only to be later

displaced by Whites. They were, in a sense, ambiguous settlers, tied to the colonization process not only through a desperate need to survive after slavery, but by Christian beliefs that land must be cultivated to do God's work and by their acceptance that the land would be theirs if they could claim it. Hill demonstrates these contradictions in the writing of John Little, a Black refugee from North Carolina, who settled in the Queen's Bush with his wife, in 1840:

> We had not a second suit of clothes apiece; we had one bedquilt and one blanket, and eighteen dollars in money. I bought two axes in Hamilton, one for myself and one for my wife; half a dozen plates, knives and forks, an iron pot, and a Dutch oven; that's all for tools and furniture. For provisions I bought fifty weight of flour and twenty pounds of pork. Then we marched right into the wilderness, where there were thousands of acres which the chain had never run around since Adam. At night we made a fire, and cut down a tree, and put up some slats like a wigwam. This was in February, when the snow was two feet deep … the settlers were to take as much land as they pleased when it should be surveyed, at various prices, according to quality. Mine was the highest price, as I had taken the best land. It was three dollars seventy-cents an acre. I took a hundred acres at first, then bought in fifty. (Little in Hill 1992, p. 52)

Careful reading of this text demonstrates what else is left out when Indigenous peoples' presence is ignored: we do not get to even consider what the range of relationships might have been between early Black settlers and Indigenous peoples. For example, while it is not clear whether Little and his wife are Black Indians, the fact that they build wigwams at night to survive, and that, after escaping from North Carolina, know how to survive in the Ontario bush in February, suggests that they have been close enough to Native people in Canada to have learned survival skills from them. However, the overprint of Christianization separates them from so-called savages, as they refer to the bush as "a wilderness … which the chain had never run around since Adam."

Hill's silence around Indigenous presence is not unique. Most accounts of early Black settlement in Canada ignore Indigenous peoples, and their relationship to Black settlers. Therefore, not only is the colonial context of settlement ignored, but also the possible anticolonial framework of Black–Native alliances of the time, which undoubtedly took place during the difficult times of Native dispossession and Black marginalization. Nowhere is the presence of Black Mi'kmaqs in the Maritimes, and Black Ojibways in central Ontario even mentioned in Black histories of early Canada. A question which therefore must be asked is the extent to which Black historians may need to revisit the past to examine whether their portrayal of Black people as settlers in early Canada truly reflects the reality of Black–Indigenous connections.

Although Black historians ignore Indigenous presence, it is a hallmark of the more critical Canadian Black writing that it at least obliquely references Canada as a settler nation by invoking a contemporary Indigenous presence. By comparison, in African-American writing the reality of the United States as a settler nation has been absolutely invisible. And we cannot deny the hegemonic influence of African-American writing on anti-oppression writing within Canada; nor can we deny the presence, within that body of theoretical work, of a significant erasure (even a conscious displacement) of Indigenous presence by Black presence.

6.5.2 Black Writing in the United States

When Toni Morrison stated, in an interview with Paul Gilroy, that "modern life begins with slavery,"[14] she articulated the parameters of a discourse whereby slavery is seen almost as the defining moment creating the (North) American experience. Indeed, in other work, Morrison has stated that the major characteristics of American national literature are all responses to a "dark, abiding, signing Africanist presence," and that the very existence of an American literature is rooted in this "unsettled and unsettling" population (Morrison 1993, pp. 5–6). In other words, its literature marks America as being fundamentally about White and Black people; all others are irrelevant to the dynamic.

I do not want to imply that Toni Morrison created such a trend; indeed, from the moment of emancipation, when "unowned/disowned" slaves[15] began a relentless struggle for a toehold in American society, it would have been inevitable that Black people would need to define themselves in relationship to White America – and therefore as central, in some ways, to what America *means*. But the problem has been that almost overwhelmingly, both the theoretical and literary writing coming out of Black America positions Black people as being at the core of racial oppression and marginality in the United States, in ways that exclude the possibility of an Indigenous presence fundamentally *mattering*. It is as if, in African-American writing, White settlers landed in empty lands, bringing with them the African slaves who would represent the *other* America to the world. This erases the reality of colonization, and that the agenda of settler nations across the Americas is still to destroy all remaining Indigenous peoples, if not directly through murder then through forced assimilation (Churchill 1995, p. 34). It also erases the generations of Native American slavery that preceded and accompanied Black slavery (Gallay 2002), and the powerful bonds that this created between African-Americans and Native Americans – the reality of generations of intermarriage so that, according to Jack Forbes, African-Americans, particularly in the south, should be viewed as actually being "Red–Black people" (Forbes 1988).

The existence of Indigenous peoples in White settler nation-states is *inevitably* central to the identity problems at the heart of these nation-states (Churchill 1992, pp. 17–29). In referencing the massive proliferation of images of Indianness which exist across North America, the late Vine Deloria Jr. wrote:

> [T]herein lies the meaning of the whites fantasy about Indians – the problem of the Indian image. Underneath all the conflicting images of the Indian one fundamental truth emerges: the white man knows that he is alien and he knows that North America is Indian – and he will never let go of the Indian image because he thinks that by some clever manipulation he can achieve an authenticity which can never be his. (Deloria 1980)

White images of Native people are so far embedded in the vernacular of America that even Toni Morrison, in *Playing in the Dark*, in referring to how Ernest Hemingway constantly creates subordinate Black characters who exist solely to provide a range of services for White men, speaks of these servile or sullen Black characters as

being "Tontos" to Hemingway's White "Lone Rangers" (1993, p. 82). Amazingly, Morrison does not register any awareness of the oddness of utilizing a terminology based on an already-existing relationship of colonialism to ascribe slavery and not colonialism as the defining moment shaping meaning in American literature.

It is equally important, however, to note that as White settlers in Canada consolidated their hold on the nation and maintained a century of Whites-only immigration, a powerful body of racist images harnessed by Black slavery was utilized to promote a sense of White racial superiority and ownership of the land among new European settlers.[16] Even today, in the western United States, where the predominant racialized other is Native American, a common racist term for them is "bush nigger."

We must therefore see this as a two-way process – that if White images of Indians are so deeply embedded into the vernacular of American (and Canadian) society that they are capable of evoking fundamentally demeaning relationships, a body of demeaning images of Black people originating in slavery has also become a potent tool of White identity formation as part of the colonial process, in Anglo North America. Nor should the centrality of *both* Native and Black imagery in White identity formation be a surprise to us. As Comanche activist Paul Smith has written, about the United States: "The essence of this country is bound up in Indian land and African slave labor" (Smith 1992, p. 23).

Unfortunately, in the United States, it is more common for American Indians and African-Americans to adapt mutually exclusive views. However, Native Americans are less than 1% of the population, and are still far more commonly written about than the ones shaping the discourse defining them. They remain far less visible within the mainstream than African-Americans. And at present, most African-American writing still decenters a Native American presence, and therefore contributes to their ongoing invisibility.

This is doubly problematic considering the hegemonic role that theoretical work by African-Americans has played internationally within anti-oppression writing. An entire generation of academics from other White settler nations, particularly Canada, have taken up African-American writing as "the canon" of antiracist thought, in ways that have contributed to displacing and silencing of local Indigenous activists. Cree Metis academic, Emma LaRocque, for example has described how in Canada, Indigenous writers attempting to call Canada on its genocidal history toward Native people were pathologized and accused of "blustering and bludgeoning" society, while writings by African-Americans describing their oppression were taken up willingly by White liberals (LaRocque 1993, p. vii).

It is, in fact, highly instructive to see how eagerly an African-American discourse which positions Blackness as the quintessential racial "other" has been taken up by "progressive" Whites from other settler nations and reproduced to further erase local Indigeneity and ongoing colonization. For example, the Australian film *Black Soldier Blues*[17] valorizes African-American soldiers stationed in Australia during World War II, and therefore positions White Australians as free of racism by virtue of their positive views of African-American soldiers. This can only be

accomplished, however, if the presence of Indigenous Australians is erased: White Australians are not settlers then, just "good" antiracist Whites. What gets erased here is not only Australian Indigeneity, but a truer picture of the complex racial dynamics in colonized Australia at a specific historical moment; this might have also taught us something about the complexity of racial dynamics in contemporary colonized America. Another example, from Brazil, where many Indigenous peoples are also of African heritage but are frequently positioned within the mainstream as being "really" Black (Warren 2001), concerns the manner in which an African-American discourse of antiracism is being imported by White progressives to eradicate racism against "Black" people; in the process erasing them as Native people.[18]

A minority vein of Black writing in the United States has attempted to resurrect the reality of powerful and sustaining relations between Black and Native peoples under colonization and slavery. The first efforts came from bell hooks (1992), who has emphasized not only the shared resistance but the shared value systems of Africans and Native Americans. Hooks also speaks of the manner in which many Black people, as they left the south, willfully silenced themselves about their Native ancestry – sometimes because of the racism they faced as Black people, and sometimes because of pressure from other Black people who viewed those who identified with Native Americans as being race traitors.[19] Meanwhile, Carol Boyce Davies has utilized Native American theoretical models to affirm and strengthen Afro-Caribbean and African modes of thought through the writing of Laguna Pueblo writer Leslie Marmon Silko. She also references how Indigenous peoples "made possible the emergence of African-Americans" (Davies 1994, pp. 9, 162). For hooks and Davies, as well as novelists such as Alice Walker, Indigenous thought and spiritual frameworks are a means to unify the fragments of an African heritage torn apart by slavery and diaspora. Indeed, there are signs that Toni Morrison is also moving in this direction, in her most recent book, which references Native American as well as African presences in early America.[20]

In examining this more recent trend in African American writing, it seems clear that Black peoples of Native heritage have suffered a double loss – not only the suppression of their knowledge of their North American or Caribbean Indigeneity, but the shattering of an African Indigeneity that can neither be affirmed as whole nor entirely relinquished. The powerful yearning for reconnection with ancestral roots felt by many diasporic Black peoples, and the strong affinities between North American Indigenous knowledge and spirituality and African Indigenous knowledge and spirituality suggests that building connections between Black and Indigenous communities, in the Americas and Canada may be a crucial source of empowerment for Black people. However, for the most part, when Indigeneity is raised, among Black activists and writers, overwhelmingly it is in a context which takes colonialism and genocide to be a tragedy of the past – so that ongoing colonialism in the present is taken-for-granted as normative, inevitable, and, indeed, invisible. It is an important step for African-Americans to begin to celebrate their Native roots. The next step, however, is for Black people

to begin to interrogate how "stolen people on stolen land" can situate themselves in relation to today's existing Native peoples who are *still* struggling to reclaim stolen lands.

6.6 Racial Classification and Its Effect on Indigenous–Black Relations

The failure of many African-American writers to critically interrogate their positioning when they assert the primacy of slavery over Indigenous genocide may be connected to the manner in which some Native American groups are powerfully threatened by the notion of a Black Indigenous presence. However, the divisions of colonialism and racism are powerful enough to undermine most attempts by individuals from both sides to critically embrace Black Indigeneity. As Eva Marie Garroutte, in her study of Native American identity, has noted, the differences in racial categorizing (and the corresponding racial identity formation) for Black people and Native Americans has been huge. Racial classification of Blacks has hinged on the notion of hypodescent – that "one drop" of Black "blood" constitutes a Black identity. In some cases, up until the 1970s, anybody with more than one-thirty-second parts "Negro blood" was legally classified as Black. Native Americans, on the other hand, are required, both by law and by public opinion, to establish rather high blood quanta for their claims to a distinct racial identity to be accepted as meaningful. Quoting Jack Forbes, Eva Marie Garroutte notes that "modern Americans are always finding Blacks and losing Indians" (Garroutte 2003, pp. 45–48). This destructive manner of measuring Native American identity according to degrees of Indian blood, with an established cut-off point where Native Americans will cease to be recognized as Indians, has been internalized by many Native Americans and has been highly detrimental to their ability to *see* Black Indians as Indians. It has also been central to the struggles within the five tribes – the Cherokees, Creeks, Choctaws, Chickasaws, and Seminoles – who formerly held African slaves (and who also had Black allies, in the case of the Seminoles), about expelling those Black freedmen citizens who cannot prove their degree of Indian blood. This, however, is taking place on top of another legacy – the pervasiveness of anti-Black racism within American society and its reproduction in many southern Native communities.

The reality is that in both the past and the present, in Canada and the United States, Black people and Native people have been subjected to different forms of racism and racial categorization by Europeans and their descendants, in the interests of exploiting both peoples. This is most obvious with racial classification in the United States, but the peculiarities of Canada's "Whites only" immigration system, its pervasive anti-Black racism, its Indian Act, and its constant erasure of Black presence may wreak havoc on Black–Native relations in different ways in the future.

6.7 Where Are the Struggles Today and What Are the Implications?

For the increasing numbers of people in Canada who are not only from historic Black Mi'kmaq or Black Ojibway communities but are the product of contemporary intermarriage between Caribbean or African peoples and Native people in Canada, as well as numerous Black people of Caribs or Taino descent from the Caribbean, relations between Black and Aboriginal peoples are complex, but not inherently contradictory. The strength of the historic connections between Black and Native people has been weakened by exclusionary racial classification, by anti-Black racism among Native people and a profound ignorance on the part of many contemporary Black people about Indigenous presence, nevertheless, it appears that there will be growing movements of Black–Native people across both Canada and the United States to reclaim Indigeneity – not only to lost African roots but to contemporary Native realities in Canada.

Black people without known Indigenous heritage, however, exist in a profoundly contradictory relationship to Indigenous peoples. Despite both groups having distinct histories of cultural genocide, and sharing present marginality, Black peoples at present have little option but to struggle for power as settlers in Canada. This overwhelmingly speaks of a failure among Indigenous leadership to provide an alternative vision for those racialized peoples who may have little real allegiance to the Canadian settler state but have no option for their survival but to fight for increasing power within it.

There is also the reality that Black peoples have been profoundly changed through processes of struggle for racial empowerment. Throughout days of slavery, Africans and Indigenous people were enslaved together on plantations in the United States as well as in various parts of Latin America and the Caribbean. Throughout this history there have been alliances between groups and the formation of community as a form of resistance.[21] The crucial difference was that these alliances took place within strong and viable Indigenous cultures whose vitality had not been attacked and usurped through physical extermination and cultural genocide.

In "Canada," Indigenous communities such as the *Rotinosoni* adopted runaways into their clans and their communities. There was an Underground Railway not generally taught about in schools, run by *Rotinosoni*, where renowned Tuscarora guides risked their lives at a time when Indigenous people could have been enslaved, killed, or dispossessed of their land for helping runaways. Once "adopted in" runaways became *Rotinosoni*. They became Bear, Wolf, or Turtle clan members, etc. Elders describe processes where the Clan Mothers would decide which clans needed more people and they assigned runaways to the neediest. So Africans, both in Canada and the United States, did not live as Whites or even as African settlers in these communities. They lived under the laws and the social dictates of the Indigenous nations into which they were adopted.

The reasons as to why Blacks and Indigenous people got along so well in this early phase of colonial expansion had to do with cultural similarities. Both peoples

had a spiritual worldview, land-informed practices, and were held together by a kinship structures which created relationships that allocated everyone a role in the community. These commonalities helped Africans and Native Americans to maintain good relations but, of course, there was also a common cause: the colonial project threatened the very existence of both Black and Indigenous peoples. With minor exceptions, African runaways were not enslaved in Indigenous communities located in what we now know as Canada. Indigenous communities looked to African newcomers as people who could inject new life, new blood, and new ideas into nations threatened with extinction by European disease and genocidal policies. Africans who spoke the languages of the settlers and knew their battle tactics were an asset to many communities defending themselves against or negotiating European aggression.

Today, at the risk of generalizing, the struggle for an equitable distribution of resources within or among nation-states that form a part of antiracist and diasporic struggles of Black peoples can be critiqued from Indigenist points of view for internalizing colonial concepts of how peoples relate to land, resources, and wealth. There is no indigenous framework around which such struggles are carried out.

Diasporic Black struggles, with some exceptions, do not tend to lament the loss of Indigeneity and the trauma of being ripped away from the land that defines their very identities. From Indigenous perspectives, the true horror of slavery was that it has created generations of "de-culturalized" Africans, denied knowledge of language, clan, family, and land base, denied even knowledge of who their nations are. Moreover, while many African diasporic peoples took up Christianity as a theology of liberation and "racial uplift"; there are tenets of Christianity that are profoundly anti-Indigenous, which equate Indigeneity (both North American and African) with savagery. Whether or not Christianity is responsible, to put it bluntly, Black activists in the Americas have internalized colonial, imperial, and Eurocentric values at the same time that they decry them. What many Black struggles tend to be centered around is how the legacy of racism and slavery rationalizes their inequality and hampers their ability to compete for power, wealth, and opportunities in colonial, settler states or the global economy.

Even socialist-oriented movements are not framed around, nor are they inclusive of, Indigenous struggles, even when integrating an antiracist framework. Socialist discourse maintains a perspective on spirituality that ranges from antagonism to ridicule. Identification with a "national" identity is seen as some sort of proto-fascism. Indigenous economics have never been well understood in the scholarly work of self-identified socialists or Marxists. John Mohawk (Seneca) illustrates how Indigenous activists and academics regard these philosophies:

> Let's say you have three people approach a tree. One's a socialist materialist, one's a capitalist materialist and one's a traditional native person. The capitalist materialist will explain to you that he has to cut the tree down because this is the best interest not only of himself but also of society; that it is a kind of destiny; that by cutting the tree down he will rationally distribute the materials from the tree and he'll do the most good for the people. A socialist person approaching the tree will also tell you to cut the tree down, because after cutting the tree down you can distribute it equally to everybody and it's going to do

> the most good for the world that way. But a native person looking at the tree will say that the tree, in its unharmed, original form, has a value that's greater than anything the others are proposing. (Mohawk 2006, p. 26)

While this is an oversimplification, because we know that environmental concerns sometimes impact materialism and that Indigenous people sometimes cut trees down (albeit for the purpose of subsisting), Mohawk's point is well taken. Indigenous academics and activists regard both capitalism and socialism as Eurocentric materialist ideologies. The majority of diasporic Black struggles are equally materialist. The Civil Rights movement in the United States focused on "equal rights and opportunities." Today the ultimate vision driving Black struggles in Canada (with some notable exceptions) is much the same: Black people want equity within the laws, economy, and institutions of the colonial settler state.

However, in looking at recent Native activism, we can see another role that racialized activists, including Black people, are beginning to take. The proximity of Six Nations and Tyendinaga to the urban centers of Toronto, Hamilton, and Montreal have enabled racialized activists to provide material and moral support to these besieged communities to a level not previously experienced in the last century and a half of the Indigenous movement on Turtle Island. In the process these groups and individuals are beginning to explore the implications of Indigenism to both Indigenous and non-Indigenous struggles. However, the situation on the ground changes rapidly and we have witnessed significant evolution of solidarity and activism work since March 2006, when members of the Six Nations of the Grand River community began a land reclamation near Caledonia, Ontario.[22] Many groups across Canada have mobilized to lend support to this struggle. This support consists of fund-raising efforts, providing food and supplies as well as working at the camp doing a variety of jobs that include cooking, woodcutting, and taking security shifts.

At Kanenhstaton there is a discourse that seeks to prove ownership of the Haldimand Tract under Canadian law. In her July 1, 2006 *Update from Grand River* Confederacy spokesperson Hazel Hill wrote: "The Six Nations people have a legitimate claim, and will continue on a peaceful path to bring awareness to the world of how corrupt the government has been with respect to the sale of lands to which they hold no title, all along the Grand River. As I've stated before, Canada is guilty of the biggest white collar crime in the history of their people." On November 16, 2006, Hill recounts what happened in a negotiation session: "Clearly, the Six Nations presented a full and complete history not only of how the Crown had frauded our lands away, but also how they had usurped the authority of our Traditional Government, imposed their laws on our people which is a violation of the ancient agreements between us, but far more concerning, a Direct Violation Against Creation." [sic]

However, in a parallel discourse, the Clan Mothers, Elders, and Confederacy supporters constantly remind us that the seizure of this land and the negotiations they have entered into with the province and the federal agencies are not about contesting Eurocentric concepts of ownership. The Confederacy and its supporters

have made a decision that is perfectly legal under Rotinoshoni Law to prevent further development of the land in order to protect it for generations to come, whether those generations are Onkwehonwe (Indigenous) or not. Hazel Hill's July 12, 2006, update speaks of this.

> It is an issue of Sovereignty that runs far deeper than a simple issue of a land claim, and one that reaches deep into the hearts and souls of our people. It is the very essence of who we are, and the strength that comes from believing in the Kaienerekowah,[23] and upholding our responsibilities to our Great Law. We would be negligent if we did nothing to ensure that our future generations didn't have the same strong foundation that our ancestors laid out for us.

What many non-Indigenous supporters initially assumed was a struggle for a piece of the colonial pie or even a recognition of territorial boundaries negotiated with the federal government is now coming to be understood as a call to everyone on Turtle Island to shift their ideological frameworks, values systems, and conceptual understandings of how humans relate to land and the resources within it. As Hill's September 22, 2006 update states: "We dare to uphold our obligation and responsibility that was given to us not only for our own good, but also for the good of all of Creation, including all of the other races of the world."

This is the issue that Indigenous and non-Indigenous activists (many of them Black) have put their lives on the line to defend. Individual as well as organizational (community support) is evident. For example, Palestine House, the Coalition Against Israeli Apartheid, and No One is Illegal are organizations comprised primarily or entirely of racialized people that have raised funds, worked on the site, and transported supplies to Kanenhstaton. On May 17, 2006, the Canadian Islamic Congress issued a media statement entitled "Islamic Congress Supports Six Nations Land Reclamation." The following excerpt illustrates one aspect of the connections that are starting to be recognized:

> Many of Canada's 750,000 Muslims have strong emotional ties to this situation, in which aboriginal peoples are systematically being denied their birthright. Palestinians are being robbed of their native land in similar ways by the Israeli occupying power that denies them justice through unilateral expropriations and by refusing to negotiate in good faith with their elected representatives.

The Black Action Defense Committee's (BADC) office in Toronto proudly flies the Hiawatha Flag, the banner of the Haundenosaunee. BADC has developed programming such as Freedom Cipher Youth that enables urban racialized youth to interact and collaborate with Six Nations youth around arts and cultural activities. On several occasions over 2007/08 BADC brought urban youth from Toronto to cultural events on Six Nations territory. Six Nations youth were hosted at a BADC event in June 2007 to share their experiences. Chris Harris, a youth programmer at BADC, has spoken publicly on several occasions about his organizations work at introducing Black and other urban youth to Indigenous solidarity activities. Six Nations hip-hop activist Shiloh and youth involved with Freedom Cipher spoke on a June 30, 2007, CKLN radio show about the need for Black–Indigenous solidarity and the use of hip-hop to educate youth about anticolonial resistance. Former CKLN radio personality Norman Otis Richmond, a veteran Black community

activist, spoke out several times on his radio program about the need for the Black community to support Indigenous struggles. Richmond also provided space for invited guests from Indigenous communities or Black activists who worked in solidarity with Indigenous struggles to discuss topical issues on his program.

Another development worth mentioning has been the fall 2006 formation of a Toronto chapter of INCITE[24] comprised of Black and Indigenous women devoted to exploring relationships between the two communities on Turtle Island. Up to now their discussions have been internal but it will be interesting to see how the group evolves and how its activism will be impacted.

At an April 2007 gathering of the Coalition in Support of Indigenous Sovereignty, activists representing the Coalition against Israeli Apartheid, the Ontario Coalition Against Poverty, No One is Illegal as well as unaffiliated activists, from a variety of ethno-cultural backgrounds began a process of "decolonizing our mindsets" and looking seriously at what it means to be an ally to Indigenous struggles, which means being an ally to the land. This work took place under the tutelage of an Indigenous caucus, also admittedly in a process of internal decolonization. All parties have committed to a long-term process aimed at exploring the implications of Indigenous solidarity work as well as the impact of Indigenism on various settler struggles. This and future gatherings will discuss the question of expectations we have of each other and how we hold each other accountable.

One of the questions that emerge from the work described above must be posited to Indigenous peoples: Where do racialized settlers fit in the vision of Indigenous sovereignty? For the purposes of this chapter we need to ask where Black people fit into the vision.

This is a huge question. If Indigenous sovereigntists expect Black community support of nation-to-nation negotiation processes regarding land, resources, and reparations, we have to recognize how Blacks become completely disempowered in that process. Through such a process, Indigenous nations inherently (and begrudgingly) acknowledge Canada's nationhood. But Black people have no power or even validity in the Canadian nation state.

This leaves Blacks who do not identify or are not accepted in whole or part as Indigenous North Americans in a kind of limbo, waiting for a colonial state and Indigenous nations to "work out" a relationship while they continue living in a land that denies their contribution to "nation building," whether that contribution was forced, coerced, or willful. Worth remembering here is the fact that many Blacks historically contributed to sustaining the Indigenous communities such as the Rotinoshoni that helped them achieve freedom from slavery.

Settlers working in solidarity with Indigenous struggles have pointed out that they have a particular responsibility as "Canadians." As legal citizens or residents of Canada they must hold the state accountable to recognizing sovereignty and negotiating in good faith with the true leadership of Indigenous communities. Though this might be a perfectly moral stand, the reality is that Blacks, and other racialized settlers combined, do not have the political clout to make a significant impact in this regard. Furthermore, on the face of it, they

cannot be sure they will survive such a political stand, particularly when one takes into account the racism that Indigenous communities have internalized as a result of colonization.

This challenges grassroots Indigenous leadership to develop a vision of sovereignty and self-government that addresses the disempowered and dispossessed from other parts of the world who were forced and/or coerced into being here on Turtle Island (a global phenomenon in which Canada shares culpability). How much support should be expected from communities when there are glaring examples in our midst, such as the expulsion of Black Cherokees in Oklahoma, that there is no guarantee that Black Indians and Black people who lend their support to Indigenous communities will have a place in or beside them?

Further questions emerge regarding the framework of the Two Row Wampum, often referred to as the agreement that sets out how settlers and Indigenous people are supposed to coexist on Turtle Island. The wampum belt depicts two parallel rows of lavender beads running the belt's length. Elders tell us this symbolizes that White settlers and Indigenous people agreed to sail in their canoes or boats down the waterway respecting and not interfering with each others' progress nor interfering with each others' communities (another "treaty" not kept). The notion that Indigenous nations can coexist with the Canadian state, whose ideology, values, and institutions lead to the poisoning of the air, water, and land that we all depend on; that forms the basis of our identities and cultures, is increasingly coming into question.

Indigenous Elders and oral historians at Six Nations and elsewhere are appealing to settlers to modify their values systems, worldviews, and practices to enable the original vision of the Two Row; to understand that the mutual respect agreed to in the Two Row requires settlers to reimagine their analytical frameworks, belief systems, and behaviors.

Having posed these challenges it is important to recall that the fundamental framework for how Indigenous peoples relate to non-Indigenous peoples is laid out in our histories, stories, and spiritual tenets, as we saw earlier in this essay. Whatever emerges from relationship-building between Black and Indigenous communities should take place within this framework as opposed to competitive materialistic ones, which to date have not served either people.

We also want to acknowledge that Indigenous communities are consumed with simply trying to stay alive, waging struggles that must address youth suicides, violence against women, the rapid spread of HIV/AIDS, housing shortages, contaminated drinking water, mining and deforestation on their lands, the loss of language and ceremonial knowledge, etc. Thus, there is limited capacity to drop these struggles to "develop a vision" on how racialized settlers and Indigenous people can coexist on Turtle Island. Black communities are also waging significant struggles with life-and-death implications. The colonial system benefits greatly from the fact that our communities are in a perpetual state of crisis. But do we not owe it to the coming generations to find a way of supporting each other and the land that sustains us all?

Notes

1. While the myriad complexities of Black–Native identities and alliances in the Caribbean, as well as parts of Central and South America have taken a very different turn from the polarized and contradictory situation in some regions of the United States, the hegemony of the United States not only in influencing how Black–Native relations are perceived, but also in shaping how "race" is understood in Canada has required us to focus primarily on the American context in order to begin to delineate the Canadian situation at all.
2. Indigenous peoples globally have experienced *and continue to experience* the brutality of colonization, land theft, and being targeted for extermination. In emphasizing historic Indigenous American genocide, we do not wish to detract from a recognition of ongoing Indigenous holocaust globally, only to highlight the historic scale of depopulation in the Americas and the global imperialist system that the sack of Indigenous America helped to create.
3. Between 1493 and 1800, 85% of the world's supply of silver, and 70% of the world's supply of gold came from the Americas. Without this gold and silver, the mercantile system would not have been able to expand the way it did. Gold and silver were the primary currencies; with the flood of gold and silver into Europe a huge global expansion in commercial transactions became possible (Weaver 2002, p. 21).
4. Of approximately 270,000 members, 8,700 voted; of those, 76.6% voted to amend the tribal constitution to limit citizenship to those tribal members whose "Indian" blood quantum could be proven (BBC News, March 7, 2007).
5. The list of descendants stems from the Dawes Commission, established by Congress more than 100 years ago. It created what are known as the final rolls, establishing different categories including "blood" Cherokee, Cherokee freedman (of African descent), Cherokee by intermarriage, and Delaware Cherokee (BBC News, March 7, 2007).
6. In communities that are currently struggling for federal recognition as tribes, such as the Mowa Choctaws of Alabama, the Golden Hill Paugussetts of Connecticut, and the Ramapough Mountain Indians of New Jersey, a significant problem they face with the Bureau of Indian Affairs' Branch of Acknowledgement and Research (BAR) is that too much "black blood" is seen as a contaminant for Indian authenticity and can result in a failure to be federally recognized, while "white blood" is seen as more neutral and less problematic (Cramer 2005, p. 60).
7. From 1869 to 1985, women registered as Indian were designated non-Indian if they married non-Indians, as were their children. In 1985, women who lost their status had it reinstated; in the process, a new system of "half-status" was implemented to provide Indian status for their children. Those with half-status who marry non-Indians will have children designated as non-Indians. Meanwhile, those designated "half-breeds" in western Canada during the treaty process, and those who were left out of the treaty process in eastern Canada were classified as non-Indian; they were not recognized in law as Native peoples until 1982. However, at this time they were recognized only as "Aboriginal", and the treaty rights accruing to their status Indian relations are denied to them.
8. M. Nourbese Philip's critique of multiculturalism encapsulates the pain manifested by racialized peoples for the false sense of equality it evokes, by emphasizing cultural equality and belying the deeply embedded racism within Canada (Philip 1992, pp. 181–186). However, Himani Bannerji takes the more complex role of challenging the liberal framework of equality talk in general that is enabled by the multiculturalism policy. She notes above all the role that multiculturalism plays in enabling Canada to maintain the facade of being a liberal democracy while maintaining itself as a colonialist nation for Indigenous peoples (Bannerji 2000, pp. 8–11).
9. As Rinaldo Walcott notes, there has been a deliberate and ongoing erasure of Black historical presence in Canada, accomplished through the constant razing of old Black settlements and the changing of their names, coupled with the linking of contemporary Blackness solely to Toronto, to Somali youth, and illegal immigration, or to "Jamaicanness" and crime. The result is that Blackness in Canada is situated on a continuum that runs from the invisible to the hypervisible (Walcott 1997, pp. 36–37, 39, 118).

10. It is important to recognize that their lack of knowledge is part of deliberate policy. In those areas of Canada where there are large numbers of Indigenous people, ongoing segregation maintains a distance between Native people and the Canadian public. Meanwhile, Canadian schools continue to be places where a colonialist mind-set is cultivated, and the media reflects colonialist biases. In such a context, for non-Natives to have knowledge of Native peoples is highly unusual.
11. Paraphrased by Zainab Amadahy from a variety of oral teachings.
12. Aboriginal concepts of "life" are more inclusive than Eurocentric definitions and are based in a spiritual ideology that provides a conceptual framework for understanding and interpreting the world.
13. After over a century of sporadic wars with the English, the combined onslaught of being hunted for their scalps by bounty hunters, and burned out of their villages by British soldiers decimated Mi'kmaq populations in the years immediately prior to the Loyalist settlement. Furthermore, as loyalists took their lands, no reserves were set aside for them for almost a century. Homeless and destitute, Mi'kmaq misery was so extreme that in New Brunswick in the early 1800s it is reported that some parishes auctioned Mi'kmaq paupers off to those willing to provide for their care (Twohig 1996, p. 338). In the 1830s, cholera devastated a starving population, and by the 1850s, tuberculosis reached epidemic proportions. Among settlers, the generalized belief was the Mi'kmaq population was going to go extinct (indeed, the population finally stabilized at just under 1,600 from 20,000 a century earlier, and an estimated 300,000 at time of contact (Paul 2000, p. 184).
14. Gilroy (1993, p. 221).
15. Williams (1991, p. 21).
16. Minstrel shows, with Whites in blackface, were performed regularly across Eastern and Central Canada from the 1840s in the East and the turn of the century in Western Canada (Le Camp 2005, 350–361).
17. Written and produced by Veronica Fury and Nicole McCuig.
18. Personal communication with Jonathan Warren, August 2007, at "Who is an Indian" conference, Montreal.
19. One reality which hooks perhaps overlooks is that one's Indigenous identity and culture inevitably transforms when separated from the land. Indigenous identity is difficult to maintain when the relationships with other life-forms on the land are lost. It is perhaps inevitable that Black Indians would cease to identify as Indian as their connections to land and community were ruptured.
20. Morrison (2008). *A Mercy*. Alfred A. Knopf.
21. Since the beginning of European arrival there are historical accounts of the Algonquin Confederacy, the Natchez, and other nations raiding colonial towns to free African slaves. The Seminoles of Florida raided the plantations of neighboring states in Georgia and Alabama, freeing slaves and bringing them home to their communities. Thousands of runaways found homes with the Mi'kmaq, the Wampanoag, and other nations, and then fought side by side with their adopted brothers and sisters to ward off European incursion. Runaways formed maroon colonies in places like Jamaica and Florida. In Brazil these maroon colonies were called *quilombos*, the most famous of which is Palmares, where generations of Africans, Indigenous, and mixed-race peoples lived side by side, grew crops, raised their children and fought off several Portuguese military campaigns aimed at wiping them out.
22. This tract of land is a small portion of what was granted under the Haldimand Deed in 1784. In early 2006 the US-based Henco Corporation began construction on the territory for the purpose of building a residential complex. Henco proceeded to remove the topsoil, fill in the creek flowing through the property, and construct homes. No traditional or elected leader at Six Nations gave permission for this land to be sold or developed. In addition, this territory is currently included in an unresolved land claim and under federal law cannot be sold, leased, or developed. The case is in abeyance, as are many land claims.

    Consequently, after many attempts through letters and phone calls to persuade local and federal authorities to halt construction, the Six Nations community peacefully reclaimed the site on February 28, 2006. Rather then deal with the issue politically, the government decided to

move in with police and on April 20, 2006 the OPP attacked the camp, armed with tasers, pepper spray, and automatic weapons. Some members of the community were injured, 17 were arrested, and over 50 are facing criminal charges. Astonishingly, the community was able to peacefully reestablish the camp. They subsequently blocked all roads leading into the tract of land in an act of self-defense.

Negotiations are currently underway between members of the Six Nations Confederacy (traditional government) and the federal and provincial governments. All roadblocks were removed in May 2006 as a show of good faith by the community of Six Nations. Meanwhile, the site has been renamed Kanenhstaton (the Protected Place) and it continues to be peacefully occupied by the Six Nations community.

23. Great Law of Peace.
24. INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence is a US activist organization of radical feminists of color advancing a movement to end violence against women of color and their communities through direct action, critical dialogue and grassroots organizing (http://www.incite-national.org/about/index.html).

References

Amnesty International. *Stolen Sisters: A Human Rights Response to Discrimination and Violence Against Indigenous Women in Canada*. London, UK: International Secretariat, October, 2004.

Bannerji, H. (2000). "Introduction" in *The Dark Side of the Nation: Essays on Multiculturalism, Nationalism and Gender*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.

Bobiwash, R. (2001). *The Fourth World: Site of Struggle and Resistance in the Fight Against Global Capital*. Statement to the World Social Forum, Porto Allegre, Brazil.

Chang, D. (2006). "Where Will the Nation Be at Home? Race, Nationalisms, and Emigration Movements in the Creek Nation" in T. Miles and S.P. Holland (Eds.), *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds: The African Diaspora in Indian Country* (pp. 80–99). Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Churchill, W. (1992). *Fantasies of the Master Race: Literature, Cinema, and the Colonization of American Indians*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Churchill, W. (1995). *Since Predator Came: Notes from the Struggle for American Indian Liberation*. Littleton, CO: Aigis Press.

Collins, R. (2006). "Katimih o Sa Chata Kiyou/Why Am I Not Choctaw?" Race in the Lived Experiences of Two Black Choctaw Mixed Bloods in T. Miles and S.P. Holland (Eds.), *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds: The African Diaspora in Indian Country* (pp. 260–272). Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Collins, R. (2007). "On the Black Part of Being Indian: Evidence from Choctaw Life Histories" at the panel *What Is This "Black" in Studies of American Indian Culture?* Native American Studies Conference, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, May 3–5.

Cramer, R. (2005). *Cash, Colour and Colonialism: The Politics of Tribal Acknowledgement*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Davies, C. B. (1994). *Black Women, Writing and Identity: Migrations of the Subject*. London/New York: Routledge.

Deloria, V., Jr. (1980). "Forward: American Fantasy" in G. Bataille and C. Silet (Eds.). *The Pretend Indians: Images of Native Americans in the Movies* (p. xiv). Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.

Forbes, J. (1988). *Black Africans and Native Americas: Color, Race and Caste in the Evolution of Red-Black Peoples*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Gallay, A. (2002). *The Indian Slave Trade: The Rise of the English Empire in the American South 1670–1717*. New Haven, CT/London: Yale University Press.

Garroutte, E. (2003). *Real Indians: Identity and the Survival of Native America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hill, D. (1992). *The Freedom Seekers: Blacks in Early Canada*. Toronto: Stoddard.

hooks, B. (1992). *Black Looks: Race and Representation*. Toronto: Between the Lines Press.

Klopotek, B. (2007). "Of Shadows and Doubts: Indians and Blacks and the Legacy of Jim Crow". Presentation at panel *What Is This "Black" in Studies of American Indian Culture?* Native American Studies Conference, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma, May 3–5.

Krauthamer, B. (2006) "In Their 'Native Country': Freed People's Understandings of Culture and Citizenship in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations" in T. Miles and S. Holland (Eds.) *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds: The African Diaspora in Indian Country* (pp. 100–120). Durham/London: Duke University Press.

LaRocque, E. (1993). "Preface – or 'Here Are Our Voices – Who Will Hear?' " in J. Perreault and S. Vance (Eds.), *Writing the Circle: Native Women of Western Canada* (pp. xv–xxx). Edmonton: NeWest Publishers.

Lawrence, B. and E. Dua. (2005). "Decolonizing Anti-Racism." *Social Justice: A Journal of Crime, Conflict and World Order*, 32(4), 120–143.

Le Camp, L. (2005). *Racial Considerations of Minstrel Shows and Related Images in Canada*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation (pp. 350–361). Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/University of Toronto.

Maaka, R. and Fleras, A (2005). *The Politics of Indigeneity: Challenging the State in Canada and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Mensah, J. (2002). *Black Canadians: History, Experiences, Social Conditions*. Halifax: Fernwood.

Micco, M. (2006). " 'Blood and Money': The Case of Seminole Freedmen and Seminole Indians in Oklahoma" in T. Miles and S. Holland (Eds.), *Crossing Waters, Crossing Worlds: The African Diaspora in Indian Country* (pp. 121–144). Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Mohawk, J. (2006). "Subsistence and Materialism" in V. Tauli-Corpuz and J. Mander (Eds.), *Paradigm Wars: Indigenous Peoples' Resistance to Globalization*. Los Angeles, CA: Sierra Club Books and University of California Press.

Morrison, T. (1993). *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. New York: Vintage Books.

Paul, D. (2000). *We Were Not the Savages: A Mi'kmaq Perspective on the Collision Between European and Native American Civilizations*. Halifax: Fernwood Press.

Philip, M. N. (1992). *Frontiers: Essays and Writings on Racism and Culture*. Toronto: Mercury Press.

Razack, S. (2002). *Race, Space and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*. Toronto: Between the Lines.

Razack, S. (2004). *Dark Threats and White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping, and the New Imperialism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Saunt, C. (2005). *Black, White, and Indian: Race and the Unmaking of an American Family*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Smith, A. (2005). *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: Zed Books and University of Otago Press.

Smith, P. (1992). "Lost in America." *Border/Lines* 23(Winter), 17–18.

St. Germain, J. (2002). *Indian Treaty-Making Policy in the United States and Canada, 1867–1877*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Todorov, T. (1984). *The Conquest of America: the Question of the Other*. Translated by Richard Howard. New York: Harper & Row.

Twohig P. (1996). "Colonial Care: Medical Attendance Among the Micmac in Nova Scotia." *Canadian Journal of Medical Health*, 13, 333–353

Walcott, R. (1997). *Black Like Who? Writing/Black/Canada*. Toronto: Insomniac Press.

Weaver, F. (2002). *Latin America and the World Economy: Mercantile Colonialism to Global Capitalism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Williams, P. (1991). *The Alchemy of Race and Rights: Diary of a Law Professor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.